

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 15, 2020
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 09/29/2020

Summary of Discussion

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

President Brakel: Welcome to our third Faculty Senate meeting in the fall semester. At this time I will ask our President-Elect, Terry Bigioni to call the roll.

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

Excused Absence: Duggan, Reeves

Unexcused Absence: Ali, Lee, Lipscomb, Longsdorf, Stepkowski, Topp

President Brakel: Do we have a quorum?

Senator Bigioni: We do have a quorum, President Brakel.

President Brakel: Thank you. So, you have before you, today's agenda; I will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda. Thank you. The September 1st Faculty Senate draft Minutes were forwarded to you for approval. Are there any questions or concerns regarding the draft Minutes? Any discussion? Hearing none. **Motion Passed.** Thank you. Next, the draft Minutes from the Senate meeting held on August 18th were forwarded to you as well. Any discussion? Hearing none. **Motion Passed.**

The agenda was accepted. Next, today's Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report: The Executive Committee met on September 4 to plan today's meeting and to discuss several issues of importance to faculty senate. Today we will hear about the University Diversity Strategic Plan from Vice-President for Diversity and Inclusion Willie McKether and begin the first reading of the Constitution.

As you will recall from the last Faculty Senate meeting's discussion of COVID related issues, Senate was concerned about the timeliness of information and other issues related to the COVID dashboard. Later that week, the Executive Committee learned there are plans to revise the dashboard. At last check today, the statistics have continued to be updated weekly and President Postal provided a new video about the dashboard today. The dashboard now includes information about on-campus and off campus cases, and the percentage of our positive cases in our testing of asymptomatic testing. We thank the administration for responding to Senate concerns about the dashboard and look forward to continued shared governance in this and other matters.

Besides the Constitution approval process, we discussed two important matters that the Executive Committee will be addressing this year. Last year, the Executive Committee was looking into a faculty member's concern regarding the UToledo Foundation. Last Spring, we had examined some publicly

available records from the Foundation and then placed the issue on the back burner when we went to remote learning. We will resume looking into this issue at this week's Executive Committee meeting.

We also discussed the need to conduct evaluations of each College Dean this academic year as this is a charge of Faculty Senate. These evaluations will occur in the Spring 2021 semester.

I also made some inquiries regarding updates concerning health science campus issues to make sure we address concerns that were raised last year and other issues that you have heard about in the media such as the shift of medical students from the Dana Cancer Center to ProMedica facilities and its related accreditation concerns.

At last Friday's Ohio Faculty Council meeting, they were working on a draft statement concerning University Reorganization and affirming the Role of Faculty in any reorganization. While you have no doubt heard of reorganization efforts at other universities within Ohio, we are not aware of any plans for reorganization here at UToledo. The Ohio Faculty Council plans to make some edits to the draft this week and to put it for a vote to its Council representatives. The Executive Committee will review this draft at this week's meeting with the goal of instructing your OFC representative how to vote on this issue.

At the last Faculty Senate meeting, there was a mention of a group called Save Ohio Higher Education. While Senators may want to be aware of this group, it is largely comprised of AAUP chapters, and now some student organizations. It is my position that this matter concerns the union and that as a Senate we should not take any action on it other than be aware of it.

This concludes the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report. Does any Executive Committee member have something to add to this report? Hearing none. Next, we have Dr. McKether who is going to join us for discussion regarding equity and the campus pride index.

Dr. McKether: What came out from that, was that they want to see more faculty, staff, and particularly administrators show some level of care beyond some usual faces that we always see. Now all colleges and several units have a strategic diversity plan, and a committee, and have a named leader for diversity, which is really important. We didn't have a campus pride index score. When we first started we did our first pride index. Again, campus pride index is a self-report indicator by campuses throughout the country which indicate the campuses' friendliness and responsiveness to the LGBTQ community. Our first score was 3.5. We submitted for the next year and we now have 4.0 out of 5.0 scale. Of the thirteen or so universities and colleges in Ohio right now they are probably 6.0 or rank higher. The University of Toledo and the other universities rank lower on that score. We created, implemented a LGBTQ strategic plan. We created face-to-face online diversity trainings. I will tell you, in that area of the diversity trainings, that is one that we have struggled in keeping up with demand; having a small staff of two serving both Main Campus and the Health Science Campus can be challenging so we are working on ways to streamline that process. We created a diversity module for all FYE courses, which means at least all first-year students receive some level of diversity education. We created difficult conversations module for faculty. We did this because we knew that, given what is going on in the world that faculty are challenged in having these conversations in the classroom so we created that module. We've also created a module about how to have race relation discussions in the classroom. Those are all uploaded to our website. We created and established college level and university retention committees. I believe that in many ways those committees and having faculty and administration at the college level engage with the

data, creating strategies to help retain students in individual colleges, all contributed to the increase in retention rates that I just mentioned. I also established diversity, religious and LGBTQ liaison roles as a way to ensure that the needs of diverse faculty, staff and students are all being met. Again, as a way to extend the staff from my office.

So on to the 2020-2023 strategic diversity plan. So as we titled it, 'Further Progress,' I should say very clear, while I am pleased with the progress that we've made to date, I don't fool myself. I know that we still have lots of work to do. Just recently some things have happened on campus that I really can't talk about is an indication that man, you know, we have made some progress, the University has shown its commitment to doing this work. I know that at the last Faculty Senate meeting there was a resolution that was passed by Faculty Senate, to which I was most grateful to see. Again, just further indication that we have made progress and we have commitment, but there is still work to do. So with this new strategic diversity plan, again, wanting to ensure that we have broad campus input, I recruited a 26-member diverse ad hoc committee from across campus with community direction and input in creating a plan. So, in creating a plan we, of course, used institutional data, looking at what we have done with respect to student retention and graduation, looking at faculty data changes over time as well as staff. In other words, how far we've come. When I think about strategic plans for diversity, I think about those plans center around moving the needle just in terms of numbers, how we are doing there. I think we have shown some progress in some areas. I think this is also about the culture, how we are changing the climate of the university. So those things to me must go hand in hand. The diversity survey we conducted, which was a much smaller survey that was conducted last spring, here compared to the first survey which we had five-thousand responses, here we got about thirty-one hundred responses from faculty, staff, and students. But also now, having those three or four years under our belt, we learned a lot from the first plan. So I say our lived experiences also contributed to this new plan. I can also share with you the names of individuals from both Main Campus as well as the Health Science Campus who are on this 26-member panel, including Dr. Brakel who is also a member of this panel as well. So this plan was balanced with changing and emerging campus needs, recognizing that students' needs were changing, and where equity emerge as a core concept driving our work. Again, this idea of equity suggests that a one-size approach to student success, faculty success, and staff success doesn't work. It is important for the University to meet students, faculty and staff where they are and to create the right infrastructure programs and incentives to ensure that everyone is successful and every faculty recruited is able to be promoted to tenure and full professor, and every student that is recruited is able to retain and graduate, and every staff member is able to advance to the University where appropriate. Now again, we still have work to do, so I don't want for me to give the impression that I think we have arrived, because we have not, but I think we have made some good progress. I guess, also part of the equity meant that we begin to disaggregate the data and not just look at data, you know, I think at one point we were very good looking at just the University scores or the University numbers with respect to diversity. I think an important difference over the past several years is that now I recognize diversity is important, but diversity without inclusion in my mind is meaningless. Then you have to go a bit further and now talk about equity. You cannot bring faculty, staff or students to the University and think that the look [is]one, we must look at them individually.

