

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 06, 2018
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS meeting on 11/20/2018

Summary of Discussion

Dr. Andrew Hsu, Provost of the University of Toledo
Dr. Rick Francis, Research and Sponsored Programs
Dr. Terry Bigioni, Academic Programs Committee Report

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

President Rouillard called the meeting to order; Executive Secretary, Mark Templin called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2018--2019 Senators:

Present: Andreana, Bailey, Bigioni, Bouillon, Brakel, Chattopadhyay, Compora, Dinnebeil, Edgington, Egan (proxy for K. Keith), Emonds, Ferris, Frank, Gibbons, Gibbs, Gilchrist, Gray, Hammersley, Hefzy, Jaume, Jayatissa, Kistner, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lundquist, Menezes, Modyanov, Molitor, Monsos, Nigem (proxy for S. Ariss), Ortiz, Relue, Rouillard, Said, Sheldon, Steven, Stepkowski, Taylor, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Tucker-Gail, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, Weldy, Woolford, Zhu

Excused absence: Duggan, Giovannucci, Hall, Kovach, Krantz, Maloney, Murphy, Niamat, Ohlinger, Reeves, Tiwari

Unexcused: Ariss, Heberle, Longsdorf, Oberlander, Park, Schlageter, Schroeder, Tucker-Gail

II. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting held on October 23, 2018.

President Rouillard: Good afternoon on this election-day. The first order of business on the agenda is approval of the Minutes for October 23rd. The draft Minutes were distributed to you for review. Is there a *second* to approve these Minutes?

Senator Hammersley: *So moved.*

President Rouillard: Is there any discussion or correction? All those in favor of approving the Minutes from October 23, please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Thank you.

Executive Committee Report: I would like to bring you up-to-date on some of the work of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. At our last FS meeting, Senators Lundquist and Dowd asked specifically about the 26% tax on tech and lab fees and where this money was going. When I met with Dr. Gaber on Oct. 25, I asked her this question and she promised to find out.

At our October FSEC 26 meeting VP Denise Bartell and Margie Traband met with us to talk about a Service Learning Designation and whether that qualification would be reviewed by a FS committee or according to the approval process of WAC courses. The group favored using the WAC approval process for now. Senator Tony Edgington also spoke with us regarding registration issues for some online composition courses in English.

Regarding the dean surveys, the current FS constitution charges us: "To facilitate bi-annual formative assessments of the provost, vice provost(s), and deans to ensure accountability and improve administrative performance." That instrument was distributed to you online. As you will recall, last year President

Thompson charged two separated ad hoc committees with work on the deans survey: At the October 10, 2017 FS meeting, the ad hoc committee, chaired by Mary Humphrys and Kristen Keith, was charged to “Assess the deans’ evaluation process and make recommendations as a committee that will be placed on the floor of Senate this fall for discussion.” I chaired an ad hoc committee charged with revising the survey instrument. We forwarded our revised instrument to deans and the provost asking for their comments between April 6 and April 20. We then shared it with the other ad hoc committee at the end of April 2018. On May 15, we met jointly and received a list of recommendations. You will see incorporation of those comments later today. FSEC considered these issues during several meetings over the summer and this semester. We bring to you today our recommended instrument and procedures which were distributed to you via email yesterday.

Regarding the Constitution, Secretary Mark Templin has scheduled a meeting with the Constitution and Rules committee to consider items from the discussion of our first reading. We have a meeting scheduled for Nov. 14 with Mr. Steve Cavanaugh Chair of the Trustee and Governance Committee to look at the first draft revision.

Are there any additions or comments from anybody on the Executive Committee? Okay, that being the case then we will move on to the next agenda item, which is a report from Provost Hsu. Thank you for being here today.

Provost Hsu: Thank you, President Rouillard. There are a couple of things I want to discuss with you. Most of these we need your help with again. Obviously, without faculty help the Provost’s Office can’t really do anything. Spring enrollment is now open for all students. If you look at the tracker, we have a tracker that compares where we are this year compared to last year and we are behind. We are seriously concerned because if we don’t get our students enrolled early, if they come back after January 1st and they find out that they have a financial hold or they have a hold because of academic performance then that will be a little too late and they may have to drop out for a full semester, and that would not be good. If you would work with your department to advice students to register as early as possible, we appreciate that effort.

Some good news. I want to give a shout-out to our Law School. Our Law School had not doing very well in previous years. We all know this is a national trend. Law schools’ enrollment have been down nationally for a number of years and the quality of the students have been declining and so forth. Now, however, our Law School is growing and our enrollment went up in the last two or three years in a row. Most importantly, our bar passage rate for this year went up from 74%, first-time passage rate last year to 84%, first-time passage rate this year.

[Applause]

Provost Hsu cont’d: I can’t take the credit for it. I will tell Ben Barros that you all liked this news. In fact, in terms of bar passing rate, we are now ahead of Case Western, Cincinnati, Ohio Northern, University of Dayton, and Akron etc. The Law School faculty worked very hard trying to prepare students for the bar exam, and it really came out well. We talked about student a centered culture at the last two meetings here. Last Senate meeting, we also talked to the Academic Leadership Team, ALT that met in October and focused on what we can do to strengthen our commitment to being a student centered university. Dr. Mike Dowd asked me two meetings ago, what do you want us to do? Here is a document.

Senator Dowd: Do we have homework [laughter]?

Provost Hsu cont’d: You have Mike to blame [laughter]. We have developed a list of things that we need to do in order to better help our students. In the handout, we listed five areas of focus where we need to improve.

Creating a Student-Centered Culture

1. See student success as everyone's business

- a. Student-centered universities understand that all people who work on campus have a responsibility to promote student success and develop structures, policies and practices to support that work

2. Believe every student can succeed

- a. Student-centered universities value the assets students bring to campus, have a growth mindset about their capacities, and understand that our job is to support student learning
- b. Select Provost Office Initiatives:
 - i. APLU Transformation Cluster Initiative – UT is working with 11 other urban institutions to Grow, innovate and sustain effective solutions for systemic challenges to equity and college completion
 - ii. Ohio Strong Start to Finish Project – As part of over 30 higher education institutions in the state of Ohio, UT is working to significantly increase the number of students completing gateway English and Math courses within their first academic year, with a focus on reducing equity gaps for historically underrepresented students
 - iii. UT is working with the APLU Personalized Learning Consortium and the Digital Learning Solution Network to overcome gaps in access and prior experience to improve success in first year courses

3. Help students navigate college

- a. Student-centered universities make transparent our expectations of students, provide support for the whole student, and promote conscious understanding of how students learn
- b. Select Provost Office Initiatives:
 - i. First Faculty Colloquium - Cohorts of faculty are learning together to focus on transparent learning objectives, expectations, assessment, and transition to college in courses with high first year enrollments
 - ii. Summer Bridge Programs – Over 200 students per year participate in the MESP and Summer Scholars early-start learning community programs, and participants are significantly more likely to be retained at UT

