

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 15, 2022
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 3/15/2022

Summary of Discussion

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

President Bigioni: I would like to call this meeting of the Faculty Senate on February 15, 2022 to order. Secretary Nigem, can you please call the roll?

Senator Nigem: I will.

Present: Anderson, Baki, Bamber, Barnes, Bigioni, Bornak, Brakel, Case, Chaffee, Chou, Compora, Coulter-Harris, De la Serna, Duggan, Duhon, Edgington, Elgafy, El-Zawahry, Garcia-Mata (Fayoumi- sub), Gilstrap, Gregory, Guardiola, Hall, Harnych, Hefzy, Inch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Krantz, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Metz, Milz, J. Murphy, Modyanov, Niamat, Nigem, Pattin, Reeves bb, Rouillard, Shan, Smith, Stepkowski, Steven, Teclehaimanot, Topp, Van Hoy, Vesely, Wedding, Welsch

Excused Absence: Green, Huntley, Koch, Kujawa, Pakulski, Reynolds

Unexcused Absence: Ali, Chaudhuri, Day, Hanrahan, Lammon, Perry, Ratnam

Senator Nigem: Thank you. I believe we have a quorum, President Bigioni.

President Bigioni: Great. Thank you. The next item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. So you see the agenda before you. Are there any objections to adopting this agenda? Hearing none, we will adopt this agenda. *Agenda Adopted.* Thank you.

The next item is the approval of Minutes. The Minutes that were sent out were the minutes from January 18th. That was two meetings ago. We wanted to take some extra time since that involved the vote and the discussion of the Constitution. That is an especially important set of Minutes that people may go back to, so we wanted to make sure that those were as accurate as possible, so we took some extra time on that. That was sent out to you, I believe, yesterday. Hopefully you've had an opportunity to look at them, particularly if you want to make any corrections. Are there any corrections to be made, or any comments to be made about those Minutes?

Senator Duhon: President Bigioni.

President Bigioni: Yes?

Senator Duhon: This is Lucy Duhon from the Library. My apology, I apparently didn't catch the first go around when this draft came out and I missed making my corrections to the announcement that I had made for the library. So I just have a couple of immaterial corrections, like the spelling of OhioLINK, and the...publish term and one other sentence that just needs clean-up. Can I just give that to Quinetta?

President Bigioni: Sure. I'm not sure how that works with regard to approval. I suppose. Maybe I should appeal to a former president, like Senator Rouillard or Past-President Brakel. Any thoughts?

Senator Rouillard: I think if it's, you know, just superficial, it shouldn't be a problem with it.

President Bigioni: And we just go ahead and approve the Minutes?

Past-President Brakel: Yes, approve the Minutes with the corrections.

President Bigioni: Great. Thanks for the advice. Are there any other corrections or comments on these Minutes? Okay, then barring any objections, we can approve the Minutes. Are there any objections? Okay then, we will approve those Minutes. Thanks for that. *Motion Approved.*

The next item on the agenda is the Executive Committee report. We had a meeting with President Postel on the Friday following our last meeting. [Temporarily Muted]. So we met with President Postel on February 4th, and we brought up a number of items with him to discuss. First, we pointed out that there was quite some significant interest in the issue of religious holiday observances. So we had a very useful conversation with Dr. Postel and he had some very interesting and good news for us. Apparently, this was on his radar already and a group, and I apologize, I don't recall which office or group within the University put together a list of religious holidays. So it was a rather lengthy and comprehensive list. The plan is to make that calendar available to faculty and student alike as a list of recognized UT religious holidays. If that were coupled with the policy for accommodations for such holidays, that would provide a very useful tool to both our faculty and our students. So, that is good news. Hopefully, if one of the Executive Committee members recalls which group or office that is, perhaps you can add that at the end of my report. So look for that to appear, hopefully in the not too distant future.

Another issue of course, that always comes up is budget. So we talked about the budget model again with President Postel focusing on two things. One is the college governance structures and Faculty Senate representation. Those are our ongoing discussions. But we also discussed the need to see data coming out of the historical data used in the models, what the results of that modeling look like. We had some discussion around that, but the upshot is that we will be meeting with our CFO, Matt Schroeder and his staff on Thursday to discuss some of those details. So hopefully we'll have some updates for you on that in our next meeting.

Another topic of discussion was an update on the executive searches that have been going on. President Postel updated us on a number of them. I can tell you that the Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion is down to, at least at the time of our meeting, two candidates. And the Athletic Director position was down to three candidates, and both of those had a time horizon of about two to three weeks. So those should be filled very soon. The Dean of Pharmacy was down to four candidates at that time and was expected to be completed sometime in March. And the VP for Online Programs, that search is a little earlier in the process, narrowing the field, but there were quite a large number of good candidates, actually for all of the searches. That timeline, hopefully we'll wrap up that search in late March. So, that's the expectation on that. That is a good summary of our discussions with the President.

I also presented a report to the Board of Trustees last week which really focused on two topics. One is the new budget model, and I talked about the same concerns that I mentioned that we discussed with the President. I also talked about where we were with the Senate Constitution and updated them on our progress.

It's a good opportunity to remind you of where we are, too. The Executive Committee agreed to ask the Constitution and Rules committee to hold some informational meetings, so that's in the process of being put together. I've also been communicating with the Elections Committee about setting up the ratification vote. So again, those are ongoing and I'll continue to have updates for you in the coming meetings.

One other interesting point to note that I discussed in the Board of Trustees report, and it is worth talking about here, is the recent announcement by Intel, who is planning to invest, just at the start, \$20 billion dollars in Ohio, and \$100 million of that money is carved out, set aside, for educational purposes. So

that's a really interesting opportunity for UT to tap into, and perhaps develop some new programs and certainly develop new relationships to build with Intel and bring students here, or perhaps push graduates toward Intel and so on. Lots of opportunities for relationships. And in fact, one of the things that we should do is ask ourselves, do we have any students that we sent to Intel? I have one who is currently at Intel. We can start to build relationships there, so we should start thinking about those opportunities.

That is about a good summary of the Board of Trustees report, but I also would like to take the opportunity to note that at that Board of Trustees meeting, there were three Distinguished University professors' named, and one of them is our very own Glenn Lipscomb, Senator Lipscomb, but also Professors Thomas Megeath and Kim Nielsen. We should all take an opportunity to congratulate them on that fantastic achievement and award.

That concludes my Executive Committee report. I ask, are there any Executive Committee members who have anything to add, particularly with regard to that religious holiday calendar? Hopefully somebody has some information there. Are there any additions.

Senator Coulter-Harris: President Bigioni, may I just say a few words? I'm not on the Executive Committee.

President Bigioni: That is okay.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I do want to clarify that at our last Faculty Senate meeting, I was remiss in providing more information to faculty senators, which is the following: The Eid holiday is a movable holiday and we were only asking for this year, 2022. The Muslim Student Association was just asking if the administration would consider allowing these students to take the exam at an alternative day during that exam week. As Eid is a movable holiday, this will not occur for the next five or six years. There will be no conflicts in future years. I apologize for being remiss in stating that information. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments?

Senator Vesely: Yes, question. President Bigioni, you had talked about the Executive Committee talking with the President, and you mentioned two things that you talked about. But, what did you talk about? What did you say? What did the President counter to respond to some of these things? Can you provide more detail into that meeting?

President Bigioni: So, are you referring to the budget discussion?

Senator Vesely: I would refer to any conversation the Executive Committee had with the President. What were his comments? What were his thoughts, other than [you] just talked to him?

President Bigioni: So I had three points. One was the religious holiday calendar. Another was the update on searches. I think I gave pretty good detail on both of those. The only that thing that I didn't give much detail on was the budget model discussion, primarily because I've made these comments quite a number of times, and so I didn't want to be redundant. But we continue to push the same points. One is the representation of Faculty Senate on college level budget advisory committees. Another is the constitution of those budget advisory committees. Right now they are handpicked by the Dean, which has disadvantages. The other point, which is separate from those budget advisory committee, is we'd like to see the results of the budget model using historical data. We've not been able to do that yet, and so we've pushed on all of these points repeatedly and with multiple people, not just the President, but also the Provost and to some extent the CFO. We'll have an opportunity to push that point with the CFO on Thursday. Hopefully we'll have some good discussions there and have some enlightening conversations

and exchange of information. So hopefully, I'll have something more significant to report in our next meeting, rather than that we've just been asking. Right? These are the comments that I've been making for a few meetings now, that we've been talking about these things, and we've been asking about these things. But hopefully our meeting with the CFO on Thursday will be a little more productive, and hopefully I'll have more to report to you then.