The new plan. The photograph that I have on this particular slide I took, and I think this was over the summer, and of course, this was right after the George Floyd killing and our students were protesting. At that meeting, at that particular protest, they continued to remind me, Dr. McKether our voices are important, our voices must be heard and we must feel respected and appreciated. That is why I wanted to

make sure that I included this slide here. So for the goals for this particular strategy, again, I think the goals largely remained the same, but the strategies differ. The number of strategies differ. Here we have 31 strategies under retention of URM students. I think two things that happened over the three or four-year time period. One, the University began to focus more on student success, not that it had not, but I think it became a lot more razor focused. We hired an assistant associate provost for student success, which we have not had somebody in that role for some time with the right kind of background and passion for this work. The Office of Undergrad Admissions hired an assistant director for diverse student recruitment. I think you can see those two types of things makes a difference. It is from those people, from the Enrollment Office as well as from the Provost Office where we begin to ask. We want to make sure we have the right kinds of strategies that is going to make a difference – that number increased. The same thing with recruitment of underrepresented faculty, here is where we engaged directly with the Provost Office. I know Dr. Thompson was on the call. She is part of that group. I think Kevin West is part of that group. Wafaa from the Health Science Campus is part of that group. So again, helping to make sure these strategies are implemented. There are seven strategies on retention on diverse staff; five strategies related to community engagement and partnerships; four strategies for supplier diversity. I think in the first plan we may have had one or two strategies, and that is an area that we recognize as an institution, that I am pushing to say that we have a responsibility to the community that surrounds us and an obligation to help ensure that in the spirit of economic development that we are helping those small minority-owned businesses to be successful. Many of those people, our alum, have students here. Also, there are five strategies on increasing the feelings of inclusiveness, equity and belonging. So, those are the goals. Those are the strategies of the 2020-2023 strategic diversity plan. In June the Board of Trustees passed a resolution to accept this, and so I tell them, when you make a resolution like that, in my mind, you are committed to help fund what is in it. That is, it. Thank you so much. At this point, President Brakel, I don't know if there's time for questions. I would be happy to engage in questions if there are any.

President Brakel: Yes, we have time for just a few questions. Does anybody have any questions? I see something. In the chat here I see Senator Jayatissa's question. How do you make sure that faculty and staff hiring processes are fair and follow diversity plans at UT? For example, how do you implement diversity plans in the faculty hiring process? Does your office have involvement in monitoring the hiring process?

Vice President McKether: That is a good question. So of course, one thing, all departments or colleges have a diversity plan. One of the things that we included this year is a requirement for all colleges to also now have a faculty hiring plan so we will be able to get a sense of what are the plans moving ahead for hiring. The second thing that we did, and here is what I think...was a bit of a failure in the first plan, in the first plan we said that the vice president for diversity would be engaged in every faculty hire, and that didn't happen. So this year moving forward, I will be working a lot closer with the Provost Office to figure out a system to make that happen. In addition to that, working with the Provost Office in creating a chair's training on how to identify improved diverse faculty. The last thing I can tell you that, and we are not there yet, this is not part of the diversity plan, but something that we are considering and we can figure this out is how are we able to hold deans accountable for the diversity in their colleges including the hire and recruitment of faculty. So again, that last item, we are just now starting to think it through. We realize it has to go through many layers of approval starting with the Provost. So I've had that

conversation with Provost Bjorkman. She is in agreement, but it is the matter of figuring out what that assessment looks like.

President Brakel: Are there any other questions?

Senator Barnes: I have one. Thank you, Dr. McKether for the report as well as for all the tireless work I know that you are doing on behalf of diversity and inclusion on campus and your excellent staff.

Vice President McKether: Thank you.

Senator Barnes: My question is about the strategies within the report in terms of targeting populations with those strategies. For example, I know women overall, college students are doing well in terms of enrollment and retention, but in particular fields, women students are not doing well and women of color in particular in some fields. So I am wondering if there are strategies that disaggregate by gender and also in terms of policy that could be really helpful in terms of increasing our diversity.

Vice President McKether: Thank you, Dr. Barnes for that question and for the compliments. The work that we do, we have a great team here and again, I give so much credit to the university family for the work that it does. There is a strategy in the plan that was actually added by the Eberly Center for Women. And so we are now starting to take a closer look at the success rates of female students, but also equity in female faculty and staff as well. So again, that is a strategy through the Eberly Center. Dr. Angie Fitzpatrick, I know is starting to pull together, I believe, a small group of people from campus to zero in on that.

President Brakel: Alright. One of the issues related to equity of course, is the access to technology. Senator Bigioni, you learned something at the COVID meeting, can you state that please right now?

Senator Bigioni: Thank you. I neglected to say earlier, but it is an important point that I wanted to make. Apparently there are a couple of hundred, literally new laptops that were purchased to address the technology access problems that some of our students are having. It is important that everyone here is aware of that so that if you run into students that have problems getting a laptop, because so much of what we do is online now, there are solutions and resources available to them. Two-hundred Dell laptops have been purchased and they should be configured and ready by Friday. They don't want to broadcast this to students, because it might turn in to a free laptop thing, first come sort of thing. This is not what they want. They want to be able to identify students in need and have a rubric in order to qualify students. I ask how this would be conveyed to students. The answer was that there would be a link on the COVID website. I haven't seen the link yet, perhaps they are waiting till those laptops are ready. But they have already been qualifying some students, 30-odd students already. So again, I just want to make everyone aware of that resource for our students in need. Thanks.

President Brakel: That is an equity issue that we [had] mentioned in our resolution. Senator Bigioni, there was a question here about who to contact. I guess that is to continue to watch the COVID website for the announcement. Correct?

Senator Bigioni: Right. That is my understanding.

President Brakel: Okay.

Vice President McKether: So Senator Bigioni, thank you for mentioning it. This came up yesterday and I think Dr. Thompson was on the call there as well. Several others perhaps can chime in. We had a lengthy discussion about this and it centered on equity and wanting to ensure that it wasn't just about first come, first serve. But students who most need technology may not currently have access to technology, therefore they couldn't put in if they need it. So, we did talk about establishing a rubric that we work in collaboration with Bill McCreary. Senator Bigioni, I am not sure if you are from that team or not, but we do appreciate the collaboration and just sort of the interest in Bill McCreary and his team working collaboratively with the Provost Office, with Student Affairs, and my office to make sure that students who most need this technology would have access to it.