4. Foster students' well-being and sense of belonging

- a. Student-centered universities understand the critical connection between well-being, sense of belonging, and retention and student, and work to promote a sense of belonging and well-being for all students
- b. Select Provost Office Initiatives:
 - i. APLU Student Experiences Project – UT will receive \$250,000 to develop evidence-based tools and resources that address issues such as belonging, growth mindset and motivation for STEM students from historically underrepresented groups

5. Maintain an unshakeable focus on equity

- a. Student-centered universities understand the deep and persistent inequities in education and work tirelessly, at every level of the university, to ensure that all students have an equal chance at success
- b. Select Provost Office Initiatives:
 - i. The APLU Transformation Cluster Initiative, First Faculty Colloquium, Ohio Strong Start to Finish Project, APLU Student Experiences Project, and Summer Bridge Programs all have reducing equity gaps as a primary goal

Provost Hsu cont'd: The first one is student success. It has to be the responsibility of every university employee. So everyone who works for UT is an educator, all the way from the president to custodians. We are all responsible for our students' success, and we have to establish that mentality in order to help our students. Then the second one is to believe that every student can succeed. I think this is quite a change in how we see our students. In the past, our generation, or at least my generation used to think "you either have it or you don't have it. I'm here to teach, so if you don't get it, then it is your problem." The students that we admit actually have to meet admission standards. We are not admitting students who are not able to handle college work. The students we admit, we have to believe that they can all succeed. In fact, national studies show that if you pay special attention to the students who have difficulty and if you help them learn instead of saying, if you don't get it then we will fail you, they will actually be able to learn and be able to succeed. And this is a mentality change that we have to talk to our faculty about. Dr. Denise Bartell is willing to come to your departments and talk about the national studies. We are not trying to water-down your classes. We are not trying to lower your standards. But we are trying to say that if you look at the students who are failing and figure out how they learn and how we teach might them, they can actually be successful. So Dr. Bartell is happy to come and talk to you about the national studies and how that can be achieved. The third thing we

have to do is help students navigate their college experience. Most of our students come from first generation Pell grant eligible families, and they do not know how to navigate college. In fact, I had two conversations just last week with two students and they are all doing okay academically, but they are running into obstacles because they do not know how to navigate. One student fulfilled all of the requirement, but it seems like the department is “moving goalposts” for the student and he is really confused. He needs people like us to advise and give him the navigation skills. The fourth is foster students’ well-being and the sense of belonging. I mentioned this here before, students drop out if they don’t think there’s anyone who cares about their success. If they say, I can just quit tomorrow and there is no one on this campus will notice or care, they are likely to drop out. We need to help all students develop a sense of belonging here. The fifth one is equity. We need to help our URM students and we need to help our Pell eligible students. On the handout, in addition to the five themes, underneath the Provost Office, we have identified things that we can do and we are going to do. But like I’ve said, the Provost Office really can’t achieve much without the help from the faculty, so I would encourage you to go back and discuss this with your own college or your own department, in terms of what can you do at the department level or at the college level that would help us improve in these five areas. Again, Dr. Bartell has developed a roadshow and she is going to talk to you about this if you want.

I have two announcements. One is that we had two future of higher education forums so far this semester. They were very successful. The third forum topic is measuring and communicating their research impact. I would encourage you to participate, especially those who are research active or want to publish, whether it is scholarly activity or creative activity. The last announcement is we will have our last Social Hour for this semester on November 30th. Because it is between the three holidays, Thanksgiving, Christmas, and the New Year, this time we are going to not only have an open bar, but we will have music. The UT Chamber Singers perform holiday music, so, I would encourage everybody to come. We had very good participation for the last two social events, but I haven’t seen you there, Dr. Dowd. You were one of the ones who told us how good the original Social Hour was, so come and look at the new version. That is all I have. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Are there any questions for the Provost?

Senator Molitor: Regarding your first comment about enrollment, Brigitte Norton-Odenthal from IR just sent an email 20 minutes before the meeting that says the enrollment tracker that compares this year to last year on a day-to-day basis may not be entirely correct because our registration windows have shifted a little bit. So, it may not be that we are as far as behind as the enrollment tracker says.

Provost Hsu: Right. I suspected that because when I saw the 20% decline, I said, that can’t be. But regardless, we need your help. Thank you.

Senator Dowd: Would individual deans have specialize data that we could actually access to find out how individual departments and programs are doing?

Provost Hsu: Yes. In fact, we actually have a...

Senator Molitor: The Argos system provided by IR allows for enrollment tracking by college and by individual program. There are also other criteria you can select to analyze your results across separate student populations.

Provost Hsu: If you need data for your own department, just ask your associate dean because they have access and they can produce the chart for your own program or department.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

President Rouillard: Is there anything else? Thank you, Provost Hsu. Next, I would like to introduce to you Dr. Rick Francis from Research and Sponsor Programs. He is going to talk about the new software for IRB.

Dr. Francis: Correct, and in general about research administration software at UT. My name is Rick Francis, Director of Research Advancement Information Systems. Some of you I have worked with as Director of Sponsor Programs. So I am now spending much more time on the software and enjoying it quite frankly.

Let me take you back and give you some history on this. Our situation, Spring 2017, had issues. We needed a replacement urgently for Quali Coeus, the oddly named open source software that we have been using from IRB. So IRB, for those of you who don't know is the Institutional Review Board. It is the board that the university must have, and we actually have three. It reviews human subject research protocols. Everyone who wanted to do research, and that include a lot of graduate students and lot of people with thesis and doctoral work, had to use this Quali Coeus software. So not only was it unpopular because it was kind of difficult to use, but it was also an open source software and the consortium was falling apart. There was no path forward for development and so we needed a replacement. But in addition, IBC and IACUC are often put in the same category because they are also protocol review boards. The first one is Institutional Bio Safety and the next one is Animal Care and Use. If you want to work with animals or with certain agents, you must submit a protocol through those systems. The systems we have there were inefficient. I made up the word, "paper-ful," which is the opposite of paperless. Then on another front, the grant tracking software was grown in-house. It worked okay for what it was designed to do, but it was never designed to do the things at the beginning and at the end of the grant cycle that it needed. The budget and proposal development were not part of it. The budget submission was not built into it and it was not very good at document management. We recognized that we had a lot of things to address, so we worked with Purchasing and created a selection committee for the research administration software, that was Spring 2017. We made sure we had stakeholders from all the relevant areas. We had faculty researchers, information technology, people from our office, political trial staff, and eight core members. Patty Relue was one of the people worked as a stakeholder to help us with this review process. The scope was very broad. We wanted to find out what was available to purchase for pre-award when people are in the process to apply for grants, and to track them after they come in and then all of the five acronyms that I just mentioned before, plus conflict of interest. So in order to do this, we put out a request for information and we got replies from vendors. We felt we still didn't have enough information and so we hosted demos and gathered more information. By January 2018, we issued the request for proposals. The vendors had to submit by February 2018, and that was following the selection process, for which vendors were invited back for full demos and that was March through May. The committee made recommendations in early June of 2018. This is what they recommended: We had issued an IRB that was explicitly asking for everything vendors could offer us—if you could do all of the things tell us about that; if you could do part of it particular well, tell us about that. I think some of us had the bias that we would probably end up with a single product, but as it turned out, the committee recommended a best reproach where we got two different products for different purposes. So IRB, the name of the product that was selected for all of the research protocol institutional and due processes, it was a company that was kind of young and kind of small. They started off intending to address the IRB market, and their software works great for the other areas too.