Senator Vesely: Thank you for that. So, what I'm hearing you saying is the President absolutely had nothing to say, and you did all the talking and that's it?

President Bigioni: The President always has something to say. One of the primary things that we're interested in is seeing the data, seeing the results of the modeling. We tend to get the same answer from different people, and that is that the data are out there. You know, the data are available. Well, that's not that helpful. Or that the deans have all the data. Faculty Senate is sort of a centralized body and we're not in the habit of going dean by dean, asking them for information. We can do that, but we're not in the habit of doing that. We'd much prefer talking to someone like our CFO and getting that data from a single person. That's sort of how we've approached this problem.

Past-President Brakel: President Bigioni, the President did say, and he gave us some assurance, that he would inform the Deans that they need to get representation from Faculty Senate on these advisory committees. He did say that.

President Bigioni: That's true. Right, with regard to the college advisory committees there are two parts of it. One, is the Faculty Senate representation. And he certainly agreed that is important and that should happen as Past-President Brakel just stated. The other is a little more difficult thing, and that is the population of those committees. Right now with everything in flux, and people just trying to stand up this new budget model, perhaps it's not a priority to create a different structure to populate those committees. We just need to get it off the ground. But it would be healthier in the next go round to have some sort of structure and election from the ground up, faculty choosing who to put on their college advisory committees. That might be a healthier approach. But that takes some doing, and maybe now is not the time to do it, and priorities may lay elsewhere. But that doesn't stop us from reminding everyone that that's a better model. There hasn't been much pushback on that point. There hasn't been quite the same agreement to it, but there hasn't been much push back on it.

How's that? Good? I appreciate the question. It's an important point that needs to be discussed in detail. It's just that there aren't that many details at the moment to discuss, but that's where we are.

Any other questions or comments? Okay, then will end my Executive Committee report.

The next item of on the agenda is the Provost report.

Provost Bjorkman: Thank you, Dr. Bigioni. Good afternoon everyone. I want to thank the faculty who participated in the University Preview Day events yesterday. It was good to see so many high school seniors and their families on campus. Meeting with the faculty is always the highlight of their visit to campus, and I appreciate the time and effort that you took to help recruit those students to the University. At the start of the preview day events yesterday, I had the opportunity to welcome a group of Rocket Scholars to campus. I was impressed because when I got over to the Student Union Auditorium, the room was absolutely packed and they actually had to open up the back area and add extra tables and seating for people. So that was really good to see. These are high achieving seniors who have been admitted to the University for the Fall 2022 semester. We had a lot of special events setup for them yesterday on campus to keep them engaged and interested in beginning their higher education journey at UToledo.

Regarding our currently enrolled students, we now have our Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 retention data for first year students. I can share the good news that the retention rate has increased again to 88.9% from 86.7% last year. So that's really good news. We also experienced an increase this Spring in international student enrollment, both undergraduate and graduate and growth in graduate student enrollment in several colleges, including the College of Law, the Neff College of Business and Innovation, and the College of Engineering. We're continuing our efforts to recruit back students who dropped out or stopped out during the pandemic. We were successful in recruiting back another 69 students for the Spring semester, in addition to the 300 students who've returned since we initiated the recruit back campaign last year. And in addition, 21% of the students we have recruited back in the Summer or Fall of 2021 were URM students.

I'm also pleased to report as you just heard from President Bigioni, the Board of Trustees at their meeting last week approved three faculty members to be named as Distinguished University Professors for the class of 2022. That is following the endorsement of the Academic Honors Committee. This is the highest permanent honor that the University of Toledo bestows on a faculty member. And so, our 2022 Distinguished University Professors are Dr. Glen Lipscomb from the College of Engineering, Dr. Tom Megeath from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Dr. Kim Nielsen from the College of Arts and Letters. So, I hope you'll join me in giving a virtual round of applause as we extend our congratulations to these colleagues.

The Distinguished University Lecturer nominations for 2022 will be presented to the Board at their April meeting, following recommendations from the Academic Honors Committee. Last week, the Board of Trustees also approved sabbatical leaves for 26 faculty members during the 2022-2023 academic year following the endorsement of their sabbatical proposals by their department chairs, their deans and the University Committee on Sabbaticals. This year we had a slightly higher number of sabbatical leaves approved than usual, primarily because a number of leaves had to be postponed last year due to the pandemic.

I also want to extend congratulations to a number of our faculty members, including two faculty members who are recipients of the 2021 Arts Commission Merit Award. The Merit Award recognizes outstanding local literary performing and visual artists, and recipients are selected by a panel of renowned artists and cultural leaders from throughout the Midwest. So congratulations to Dr. Kimberly Mack, Associate Professor of English and scholar of African American Literature and American Popular Music. She received the Merit Award for literary arts. Congratulations to Dr. Ashley Pryor, Associate Professor of Humanities, a collage and digital artist who received the Merit Award for visual arts collage.

I am also pleased to report that so far this year, four of our faculty in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics have received NSF CAREER awards. These awards provide five years of grant funding and serve as a foundation for junior faculty members' research programs and early career development. Congratulations to Drs. Michael Young, Emanuela Gionfriddo, and Matthew Wohlever, all in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and Dr. Qian Chen in the Department of Biological Sciences. I want to also congratulate Dr. JT Zhang, who you'll be hearing from a little later in the program, from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences who was named as a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

On another note, I want to remind you of a few things. The applications for the Faculty Fellows program in the Office of the Provost for the 2022-2023 academic year are due by Friday, March 11th. Last Thursday, February 10th, we sent an email announcement with information about the program to all faculty. The fellowships will begin in June of 2022 and continue to August 2023 and the faculty fellows will work with our office on issues that help advance the University's strategic goals and priorities. Our

projects for this year will focus on issues related to student success: including issues related to diversity, equity, inclusion; curricular assessment; and faculty success. Information on eligibility and application guidelines is available on our website. And if you have any specific questions about the program, please contact Dr. Amy Thompson in the Office of the Provost. I'm really looking forward to re-establishing this unique faculty leadership program, following a pause over the last two years due to the impacts of the pandemic.

Before concluding my remarks, I just want to remind you of a few upcoming deadlines. Nominations for the Edith Rathbun Outreach and Engagement Excellence award are due next Monday, February, 21st. Nominations and applications for the following three awards are due on Monday, February 28th. Those include the Faculty Mentoring award, Outstanding Teacher award, and the Outstanding Advisor award. Guidelines and nomination forms for those awards are available on our website, and the Outstanding Faculty Research and Scholarship award is also due on Monday, February 28th. Information on that award is available on the website of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. So, we look forward to receiving this year's nominations and applications.

And just one last reminder. Starfish Early Alert closes this Friday, February 18th. So please do take the time to submit feedback that can help our students, and their success coaches, and advisors. That's all I have to say today. Thank you. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

President Bigioni: Are there any questions for the Provost? Okay. Looks like it was an easy day. All right. Thank you.

Our next item on the agenda is the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report by Senator Anthony Edgington. Senator Edgington, you can take it away.

Senator Edgington: Thank you very much, President Bigioni. For today we have five new course proposals and 15 course modifications that we are bringing to you. I'll start with our five new course proposals. We are going to start with **DST 3040**, Disability, Technology, and Society. "Interdisciplinary investigation of the relationship between disability and technology, focusing on the social and political dimensions of designing and using technology with, for, and by disabled people." The second course is **MKTG 3380**, Digital Content Development. "An exploration of inbound, branded content strategies across digital marketing channels. Students will explore written and visual content development to enhance the overall customer experience. This is an applied course where students will be introduced to frameworks and best practices on content creation and planning in order to optimize effective content for a brand's target market." This is **MKTG 4380**, Digital Marketing Tools and Analytics. "This is a hands-on course examining the strategic use of the Internet and other digital technologies in order to improve an organization's marketing efforts. Students will explore online marketing strategies, navigate social media marketing, and utilize marketing analytic tools, resulting in an industry-recognized, digital marketing certification." The next one is **EECS 3560**, Programming Languages and Paradigms. "Primary constructs of contemporary programming languages, four major programming paradigms (imperative, functional, logical, and object-oriented), representative programming languages of these paradigms and their usages." The final course is **RCRT 4040**, Recreational Therapy Services with the Veteran's Administration. "The course will focus on current trends, issues, and clinical techniques specific to serving Veterans within the Veteran's Administration (VA) system as a Recreational Therapist. Course content will include orientation to military culture and rituals, specific diagnoses, and conditions commonly experienced by Veterans, delivery of outcome-based RT interventions and special programs, partnerships, and an in-depth look into internships and employment opportunities within the VA system. Minimum "C" required

for RCRT majors. Prerequisite: Junior Standing or RCRT Professional Sequence Acceptance or instructor permission.”