President Brakel: A question here in the chat, why do we not have one of the student offices handle this kind of student issues? Vice President McKether, I don't know if you want to take that.

Vice President McKether: I'm sorry, I was trying to un-share my screen. Can you repeat that, please? I'm sorry.

President Brakel: Yes. The question here in the chat is, why do we not have one of the student offices handle this kind of student issues? Senator El-Zawahry, do you want to elaborate on your question?

Senator El-Zawahry: Yes. Whenever we are saying something like this, it seems to me, it is not easy accessible to the students and most of the faculty. When you go to online, these things are very difficult to navigate in a short time. So, my question is, why don't we have one of the student affair offices or the administrative offices located so whenever students have some issues like this, they can go to them and they can direct them to the resources?

Vice President McKether: Through the Provost Office you have the success coaches and these success coaches are engaging with students on a regular basis, and that is what they do all day. So through this process, and I think the success coaches as they are contacting students they are making notes. To your point though, you have the success coaches through the Provost Office, we have the division of Student Affairs who is also engaged, so [I guess] that is our way of ensuring that we have broad cross-campus collaboration in trying to figure out where the neediest students are.

Vice Provost Thompson: Dr. McKether, this is Amy. If I can just jump in for a second too. From a faculty perspective, there is the Office of Student Advocacy that does a lot of this work as well on behalf of the students. And again, from a faculty perspective, if you notice you have students in your class not performing or struggling because of technology issues or access issues, you can always also fill out the report of concern through the Rocket Care portal and those are things that can also kind of start the process so that we can kind of help understand what the challenges or issues the students are facing. The Office of Student Advocacy really is a big part of addressing those kinds of challenges for our students.

President Brakel: Thank you. Any other questions here? Hearing none or seeing none, we thank you, Dr. McKether for your presentation and bringing us up to speed about the diversity strategic plan and equity.

Vice President McKether: Thank you so much for inviting me. Much appreciated.

President Brakel: Right.

Alright. That brings us then to something that's been long worked on for a couple of years and we were making some good progress and got held up last year by the Office of Legal Affairs and then we went

into COVID and a shutdown. So we are literally starting at square one with the first reading of the Constitution. What will happen is once we get done with the first reading of the Constitution then I will have to sit down with the Board of Trustees representative to go over it, make sure everything is in line. We shouldn't have to go by Legal again, because we have already run it by Legal, and then we can go ahead with the second reading. Chair Mark Templin, if you will, lead us through the Constitution reading.

Senator Templin: Sure. I am going to share my screen, so hopefully you should be seeing this. Let me start with the Constitution. Four documents were sent out. One of the four documents is the draft of the new Constitution. The second document is the draft of the Bylaws. The third document was the draft of the Rules for Faculty Senate. The fourth document is basically a table of, currently we have an existing Constitution, Appendix and Rules and then where did those various things end up. So it is kind of color coded. If you'll notice in the Constitution, Article 14 was deleted. That was a transition article that got us to the Constitution we have now. It was intended to be deleted since it is no longer needed. Now, we could suspend the reading today. It is parliamentary in order. Reading means I have to read this line by line so we could suspend the reading of line by line for today and have it as 'the reading was done in terms of I brought it to Faculty Senate.' Now, let me just say President Brakel is correct, we are going to have to talk to the Provost and the President's Office to make sure the documents are still acceptable. But when it comes to the second reading, parliamentarily you can't suspend the second reading; it has to be read line by line. What happens is the Constitution gets voted on Article by Article. So, what happens is, if there are any issues that senators are objecting to, we can talk about it and then when it goes up to a vote, either that Article is approved or that Article goes back to the Constitution Committee for further work. Once all of the Articles are approved and everything is fine, then it will go out to the faculty as a whole for ratification. I think I can do like a WebEx room and we can set up some times when these would be for faculty who are not on Faculty Senate, but still have a vote. After Faculty Senate endorses the Constitution, you want to give time for non-Faculty Senate faculty to ask questions -- we would do that through WebEx, I am assuming. I would be in my WebEx room and the Senate Office, I believe, can send out a link saying, if you have questions, see Dr. Templin in such and so room. We will probably have a time that is like a Tuesday and a Wednesday because classes are usually Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday, so we can have a couple of different times to make myself available to the maximum amount of faculty. I think that is an overview of the process. President Brakel, do you want to entertain a motion to suspend the reading?

President Brakel: Yes, I will entertain a motion to do so.

Senator Templin: I cannot move that, but somebody else can.

Senator Kistner: I move to suspend the first reading of the Constitution.

Senator Molitor: This is Scott Molitor from Engineering. I just have a question. If we suspend the readings, can we still request discussion on particular Articles today?

President Brakel: Yes, you can.

Senator Molitor: Okay. Thank you. I will second the motion then.

President Brakel: Any discussion on the motion? All in favor, put 'yes' in the chat and 'no' for no, or 'abstain' for abstain. Looks like that has passed. *Motion Passed.* Please proceed.

Senator Templin: Senator Molitor, you had a question.

Senator Molitor: Yes. Do you mind if I take the floor to discuss the propose change of Article 3 to the Constitution?

Senator Templin: Sure---

President Brakel: Can we just kind of go more by Article by Article? Any questions about Article I? It is pretty straightforward. Hearing none, [next,] Article 2. Senator Templin, would you like to explain the red please?

Senator Templin: This was language that we were wrestling with back and forth. I am hoping I got the right version here. I'm going to have to look at this because Legal wanted one language and the Constitution Committee wanted another. I've got sixteen versions and I might have pulled the wrong version. My apologies.

President Brakel: If I am not mistaken, Legal wanted the word 'participate' and we wanted the word 'govern.'

Senator Templin: Oh, yes, that is right. So, I have 'govern' and 'participate.' The committee cannot decide on which way. In one sense we govern and in another, we participate.

Senator Molitor: If the Board of Trustees is not going to accept 'govern,' what is the rationale for trying to continue including that word?

Senator Templin: Well, I just didn't feel like the committee voted it a certain way. The "committee" being the Constitution Committee. I can't unilaterally just take it out. Now, Faculty Senate can overrule the Committee and Senate in its wisdom can say, 'no, just have participate.' I mean, that is fine, but I can't take it out on my own.

Senator Molitor: Could we forward a motion to change wording as we go through Article by Article?

Senator Templin: You could.

Senator Molitor: Okay. I would like to submit the motion that Article 2. E, we use the wording, 'to participate in the making of academic policy and speak on behalf of faculty.'

President Brakel: So, we have a motion on the floor. I need a second.

Senator Anderson: Second.

President Brakel: Okay. Hearing none---

Senator Heberle: Wait. Aren't we open for discussion, President Brakel?

President Brakel: Yes, we are.