InforEd was the name of the product that was selected for all the other areas. The second recommendation they made was the InfoEd IRB manager because of the critical situation with Quali Coeus—do that first and do it fast. Then things got worst. What happened then was we knew we had a problem with the product development with Quali Coeus, but at the time we were getting by with a consultant, we were originally planning to roll that over six months from basically August through December. This really should read consultant support ended in October. We had to really accelerate the timeline and move it up to try to get it in three months and we did it. The new submissions is through the new system. IRB Manager started October 29, a week ago.

We are doing it in phases by necessity. Phases Two and Three will add additional functionality. We didn't start off with all of the legacy data in there and all of the functionality, it has to be rolled out in stages and that will take us through the end of calendar year 2018. So coming soon once IRB Manager is in place for the first one, we will be rolling it out for the review board. We will be starting with the foundation from IRB implementation and it is already a single sign on that is integrated with utad and it is already the Banner data for personnel with all of the sponsors that you would want. We will have people in-house that know what we are doing to make it go more smoothly. So because of the necessity of the urgency for getting the first product up and running, we are doing it in phases. When the IRB manager is implemented prior to IUC, it will be a big bang launch. We won't have a date until we know we can get all of the legacy data converted and tested and people ready to go. I think that would be easier for people. It is how we would like to do the whole thing, but we had to accommodate some events that were out of our control. It has been up for a week and prior to that we had training sessions for researchers, the reviewers, and staff members. We now have reactions from all of these people, the submitters, administrative staff, reviewers, and the committee chairs, which some of you have probably served on some of those committees and you know it is a lot of work. It is a lot of material that has to be reviewed and a lot of comments that have to be preserved and so forth, but so far, it is really good. People really do like it. They think it is easier and simpler to navigate. It is easier to go back and find documents where you expect to find them. If I had something bad to say, I will tell you that we promised tutorial videos to people who need them and we are a little behind on that, but we expect to get that up within the next week. It will be one or two minute videos on the web to help people if they are stuck on a particular point. That is pretty much it. Do you have any questions for me?

Senator Edgington: Is this available on the same website?

Dr. Francis: Yes, you should still see a warning sign that says don't submit through here anymore. But I can tell you, it is very easy to find the new one. It is IRB.utoledo.edu. It is really straight forward. It is an alias that takes you right to where you log in. So you will log in with your utad credentials and it knows enough about you so we will be able to tie the legacy data if you have any protocols in the system.

Senator Relue: So now that you got the IRB Manager launched, when do you expect to move on to the second one, which is the InforEd?

Dr. Francis: So as you are probably used to here at the University of Toledo, we have limitations of staffing and money. We are able to find funding for the first product and we have the manpower over the next couple of months to see that one through for the first one and then launch in January for the other ones. But I can't give you a list of the timeline at all for InforEd, and here is why. Bill McCreary, our CIO has worked with four other Ohio schools that also use Banner. He has a very impressive track record as a consortium. They go to the...and Banner what we use for everything here at the University of Toledo and some of the other schools that get involved and they call themselves the "fab-five." So what they offer is program expertise. They make a very attractive offer to both the Lucy and Banner and the third party vendors who want to have their products integrated with Banner. They will say, you know we use your product and what you should do is give us a great price because of what we can do for you. He has been really successful with it. He is in negotiations now for InforEd to see what kind of price we can get for that. But having said that, even if we had a pile of money and didn't worry about negotiating, we still wouldn't be any further along, and we will still have to go sequentially with these because we just don't have enough people to do them either in IT or our shop. So we need to pretty much get IRB Manager rolled out for all of...and then we can move on to InforEd. I have a pretty good feeling that we will be somewhere where we want to be with negotiations by the time we are ready to sign and move ahead.

Unknown Speaker: I want to ask about help if necessary.

Dr. Francis: Well, we can always use reviewers and testers—I am not joking. Some of the best help that we got was people willing to try protocol in support of the system and point out any glitches. We will be in touch.

Senator Menezes: I've already submitted an IRB using the system, and it is really good and really fast. But my question is how do we do the renewals which are done on the old cases?

Dr. Francis: Well, they will go through the new one and that is Phase Two and Phase Three, so, [it will take place] once we get the legacy data in there. We are working on the forms now and testing them. What we want to do is have all renewals and amendments going through the new system. There is probably going to be some redundancy in putting some things in, but it will pay off because of the ease of tracking it through the process. So, one of the big advantages that you get with the new software is you can very easily track who has it, who desk it is on, has it been signed and forwarded, what comments were made, and what do I need to do next, all in a dashboard form.

Senator Menezes: I have a renewal coming up pretty soon so that is why I was asking.

Dr. Francis: We knew Phase Two would have to be shortly after Phase One because it is incredible. The administrative staff is working very hard to figure out which ones is going to come next and [they will] be ready to help. One of the things that was not in place with the previous Quali Coeus is the university is really doing a better job staffing more when we really need it. The IRB administrative staff has more people and they are all on board with helping with this process. Before, it was kind of a divorce and so they said, no, we will answer IRB questions, but if it is anything that has to do with that computer, go ask those people. And now it is the same people, which is great. So often the questions are kind of the same. The question about how do you do it requires someone on the other end knowing what you really want to do. So, we are in a better place because we have more staff who can really give qualified answers on how to get through it. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you for coming. Next on the agenda is Dr. Bigioni, Chair of Academic Programs.