Senator Edgington cont’d: Those are our five new course proposals. Are there any questions or comments on those five courses? Okay, hearing none. I believe we can go to vote then. So in the Chat, if you are approving these courses, please put ‘yes.’ If you do not approve, put ‘no.’ If you're abstaining, please put ‘a.’ I believe President Bigioni, we have approval of those.

President Bigioni: Yes, it looks unanimously in favor, and with more than enough yes votes. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Edgington: Perfect. Let's move on to our modifications. The first one is **ITEC 2100**, Small Computer Systems. “Change to credit hours (from 0-4 to 3 credits). Elimination of lab component. New prereq: EET 2210. Updated syllabus and learning outcomes. NOTE: The topics can be covered in three credit hours.” The next modification is **MED 3030**, Music for the Early Childhood Teacher. “Course is not repeatable for credit. Prerequisite is being removed. Updated syllabus. Updated SLOs. NOTE: The prerequisite (MUS 2200) needed to be removed. The next one is **ART 4400**, BFA Thesis Exhibition. “Course name change (new name: BFA Thesis). Change to long and short titles. Elimination of spring offering. Course not repeatable for credit. Change to course description. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: Shortened title is more accurate to the nature of the course and reflects that instruction occurs prior to exhibition.” The next one is **MKTG 3280**, Internet Marketing. “Course name change (new name: Digital Marketing). Change to long and short title. Course is not repeatable for credit. Change to course description. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: This is part of a more comprehensive curriculum analysis and revision for the Marketing Major which relied on benchmarking, alumni survey, student focus groups, job description analysis and more. See program modification.” The next one is **MKTG 3690**, Principles of Marketing Communications. “Course Name Change (new name: Marketing Communications). Change to long and short titles. Course not repeatable for credit. Change to course description. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: This is a minor course description change as a part of a more significant curriculum change based on data from focus groups, alumni surveys, benchmarking, job description analysis and more.” The next one is **MKTG 3880**, Marketing Research and Database Management. “Course name change (new name: Marketing Research and Digital Analytics). Change to long and short titles. Course not repeatable for credit. Change to course description. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: part of a comprehensive curriculum review and revision for the marketing major. See program modification documentation. Based on benchmarking, alumni surveys, student focus groups, job description analysis and more.” **MKTG 4130**, Marketing Analysis and Decision Making. Course is not repeatable for credit. Change to course description. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: Major revision to entire marketing major - see program modification. Based on alumni surveys, student focus groups, job description analysis, benchmarking, and more. **MKTG 4980**, Special Topics. “Change to course description. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: Part of marketing major program modification based on extensive research (see document in program modification.) The special topics class is designed to allow a seminar-like approach to current or particularly relevant topics (e.g., currently offering marketing in a worldwide crisis). The description change was to align with the current areas taught within the Marketing & International Business Department.” **ART 3400**, Concepts in Art, Studio, and Theory. “Change to prereqs (moving from 2050 AND 2060 to 2040 OR 2060). NOTE: Only 1 survey of Western Art is needed prior to taking this course. Requiring both caused students to delay in registration and this is a critical course in the graduation pathway.” **FILM 4940**, Internship. “Change to credit hours (from 3 to variable 1 to 6 credits). NOTE: The Dept. of Theatre & Film has seen a need for a variable credit hour option with its Internship courses and would like to change the credit hours offered for this course to be a

1-6 credit option based on the needs and length of the internship. In addition to this change, a guideline was added to the syllabus that states that a minimum of 40 contact hours will be expected per credit hour for the course, (1 credit = 40 hours per semester, 3 credit hours = 120 hours per semester, and so on.)”

CHEE 1000, Orientation and Computing for Chemical Engineers. “Course name change (new name-Orientation and Computing for Chemical and Environmental Engineers). Change to long and short titles. Change to credit hours (from 0 to 3 to a set 3 hours). Course not repeatable for credit. Change to course description. NOTE: Course name change initiated by Civil and Environmental Engineering department chair to help EnvE students feel more connected to the programs. The goals of this class are to facilitate the transition to university life, introduce the various engineering disciplines, and prepare students for the chemical and environmental engineering programs.”

CHEE 3110, Process Heat Transfer. “Change to credit hours (from 2 to 3). Course not repeatable for credit. Change to course description. Updated course syllabus. NOTE: Based on many faculty meetings over the last 2+ years, we have approved the changes proposed. Based on feedback from our industry advisory board and discussions with working engineers, changing our curriculum will better prepare our students to be chemical engineers in the 21st century. New content will be added to the course as highlighted in the syllabus.”

CHEE 4500, Chemical Engineering Laboratory I. “Change to credit hours (from 2 to 3). Removal of prerequisites. Course not repeatable for credit. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: Based on many faculty meetings over the last 2+ years, we have approved the changes proposed. Based on feedback from our industry advisory board and discussions with working engineers, changing our curriculum will better prepare our students to be chemical engineers in the 21st century. New content will be added to the course within the framework of the newly-written 10 course level learning objectives.”

Finally, **CHEE 4550**, Chemical Engineering Laboratory II. “Change to credit hours (from 2 to 3). Course not repeatable for credit. Removal of prerequisites. Updated syllabus and SLOs. NOTE: Based on many faculty meetings over the last 2+ years, we have approved the changes proposed. Based on feedback from our industry advisory board and discussions with working engineers, changing our curriculum will better prepare our students to be chemical engineers in the 21st century. New content will be added to the course within the framework of the newly-written 10 course level learning objectives.”

Senator Edgington cont’d: Those are our 15 course modifications. Are there any questions or comments on any of these modifications? Hearing none. We will go ahead and proceed to a vote. Again, put ‘yes’ in the Chat if you approve, ‘no’ if you do not approve and ‘a’ if you abstain. And again, it looks like we have approval if I am correct, President Bigioni?

President Bigioni: Yes, it looks unanimous and with enough votes to approve. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Edgington: Thank you all very much.

President Bigioni: Thank you, Senator Edgington. Our next item on the agenda is an Academic Programs Committee report by Senator Patrick Lawrence. Senator Lawrence, the floor is yours.

Senator Lawrence: Okay, you should see your list presented by the committee today. We have 10 program modifications and one new undergraduate program. Looking at a modification in the Disability Studies, Minor. It is to add DST 3040, a course we just approved. This would add this course to a selection of options as one of the requirements. It doesn’t change any of the total hours. We have an updated plan of study, learning outcomes, and curriculum map.

Similarly, same change this time for disability. Sorry. The [previous one was a] Minor and this one is the Major. Again, adding DST 3040 as a selection among courses that meet the requirements in the major. It does not change the total credit hours. We have an updated plan of study, starting learning objectives and the curriculum map is complete.

Moving on. We have a few more of these that carry over from our last meeting; you might recall the list from Business. This is the BBA in Accounting, adding Math 1320 as a replacement. It is replacing Math 1730. Again, we approved several of these same changes for other majors in Business at our last meeting.

We have BBA, Entrepreneurship and Innovation. With that change we are adding the 1320 as the requirement. There is a change in the program name, updating that. We have a removal of a course and another course, either the plan of study. Again, the plan of study has been updated as the learning outcomes and the curriculum map is complete.

We have a Marketing BBA. Several changes here. Again, adding 1320 as a requirement and replacing 1730. Adds five required courses so there is an adjustment to the degree requirement. It does not change the total of hours of those five, including two new courses: Marketing 3380 and Marketing 3480 that Faculty Senate just approved.

Similar changes with the Marketing, Minor. Revised requirements, adding several new courses there: 3280 and 3690 and 4980 redevelops the course modules and the structure. Again, there's no change or update in terms of total hours. And we have learning objectives and all of that is in place.