Senator Heberle: Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't hear that. I would advocate to keep 'govern' in the text and let the BOT tell us that we are not part of the governance, even though we are supposed to be sharing governance. We don't share participation. We share governance. And so, given what I am hearing from other campuses about the sort of erosion of shared governance and this sort of both optimistic and sense I have here at UT, but also some issues that have risen here at UT around shared governance, I would argue

that we keep that word ‘govern’ because it is actually what the AAUP in its largest sense sort of thinks about in the context of shared governance. It is not shared participation. Participation means that we can continue to have Q and A’s with administrators coming to meetings and that means we have participated. It doesn’t mean we have shared governance. So I think it is really important that we keep the word ‘govern’ in there.

President Brakel: From the Board of Trustees perspective, they see themselves with fiduciary responsibility of the University. Any other discussion? [*Recording Malfunction*]

Senator Barnes: I really appreciate what Senator Heberle is saying here. I think that sharing responsibility is one aspect of governance. By that account, we probably would be firing them if we could, based on what’s happened in the last six to eight months. So, President Brakel, can you tell us what is the harm of leaving it this way?

President Brakel: From the Board of Trustees legal perspective, they say that we don’t have the authority to use ‘govern.’ Now, one thought that comes to my mind and I’ll take it back to Senator Molitor since he made the motion, perhaps the language might be ‘to participate in the shared governance in the making of academic policy and to speak on behalf of faculty. Maybe that would be palatable to both sides.

Senator Steven: This is Senator Rob Steven. I wondered if I could make a comment.

President Brakel: Go ahead, Senator Steven.

Senator Steven: I was a member of this committee, the Constitution Committee. It was actually my suggestion to use the word ‘govern’ because the wording that was previously there essentially defined govern. Also, if you look at the first sentence of this article II.E, “*Subject to the supervision and control of the Board of Trustees,*” why are they worried? That is right there at the front of this sentence. So ‘govern’ is completely appropriate in my opinion.

President Brakel: Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

Senator Heberle: Just jumping in again as a political scientist. We might [want to] think about that term governance. It is not a legal term and so people love to throw around the language of legality as if it is an answer to all ethical and political dilemmas. And I think that is really a good point, subject to the supervision and control of the BOT. They do have the final say. We all know that. But governance is a really strong term that participation does not capture, and I think that is what shared governance is about. Of course, there is sort of where the buck stops, and that is the Board of Trustees. Like Senator Barnes said, they’re hardly really holding up their end of the deal. But I think the term ‘govern’ is important rhetorically and semantically here.

Senator Molitor: Since I submitted the motion, I would be happy to accept President Brakel’s friendly amendment to word it as ‘to participate in shared governance and in the making of academic policy and to speak on behalf of the faculty.’

Senator Anderson: I am wondering if [the language could say] ‘equally participate,’ like put in the word ‘equally’ or not.

President Brakel: I don’t know how the word ‘equally’ would fly with them.

Senator Anderson: So I agree with everything that Senator Molitor said in the amendment, but just adding ‘equally participate.’

President Brakel: Right. I see Senator Chaffee, it says that governance actually is a legal term, and so we will defer to our legal people here.

Senator Chaffee: I mean, actually in regard to that, I think it is important that the term “governance” is there. Meaning, that we are a shared governance institution and frankly, I think it would be an improper abdication of our governance power to try and essentially downgrade ourselves to “participating”. This is a similar position to the other comments were made. Although, the amendment I think would ~~still~~ adequately express what we are required to do.

President Brakel: Does the BOT have authority over academic policy? Yes, they would, although they don’t really step in a whole lot in that area. They leave that to us. So, we have right now a motion [on the floor] and it currently reads, Senator Molitor, will you restate that please?

Senator Molitor: So I think my motion was to ‘participate in shared governance and in the making of academic policy, and to speak on behalf of faculty.’ I can put that in the chat box too if that helps.

President Brakel: So any other questions or comments on that? So since that has been amended, I need the person who seconded that, I should have taken the note---

Senator Anderson: Senator Anderson did the second. I second the amendment.

President Brakel: Okay. Alright. So any further discussion, going once, going twice? Please vote on this motion – ‘yes’ means that you are accepting the rewording and ‘no’ means no. Well, I saw a few ‘no’s’ in there.

Senator Molitor: I saw four ‘no’s,’ President Brakel.

President Brakel: Right, that is what I saw. Overwhelmingly, this motion has been approved. *Motion Approved.* Moving on. Do you want to explain?

Senator Templin: So, 2. G, the red words there ‘*including those who served in these administrative positions on an interim basis,*’ that was objected to by the Provost Office because you have people who, as an interim, they might only be there for a short time or something. They thought it was a bit too far to do formative assessments for interim positions.

President Brakel: The position of Senate last year was that because deans are reviewed every two years, that if it was an interim position, hopefully by the second year it would have been filled in a permanent role. So that was the position of Senate last year. Any discussion on this?

Senator Hall: How long has the current interim Provost been serving, it must be coming up on two years?

President Brakel: She was actually made permanent Provost last January.

Senator Hall: Okay, that is right. But the point I was trying to make is if some of these positions are interim for a long period of time, we would want to hear from them. So perhaps we could say that an interim position serving for a certain period of time should report to the Senate or something.

Senator Molitor: Isn't the intent of the addition to assess anybody in that administrative role whether they are permanent or interim, as long as they been in their position for a duration of at least two years?

President Brakel: That is the intent. And again, the thing that has to be remembered is that our assessment that we do as the Faculty Senate is only one piece of information in the evaluation process that the provost and/or president would undertake of that dean. Because the deans are given their marching orders from the provost, and thus they are evaluated on that - those instructions the president does the same and so they have things that they have to address there as well.

Senator Heberle: I am thinking about whether we've had interim positions for longer than two years since I've been here, and I can't say that we have, but I could very well be wrong. I am sort of two minds about it, because on one hand it is a lot of work to evaluate somebody who is going to be replaced and there is a search going on and they are still here and we have to evaluate them, but we know they are leaving. So that would be a little odd, especially if we know a search is going on. On the other hand, leaving it in there, places pressure on the administration to fill the position and not sit around with an interim for longer than two years. But I am not really sure that's been a habit here. So, if we are trying to do something with this to keep people accountable, then I think one, it would be weird to evaluate somebody on their way out, but on the other hand, we want to have some means by which to keep the pressure on, not to have interim positions. I don't think this is a good way of doing that, but---

Senator Molitor: I just wanted to add to Senator Heberle's point. Evaluating somebody on the way out can be useful information to the person coming in. So, I would still see value in that if the person has been in the position for two years. That gives faculty enough time to evaluate their performance and even if that person is on the way out, again, that can be useful for the person coming in.

Senator Heberle: Is that evaluation open, available to the person coming in? I mean, are these public records? In some sense they are, but also, I don't know the terms on which they are public records that somebody coming in would be looking at.