Senator Bigioni: So my committee has been working hard. We want you to review everything that is on our docket, so hopefully we will get to vote on everything and finish up what we have today. There are two new programs, both of them are minors and then there are some program modifications that are just hour changes that we will do at the end. The first one is the minor in Cosmetic Science. This is a new BS level program in Cosmetic Science, which from what I understand is the only one in the country. That leverage a relationship between chemical engineering and pharmacy to do some new stuff. This is an offshoot of that, a minor version of that program. Again, it is trying to do some cross-fertilization between those two disciplines. It is an interesting point up there that 90% of cosmetic science students are female, but only 30% of chemical engineering students are female. Maybe that will give women a new way to look at chemical engineering and maybe change some numbers there. Here are the interim materials. We will take a look at the courses in a minute. The minor is housed in the Pharmacy Practice Department in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. The minor program is composed of four required courses that total nine credit hours and six hours of electives from the list here. So the total minimum number of credit hours is 15.

Senator Hefzy: Can the electives be taken from any college or are there some restrictions?

Senator Bigioni: Those are the options; six hours from any of those courses listed.

Senator Hefzy: So a student can literally take a total of six hours from the College of Pharmacy?

Senator Bigioni: That is true.

Gabrielle, College of Pharmacy Student: Well, I am the one who is proposing the program. I am Gabrielle from the College of Pharmacy. We have a major replace and we are housing it in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. Students would not do all of the coursework in the College of Pharmacy, and if they would want to do that, they would be doing the major. It wouldn't make sense for a student to just do a minor inside the College of Pharmacy. We imagined this minor to be a really good option for chemical engineering students, most chemist BS students and maybe biology and biochemistry students. Now, they might find elective courses from their own college that would better fit them, but it is an option.

Senator Hefzy: The bottom-line is what is here in writing. There is nothing here that says anything about students can complete the six hours in---

Gabrielle, College of Pharmacy Student: Well, they can. It is nothing against it. If that is what they would like to do then yes, they can do that.

Senator Molitor: I have a question. What are the prerequisites for the required Pharmacy core courses?

Gabrielle, College of Pharmacy Student: So Intro to Cosmetic Science, there are no prerequisites, however, for Cosmetic Raw Material, it is just chemistry.

Senator Molitor: Is that Inorganic Chemistry or just Biochemistry?

Gabrielle, College of Pharmacy Student: I should know that by the top of my head and I do not. I can look it up right now, but for Cosmetic Science I and II, those will be Cosmetic Raw Materials.

Senator Molitor: So it doesn't require any other pharmacy course?

Gabrielle, College of Pharmacy Student: No.

Senator Bigioni: Are there any other questions? Hearing none. All those in favor say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? [1] *Motion Passed*. Thank you.

New Program

Minor: Cosmetic Science

Department: Pharmacy Practice

College: Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Justification: Opportunity to study cosmetic science primarily within the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, but also appeals to chemical engineering students (NB: undergraduate cosmetic science students are 90% female, but only 30% of chemical engineering students are female)

Proposed Course Plan:

A) **Required core courses (9 credit hours):**

- PHPR 2040 Intro to Cosmetic Science (1) – fall
- PHPR 3040 Cosmetic Raw Materials (2) – fall
- PHPR 4730 Cosmetic Science I (3) – spring
- PHRP 4750 Cosmetic Science II (3) – fall

B.) **Elective courses (6 credit hours):**

College of Natural Science and Mathematics

- CHEM 3510 Biochemistry I (3) – fall
- CHEM 3610 Inorganic Chemistry I (3) – spring
- CHEM 4720 Modern Topics in Physical Chemistry: Nanomaterials Science (3) – spring
- CHEM 4200 Green Chemistry (3) – fall
- CHEM 4810 Materials Science 1 (4) – fall
- CHEM 4820 Materials Science 2 (4) – spring

C.) **College of Engineering**

- CHEE 4800 Polymer Science and Engineering (3) – fall
- CHEE 4820 Colloid and Surface Phenomena (3) –
- CHEE 4960 Senior Honors Thesis (3) – For research projects related to cosmetic science, needs approval by minor director – fall, spring, summer
- CHEE 4980 Special Topics in Chemical Engineering (1-4) - Need approval by minor director – fall, spring, summer
- CHEE 4990 Independent Studies in Chemical Engineering (1-4) – For research projects related to cosmetic science, need approval by minor director – fall, spring, summer

D.) **College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences**

- PHCL 3700 Pharmacology I (3) – fall
- MBC 3500 Physiological Chemistry I (3) – fall
- MBC 3560 Physiological Chemistry II (3) – spring
- MBC 3330 Techniques in Pharmaceutical and Medicinal Chemistry (2) – fall
- MBC 3340 Techniques in Pharmaceutical and Medicinal Chemistry (1) – fall
- PHCL 4760 Toxicokinetics (3) – fall

Minimum number of credit hours for completion – 15

Senator Bigioni cont'd: So the second program to consider is also a minor in Financial Data Analytics. This is the data analytics minor that we considered at the last meeting. So this one is in Information Operations and Technology Management. The goals are similar to take data analytic skills from the IT realm into the trenches where the data is used to solve everyday problems. So the courses are as follows: There are four required courses that are three hours each for a total of 12 hours. Students can choose one of the following electives for a total of 15 credits, as the minimum, for the program. Are there any questions about this program?

Senator Molitor: I have a quick question. I don't know if anybody from the College of Business knows this, but you have minors that are specifically for Business majors and then you have minors for students outside of the College of Business. Is this for students outside the College of Business or is this for Business students inside?

Senator Ferris: It said for finance and accounting majors.

Senator Molitor: Is that what it said?

Senator Relue: Well, that is what it is designed for, but it is eligible?

Senator Bigioni: That is a good question and I don't know the answer.

President Rouillard: But it got four required courses and the possibility of one elective from the choice of three.

Senator Dowd: Forgive me, I can't read the course because I am in the "cheap seats." For the required classes, are the upper division classes in the College of Business or are they lower division? The third one down, Finance 3890 Data Modeling with Excel, do you have to have standing in the College of Business to take that?

President Rouillard: Do we have some people from the College of Business here?

Senator Dowd: Senator Molitor, is that getting to your point?

Senator Molitor: Yes. If you look at the College of Business Undergraduate Programs website, they specifically lists minors for students getting a business degree. Then there are other minors that are applicable to anybody in a degree program outside of the College of Business. Usually the minors for business degree students are 12 hours and the minors for non-Business students are 18-21 hours.

President Rouillard: But this one is specifically listed for majors in the Business College.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. Does that sufficiently address the question?

Senator Dowd: Yes.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. Are there any other questions?

Senator Bigioni: Okay, then let us take a vote. All those in favor, say “aye,” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

Minor: Financial Data Analytics
 Department: Information Operations & Technology Management
 College: Business and Innovation

Justification: Data and business analytics has become a significant element of the accounting and finance occupations. This minor will help our accounting and finance majors to improve their skills and align it with the market needs.

Comments: This minor is specifically designed for Accounting and Finance majors.