The next set are from the Department of Art, Graphic Interactive Design Concentration, BFA. This is adding an existing course. ART 3400 is currently not required for the problems, never been. There was never a program modification to add it, so they are just trying to do a little bit of 'housekeeping' here. Also adding an additional course to tech electives to align with other concentration for the missing three credits; aligning with all the other BFA concentrations that exist within this degree, Department of Art. So it is more or less a 'housekeeping' maneuver there.

The Studio Art Photography, Digital Media. No new courses are being added. They are correcting the concentration name and the requirements so it is consistent and adding an existing course, ART 3950 as a course option.

Studio Art 3D Studies Concentration, BFA. Adding two additional elective options for students, scheduling flexibility and align electives with the other BFAs. I mean, all of these ART proposals do have an updated, complete plan of study, student learning objectives and curriculum maps.

The final program modification is the Visual Art, BA. I guess some cleaning up here adding ART 1040 to the foundational courses in the major. It was previously a suggested course, however the department has decided that it forms a critical part of their curriculum and should be part of the requirements. This addition of the...would replace another core art studies elective and will not raise hours required. Modification removes ART 4410 as a specific requirement given them the option. You also see they've cleared up, so they are at a 120-hour degree. And again, we have a complete plan of study, learning objectives and a curriculum map.

So, I'll pause there for any questions before we move to vote on the program modifications.

Senator Anderson: Since we're bringing up three more changes in programs for the BBA. I was going to wait until items from the floor at the end, but I think I'll just go ahead and bring it up now. In the last Senate meeting on February 1st, we also approved similar program changes in the BBA like the proposed changes today. I have two questions. One, does this change affect any of these programs with outside accreditation agencies? Could these programs lose their accreditation by not having Business Calculus?

Senator Gilstrap: Senator Anderson, I can speak to that because I made this proposal, like back in our college. And so, no, the AACSB does not require Business Calculus for accreditation.

Senator Anderson: Okay. And so my second question, does this change affect students, who would want to go on to an MBA by not having Business Calculus?

Senator Gilstrap: It depends on the MBA program they're going into. If you want to go to Wharton at the University of Pennsylvania, possibly. If you want to go to Ohio State, no. So, that is something that we talked about. We still are leaving Business Calculus as an available prerequisite for these courses, if the student would like to take it. But we sort of think we cannot condition our curriculum based on whether someone wants to go take an MBA 10 years or five years after they leave the undergraduate program. A lot of MBA programs will have remedial course work if you did not have undergraduate Business Calculus. They will have a remedial course for you to take the summer before you start the MBA program.

Senator Anderson: Okay. I just wanted to check on that. And I apologize for the last Senate meeting, I should have raised that issue, but it sounds like it's not going to create any problems.

Senator Gilstrap: Thank you.

Senator Lawrence: Are there any other questions from the senators before I move for a vote?

Senator Gregory: I have a question, Senator Lawrence.

Senator Lawrence: Yes?

Senator Gregory: I was just wondering if someone from Business could speak. I thought that MATH 1730 had been specifically created for the Business School, for business majors rather. Is that true?

Senator Gilstrap: Yes, I guess so because it's called Calculus for Business. I imagine it was created 20 years ago.

Senator Gregory: Okay.

Senator Gilstrap: I guess I don't know the history of that course.

Senator Gregory: Okay so, was there collaboration between NSM and Business in making this change? I'm only asking because I know NSM teaches a lot of sections of 1730.

Senator Gilstrap: Yes, that is right. You know what? We didn't ask about it, about those sections. We sort of see it as, you know, they're getting these students in both of these as a shift into the college algebra course, so we didn't really think it is sort of hurting their tuition revenue or anything.

Senator Gregory: Well, yeah, but, I mean, if they have like 10 sections of 1730 on the schedule and all of a sudden another college is like, oh, by the way, we don't need those anymore. That's a huge disruption in terms of staffing and workload. I'm not in NSM, so maybe this is an easy shift for them to make, but it's the kind of curricular change that's large scale enough that I would have expected to see sort of significant collaboration. And I just was wondering if that had been the case.

Senator Gilstrap: Yeah. No, we have not reached out to them. I guess our thought was we need to go through this first and then with scheduling. I mean, because this would not even impact students registering this semester. I guess it would start for the fall semester. But yes, that is a very good point.

Senator Gregory: Yes, because I mean, well---

Senator Anderson: I am in the Math Department, and I think that this will create some problems. Now, granted it is a one to one switch, but basically the only students, for the most part that would be taking

MATH 1730 would have been students in Business. And simply by past practices, we would know how many sections needed to be run. Now, you're putting all those students in with a lot of other students who take College Algebra for whatever reason. I can see where there may be a problem of business students being able to get into a section of College Algebra because they just simply fill up. One of the things is, if I could buy stock in College Algebra, I think I'd like stock in College Algebra because it's the hottest commodity right now in our department.

Senator Gregory: Well, okay, if I could just follow-up with that? I mean, I think the thing is, we're not buying stock. This is not a run to make a profit in the hottest spot you can find and then go home, right? Curriculum is really, really delicately balanced and it's always tied to staffing plans, and workloads, and unit structures. And so I think that if we're going to make a really large change to a curriculum in our home college that's going to impact another college, I don't know that it's good. Well, it is not good practice I would say, to do that without any kind of collaboration with the other school. It just seems like it would really potentially torpedo something that's been very delicately placed together. It's not like colleges create staffing plans and have so many resources that they can just throw another 10 sections of something onto the books and take 10 sections off. I mean, I would suggest this maybe should be paused until that collaboration has time to take place. But, again, I am also not in this college. This is just a sense of look at how the curriculum gets put together from an outsider's perspective.

Past-President Brakel: Senator Gregory, is that a motion?

Senator Gregory: It is not an official motion, not at this point. I don't think it is my place to make that motion. But, I think it is an appropriate point of conversation.

Senator Lawrence: I can add maybe a bit of clarification if it might help the discussion. Please, if somebody is from Business, they can correct me. But just looking at their proposal, it stated that MATH 1320 or higher accepted replacements include MATH 1340 etc. So there are others if we are talking about the scheduling option, just put that on the table. There are other options for the students. There was a question about whether students would be able to get into MATH 1320. There are replacements that allow them substitute courses under that requirement if I read that correctly.

Senator Gilstrap: That's correct. And in fact, there's one department or college that still will be using the Calculus for Business. One department is going to keep that as a requirement for some of their courses.

Senator Lawrence: So, President Brakel, how would you like to proceed on these? We have already approved several of these, but procedurally, how should we move forward?

Past-President Brakel: Well, first off, I am not the president.

Senator Lawrence: Sorry. Your name popped up there, Past-President Brakel.

Past-President Brakel: Yeah, I was just kind of clarifying if that was a motion from Senator Gregory or not.

President Bigioni: I hate to say it, but I was trying to manage another issue, so I didn't catch all of that discussion. Could you summarize the question for me?

Senator Lawrence: So, President Bigioni, the question was raised by Senator Gregory, whether we should pause approving this set of changes with the various degrees here from the College of Business and add MATH 1320 as replacement for 1730. To allow the two colleges, Natural Science and Math and Business to discuss the implications, particularly in terms of scheduling and section availability. It wasn't

put forth as a motion. It was just put forth by Senator Gregory as a discussion point. And I just raised, you know, to remind Faculty Senate that we have already approved several of these. Again, that's just a discussion point. So the question I had for you, President Bigioni, is how should we proceed?

President Bigioni: So if there's a real concern that there's a conflict like that and more consultation is prudent, then we can set this aside and bring them up at the next meeting.

Senator Anderson: I will just interject. We approved nine of these at the last Senate meeting that MATH 1730 would go to 1320, and now there's three more. So, we're looking at 12 programs in the BBA that would now be wanting College Algebra instead of the 1730.

President Bigioni: So those could have created the conflict that was brought up today?

Senator Anderson: Yes. Unfortunately, I'm not involved in scheduling, but I could see a potential problem when you're trying, like I said, 1730 is specifically for business students, whereas now those business students will be thrown in with all other students whose math requirement is 1320. Unfortunately, I don't have what that number is, but right now we run a large number of sections of 1320 as it is, let alone for accommodating these 12 program changes. And nine were approved at the last Senate meeting. And again, I apologize. I should have been a little bit more on my toes with this, but somehow just went over my head for whatever reason.