Senator Molitor: I assume that would be a matter of the person who is going out and the person who is coming in if they came to an agreement to share the results, or if the faculty in the unit who will receive the results of the evaluation will share it with the incoming individual.

President Brakel: I know the College of Education has had several different people in the dean role during the years that I've been here. I can't remember what the longest interim position has been. Can any other Education Senators think about that?

Senator Welsch: Yes, we did have an interim dean for three years at one point.

President Brakel: That is what I thought.

Senator Templin: President Brakel, one possibility is to take what is in red and put it in parentheses. So you could say parentheses, "including those who serve in these administrative positions on an interim basis longer than two years," close parentheses. So in other words, it is like, look if an interim goes on too long, this little parenthetical note will kick in, but the main intent is informative assessments for the provost, vice provost, and the deans.

Senator Heberle: So if there is no search going on and we know that person is going to continue, then we will go ahead and do an evaluation their second year?

Senator Templin: Yes, I don't know how we would write that, but that would be the intent I would think.

Senator Molitor: So, Senator Templin, you are suggesting the wording would be to facilitate formative assessments of the provost, vice provost, and deans at least once every two years. Then parentheses, "including those who serve in administrative positions on an interim basis for a duration exceeding two years," end parentheses.

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Molitor: Okay. I am fine with that, and I would move to make that change.

Senator Anderson: I think you could strike 'in these administrative positions,' and just 'who serve on an interim basis' because we've already defined the people that are being assessed.

Senator Molitor: Well, I think the issue with that is previously when we didn't mention 'interim,' it was kind of assumed that this only apply to permanent provost, vice provost, and deans.

Senator Anderson: No, I am just saying you could strike 'and these administrative positions.'

President Brakel: So it will read, 'including those who serve on an interim basis.'

Senator Molitor: Got it. I will enter a motion in the chat box here so everybody can see the text. N.B. – motion in chat box is to approve the language "including those who serve on an interim basis for a duration exceeding two years."

President Brakel: Senator Jayatissa, I see you've made a comment here. You wrote, should include two or more years on an interim basis. Was that a motion? I don't hear him. Oh, it is just a suggestion. Thank you. Alright, so we have a motion that was at least verbally made and went into the chat. There it is. The motion is to 'facilitate continuing on deans at least once every two years, including those,' parentheses, 'that serve on an interim basis for more than two years,' closed parentheses.

Senator Van Hoy: I second the motion.

President Brakel: Thank you, Senator Van Hoy. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Senator Bigioni: President Brakel, this is Senator Bigioni. I had another potential edit. Should it be handled separately or as part of this?

President Brakel: Well, right now we have a motion on the floor so if it doesn't pertain to this particular motion, it needs to wait.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. I will private message it to you.

President Brakel: Okay. Any discussion on this motion? Hearing none. We need to call the question. So put 'yes' in the chat box to approve this, 'no' for no and 'abstain' for abstain. That appears to have passed. *Motion Passed.* All right now, Senator Bigioni, would you please go with your comment?

Senator Bigioni: Does this edit also pertain to II.G? That was my question earlier. So, I recall last year that this included an assessment of the President, and of course, the spirit of this was that this provides some sort of feedback from the faculty and the administrators, and of course, they have no teeth. The

nature of feedback is to try to improve our institution. So, I don't recall the details of how the President was dropped off this list, but perhaps we should consider reinstating it, because, I, well, I'll leave it at that and leave that open for discussion.

President Brakel: I can address that Senator Bigioni. In my experience here in this President's role and previously as President-Elect, the Board of Trustees does contact the president and president-elect for input regarding the faculty's perspective of the president for their evaluation purpose. So I think that is why that was left out.

Senator Molitor: I'll also like to point out that the previous version of Article 2. G, did not include assessment of the president. It was only provost, vice provost, and deans.

President Brakel: Right. Thank you.

Senator Bigioni: So I take it that it means there was discussion without change. Is that correct, Senator Molitor?

Senator Molitor: Yes. The discussion was, should we include the president in our amended Constitution?

Senator Steven: Can I just clarify there? This is Senator Steven.

President Brakel: Yes.

Senator Steven: As a member of the Constitution Committee, we did put in 'president' and it was voted on by the Constitution Committee to bring that forward to Faculty Senate. So in the process after it was confirmed and voted on by the Constitution Committee, it was later dropped – I don't know how – but by discussion through the administration that 'no, we are just not going to accept that.' So, it was removed without any real further discussion.

Senator Templin: My understanding was, President Brakel, correct me if I am wrong, but the Board views their role as assessing the president and so it just didn't pass muster with Legal.

President Brakel: That is correct. From my school board experience, I can say, and this is really their perspective. The Board really only have one employee and that is the president, and then the president is responsible for running the rest of the institution. While the Board is interested in all those factors, it is really the president that is accountable to the Board. The Board gets their input from faculty via this consult that they do once a year regarding the presidency evaluation. Now I will say this, that when President Gaber did announce her departure, that there was no evaluation of her for this year to my understanding. At least, we were not contacted to participate in such an evaluation.

Senator Heberle: I'm remembering back to the little bit of PTSD--I am remembering back to the Jacobs years-- and thinking about discussions that went on there. I think about evaluating him and the fact the Board never did. The Board hasn't really taken up this responsibility very seriously. So, I am wondering if one way of doing this might be to require our Faculty Senate leadership in our Constitution to do an evaluation among the faculty, through the Faculty Senate, but then they use [it] to bring to the Board consultation, because it seems to me that would then speak to the Board sense that 'oh, we only have to consult the faculty, we don't really have to listen to them.' But it would also satisfy sort of the sense that faculty aren't, I just don't know. It is not about the matter of trusting the Senate leadership, but it just the

matter of knowing, having the finger on the pulse to be able to express it. So, is there a way we could put that in the Constitution to require the leadership to conduct a kind of evaluation or evaluatory process that they then bring to that consultation?

Senator Bigioni: Can I add to that point? So clearly this assessment serves no oversight role. Right? This is the job of the Board of Trustees. This is more feedback, advisory, how are you doing sort of assessment. So, as President Brakel points out, there is a mechanism for this, but let's say it is just less well defined than it would be if it were formalized such that all faculty have access to this assessment tool. Then that could be used by the Senate President and whomever else is involved in that discussion to more comprehensively convey the faculty concerns, and opinions, and approvals, and so on to the president. So this could be used as a tool within the current feedback mechanism, but a tool that would comprehensively survey the faculty as a whole than is probably done now. So, it could serve a role changing how things are done in the interaction of president them self.

Senator Heberle: I am also thinking, just to jump in and add on to that. If we did this every five years, if we were required to do it one way or the other, if the president has been here for four or five years, that could put more pressure on the BOT if the Senate is engaged in this sort of internal discussion about the presidency. It could theoretically put pressure on the BOT to actually do their evaluation of the president. If the Faculty Senate leadership is prepared with this assessment from the faculty – and no, it's not going to govern anything. It is not going to be the final word on anything, but it would be the input that is out there, so it might be a way to encourage them to do their job.