Proposed Course Plan

Required courses:

- BUAD 3040 Principals of Financial Management F/SP/SU
- BUAD 2020 Information technology Management F/SP/SU
- FINA 3890 Data Modeling with Excel F/SP
- OSCM 4250 Business Analytics: Techniques and Cases F

Electives:

Choose one from the following:

- INFS 3150 Principals of Structured Programming and Problem Solving F/SP/SU
- INFS 3400 Principals of Information Security SP
- INFS 4100 Business Intelligence Using Data SP

Minimum number of credit hours for completion – 15

Senator Bigioni cont’d: Now, let’s start with the easy stuff. There are five programs that are all moving from the historical 124 hours to 120 hours, which is the new recommended number from the state. So all of the hour reduction is in the electives and there is no change to the core programs. Any discussion on this?

President Rouillard: Just one point. The 120 hours isn’t required by the state, but it is the range that is recommended. It is in the range of 120-126, so it is well within the range.

Senator Bigioni: Thank you for that clarification. Any discussion? Hearing none. Let’s put it to a vote. All those in favor say, “aye.” All those opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

Program Code	College	Dept.	Program Name	Contact Person
SM-BIOL-BA	SM	BIOL	BA in Biology	Robert Steven

SM-BIOL-BA	SM	CHEM	BA in Biochemistry	Xiche Hu
SM-BCHM-BS	SM	CHEM	BA in Biochemistry	Xiche Hu
SM-CHEM-BA	SM	CHEM	BA in Chemistry	Xiche Hu
SM-CHEM-BS	SM	CHEM	BA in Chemistry	Xiche Hu

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Bigioni. All right, the next order of business we are seeking the approval of two non-senators for committee chairs. We are seeking approval for John Napp as chair of Student Affairs. John Napp is an associate professor in the College of Libraries, and he has agreed to be chair of Student Affairs. I would entertain a motion to approve his position as chair.

Senator Dowd: *So moved.*

Group of Senators: *Second.*

President Rouillard: Is there any discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor, signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

The second non-senator that will need Faculty Senate approval for committee chair is Richard Kruzal, who is also an associate professor in the College of Libraries. Richard has agreed to be the chair for the Faculty Senate Elections Committee. Is there a motion to propose Richard Kruzal as chair for the Elections Committee?

Senator Kistner: *So moved.*

Group of Senators: *Second.*

President Rouillard: Is there any discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor of appointing Richard Kruzal as chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Elections, please signify by saying, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you. So all chairs have been appointed to Faculty Senate committees and the committee’s list is posted on the website.

Our next item of business as listed on the agenda is the discussion on a faculty survey on deans and provost. This was circulated to you yesterday. As I indicated in my Executive Report, at the October 10th meeting last year, there was a charge that was given to an ad hoc committee to review the processes and procedures. Then a second ad hoc committee was charged with revision of the instrument. You can read that in the meeting Minutes. I chaired the committee that revised the instrument. I gave you the timeline, and so this is what we came up with. We took the previous instrument which had been revised several times. These previous revisions were circulated to deans to solicit comments, reaction, and suggestions. Those different revisions were brought to Faculty Senate so that Senate could be informed, and we do the same thing here today. We wanted you to see the instrument. You saw it in an electronic form yesterday. I also indicated in my message that went out that within each of these areas, there are bullet points. When this goes to Institutional Research to be formatted for the electronic survey, each one of these bullets will have a series of radio dials right next to them. That will allow you to indicate your range of scores from 4, being exceeds expectations to 0, unsuccessful, including not applicable, do not know, or not evaluate. So each one of these questions will have that Likert scale attached to it. My formatting made in a Word processor just made that a little too difficult, but that is what it would look like when Institutional Research formats it for electronic delivery. These bullet points were divided into areas, academic integrity. You will have your Likert scale for each

bullet and then you will have a box within which to put your comments. The second area: leadership and accountability, undergraduate student success, graduate and professional student success, faculty success, sustainability of academic programs, academic excellence and innovation, research scholarship and creative activities, diversity and inclusion, recruitment and retention, external relations and a final area with overall comments. Now, the ad hoc committee that was charged with looking at the process and procedures came up with some recommendations that we folded into this first page with direction and information about the survey. The first sentence is basically what our charge is from the Senate Constitution. The second sentence is an addition that reminds faculty that this is about one component in a deans overall evaluation conducted by a provost. This is faculty input into a bigger evaluation. We included this language on the basis of the recommendation of the process ad hoc committee to complete the survey of professional accomplishments of your college dean. So this is not addressing what your college dean does “for hobbies” or “what flavor “scotch” they like, but this is strictly professional. Everyone is asked to consider all of the bullet points. We’ve also made the comment box a little bit more precise. We are asking for specific and relevant examples of excellence. So again, it is not that “I like that my dean drives a really cool red sports car,” is that it is pertinent information. We have this part of the scale for non-applicable. We explained the Likert scale. The questions that are answered by a bubble on a Likert scale, that is information that would be shared 100% with the provost, the dean, and the faculty of the college. As recommended by the other ad hoc committee, the responses in the comments boxes will be randomized. The comments will be shared verbatim with the provost and the dean in question only. In the past, all of the comments have also gone verbatim to all of the faculty. In this iteration, the comments will be forwarded only to the provost and to the dean in a randomized fashion. We had another reminder that it is only the performance of the college dean and no mention of any other party by name, and that is also a recommendation from the other ad hoc committee. We’ve also specified that these surveys are open records and they can be requested. We have also reminded people that you may need a faculty id to access the electronic survey, but the faculty information identity and responded would be anonymous. So, that is an overview. I don’t know how many of you had a chance to look at the items. We do have some people here who participated in the revision, for instance, Wade was on that committee. Is there anybody else who was on that committee? Patty, Kevin, and Chris Cooper were on the committee. Another dean was invited but unfortunately, her schedule would not allow [her] to attend the meetings. But people had the opportunity to certainly respond via email if they couldn’t make it to the meeting. This instrument was circulated to the deans on April 6, 2018. They were given a two-week window to make responses and/or comments. I did get a few responses. There was a comment regarding the title of the instrument. I think in the past it was called “dean evaluation” and that sort of led people to believe that this is the only way the deans were evaluated, and so we revised the title and we call it a “performance survey,” which we remind people that it is about one component of a more comprehensive review of the deans. There were a couple of word choice items that the deans suggested and sent to us. Are there any questions or comments?

Senator Relue: I have a concern. The last time we met as a committee, we met with both committees together. During that conversation it was brought up that we should be doing a bigger view of this survey, that it is simply taking the survey that existed and reframe parts, and to look at best practices to see what instruments were developed and used by other institutions. For some of us on the committee we indicated that survey development is really not our expertise, but there were people on the committee who were willing to step forward and work on survey development to make sure we had a very good instrument to deliver. It was the recommendation of that group that we get a group together to do that. So, I am not sure why this is coming to Faculty Senate when the committee recommended that we develop a service based instrument by experts and survey development.