Senator Lawrence: And again, just to make sure we're clear on this. 1730 remains an acceptable replacement option for 1320. So just to clarify, there are a number of - just for the record - of other math sections that students could use to substitute for the 1320 requirement.

President Bigioni: Okay.

Senator Anderson: I would just add, at least I know a little bit of the scheduling. I mean, the Math Department could offer several sections of 1730, but if the enrollment numbers don't reach what they would need to, those sections would get cancelled. So those students would be closed out of 1730. It's simply because right now, 1730 is not going to be in demand. So, there would be probably only a few sections of it scheduled and if there's not enough students that would populate those sections, they would get canceled.

Past-President Brakel: So President Bigioni, there's a couple options that you have here. Either Senator Lawrence as the Chair of this committee can pull back those himself, or a motion can be brought forth from the floor to table this.

Senator Gilstrap: And again, I started this proposal in the College of Business and so I would actually go ahead and propose that we table this and we will discuss with Math a timeline if they can accommodate these sections, I think. And maybe we need to push just making this change until next year, you know, to give them time enough to get their faculty ready if they are able and need time.

President Bigioni: Tabling it and bringing it back at a later meeting is the normal procedure that we would do. There is an extra little detail, though, with the new year-long registration process in place. If the approvals to these changes need to be done by, I believe the date was --- actually, Senator Lawrence, can you remind me of the date? I was going to say March 4th, but I think it is later than that.

Senator Lawrence: Well, I think President Bigioni there's a little difference. This year we were asked to get these through, I believe, by the middle of February in order to allow the Provost Office and Registrar's Office to advance these forward so that yes, they could be put into place in the catalog in time for when students start to register, which I believe is March 16th. The other day, what we've talked about

is just other proposals that we'd like to clear off the slate this semester - that's the March 4th date. So, we would have to look at that schedule from the Provost Office. Again, just for point of order, if we pull these three, it affects the nine that were approved the last meeting. We'd have to go back and revisit all. I'm not saying that's not an option, I'm just putting it out there so he will understand where we are with all of these proposals in terms of how we want to proceed.

Senator Gilstrap: This is the thing that's been kind of been talked about and...for the last 10 years. So I don't believe that postponing this for one-year, that is what the Math Department needs to adjust their faculty would really be a problem on our side.

President Bigioni: Okay. I'm not sure what happens to the ones that were already approved.

Past-President Brakel: President Bigioni, I am going to second Senator Gilstraps' motion. He has a motion, correct?

Senator Gilstrap: Yes, a motion to table.

Past-President Brakel: So I am going to second his motion, and call the question.

President Bigioni: Okay.

President-Elect Insch: Calling the question doesn't end debate, unless the Chair decides. So the other question here though, is still the fact there are nine that we have already approved.

President Bigioni: Yeah.

President-Elect Insch: It seems to me, the challenge is, and I don't know how big of a challenge it is, but this is an answer that we can find is, how many sections of 1730, would need to be offered? And if we offer three of those and that seems like there are normally five, and then you have two sections of algebra, I would suspect that someone teaching calculus could probably teach algebra. I'm just saying, it's a scheduling question. Now, how big that scheduling question is? I don't know. But it also doesn't seem to be quite the same problem as a fact that there's a pathological reason in the College of Business to do this. I'm just confused as to scheduling when we're now in the 'hunger games' era, there is a one to one trade on where those kids are going and the money is going in the same place. It doesn't seem that the scheduling challenge is quite as bleak as it appears. It is to be moving, and I don't know, I am speaking out of complete ignorance of how you structure these classes. But it is a scheduling question, not a program question, or a course question. And I am not arguing it either way. I'm just trying to get clarification as to what's happening here.

Senator Anderson: The issue would not be with the faculty because again, like you're saying, that you're trading teaching Business Calculus for College Algebra. What the problem is, like right now 1730 is specifically for students that are majoring in business. So they have their own set classes, because you're not going to get somebody like a College Algebra student registering for Business Calculus. But now when we say, okay, we're going to replace the Business Calculus by College Algebra, that puts all those business majors who had their own course for them competing for sections of College Algebra with everyone else. We can change the number of sections for Business Calculus to be College Algebra, but we can't say, well, these are only College Algebra for business students. It's going to be College Algebra for whoever wants to sign up for College Algebra. And it's going to be a free for all of students registering for College Algebra, and of course, again, maybe things will work out in the scheduling because if you need to run more sections, then you need to be able to have the ability to get more faculty if that's necessary. I don't think that would happen, but it becomes a free for all for anybody that needs College

Algebra to register for any section of College Algebra whereas before, if you were a business major and you needed Business Calculus, then you simply had courses that were set aside for just that. Now you would be in competition with other students from throughout the whole University. For Business Calculus, you are only in competition with business students. And I think that's where the problem could lie with business students, and I think that is where the problem could lie with the scheduling issue.

President Bigioni: Okay, so the question of tabling those three courses has been posed. And in fact, I recall in the past tabling a few courses or programs, setting them aside in a vote, without a vote in the Senate. If there was a problem identified, we'd set them aside and vote on the remaining courses. So, I am not so sure that we need to vote to table.

Past-President Brakel: I think in the past those were pulled by the committee chair when they withdrew their motion.

President Bigioni: So that could be done here.

Past-President Brakel: But right now you have a motion on the floor, unless Senator Gilstrap retracts it so that Chair Lawrence can withdraw.

Senator Gilstrap: I'll retract my motion.

President Bigioni: Okay, that would save us a vote.

Past-President Brakel: I second.

President Bigioni: Senator Lawrence?

Senator Lawrence: Yes, just one second please.

President Bigioni: Okay.

Senator Lawrence: Just for my records, if you don't mind while we're just chatting for a second. I am just going to do this. There we go.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. So we can proceed with a vote on the remaining?

Senator Lawrence: Yes, the other remaining ones come from the floor from the committee. These are the remaining program modifications that we reviewed are required a second. Then hearing no other debate, please vote yes, nay, or abstain.

President Bigioni: Great.

Senator Lawrence: Give it a second to run and then we're finished with our last one here.

President Bigioni: Okay, it looks like it's unanimously in favor. There's still perhaps a couple more votes trickling in, but it looks like those have been approved. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Lawrence: Thank you. I will coordinate connections between the two colleges and have them look at all of these various proposals and discuss how we want to proceed, and then I'll come back to Faculty Senate to discuss how we want to handle the ones we previously approved.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. And perhaps this is also an opportunity to state the deadline for courses and programs coming to both yours and Senator Edgington's committees.

Senator Lawrence: Just before I do that, we do have one more proposal, which is a new undergraduate program. We can do that first.

President Bigioni: Sorry about that.

Senator Lawrence: It's okay. Our final proposal here is a new certificate, a Graphic Design Certificate from the Department of Art. It is a new certificate using three existing courses. We have a complete plan of study, learning objectives and the curriculum map, so nothing particularly unique about this. Is there any discussion on this new certificate? Hearing none. This comes from a motion from a committee, so I'll entertain senators to vote yes, no, or abstain.

Yes, as President Bigioni just mentioned, just for everyone's timeline here. Our two committees, both the Undergraduate Curriculum and our Program Committee have set Friday, March 4th as our deadline for proposals that would come to our committees, which would still allow us time with the remaining meetings of Faculty Senate in March /April to complete those in this academic year of business of our committees. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. It looks like that last proposal is approved. *Motion Passed.* Okay, thank you very much Senator Lawrence. Our next item on the agenda is an Ohio Faculty Council report by Senator Linda Rouillard.

Senator Gregory: President Bigioni, I am so sorry to interrupt. This is Melissa Gregory. Did you want the core curriculum that we brought forward kind of late?

President Bigioni: Right after Senator Rouillard.

Senator Gregory: Oh, sorry. I thought we were always after the other thing.

President Bigioni: Oh, I'm sorry. Well, is it okay?

Senator Gregory: Of course, yes. I just didn't want to forget about it. Thank you.