Senator Bigioni: Well, I just want to make sure my point is clear. My main point is making sure every voice is heard. It is a better way to do it than informal discussions with a few people that funnel their way up to the top---

Senator Heberle: Absolutely.

Senator Bigioni: So that is my primary motivation.

Senator Wedding: President Brakel, this is Don Wedding. Can you hear me?

President Brakel: Yes, I can.

Senator Wedding: I have a hardcopy of the evaluation that was done by the faculty of Jacobs. I have that; I found it and nothing happened of it. It was a terrible evaluation of Dr. Jacobs. So apparently there have been evaluations done in the past of presidents by faculty. The second thing is that regardless of what it says in this Constitution, under the [first] amendment, we could as a body, in fact, the AAUP could do an evaluation of the president.

President Brakel: We lost you.

Senator Wedding: I'm sorry?

President Brakel: We lost you there for a moment.

Senator Wedding: I said that regardless of the Constitution wording, we as a body could conduct an evaluation of the president, or even the AAUP, or some other group could do so. I don't think that under the first amendment that anyone could be blocked on this campus from conducting an evaluation of the president. The problem with putting it in the Constitution, and I agree with Senator Heberle on all of this,

the problem with the Constitution insertion is it might cause us to get a turn down by the Board, in which case the Constitution won't get through. So that is a political factor. But overall, I think we need to evaluate the president and maybe we just do it or some Senate does it going forward if they want to. I don't think we need permission from the Board or anyone else to conduct an evaluation of the president.

President Brakel: Senator Jayatissa put this in the chat. How about other universities in the U.S., do they evaluate the president? I'm personally not aware of other institutions that I seek a widespread faculty input there with regard to evaluating the president. Other senators may know something differently. However, that said, there has been Senates, of course that have done as what Senator Wedding has stated, sort of ad hoc evaluations and/or votes of confidence or no confidence in the president. So, you are not eliminating something if you don't have the president listed here in G.

Senator Anderson: I was wondering if the Board of Trustees does an assessment on the president, could we have some type of clause that that assessment be shared with the Faculty Senate, and that it will be given to the Faculty Senate or the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate?

Senator Molitor: I don't think we are in the position to tell the Board of Trustees what to do.

President Brakel: Right. I was going to say the same thing. If you take it in another sense, how would we as an individual faculty member like to have our own evaluation out there in the public as well? Now, that said, evaluations can be...and all that stuff.

Senator Heberle: I don't know quite what is in the Bylaws. Is this potentially a Bylaws thing to hold the Executive Committee responsible for conducting an evaluation through the Faculty Senate? Maybe not the Constitution, but the Bylaws. Does the BOT also approve that? I see Senator Wedding's point and I think it is, I mean, there is some things I will go on the hill and die for, and this is maybe not one of them since we can do whatever we want. But I also think that Senate leaderships come and go and I do think we need to hold ourselves accountable in writing to do this kind of work. So, I am wondering if there is something in the Bylaws we can do.

Senator Templin: To my knowledge, there is nothing explicitly in the Bylaws. Keep in mind that we're moving away from the Constitution, Appendix and Rules to end towards Constitution, Bylaws and Rules. The Senate has authority to change its Bylaws, so in theory, you could put a Bylaw in there that you're going to do that. Of course, it is also in the Ohio Revised Code that the Board of Trustees can disapprove that. So constitutions and Bylaws, those parliamentary documents must go to the Board of Trustees to be approved.

President Brakel: Okay. I think that answers Senator Molitor's question about Bylaws subject to the Board of Trustees approval. I'm just trying to think personally of the logistics, from the Executive Committee, to conduct yet another survey and compile that information and how that would work out. That is my only concern about that. I would hope that whoever is in the leadership position has a good pulse of the faculty as to what they are thinking from the faculty and from the Executive Committee members branching out into various colleges. So, we need to make some decision here. There is no motion on the floor here right now regarding president. Is there a motion?

Senator Bigioni: I suppose I will make the motion.

President Brakel: Okay. And your motion please?

Senator Bigioni: To add to Section 2. G., in front of Provost there.

President Brakel: Is there a second?

Senator Heberle: Second.

President Brakel: Any other discussion on this motion?

Senator Molitor: I agree with Senator Wedding's comments. We have the ability to evaluate the president whenever we want. But by putting it into this document, you guarantee that the Board of Trustees will reject this language. So I would advocate that we not include it.

President Brakel: Thank you.

Senator Heberle: Is there any discussion with the Board of Trustees about these clauses, because it seems to me that to facilitate formative assessments, I am not really sure that any of this, if we include the president here, steps on their toes at all because they can do what they will, whether it is the provost, vice provost, or deans. So, I am just not sure what their problem would be with it. So maybe it is better to do it the way Senator Wedding was talking about, just hold ourselves accountable to keep doing it and keep the pressure on before putting it in the Constitution, and maybe that could be even better.

President Brakel: In response to that, Senator Templin, you were there as well. This was two years ago when we met with Board of Trustee Cavanaugh about this matter.

Senator Templin: Right.

President Brakel: If I recall, his perspective at that time, and it had not gone to Legal at that moment, the Board of Trustees was not receptive of the formal language of having an assessment of the president in that Constitution. Was that your recollection?

Senator Templin: Right. Exactly.

President Brakel: Any other discussion on this motion that's been made, to add the president to the individuals that we are going to assess?

Senator Bigioni: So, one of the reasons I made the motion is because I don't know where the rest of the faculty stand. Does it serve a purpose? I want to hear. If it serves a purpose then let's do a straw vote and if there isn't much support for the idea, the motion can be withdrawn and we can move on.

President Brakel: Here is what I can say, Senator Bigioni with regard to what was asked two years ago regarding President Gaber. They asked a lot of questions dealing with our perception of how does she participate in shared governance? What was the communication between the president and faculty? What were faculty's perceptions? They also asked about specific issues. I don't want to reveal what those specific issues are right now, but they wanted to hear our perspective of that. You can guess at the time the hospital was one of those.

Senator El-Zawahry: May I just comment? I put two comments in the chat box. Number one, why are we considering the president above the evaluation or assessment? We are all under this governor and the president is responsible for the university and the well-being of the University. If we are with him, and we are in a Constitution that allows us to speak freely, we should be able to do this and it shouldn't be

neglected not to be in the constitution. The same time I am going to argue against that, and say, well, as a faculty, I don't have any direct connection with the president so how can I evaluate a president that by any means, I don't have direct connection or relationship to as regard to the way they are doing the work? The only connection to me in my view is through the dean and the work of the dean. If the dean is not performing well, this tells me that the president does not have the proper personnel that helps me to go through my career or through my work. Just my comments about that.

President Brakel: Any other discussion?