President Rouillard: We were charged to revise the instrument. The recommendation came at the end of the year. One ad hoc committee also does not have authority over another ad hoc committee. This will not be the

last iteration of this instrument, I can assure you. But we do have to be ready for these surveys to go out in the spring. I think that this is an adequate instrument for this year, and if somebody wishes to revise it in the future, that is certainly a possibility. But, I would also point out that the list of recommendations included the possibility of using this instrument in any case. Let me see if I can find that memo. This is the memo that came, I believe it was in late May. So there was one recommendation that said, “*either instrument should be written using best practice technique.*” There was another recommendation that said, “*if using the current instrument drafting at the starting point for the new instrument, make each bulleted item its own question and minimize survey fatigue by reviewing each bulleted item to see if some of it can be confined or deleted.*” In the process of revising this instrument, we did that very thing. As some of you will recall, we did in fact collapse some questions together and we moved some questions around into different areas. An additional recommendation was “*make sure the bulleted items are questions faculty are in a position to evaluate to minimize non-applicable responses.*” I don’t know that you can completely eliminate non-applicable answers. I mean, people have different relationships with their dean depended on their position and their function, and so I think there is always going to be non-applicable answers.

Senator Hefzy: I have a question. If there are say, 65 questions, how long will it take to complete this survey without saying this is too much?

President Rouillard: That is a very good question. In fact, that was my question when Tim and Wade, I believe it was, brought up the issue of why not give each bullet point its own Likert scale for each response. I was resisted to that, and about the same time Dr. Willie McKether put out his campus Climate Survey—I believe that had 80 questions. It had many questions, but in the course of doing it, I discovered that it was actually pretty quick because you are considering one item at a time rather than grappling with a whole section and being asked to give that a rating. So I think people will find that it doesn’t take that much time, but they may also have to try one iteration of it and see how it goes.

Senator Bouillon: I am following along. Did the ad hoc committees have any opportunities to review other evaluations?

President Rouillard: Well, Amy forwarded a few and frankly, they were rather perfunctory. I think this instrument is actually more thorough.

Senator Gilchrist: I am wondering what the reason for withholding faculty comments from the faculty. I can certainly understand why the dean would want us to do that, but we are Faculty Senate and so I am wondering why we want to do that?

President Rouillard: That is a good question. We wrestled with that for a long time. In the past I don’t recall that was as much of an issue as it was for the last iteration of surveys. But based on what I think was a real anomaly, we were faced with a need to do this. And so the discussions would go back and forth, do we do it verbatim, or do we summarize, or do we redact. Personally, I have a problem with redacting because there is a lot of opportunity for subjective interpretation, and that seem to defeat the purpose. This was the best compromise that we could come up with, which would be to at least forward the comments to the provost and the dean and [at least] the faculty would see the objective responses on the Likert scale.

Senator Gilchrist: If I can just follow-up? I am missing what interest we are protecting. What is the compromise in favor of?

President Rouillard: The last iteration produced a couple of results. I believe it was two colleges that felt apparently experienced inappropriate comments, perhaps personally vindictive comments. That was presented to us as an issue that we were going [to try] to figure out together how to navigate. However, these are public records.

Senator Wedding: Can we vote on this document and then have a second vote on whether or not we want to make it public?

President Rouillard: Do you mean forward the comments as well?

Senator Wedding: Yes.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Wedding: I think I would split the vote because that second issue is apparently controversial for some people.

President Rouillard: So maybe we need to do it in an inverse order and we need to vote on making comments public first.

Senator Wedding: The form you are talking about is the one you want to vote on.

President Rouillard: I'm sorry, my back was to you Senator Templin.

Senator Templin: So in the preamble material it talked about anonymity. I am wondering if the very last word, "kept anonymous" should be "kept confidential" instead of anonymous?

Unknown Speaker: Yes.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Templin cont'd: Because I know from an educational research perspective, they tell us to never promise anonymity.

Senator Dowd: President Rouillard, even in the process I don't know if "confidential" is the right word. When you log in, you go through this process, the identifying information earned is lost. It is stronger, but you cannot retrieve that data. You can invite one of these out and later on I would like to prove that I had said something or I didn't say something, you can't. It is not just confidential, it is anonymous.

Senator Gilchrist: In fact, it is not confidential, the response is. It will not be confidential, the response is public record.

Senator Dowd: It is anonymous.

Senator Van Hoy: In the past, Senator Dowd, people have been able to figure out who were commenting.

Senator Dowd: Well, they can refer that from the comments, however the process---

Senator Van Hoy: Well, we need a way to convey that.

President Rouillard: Senator Van Hoy, that issue came up in some of the discussion—it might have been in the joint meeting between the two committees. And that is why it was determined that the comments would be randomized so that you couldn't determine a sequence—you could not see that it was the same person always making "this" comment because it shows up regularly every fourth comment or so. We are hoping that randomizing those comments will help address that concern.

Senator Brakel: Well, I think one of the issues related to the comments comes back to the issue of liability. Because if a person makes a particular comment and that [comment] can be traced back to that individual, then that opens that individual up for potential liability and perhaps also to the university as well. I think that was the question, but I am not a legal person on this.

President Rouillard: And that reminds me that one of the thing we didn't consider, but perhaps we could add is a line about this report doesn't represent the opinion of Faculty Senate as a whole or any individual senator, it is simply a report. I don't know—does that seem like it might address anything? Is it a possibility?

Senator Gibbons: I know we are randomizing the answers, but if you look at choice of diction language—give me a computer and I can try to figure out who made the same statement. The second comment I would like to make is when someone submits something, is it possible that they start out as a junior on tenured faculty member of color blank, blank, blank, blank—so delete that and just have the actual comment? So in other words, if someone oust themselves, just delete the ousting part and keep the subsequent part. My other thing is there need to be a clear “what is your rights here.” Let's make it clear to the faculty, if you are candid, you cannot be disciplined. Let's make it clear, your dean or department chair can come after you, despite the fact you may have tenure. Suppose you can make it clear regarding what are the consequence of a candid response.

President Rouillard: Well, first of all, we do have a no retaliation policy. Secondly, I personally do not want to get in the business of redacting anything. A faculty member who ousted him or herself, I consider that to be that person's responsibility. I think we've tried to address some of the issues of in advert identification by reminding people that these are public documents.

Senator Gibbons: Can we add the no retaliation policy on the front cover of this so people will know?

President Rouillard: That can be done. Prof. Humphrys, do you have a comment?