Senator Rouillard: Okay. So one of the things that has been discussed at more than one recent Ohio Faculty Council meeting has been resolutions to the HB 327 bill about the interdiction on teaching divisive topics in our university classes. We've seen responses from the IUC. We have seen resolutions that have been passed by other faculty senate, such as Ohio State. I think I've looked at one by Miami University. The Ohio Faculty Council is certainly working on a resolution statement in conjunction with the Ohio Faculty Senate, which represents the community colleges. And so, I took a stab at proposing something that could work as a resolution for our consideration here in our Faculty Senate, and it's based on a template that I saw on the academia blog. So I took the template and I massaged it a little bit for our campus, shared it with the Faculty Senate Exec. and got some feedback from them. So what you see today is a version of that draft resolution that reflects some of the changes that the Executive Committee asked for. So we're bringing it to you today for your consideration. I think that you probably are going to want to have a little bit more time to look at it, consider it, and make any suggested changes. What you will see in this version is a reference to current legislative proposals, such as what we have in Ohio. In fact, as I look at this, we probably want to refer to Ohio House Bill 327, specifically in the first 'whereas.' I refer to our Faculty Senate Constitution, the 1940 AAUP statement on principles of academic freedom, faculty responsibility for curriculum as we are authorized by the Board of Trustees, a definition of the term, divisive as being subjective, the need for our students to understand systemic barriers to diversity, and again, referring to the support of over 70 organizations against these kinds of legislative proposals, a reference to the University of Toledo's value of diversity, a reference to issues of racial inequity and

injustice in the history of our nation and the resolution that Faculty Senate of University of Toledo rejects any attempt to restrict or dictate University curriculum, and that we also stand with our K-12 colleagues. This is also important because I think it's Bill, I forget if it's House Bill 311, or 322, which interdicts the teaching of what they determine to be divisive concepts at the elementary and high school level. I think we want to show solidarity with them. I request that President Postel and President Bjorkman affirm that they reject these attempts. That we are also invoking a joint statement on efforts to restrict education about racism as articulated by the AAUP, PEN America and so forth. And, there you are. The third page is references that were included in the template that I saw. So as I've gone through it with you, just now very quickly, I realize that there are a couple of things that need to be more specific. In the first 'whereas,' not state legislative proposals, but I think we would have to add here, Ohio HB 327. The second 'whereas' need to specify the University of Toledo Faculty Senate. I think those were the two that came to mind as I was going through that. So, I'll leave it there. I'll leave it to anybody who has comments, observations, or suggestions or, you know, if there's discussion about being completely opposed to presenting a resolution.

President Bigioni: Okay, are there any questions or comments? Otherwise, you'll expect to see that in your inbox to read over and make comments on for the next time. Okay, anything else, Senator Rouillard?

Senator Rouillard: I'm trying to think of the other items of discussion. I think that is it for today from the Ohio Faculty Council.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. Well, thanks for your report.

Senator Rouillard: You're welcome.

President Bigioni: Let's move on to our next item of business, which is a Core Curriculum Committee report by Senator Melissa Gregory.

Senator Gregory: Thank you. The Core Curriculum met and discussed, I think seven courses, four of which we voted to recommend approval for to the main Senate body. The first one is Disability Studies 2020. This is a course that is already in the core for social science credit and also multi-cultural US diversity credit. The course is simply changing and realigning some of its SLOs. We voted to approve that unanimously. ECON 3050, Economics of Gender, again, already in the multicultural US part of the core. That course removed some prereqs. We voted to recommend that to move forward. LGL 1500, Legal Aspects of Poverty. This is a new proposal for the core. The committee did vote to approve that one forward for social science credit. This is a new proposal for the core under social science. Then finally, WGST 3550, Feminism and Philosophy, again currently in the multicultural US part of the core. That course is changing its title. It is adding a subtitle -- which I apologize, I can look up in a minute and give to you, or maybe someone in Women and Gender Studies could throw that out there -- and also tweaking the catalog descriptions. Anyone. I am happy to take questions about any of these courses.

Senator Smith: I have a question. Maybe I misheard it. The LGL 1500, Legal Aspects of Poverty, you said that was for social science credit?

Senator Gregory: Yes.

Senator Smith: But it is not in, what college is that in?

Senator Gregory: That course comes from HHS.

Senator Smith: All right, I see there was one vote against it. You know, based on the last discussion we just had, I'm concerned about any kind of duplication or repetition of courses here. I'm confused by the social science credit. I'll just put it that way.

Senator Rouillard: Senator Gregory, I have to admit, I also had a question about this course. This would be social science for gen. ed., right?

Senator Gregory: Well, of course, I am now confusing this with core curriculum and the State requirements. But if this were to go for a State requirement in the OTM, it's pretty specific as opposed to being general. And so I'm wondering if that's something we might not want to consider for our own gen ed.

Senator Gregory: Yeah, go ahead.

Senator Van Hoy: When I looked over the syllabus, I had a hard time figuring out what social science or social sciences, plural, approaches the course would take, because legal approaches are not social science approaches.

Senator Rouillard: That's a good point.

Senator Gilstrap: I am actually on the Core Curriculum Committee, and so both of these points were brought up in committee discussion. If you read all this, I draw a different conclusion about that course, and that it's looking at large statistical demographic changes, and law changes, and looking sort of at the whole. It's not necessarily a legal course. It's more about sociology in a legal frame, or sort of looking at legal things in a sociological frame, I guess is how I would say it. We did have discussion in committee and we felt that this did pass the sort of barrier for being a, definitely fits the social sciences. So, that was discussed. As far as the question about, if this doesn't fit into the Ohio Transfer Portal, we also discussed that. We kind of feel like, I think generally – and if anybody from the committee wants to speak about it – generally, we don't want to always compel our core to be shoehorn into Ohio. We want the course to be able to select it. And so that is just comments from the committee.

Senator Rouillard: But I would agree with Senator Van Hoy. I mean, the course description does really highlight law and policies. And that really is a much more specific perspective than what one would find in a 1000 level sociology course, or general social science course, whether it's economics or sociology.

Senator Case: I am in Sociology along with Senator Van Hoy. I'm not seeing the sociology in the description. Is it possible to scroll down a little bit further in the syllabus and look at some of the topics?

Senator Gregory: Okay, so I am showing these student learning outcomes here, and I'm just going to pause on those for a moment.

Senator Barnes: I'm also wondering about that process of checking in with departments who may have similar curriculum. I'm wondering if it is in fact a sociology course, should it not be in the sociology and anthropology sector? Did that process of checking with that department happen in this case? Let me actually pull up the---

Senator Gilstrap: I recall looking at the course proposal and the department. I guess in the check box there, [it] did say that they had checked that there was nothing, but I am suspicious of that. You know, just generally, like self-regulating mechanism.

Senator Gregory: Well, this is what I do [have]. I'm sorry, I have an answer for that. So in the CIM part of that where that question is asked about possible related or overlapping content, the proposer says, yes

and says we are not aware of any other undergraduate programs in Legal Studies. But you are correct, the course is not a course proposal for legal studies, but here, it's being proposed for sociology in the core.

Senator Case: I would not think of legal studies as necessarily being social science. I'm not convinced that this should be a social science course.

Senator Smith: I think that was my confusion as well because I read through the syllabus as well, and it seems to be a hybrid of many different things. But as a 1500 level core curriculum course involving social science, it doesn't seem to be that.

Senator Case: One other thing too. You know, I can't remember if it was Linda or Sharon. You mentioned that the intro level social science courses include discussions of poverty, but that's not the only thing they include. They're far more generalized in their approach to social issues than a class that only focuses on the legal issues around poverty. So, if this were to be a social science class, and I don't think it is, it would be a much higher division of the course than the gen ed. would be, because the topics are not wide enough.

Senator Smith: We have similar thoughts.

Senator Gregory: Like I said, I had some concerns of these concerns. I was the holdout vote on that just because I thought it seemed duplicative, but I also want to make sure that the committee can offer up their thoughts. Because like I said, I was the outvoted party there.

Senator Hall: Senator Gregory, if I can pipe in too.

Senator Gregory: Okay.

Senator Hall: I was also a participant in that discussion. All of these issues we considered, but in the end, when we looked at this list of topics and what they were talking about in the class, even though you couldn't really shoehorn it into a particular social science field, the broad range of topics that they were considering; even though they were looking at it from the point of view of how all these things would impact the law really did fit into the overall topic of social sciences. So, that was why I think overall the majority of us went with approval.

Senator Gregory: And I admit, in my part, I tend to defer to the social science in professors with degrees in those areas to deliver that content and kind of make those determinations.