Senator Heberle: Well, I am willing to concede all the good points that have been made about putting it in the Constitution. But, I really don't agree with President Brakel that the leadership of the Executive Board does adequately have their finger on the pulse. I really do think we need to hold ourselves accountable to doing some formal assessment. I also take that point about being kind of distant from the president, that is really true as faculty. But again, it is just one data point in the way in which the community sees the president. The faculty is the most important constituencies on this campus in terms of the academic mission and so I just feel like we should have a say in what the president is doing and how they are doing it. So I think that is really important, even though, no, we're not as close to them as we are to the dean or perhaps to the provost, but I think it is just another data point. And I do want to hold the Senate itself accountable for getting this done somehow so that when the Executive Committee, or the president, or vice president speak to these issues that it is a broader perspective, even though it is certainly more work and logistically more difficult. But, we will be in good practice because we will start doing the provost and the deans on a regular basis so we will have lots of practice doing it and so, we will figure it out.

Senator Bigioni: Well said, Senator Heberle. That is my primary concern, is just making sure everybody is heard. If this is not the mechanism, that is fine, as long as we have a little bit better way of making sure every voice is heard in the process of this other mechanism of feedback to the president, as you mentioned earlier. So if there's some motivation to do that, then that is fine; this amendment doesn't need pushing, it can be withdrawn. But, that is my motivation and my feelings on it and I appreciate, not just Senator Heberle's comments, but Senator Wedding's earlier as well.

President Brakel: Well to be clear, Senator Bigioni, are you withdrawing your motion?

Senator Bigioni: Well, given the arguments about it sort of "beating a dead horse" with regard to the BOT and so on, I don't want to "beat a dead horse," but I do want to make sure people's voices are heard. If there is a better mechanism to do that, then that seems to be the way to go. So yes, I am happy to withdraw it so that we can move on.

Senator Molitor: If I can make a potential suggestion? I believe we are putting the duties of the Executive Committee in the Bylaws. Are we removing it from the Constitution of the Bylaws, or are we going to keep it in the Constitution?

Senator Templin: I don't remember it. I can't look it up right now because I am sharing, but the Executive Committee is named in the Constitution. Whether all the duties made it into the Bylaws, I think the duties of each office went to the Bylaws.

Senator Molitor: I am looking at, I think it is Section 3. of the Bylaws. One suggestion would be to put it in the Bylaws, not to say that the Executive Committee will conduct a review of the president every so

many years. We can make a duty of the Executive Committee if requested by the Board of Trustees to provide an evaluation of the president, then the Faculty Senate must consult with the Senate or language along those lines.

Senator Templin: That sounds reasonable. I can write it in and once we get to it later we can word smith it.

President Brakel: Or something along the line, perhaps the Executive Committee will solicit feedback from faculty.

Senator Krantz: I have a comment on that. The way Senator Molitor framed that, it sounded restrictive, only upon the request of the Board of Trustees. I think that we, the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee should have the flexibility to request that information from the general faculty when we feel it is needed.

Senator Molitor: Senator Krantz is correct. As it's been pointed out, we can evaluate the performance of any administrator when we want. But the language in the Bylaws should state if the request is made from the Board of Trustees for the Faculty Senate Exec. to evaluate the president or other administrator, then the Faculty Senate Exec. must collect information from the entire faculty.

Senator Krantz: Further, I do agree that this is best served in the Bylaws rather than in the Constitution for all the reasons. I mean, obviously, this is a complex issue, but I think everything that we have discussed rules against putting it in the Constitution directly.

President Brakel: Yes. All right, so we got about fifteen minutes left here. If I am not mistaken, the motion has been withdrawn and we are hearing right now that the idea of the president evaluation would somehow be addressed in the Bylaws. Was there anything else in Article 2? Hearing none, we will move on to Article 3.

Senator Molitor: May I have the floor, President Brakel? First, a couple of comments for Article 3. for Senator Templin. Senator Templin, you need to highlight the statement, '*any administrator holding the rank of assistant dean.*' That should be in red because it is not in our current Constitution.

Senator Templin: Okay.

Senator Molitor: And I think in your tables of Article disposition, you should probably mention that there is another paragraph in Article III in the current Constitution that was moved to the Bylaws about the number of members in Faculty Senate.

Senator Templin: Okay.

Senator Molitor: And now for the third consecutive year, I am going to give my little speech about associate deans, so here it goes. I would like to point out to everybody in this conversation that I do have a conflict of interest here. I am an associate dean and I will talk about conflict of interest in a few moments. However, I do want everybody to know that this issue is not necessarily personal to me. I've had the pleasure of serving on Senate nine out of the last eleven years. I'm in the 3rd year of my current term. Regardless of the proposed amendment to Article 3. of our Constitution, there is a good chance I won't be back on Senate next year. My opposition to this proposed amendment is not for me, it is for my faculty colleagues, for my associate dean colleagues, and for the Faculty Senate as the body that serves as

the voice of the faculty in the process of shared governance. Senator Heberle, yes, we did discuss this last year, but this is a new Senate and a new reading. So, I would like to address the current Senate on this issue, if that is okay.

President Brakel: Point of order. Yes, because this is the first reading, it is proper for this discussion to be redone.

Senator Molitor cont'd: Thank you, President Brakel. For my faculty colleagues, I do not believe it is appropriate to deprive them of selecting any colleague that they believe would best represent their interests in the Senate. Faculty in some colleges may feel that their associate deans represent their faculty as well as anybody else. Faculty in other colleges may not. I don't think we should dictate to faculty in individual colleges who is appropriate or not appropriate to represent their interests. The faculty in each individual college should have the authority through the nomination and election process to determine who should or should not represent their interests in this body.

For my associate dean colleagues, I am offended by the notion that we are not viewed as faculty members by virtue of serving as an associate dean. Despite my administrative position, I am still a faculty member - I teach, I am active in research, and I engage in service to my colleagues at this institution and within my profession. I may not engage in these activities to the extent that non-administrative faculty do, but I consider myself a faculty member first and foremost.

And for this body, what good would it do to exclude the perspective and experience of associate deans? Some of the most significant Faculty Senate achievements over the past few years - revision of the core curriculum, adoption of tenure & promotion guidelines, and implementation of electronic ballots - have been led by associate deans who were or are currently on Senate. And we have seen what happens in deliberative bodies when you narrow down the pool to get people who think more and more alike. If anything, the Faculty Senate should be a very big tent - it should include a number of different points of view and a number of different experiences so that we make the best decisions for the faculty and institution as a whole.

I understand the rationale for wanting to exclude associate deans. There is the potential that associate deans would advocate for the interests of the administration over the interests of the faculty if such a conflict arose. Conflicts of interest can occur for any member of the Senate, not just associate deans. Your vote on a course or program proposal might be affected by how this proposal would affect your courses and programs. Your vote on a college reorganization might be affected by how this reorganization could impact your workload or prospects for promotion. Conflicts of interest cannot be removed, but they can and should be identified. Again, it should be up to the faculty to consider potential conflicts of interest and to decide which individuals would best serve their interests in this body.