Prof. Humphrys: Yes, a few things. As you mentioned, President Rouillard, I was co-chair of one of the Administration Review committees. Concerning redaction, I asked the university's attorney if anything was [to be] redacted and someone would ask to see it as a public records request, would they get the redacted version or not. He said they will not get the redacted version, they will get the version without redactions. So redacting isn't necessarily going to protect anyone from being made public. This is along with your concerns about who is going to do the redacting and who gets to decide what is going to be redacted.

In regards to Greg's question about our recommendation from the committee to not give the written comments to the faculty in each college, the representative from the College of Law brought the following to light. When the Faculty Senate automatically, as we did last time, gives the comments to the faculty, the Senate is the distributor of the comments and becomes liable for the release of any unprofessional, inaccurate, or unrelated comments. Whereas, if someone were to make a public information request for the comments, then any subsequent release is going to be their responsibility and not fall on the Faculty Senate. One additional thing that goes along with what Senator Relue said is that I also came out of the joint meeting with the two Administration Review committees thinking that we were going to have a committee made up of volunteers who knew about writing surveys to look at producing a new survey. I know I will hear from members of the committee; I will be asked who made the decision not to do that.

President Rouillard: I will take responsibility for making that decision. Number one, because ad hoc committees work on yearly basis and as I said, one ad hoc committee does not have authority over another ad hoc committee---

Prof. Humphrys: But it was a joint committee decision.

President Rouillard: This year's Faculty Senate Executive Committee has spent some time with this and this is what we decided to do. In the future if someone decides to do something different, that is entirely possible.

Prof. Humphrys: Okay.

President Rouillard cont'd: I also confirmed with Tim, who was at that same meeting, and we did not remember agreeing to that. There is nothing that stops anybody who want to produce a different survey from doing so, but this year we are not going to delay the distribution of the surveys. We have something to go, and in the future if somebody wants to develop another instrument, that would be perfectly welcome.

Prof. Humphrys: But I guess the point is if what you just mentioned is the case, if someone right now would produce another document as this joint committee had recommended, you are telling me that you could have the authority to say, "no," we are not going to do it?

President Rouillard: Well, we can bring it to Faculty Senate and see what they prefer and if people prefer that, then that's fine.

Prof. Humphrys: But that was not brought to Faculty Senate. I just want to make sure because I want to be clear to the members of the committee. The decision to not go ahead with the joint committee recommendation and have this additional committee would be based on your decision and the members of the Executive Committee?

President Rouillard: The joint committees, those two ad hoc committees no longer exist.

Prof. Humphrys: Right, but when they did exist they made a recommendation to have this other committee formed.

President Rouillard: I am not going to let this take on a life of its own. If somebody wants to produce a different instrument and want to present it to Faculty Senate, by all means, do so. But I am not forming another committee this year to do work that was done last year as we were charged to do.

Senator Dowd: My comments are torn between the views of two of my friends here, so I am going to try to walk a very, very fine line. The Constitution mandates Senate to form these assessments of administrators. If a new committee is formed and it develops a new instrument, that is swell. We are mandated to conduct these assessments. And just for general knowledge, if Senate was to say this is just peachy, let's go with this, you are talking about anywhere from 1 ½ to 2 months to get this thing coded. It will take another month or so to actually get it ready to go and make it available. There is a time lag. We have to be ahead of the curve by 2 to 3 months. We are mandated to do this. If somebody is going to create a new instrument, that is swell. If there is a need for it [the new instrument], let's go with that. But, there is also a point of interest of looking at what the results of this survey could actually produce. Two years ago when the instrument was run, comments were made and last year we worked on it to improve the questioning and responses etc. What it would actually provide if we were to run this is continuity that with this revised instrument, it is still comparable to the evaluations that were conducted two years ago, three years ago, and perhaps four years ago. But the notion that if a dean received comments three years ago on an evaluation, with this instrument you can actually see if the dean responded to the comments. Now, that is one of the advantages. To my two friends here, what you are discussing is not mutually exclusive. This instrument can go forward. In fact, it has to. We have to have evaluations this year because of the Constitution. But, if the wisdom of Senate is to revise the instrument and go out and seek best practices, yeah, we can always do that. I just wanted to get across this notion that even if Senate approve whole heartedly, unanimously this instrument, it will take months to actually get this thing to be ready for CCI to make it available to the university faculty.

Prof. Humphrys: It doesn't. They turned it around last quickly. Just for informational purposes and maybe it has changed, but it is about one week.

Senator Dowd: No, because every time you revise it--The last time they did it, it was the same instrument as the year before. But every time you revise an instrument, CCI has to recode all of it.

President Rouillard: It is going to be done by Institutional Research.

Senator Dowd: I am sorry.

President Rouillard: It is going to be done by Institutional Research this year.

Senator Dowd: Oh.

Senator Gibbons: My first comment is in reference to approximately three committee reports individually with a joint committee. Could those ad hoc committee's proposals be presented to Senate? And then next semester we take up what can we do in terms of the survey instrument for academic year 2021 or whatever so we will have a year to decide what we want to do.

President Rouillard: If another committee wants to write another instrument or another iteration that is absolutely fine with me. But, I am not going to invalidate the work of two committees that spent enormous amounts of time with this iteration of the survey, unless there are huge objections to the questions.

Senator Gibbons: I just want to see the reports. We are talking about something that we haven't seen. If there's an issue with the reports then I apologize.

President Rouillard: If I can figure out how to upload the documents. If you want to see the recommendations, that is fine. What you see in this instrument is what the one ad hoc committee advised. But what I will tell you is that of the 11 recommendations, written comments should continue as an option; written comments should be verbatim; cumulative written comments to every survey question should be arranged in randomized order; written comments should be distributed only to the reviewee and supervisor; numerical survey results for the dean should be distributed to all faculty; the front page of the instrument should contain a statement indicating they are subject to public records; responses will be anonymous; the individual identity will be protected; comments are randomized; they will be released to the reviewee and supervisor by verbatim; comments should be of a professional nature; purpose of the survey and how it will be used; if public information and a request is made...survey results; randomized verbatim comments will be released; evaluation process should become part of Faculty Senate rules in order to assist administrative process—we can take that up when we deal with the Constitution and Rules; consider conducting an evaluation at the end of the first year of the new dean; provost will work with college counsel to establish a process to conduct an evaluation to administrators below the level of dean; a new evaluation should be written to be best practice techniques without content carryover from the previous survey; to determine best practice techniques, consult UT faculty survey experts for their feedback from the current evaluation instrument—what I would also say is, when the charge was first made, why was that charge not made instead of two ad hoc committees?

[\[Ad Hoc Committee's Recommendation\]](#)

Senator Wedding: Could we go forward with this questionnaire as Senator Dowd has suggested and get it out of our way, and then we can talk about modifying new ones later? Let's take the second issue that Senator Gilchrist came up with, which is whether or not these should be made known to everybody or not.

Senator Gilchrist: I want to follow-up on that. I think I would just like to make a motion that we amend the preamble to the document proposed. Specifically, the sentence that reads, "*the responses in comment boxes will be randomized and shared verbatim with the provost and dean.*" I propose that can be amended to "responses and the comment boxes will be randomized and shared verbatim with the provost, the dean, and the faculty of the college"

President Rouillard: I will get that from the Minutes. Is there a *second* to that motion?

Senator Wedding: *Second.*

President Rouillard: Is there any discussion?

Senator Egan (proxy for K. Keith): Well, to the point where we were discussing...If you think about course evaluations, the instructor sees it and the chair sees it, period. We don't share our student's comments with every other faculty member, if that helps as a framework. Certainly, those comments need to go to the dean and they [also] need to go to the dean's superior, but we do not share our students' comments with everybody.

President Rouillard: Except for when we do tenure promotion. Those comments do get seen by other faculty. It is certainly not other faculty as a whole, but other faculty do see them. But your point is well taken. I think that seems to be the sense of Senate, yes?

Senator Egan (proxy for K. Keith): If anybody want them they can do an open records request, right?

President Rouillard: That is correct.

Senator Gilchrist: Right. But to speak to Prof. Humphrys point, which of course they are all subject to open records, but then someone has to go seek the open records which is a very open record. So, it is nice for it to come from Senate. My view on this is simple. It is by no means unique to the University of Toledo that there is an ongoing issue in academia of administrations enhancing their power over the university. That has probably been going on forever. But as the administration acquires more power over the university then faculty loses its voice. We are the Faculty Senate, and one of our Constitutional roles is to conduct evaluation of the administration. Why would we want to give part of that back to administration? Why wouldn't we want that information? I can't think of a faculty based reason to do so.

Senator Dowd: I completely agree.

President Rouillard: Can you give me your amendment again?

Senator Gilchrist: Sure. "The responses in the comment boxes will be randomized and shared verbatim with the provost, the dean, and the faculty of the college."

Senator Wedding: *Second.*

President Rouillard: So that changes things a little. We need to vote specifically on that amendment. This is your motion to amend the sentence that reads: The responses in the comment boxes will be randomized and shared verbatim with the provost, the dean, and the faculty of the college." This is Senator Gilchrist's motion. I want to go through this again. Is there a *second*?

Senator Wedding and Thompson-Casado: *Second.*

President Rouillard: Is there any other discussion?

Senator Wedding: *Call the Question.*

President Rouillard: All those in favor of the amendment for the sentence to read: The responses in the comment boxes will be randomized and shared verbatim with the provost, the dean, and the faculty of the college," please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? [4] Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** So, this will go into this particular instrument. Can I get a sense from Senate regarding the rest of the instrument on procedures?

Senator Relue: I understand we need to have an instrument in place by the spring, but I would recommend that we *table* this until the next Faculty Senate so that Faculty Senate members can go back and actually read

the questions with a little more time to ponder them and think about them in the context of the report that came from the joint committee meeting. Particularly, in terms of looking at questions where there might be ambiguity in terms of what the responses are or overlap of questions so that we have an instrument that Faculty Senate feels good about?

President Rouillard: I am willing to do that. But people need to realize that when we get to the point of doing a second reading of the Constitution and the discussion of that and possible voting, we can't let that interfere with the deployment of a survey. We need to do a survey. We didn't do a survey last year because it wasn't on the schedule. But I am perfectly willing to bring it back for discussion, provided that we don't get into a crunch with the Constitution.

Senator Wedding: We have a *motion* on the floor here.

President Rouillard: Well, we did pass the amendment.

Senator Wedding: I am talking about the primary motion. I called for a *Question* on that.

President Rouillard: Okay. I wasn't going to ask for a vote on this. I was going to ask for an endorsement on this instrument. Here is the reason why I don't want a vote and why I want an endorsement. Because this is not the final word. This is not the instrument that is going to be used forever and ever. This is an instrument that is going to be used this year.

Senator Wedding: It is one that is going to be used at this time because there is not enough time to start this whole process over again.

President Rouillard: Right.

Senator Wedding: Senator Dowd has already made a point, and he is correct.

President Rouillard: I leave the floor open for anybody who wants to volunteer to do this. I would like to get in a sense that this could be used in the next iteration of surveys, which will be taken in the spring.

Senator Wedding: That was the *motion*. I said that. I called for a *Question*.

President Rouillard: So you think we should have a vote on this?

Senator Wedding: Yes, I called for a *Question*.

President Rouillard: So in that case, the *motion* is a vote on this instrument?

Senator Wedding: Yes.

President Rouillard: So the *motion* is to use this year this instrument for the dean's survey with the amendment that was passed?

Senator Wedding: Correct.

President Rouillard cont'd: And leaving open the option for further discussion on subsequent iteration of the survey instrument.

Senator Wedding: We always had that option. You don't have to put that in as a caveat here. We got a document that we want to move forward on, let's do it.

Senator Dowd: Senator Wedding, if I may? If you include that in the *motion*, it is addressing a concern that was raised by a couple of senators, that this issue of revising will be looked at.

President Rouillard: For next year. For the next iteration.

Senator Wedding: It will be in the Minutes.

President Rouillard: Is there a *second*?

Senator Thompson-Casado: *Second.*

President Rouillard: Is there any more discussion?

Senator Lundquist: Can you just remind me? Are all the deans going to be evaluated this year or is it a rotation?

President Rouillard: It is a rotation.

Senator Lundquist: Which one?

President Rouillard: So we know that the Dean of Education will not because he is new.

Senator Dowd: Business.

President Rouillard: Yes, the Business Dean. Thank you.

Senator Molitor: The Dean of Engineering.

President Rouillard: He will be in his second year by spring, so I think he is on the list.

Senator Molitor: He arrived in July.

President Rouillard: July of 2017?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

President Rouillard: I think he would be on the list. I think right now the only two sections are Education and Business.

Senator Dowd: Interims are not included, like the Dean of Pharmacy.

President Rouillard: Well, in Amanda's case this is her first year, so it wouldn't apply. Is there any other discussion? All right. All those in favor for the *motion*, which stipulates that this will be the instrument used for the spring dean's surveys including the connected language that was passed this afternoon, please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? [2] Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** So as indicated, we can certainly continue the discussion, but it will be for the future iteration of surveys. That brings us to the conclusion of the listed items on the agenda. Are there any items from the floor? Are there any announcements?

Senator Emonds: I would like to invite everybody to our symposium on Friday. Memories of World War I is taking place in the Carlson Library. It is an all-day event. It starts at 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. We have about 12 different speakers, both faculty members from UT's campus and members from the community. They are going to talk about the impact that caused World War I.

President Rouillard: Are there any other announcements? Hearing none. May I ask for a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Mark Templin

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