Senator Hall: Well, one of my thoughts too, was I thought this was a wonderful course for students to be able to take in something that should be part of the core. Whether or not it fits into a particular place, it becomes a somewhat separate question. And as far as I know, please anyone speak up, I do not think there was a course like this at the University. I think it's one that that a lot of students, not just law students would benefit from.

Senator Barnes: This is Sharon Barnes from Women's & Gender Studies. We have a course on Women in Poverty, and I'm pretty sure it's cross listed. It seems to me that the concern, or my concern is that if it's a sociology or a social science course, it should be taught by a social science department or program. And I think, I mean, really, it feels to me like this is a consequence of people being concerned about enrollment and the new budgeting model. I think, you know, it is important to give people their areas of expertise. And speaking as someone in an interdisciplinary program, that can be really challenging, but that would really be my concern, that the course belongs in a social science or the Law and Social Thought program.

President Bigioni: Have any of these questions been discussed with the instructor, or the proposer so that we are not just guessing at some of these things?

Senator Gregory: No, we didn't go back to the instructor.

President Bigioni: Have there been enough questions and concerns raised that it's worth tabling and doing that?

Senator Gregory: I could.

President Bigioni: Does that seem like the fair thing to do.

Senator El-Zawahry: I just want to ask what is the question? Is it where are we going to teach the course? Or who's teaching the course?

Senator Gilstrap: We had a similar question, sort of come up during this meeting as well about is it the Core Curriculum job to decide what goes in core? The Undergraduate Curriculum jobs seems to be are we going to teach this class at all? And sometimes we get a class that we think could be in core, but the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee may say, well, this is duplicate work. So there was a little bit of confusion about that on the committee as well, I guess.

Senator Van Hoy: If I can say one more thing? The list of topics on the syllabus fit very well with Legal Studies in Law and Poverty in the area of legal services for those who are poor. But those approaches are not necessarily social science approaches. So I think we could ask the instructor is, if they are taking social science approaches? Are they using social science data and methods? If it's going to be a social science core class, are they educating students in the social sciences?

President Bigioni: So, I think to be able to wrap this up and move on to other things, there are two options. I think we should vote on the other three courses separately and then this remaining course could either be tabled or voted on today separately. Senator Gregory, what would you like to do?

Senator Gregory: I think we should definitely vote on the other three courses since those seemed much more straightforward. I would be happy to go back and talk to the instructor about sort of social science, SLOs, and approaches. However, I don't know if that's necessarily going to address the question of duplication, which seems to be the other thread here, which is, what evidence do we need another social science course taught from outside the social science departments. And that, I don't think the instructor can solve. The instructor has put together as Senator Van Hoy said, a very good course for a variety of reasons. I think that everyone thought on the committee that it was a really good class. It was more a matter of did it have a functional role in the core. Right? Like I said, I would be happy to try to tease that out a little bit more. I'm not sure that the instructor can answer that though. So I'm almost inclined to put forward the vote now, just because I think it might make more sense. But I am open to other suggestions too. I know this is a complicated issue.

Senator Hall: Senator Gregory, if I could make one more comment? I was on the committee. I don't want to comment about what Senator Gregory just said, but in this discussion, the question has been raised and it was also raised in committee as to whether certain areas of the core belonged. So, to speak to certain disciplines, and that opinion was voiced here. As far as we know within the committee that is not a matter of policy. If we want to make that a rule, then the Faculty Senate needs to make that a rule. But otherwise, we will just consider each course on its own merits and to whether it lives up to those standards as far as we can tell. But this might be something that we should consider if that's something we want to do.

President Bigioni: In the meantime, shall we just proceed with a vote on first the three, and then the fourth remaining course in question?

Senator Gregory: Okay. So first would be -- Actually, can we do that as a block? Can we do DST, ECON and WGST? Or, do we need to do them separately?

President Bigioni: We normally do them as a block with the Curriculum Committee, so I don't see a problem with doing it here.

Senator Gregory: Right. The first question on the table is to approve the modifications that were made to courses, Disability Studies 2020, ECON 3050, and WGST 3550. That includes, again a change of SLOs, removing prereqs, and a change of title, which I see that Senator Barnes dropped into the Chat at an earlier point. So, if you vote to approve, please type 'yes' into the Chat.

President Bigioni: Votes are slowing down, and so far it is unanimous.

Senator Gregory: You can also vote yes, President Bigioni. But I can't seem to put yes in the Chat line because I am screen sharing.

President Bigioni: Yes, that's all right. So, those passed. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Gregory: And then the next question on the table is to recommend the LGL 1500, Legal Aspects of Poverty into the core for social science credits.

President Bigioni: So that is a very scattered vote across yeses, no's, and abstentions. So that will take a little bit of time to process. [The 'no's' might have it, but we'll do a proper count and then report back in a moment.] Is there anything more, Senator Gregory, or shall we --?

Motion Failed (8 yes, 18 no; 10 abstain).

Senator Gregory: Nope, that is all the curriculum we have for today.

President Bigioni: Okay. Well, thank you for your report.

Senator Gregory: Thank you.

President Bigioni: We can move on now to our next item of business, in Other Business. Dean Chris Cooper and Dr. JT Zhang re going to tell us about the name change of the Department of Cancer Biology.

Dean Cooper: President Bigioni, thanks so much for giving us an opportunity. And if you don't mind, I'd like to take just a moment to introduce Dr. Zhang, who's going to introduce the name change. So, really delighted to have a chance to introduce Dr. Zhang. He received his bachelor's degree from Managing University, and then a doctoral degree from the University of Buffalo in Molecular and Cell Biology. He was then the post docket to Toronto Cancer Institute, and then had his first faculty appointment at UTNB in Galveston. He then moved to IU, Indiana University, where he really had a phenomenal career promoted to full professor in 2003, and a number of accomplishments at IU, including the Andrew and Peggy... basic science co-lead of their experimental developmental Therapeutics program at their NCI designated IU Simon Cancer Center and program director of graduate studies. He came to the University of Toledo, College Medicine and Life Sciences in 2019, where he was appointed the chair of the Department of Cancer Biology. His research focuses on drug resistance and cancer chemotherapy and drug discovery, and importantly, that fundamental research. And again, I think this underpins why we do discovery, why we create knowledge. It's led recently to a successful phase two clinical trial for people with triple negative breast cancer. Importantly, his scientific contributions have now been recognized

Commented [m1]: Was there ever a reported outcome of the vote taken here?

Commented [f2R1]:

Commented [f3R1]:

Commented [f4R1]:

Commented [f5R1]:

nationally. And as the Provost mentioned just a few moments ago, he was recently elected to the Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. So really, it's an honor to be able to introduce JT as we refer him to, to the Faculty Senate. So I will stop now and JT, give you floor.

Dr. JT Zhang: Dr. Copper, thank you very much for the introduction. Also, I would like to thank President Bigioni and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for this opportunity to present to you our proposed department name change from Department Cancer Biology to the Department of Cell and Cancer Biology. This proposal has gone through different vetting processes and got approved at different levels. Initially, my department discussed this several times in the summer last year, and approved it in September and then we presented this proposal to the College Executive Committee. This was on October 13th, and it was approved and then the week later, we presented it to the College Faculty Council, and it was approved. In January, we presented this proposed change to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. There were, as you know, a couple of suggestions for us to consult with a couple of other departments. We cleared potential issues and everybody was fine. Last week the proposed change was approved by the Board of Trustees. To the entire floor here, I just want to tell you what this proposed change is, what kind of impact it is going to have. The first one, we thought that by changing this name from Cancer Biology to Cell and Cancer Biology is going to impact our faculty and student recruitment, because Cancer Biology was a single disease-focused program and too narrow. Students and faculty candidates with interest in broader areas of biology research, rather than just focusing on cancer, will shy away. We thought that this change is going to help us recruit faculty and students. Secondly, we feel that the change will broaden our areas of research. This is going to help us to interact with other colleges and the departments, for example, department of biological sciences with research in cell biology and cancer biology. So the change will be creating more opportunities for interactions and synergistic impact moving forward. And finally, the change will impact our future grant prospects at National Institutes of Health. If you look at the table here, you'll see, National Cancer Institute is where cancer biologists apply for grants, and their pay line last year was 11th percentile. Currently, the Congress still has not approved any budget yet. So, NCI pay line, the intermural pay line dropped to 9th percentile to be conservative. So, for those of you who do not understand the NIH pay line, how you get the grant, what these numbers mean. The smaller number means the grant has to be that better. So, 11th percentile means that you are top 11% of the pool of applications. If you look at the other institutions, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke the National Institute of Diabetes Digestive and Kidney, the National Institute of Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and National Institute of General Medical Sciences all have lot better pay lines than the National Cancer Institute. I had a faculty who's grant scored 13th percentile but was not funded because the pay line at NCI was 11th percentile. If his grant were in the other institutes, for example, the NIGMS, it will get funded without any problem. So then we figured if we have a different name, and when we apply for grants, the administrators will not put our applications directly into NCI. This will have a positive impact on our grant prospect. So hopefully, by changing the name it will help us with that. And, of course, another important aspect is that, we also did the investigation and talk to other department and programs. We expect that there'll be no negative effects on any other programs at the University of Toledo. There's no other department, by the way, which has cell biology in their department names. That's all I want to say here. Anybody has any questions, please go ahead and shoot them to me and I'll try my best to answer it. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Thank you. Are there any questions or comments? Okay, hearing none. Well, we thank you both for coming and sharing that information about your department with us and wish you all the best. And once again, JT, congratulations on your appointment to the AAAS. That is fantastic for UT and we're very lucky to have you here.

Dr. Zhang: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Senator El-Zawahry: I second that, and thank you for your great work.

Dr. Zhang: Thank you.

President Bigioni: Okay, thank you both. So, let's move on to our next item of business, which is an update on the outcome of the HLC visit from Heather Huntley.

Heather Huntley: Hey there. Can you hear me okay?

President Bigioni: Yes.

Heather Huntley: All right. I am going to share my screen real quick. Thank you for the opportunity as always. As a reminder, a site team representing the Higher Learning Commission, or HLC visited the campus in November as part of the University's regular accreditation process. After the visit, the site team submitted a final report. The HLC's Institutional Actions Council voted to accept that at their January meeting. So, I'm happy to say that we did get continued accreditation with the next reaffirmation of accreditation scheduled for 2031- 2032. What this means is that all criteria and core components were met without concerns. I wanted to take just a couple of minutes to provide a very, very high level overview of the final report, and then point out a couple of excerpts that I think will be of interest to this group, and provide you a quick rundown of what happens next.

First, I'll start with the good stuff. First off, the introduction of the final report highlighted two unique aspects of the visit. One was that was a multi-campus review, and it covered both the Main Campus and the Health Science Campus. Then, secondly, our effective response to the global pandemic. I am going to quote, "Due in part to the University's strong online programming infrastructure. UToledo's ability to transition or implement comprehensive changes in policies and procedures demonstrate the agility of the institution, a characteristic that was evident throughout the review." I always joke that the only constant at this institution seems to be constant change, but evidently that was a good thing in this case. Secondly, the University's Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification was identified as a strength. They appreciated the examples we were able to provide of strategic partnerships in that area. In addition to highlighting UToledo Online's performance during the pandemic, a couple of other processes were called out and those included program review and also the internal audit function. They also identified faculty and staff's clear commitment to student success as a strength. And then finally, the team was impressed with UToledo's commitment to transparency and inclusiveness of the administration. I'm going to quote, again, "The level of faculty engagement and their freedom to express themselves is unprecedented." Some noteworthy examples of transparency include the information that's available through the University catalog, the IR website, Board of Trustees, public information, crime and safety reports, and we also provided them different Minutes and things from Faculty Senate. So, I appreciate those. Thank you.

So, the report indicated a few areas where we could improve. One is they noted that there is a strong awareness across the institution about the importance of diversity and inclusion. We need to take that next step, move from awareness to action. The review team felt there was a clear commitment to do so, [and] we just need to do that. There is room for growth in advising, particularly at the graduate level. They provided us with some specific recommendations to move forward. Then finally, declining enrollment and the corresponding financial challenge. This is obviously a concern. However, the report noted this is not specific to the University of Toledo. It does need improvement. But again, they felt like we recognize that, and we'll be able to make the next steps there. So, what needs to happen? First, they took us at our

word. Well, I'm sorry. First, I'm going to say, the things that we just had on that last slide, we need to work on those. They did not require monitoring. However, they're [the HLC are] going to expect that we make some changes or improve on those areas by the next site visit, or the next report. But from there, as I was saying, they took us at our word on a couple of things. As you know, we have a lot of things in process. We identified proactively some things that we were working on and described what was happening so far. It is really up to us to continue that forward momentum. So to that end, the Review Team appreciated that the next strategic planning process was already underway at the time of the site visit. They felt the planning process itself helped to exemplify the open and forward moving nature of the institution. We obviously need to complete that process and then we need to start documenting progress towards specific goals. Second, we need to complete the integration of the new budget model. It's going to place more and more of an emphasis on making data informed programmatic decisions and decisions generally, which leads me to the idea of institutional effectiveness. It really focuses on using data to make decisions. It underscores that data needs to be available and it needs to be correct. So we need to continue moving forward and getting better with those. And then finally, during the next accreditation cycle, we will need to renew our Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. So it's going to be important to continue documenting what is taking place there and continuing to work forward there.

So, finally, while the next comprehensive evaluation is not scheduled for 10 years, please know the HLC has different touchpoints built in. They also have annual data updates and things like that. You may recall me mentioning previously that we were on something called the Standard Pathway. We've had the opportunity to move to the Open Pathway. And what that means is that at the mid-cycle review, there's not a visit. It's just a report this time. Then there's also an opportunity to document some work on a specific initiative during the second half of that cycle, and then we will do the whole thing again in 2031 - 2032.

So with that, before I take any questions, I just want to say, thank you to this group. I know you had to listen to me yammer-on at several meetings. So, I appreciate that. I know several of you attended and participated in meetings while the HLC Site Team was here, so thank you for taking time to do that. I know several of you provided documents or read things for me, and for the team, and were on teams that did writing. So, I really do appreciate the time that you took. So you know, that full report is available. We just put a link to it on our website. So if you go to utoledo.edu/hlc, you can see the link right on that homepage. If you have any problems with that. Let me know, and I can always email it to you as well. With that, I am going to quit sharing my screen so I can see you. I'm happy to answer any questions that anybody might have.

President Bigioni: Just before anyone asks any questions, I'll note that Angela graciously agreed to reschedule, so we are not as pressed for time as you might think. So, please, feel free to ask questions. Any questions or comments?

Assistant Dean Pollauf: I was curious as to how many institutions are on the open pathway and what percentage?

Heather Huntley: Gosh, Kim, that's a good question. I know it's more than 50%. The Standard Pathway is kind of the lesser used. That's part of why we wanted to go ahead and switch to it. The Standard Pathway has slowly become the pathway for institutions that are having issues. So, it's a little bit of a scarlet letter. In our case, please know that the reason we were put on the Standard Pathway at the beginning was because back when they put the pathways together, the merger was less than 10 years old and so that was considered very new in accreditation circles. And so that's why they had put us on that

originally. So, I want to say probably more like 60% or 70% around the Open Pathway, but I can check that for you, Kim.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Oh, no, that is fine. I was just kind of curious, like, how much of an improvement it was for us. So that's good to know. Thank you.

Heather Huntley: I mean, it honestly doesn't matter. You have your choice to be on a pathway. We just felt like it made more sense. We didn't want anybody thinking that we had to be on the Standard Pathway. And I got the impression from some of the site visitors, they kind of questioned why we were on the standard pathway. So, I think it is better. It is good optics, I guess.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Thank you, Heather.

President Bigioni: Any other questions or comments? I'll just read Sharon Barnes' comment in the Chat. "Congratulations, and thanks for all the hard work, Heather." I totally agree with that.

Heather Huntley: Thank you.

President Bigioni: Huge amount of work, so much appreciated.

Heather Huntley: Thank you very much.

President Bigioni: Senator El-Zawahry has a hand raised.

Senator El-Zawahry: I was just going to commend Heather on her work, that's all.

President Bigioni: Okay, Great. Well, a big virtual round of applause for Heather. Great work. Okay. Thanks for that.

We can now move on to our last item of business, which is items from the floor. Does anyone have any items from the floor? No, no items from the floor?

Well, then, I guess we can move on to the final item, which is adjournment. I hereby adjourn this meeting.

Thank you very much everybody and we'll see in two weeks. Meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Kimberly Nigem
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