Given my opposition to this change in Article III, I would move to remove the clause that makes administrators at a rank of assistant dean or and above ineligible for election to Faculty Senate and return to the previous language that administrators at a rank of dean or above ineligible. I yield the floor.

Senator Giovannucci: Many of the points brought up by Senator Molitor I also brought up last year. I would add that having served on Faculty Senate, Graduate Council and Research Council, this is a practical aspect finding competent and engaged people to contribute to the shared governance in our institution is sometimes challenging. Why we would purposely negate the very valuable input by some of

our colleagues who are faculty and also administrators. I don't see a point. I would second Dr. Molitor's motion to strike that language from our Constitution.

Senator Wedding: I will vote against this. I do want to point out that at one point, a few years ago, we had twelve associate deans in the Senate representing. At that time, if we only had a turnout of around, just barely had a quorum, which on occasions we had, like, say, thirty-six senators showed up then they would have been 1/3rd of the vote. They do have a conflict of interest. I do respect Senator Molitor very much, but he's been in the Senate [he just said] for nine of the last eleven years. That is interesting. In my college we do have an associate dean that does not hold academic rank. I don't know how that plays across campus, but in any case, I think associate deans are fine faculty members as they are. Some of them are teaching classes, some are not. I do think they have an inherent conflict of interest that they have to side with the administration. I think if we are going to have shared governance, it is going to start with having the faculty involved and not the administration. So, I would vote no on this.

President Brakel: Thank you.

Senator Heberle: I think you would vote yes to include the---

Senator Wedding: I am voting against Senator Molitor's motion.

Senator Molitor: Just to clarify, Senator Heberle, my motion was to remove this clause.

Senator Heberle: I'm sorry, you made a motion. We are speaking to the motion. I'm sorry, Senator Wedding.

Senator Wedding: I'm glad you did this because I want to make sure when I vote no, I am voting no.

President Brakel: Any further discussion?

Senator Templin: Just for clarification. So, Senator Molitor's motion is boiled down to getting rid of the word 'assistant,' because what I am hearing is we would still be excluding deans and vice provosts and so on – and the president. None of those people would be eligible. It's just you are talking about assistant and associate deans. Right?

Senator Molitor: Correct, and returning to the previous and current language, which is that administrators at the level of dean or higher are ineligible.

Senator Templin: Okay.

Senator Anderson: For Senator Wedding's point, he said that there are some assistant and associate deans that do not have faculty rank. I don't have anything against, personally myself having associate and assistant deans, but I think they should have faculty rank. The reason I don't have a problem with that is the faculty votes on who gets onto Senate, and they are picking the people they want to be on Senate. So if there is a dean out there they don't want on Senate, they are not going to vote for that person. I do believe they should have faculty rank.

Senator Heberle: I want to sort of speak. It is going to sound like I am being anti-democratic and very democratic at the same time. I think that given my experience so far on Senate, which this has only been my second three-year term with a long space of recovery in between, (and I am glad to be here again) what I've noticed on this campus is that the same people keep returning. I think that, well, I agree that the

associate deans and assistant deans are phenomenal both faculty and administrators, I think that the answer to the question of involvement means more reaching out, more constituency discussions about what the Senate is, and what it does. I think the Executive Committee talked about the President of Senate on a regular basis, sending out a summary to all faculty of Senate proceedings so that people aren't just being handed these fifteen-page single space Minutes which are brilliant -- Quinetta, thank you for the record -- but that's not something that is really going to communicate with people about what Senate is and what it does. Our retrenchment was intense and deep, but we also have a lot of new faculty on campus. I think we have a really big pool of faculty talent out there without relying on assistant and associate deans. My concern is, is that once someone is an associate or assistant dean in a college, that is the name people are familiar with, and so I know for me, the way we hold our elections, I tend to checkoff the names that I am familiar with. So, I am not really persuaded that the democracy argument works here in terms of really representing the faculty will in any rich or deep way. I think it does represent something, but the same way of which the Union elections happen. I just don't think it is particularly richer or participatory. So I would argue that as a Senate we try to spread the word about what Senate does, what its role is, why it is necessary for younger people to be involved, not junior faculty, but at least those who are getting tenure and things like that, and do that work instead of relying on expanding the pool into administration, which is sort of part of what the argument is here.

President Brakel: Okay. We have about two minutes technically remaining. I just want to put one or two things out here right now just as a reference, and I am not advocating one way or the other. Just to let you aware that the Ohio Faculty Council Constitution, I just learned this last Friday, to be a member of the Ohio Faculty Council, it has to be a department chair or lower, so you could use that as a reference point. I also value the associate and assistant deans' information because they have a lot of experience and they get a lot of work done for us in that regard. With that said, we do have a motion on the floor that we need to either decide to extend our Senate meeting here, or we need to call a vote, or we need to table this motion. I am sensing that there is probably going to be more discussion on this. Is that correct?

Senator Giovannucci: I would advocate to table this motion and continue it at our next meeting.

Senator Heberle: I want to make an argument to call the question since we did vote on this last year. I know this is a new Senate, and those who were not on Senate last year maybe can speak up and say whether this reviewing of this is going to help the vote go one way or the other or help us here.

President Brakel: I also don't want us to feel forced into making a vote one way or the other right now just because the constraints of time. So that is why I put these options out here.

Senator Wedding: I think Senator Heberle is right though, that we've voted on this last year and when I noticed the vote was open by a show of hands, I saw how the vote went. Clearly it convinced me that we have to keep associate and assistant deans out of the Senate. And other universities do that. It is not an attack on them. I have great respect for them. But I think that we need to vote to keep them, out, it should be chairs and below. I think we ought to vote now.

Senator Gregory: Is there is a particular reason why we are pushing this particular vote, as opposed to all the other things that we also voted on last year? I mean, this feels slightly rushed.

President Brakel: That is why I put those different options before you from a parliamentary standpoint. If I am not mistaken, and Senator Templin, correct me, I have a motion to table this motion on the floor. Correct?

Senator Templin: The motion to table has to be seconded as well.

President Brakel: Right, and---

Senator Coulter-Harris: I second that we table this motion.

President Brakel: I had already seen a second in the chat; Senator Insch was the person who did that right after Senator Giovannucci put the motion to move to table. So, that is on floor at this time.

Senator Templin: So you have to vote on the motion to table. Whether we table it or not, that is a superordinate motion and then you can go back to the main motion.

President Brakel: So, in the chat box right now, let's have 'yes' for tabling this, 'no' for no and 'abstain' for abstain.

Senator Molitor: President Brakel, I saw four or five 'no's' so far.

President Brakel: I saw four. Let me go back and double check. But it does clearly look to me that we have a motion that's been approved to table this until our meeting. *Motion Tabled.* With that, we will move on to our last item. Is there anything from the floor that needs to be addressed? Hearing none. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 6:04 PM.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Nigem
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary