

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 18, 2022
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 2/15/2022

Summary of Discussion

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

President Bigioni: Okay, I have 4 o'clock, so I will call the January 18th, Faculty Senate meeting to order and ask Secretary Nigem to call the roll.

Present: Anderson, Bamber, Barnes, Bigioni, Bornak, Brakel, Chou, Compora, Coulter-Harris, Day (McBride-sub), Duhon, Edgington, Elgafy, El-Zawahry, Gilstrap (Johnson-sub), Green, Gregory, Guardiola, Hall, Harmych, Hefzy, Insch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Koch, Kujawa, Lammon, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Metz, Milz, Modyanov, J. Murphy, Niamat, Nigem, Pattin, Ratnam, Reeves, Reynolds, Rouillard, Smith, Stepkowski, Steven, Teclehaimanot, Topp, Van Hoy, Vesely, Wedding, Welsch

Excused Absence: Baki, Duggan, Garcia-Mata, Hanrahan, Krantz, Pakulski, Shan

Unexcused Absence: Ali, Chaudhuri, Perry

Senator Nigem: We have a quorum, President Bigioni.

President Bigioni: Terrific. Thank you, Secretary Nigem. The next item on our agenda is the adoption of the agenda. You can see today's agenda before you on the screen. I made one small modification that I'll talk about in a moment. But also, because of timing, I did something a little bit non canonical, and that is, normally the "reports" section is for the Provost report and standing committees. But, Dr. Fulkerson has a time constraint so I took the liberty to put their presentation on the Strategic Planning Committee's progress in the "reports" section for timing reasons. The other thing that I did was, again, for timing reasons. The Faculty Constitution second vote may take some time, so in discussion with Dr. Templin, we decided that it's best to split out the discussion of the results of the Board of Trustees meeting and keep that as a Constitution and Rules Committee report and then the second vote as "other business." So, I've made a couple of modifications from what you've seen earlier in your email. That is the agenda as it stands. If there are no objections, then we will adopt this agenda by general consent. Hearing no objections, we will adopt this agenda. *Agenda Adopted.* Thank you.

The next item of business on our agenda is the approval of Minutes. The Minutes from December 7th, 2021 were sent out. There were a couple of technical issues that delayed them being sent out until this morning, so our apologies for that. They did turn out to be more accurate as a result. But, if anyone has anything to add to the Minutes or corrections to make to the Minutes, please speak up now. Okay, in the absence of any additions or corrections, we can adopt and approve these Minutes by general consent, unless there are any objections to that. Hearing no objections, we will approve those Minutes. *Minutes Approved.* Thank you.

The next item of business is the **Executive Committee report**. I suppose it'll be a little bit shorter today because of the holidays, and maybe that's not such a bad thing. The most important thing that I have to report to you is the results of our meeting with the Board of Trustees with regard to the Constitution. President-Elect Gary Insch and I met with three Trustees on January 5th. Those would be Trustees Lucas, Pisanelli, and Ciucci. Trustee Lucas is the Chair of Governance and Trusteeship Committee, and so that is

our first point of contact on constitutional matters. Also in the meeting were President Postel and Diane Miller. We had a very productive and positive meeting. I'll happily share the details of that with you.

So first of all, Article X on interpretation, this was an 'easy' one. We started with that and quickly resolved it with the substitution of one word to make the text very agreeable to all. And so we were all very comfortable with that change. You'll see the details of that in Dr. Templin's committee report. That was something that we were already comfortable with and it was just a question of wordsmithing.

Article II G, on the other hand, this was a point that we spent a great deal of time discussing in our December Faculty Senate meeting. And that has to do with review of administrators, and our concern about our ability to conduct those reviews being taken away. The upshot is that the change as requested by the Board of Trustees really arose because of an incomplete understanding of the process. So we had a good long chat about what the process was, what the goals of it were, and that really closed the gap and got us to a point where we could quickly resolve the differences between our position and theirs.

In particular, both President-Elect Insch and I emphasized that the input from the faculty is an important part of shared governance. Its ability for faculty to provide some input on how things are running, which things are running well, which are not, and so on. That will become even more important as we adopt our new budget model. We also emphasize that it's a form of feedback very much like the course reviews that we get from our student when we teach classes. It's more of an informal feedback mechanism, not to be compared to a formal performance review that one would do with a superior. And so this was an important point, a point of feedback rather than a professional review. And also, it's important to note that the comments that the faculty make don't necessarily have to be limited to the administrator. They could also be more general comments on the structures or operations, or even opportunities that might exist to make things better. So it's an important opportunity for communication from the faculty to the administrators.

One final point that we drove home is, is that it's really important that this process be conducted in a very regular uniform and consistent way. This is counter to sort of the one-off reviewing of an administrator on request, which is a very difficult thing to pull off. The structure necessary and the machinery necessary to get these reviews done in an efficient and effective way, needs some predictability.

They appreciated all of those points, really, so we quickly closed the gap and reached an agreement, which is best summarized as a modification of the original text that was put together by the Constitution Committee that appeared in red in our previous meeting. So a couple of things were tweaked in that language and the original Board proposed language was set aside. And so that was a very simple resolution to that issue, and one that everyone was quite comfortable with. I should also note that the review of the President as predicted was removed, just because of the new context of how these reviews will be done.

So all-in-all, it was a very productive meeting. We preserved the faculty's ability to conduct these administrator reviews and feedback mechanisms, and really lost nothing in that discussion. So we're very pleased with how that turned out. And, many thanks to Diane Miller for her help and going back and forth between us and Legal and the Board of Trustees for resolving a lot of little detail issues that would otherwise have slowed us down. So many thanks to Diane for that.

There are a few other things that we did over the holidays. One, is that there is a new proposed auto adoption. Well, that's the wrong way to say it. The State would like us to develop an auto adoption policy for books. We had a meeting on this to discuss what that might look like and what role Faculty Senate might play in that. The idea is that this would provide some predictability for students signing up for a

course, what books might be required for that course and in particular, what those books might cost. That might be an important thing for students to know up front before they sign up for courses. And so, the idea is that those books should be chosen before the time students are able to begin registering. And if a choice isn't made, there could be a default set of book choices made so that the students have some information to base their registration decisions on.

Of course, there are going to be a lot of details around that, in particular the ability for a faculty member to change what those books might look like, especially if there are staffing changes made after the registration window opening. And also, the fact that we're now doing year-long registration pushes that registration window opening time potentially a year in advance of a course beginning. So there are a bunch of issues to first think about there. As it stands, Angela Paprocki will write a draft of what that policy might look like and then bring it to Faculty Senate for our feedback and perhaps modification and whatnot. So, look out for that in an upcoming meeting.

There was also an opportunity to remind people of the need for financial oversight committees in the colleges to have Faculty Senate representation, but also to have faculty driven representation and not just look like something that the dean puts together. Not something that depends on the personality of the dean. We had an opportunity to discuss that at a Finance and Strategy meeting and will have an opportunity to discuss that further with the Provost on Thursday and the President in about two weeks.

Finally, I'd just like to give you a heads up about paying attention to the new CDC guidelines for people coming back to work or to class after testing positive. And no doubt, we will hear about that more perhaps today, but certainly in emails. The guidelines have changed. We have a little bit of a discussion about that in this morning's COVID operations meeting. The upshot is that someone who tests positive can go back to work or back to class after five days of isolation-- so day six. But it's important that they don't show a fever and are improving in their overall symptoms. Hopefully, people won't show up very visibly sick. But, that is something that I think merits some further discussion. Most people do the right thing, but there's sometimes people who don't. So, it is important to know where we stand with regard to those cases.

So that's a good point to wrap up my Executive Committee report. That's the end of my report and I'd be happy to answer any questions if anyone has any.

Senator Bamber: Do you anticipate how long the interval was between the positive test and returning to work?

President Bigioni: They can return to work on day six.

Senator Bamber: Okay. Thank you.

President Bigioni: That is again, depending. Their symptoms should be improving, and that's not well defined. But they should be without a fever as well, so that's a little better defined. Okay, any other questions?

Senator Stepkowski: Yes, there is a question. Going back to work, I understand the basis, but this requires PCR negative results, or no?

President Bigioni: That's not my understanding. My understanding is the sixth day from the positive test they become eligible to go back to work, pending those other two constraints. So, no need to test negative at that point. I think those sorts of questions may be better, those detailed questions might be better saved for the Provost report, and perhaps Amy Thompson or Linda Lewandowski or someone can dig into those

details. Are there any other questions? Okay then, hearing none, we'll move on to the next item of business, which is the Provost report. Provost Bjorkman, the floor is yours.

Provost Bjorkman: Thank you very much, President Bigioni. Good afternoon, everybody and a belated happy new year to all of you. I hope you had an enjoyable and a restful winter break. I assure you, we all needed it. I certainly did. As we begin the spring semester, I know much as we would like to be done with it, we're all still mindful of the ongoing pandemic and the surge due to the Omicron Variant. We will again, need to be flexible and continue to be as students and others may need to quarantine during the semester. We continue to follow the CDC guidelines and masks are still required for all individuals while indoors on campus, regardless of vaccination status. The CDC is now recommending that masks be upgraded, so the University has ordered 100,000 surgical masks that we will be distributing for free over the next two weeks. The Provost Office is one of the distribution sites for these surgical masks, and there's already a basket full of masks sitting on our table just inside the Provost Office in University Hall. Should you need one, feel free to stop by and get one. The Office of Marketing and Communications is putting together an announcement of where the other distribution sites will be located around campus, for example the libraries and so on and when they will be available. They will also include information about how colleges or other units can order free masks through the Procurement Office to keep on hand in their offices. For the best protection, the CDC recommends that surgical masks be worn in combination with a cloth mask or that a KN95 or N95 mask be worn. As you've just heard, the CDC has made some changes to the guidance on the quarantine and isolation timings. We've posted a link to those guidelines on the Provost Office website. That link will take you to the Toledo Lucas County Health Department website, which, in my opinion has posted a really simple, and clear and very straight forward outline of this new guidance. I find it very helpful and so we have posted that link there in case you want to go take a look at it. Just a reminder, of course, we continue to offer booster shots for COVID-19 available by appointment at both the Main Campus pharmacy and at UTMC. And if there are COVID questions at the end, Amy's on the line too, so she can pop in and help to answer them.

On another note, a positive note, I'm really pleased to share some good news regarding our HLC accreditation. We received the official notice last week that the University's accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission has been continued. Our next comprehensive evaluation will be in 2031-32. I want to thank all of our faculty and staff who worked so hard over the past few years to complete our self-study and get us ready for the site visit. I especially want to think those faculty and staff who served on the criterion committees. That was an enormous task. It required a huge commitment of time and effort. I'm very grateful for the work you put into that. I know that I speak on behalf of the entire University leadership team when I say how grateful we are for the dedication and hard work that you put in. We are all very pleased with the outcome, needless to say.

I also want to thank the faculty who were able to participate in our December commencement ceremonies. We had nearly 2,000 students graduating, combined both undergraduate and graduate. Our speakers for the commencement gave inspiring speeches to our graduates. For the undergraduate commencement ceremonies, Dr. Tony Bova, one of our graduates from some years ago, the co-founder and CEO of Mobius, shared his fascinating educational and entrepreneurial journey and talked about how it was shaped by his experiences while a student at the University of Toledo. We got a lot of really positive feedback from what Tony had to say, and he came back in person to give the talks at both of the undergraduate commencement ceremonies, which I greatly appreciated.

I also want to thank the faculty, staff and students who made it possible for yesterday's Unity Celebration in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. This was the 21st Unity Celebration that the University has held

in partnership with the City of Toledo. That was a great event and I'm glad that we're continuing to do that.

The University Strategic Planning Committee is off and running. You're going to hear an update this afternoon from the committee co-chairs, Anne Fulkerson and Jason Huntley. So I won't steal their thunder. I'll let them talk about that. The committee has received a lot of great input from faculty, staff and students as a result of the survey they sent out last semester. They're also planning to hold a number of town hall meetings this semester in order to get additional input. You'll be hearing more about that in their presentation later today.

I want to give a shout out to the College of Arts and Letters as a recipient of a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to create a health humanities minor, with the goal of improving health care, including issues related to health disparities. This project was one of 208 projects across the country that will receive NEH funding over the next three years. And also, congratulations to Dr. Sujata Shetty, Professor in the Department of Geography and Planning in the College of Arts and Letters, who along with her colleague from BGSU is a recipient of one of the 2022 course development prizes in architecture, climate change and society. They were awarded the prize by Columbia University's Temple Hoyne Buell Center for the Study of American Architecture and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. Doctor Shetty's course proposal focuses on climate change in the city of Toledo with the goal of designing healthy public spaces in neighborhood environments. This interdisciplinary course will also advance and bolster climate literacy in Northwest Ohio.

I want to congratulate this year's recipient of the MAC Faculty Award for Student Success. The University of Toledo has selected Sandra Robinson, Associate Lecturer in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics as this year's recipient of the award. This is the third year for this MAC award. Each year one faculty member from each MAC institution is selected in recognition of their dedication to student success.

Today is a big day. I want to announce that the University of Toledo has joined over 230 colleges and universities across the nation as institutional members of the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity, NCFDD. This is a national organization dedicated to supporting faculty, graduate students and post-doctoral students in their professional development throughout their careers. There's a list of programs and resources, including some virtual workshops on the Provost website. Just click on the Faculty Affairs link to find them. This, I hope will be a great resource for all of our faculty, our graduate students and our post-docs. I hope that you will take advantage of our membership and spread the word to others, including, especially the graduate students and the post-docs about this. The institutional membership became effective today. There is a link on our website that provides more information on how to activate your own individual membership, which is free, through our institutional membership. And because you're a faculty member, a grad student, or post-doc at UToledo, you can sign up for that. To kick off this new initiative, there is a virtual webinar that will be held on Friday, January 21st -- that's this coming Friday from 2 to 4. The topic is on writing, procrastination, and resistance: how to identify writing blocks and move through them. Believe me, I think I may sit in on that myself. The link to register for the workshop is on the main page of the Provost Office website. Preregistration for that workshop is required. We've already gotten a lot of interest in this. A lot of people have already registered for that. If you have any questions, or need additional information on the workshop, or on our membership with NCFDD, please contact Dr. LaFleur Small in our office. She's on this meeting as well if you have questions about this.

And lastly, I want to remind you about nominations for the 2022 Distinguish University Lectures that are due on Friday, January 28th. Information and the nomination guidelines are posted on our website. Then, please save the date for a tenure and promotion workshop that will be held on Friday, January 28th from 2-4 P.M. This workshop is co-sponsored by the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost. There's a link to information about that on the main page of the Provost's website. You don't have to preregister for it. So, if you forget, you're still welcome to participate.

And one last announcement. I just want to remind everyone that student applications for summer, research stipends with faculty are now available through the Office of Undergraduate Research. So please let your students know that if they're interested, they need to apply before the February 15th deadline. Those application forms can be found on the Office of Undergraduate Research webpage at www.utoledo.edu/honors/undergradresearch.

Thank you, that concludes my remarks today. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator Stepkowski: I have a question. Provost Bjorkman, I have maybe two specific questions that I think needs to be asked. I understand that CDC recommendation is also about the quality of masks because of infectious, high level. I understand that they recommend N95 as a preferential use for protection. And I understand that you said that the University is going to purchase surgical masks. Can you comment on this or can you ask somebody to comment about it?

Provost Bjorkman: Well, I will take a stab, and then I'll let Amy jump in, if she would like. What they've said is if you're going to use a surgical mask, they recommend that you maybe put a cloth mask over it. But that they do not feel like a cloth mask alone is sufficient. The KN95 or N95 is obviously the preferred approach. Those are considerably more expensive, I will say. But the surgical mask with a cloth mask on top is a pretty good alternative to that. Amy, do you want to address anything I may have misstated here?

Vice Provost Amy Thompson: No, you're exactly correct. I think we're just emphasizing, upgrading the mask into a better mask across campus and, you know, making those accessible to our students. Right now, you know, it's not easy necessarily to get your hands on an N95 mask, so a lot of people are wearing KN95 masks. But, you know, the other language is trying to get something that fits you your face tightly. That's another key indicator.

Senator Stepkowski: Thank you.

Vice Provost Amy Thompson: I see the question there. Double masking is not required, but again, it's another layer of protection that you can take for yourself. Right now, we have purchased surgical masks, not KN95 masks. Those are more challenging to get in terms of bulk quantities. So we have taken the step. And again, not all institutions are doing that. We are taking additional steps compared to other institutions by providing those, and then encouraging other faculty, staff and students to go ahead and try to find those higher grade masks on their own. But we're jumpstarting them by providing the surgical masks.

President Bigioni: Are there any other questions? So, perhaps, I should just ask. I tried to restate the guidelines for going back to class. I don't know how well I did. I don't know if you want to make any corrections there?

Provost Bjorkman: No, I mean, you got that mostly right. I guess I would just, like I alluded to, I think we're all aware that we're going to have to have a lot of flexibility because we already have people, faculty members, staff members, students who are having to quarantine. And so there are going to be

times when people will not be able to be there in person. So, we just need to be able to accommodate this. I think we have become used to this kind of flexibility over the past months. We're just going to have to continue that for a while. We're doing as much as possible to keep everybody safe and also still give our students the best possible learning experience and environment that we can, given the constraints.

President Bigioni: Certainly, I think everyone is moving toward whatever we can do to get everyone back into the classroom or back to work as quickly as practical. Not possible, but practical.

Provost Bjorkman: Yes, that is correct.

President Bigioni: With regard to the symptoms, though, that's something that I find very 'squishy.' You know, the guidelines say something about the "symptoms should be improving." But "improving" is a very vague thing. Amy?

Vice Provost Amy Thompson: May I? So I actually Chair the IUC COVID Response Team. We had a very deep conversation around this. Bowling Green brought this up and I actually like this term. They're promoting the term 'heavily recovered.' I actually like that. It's not a CDC term, but to me, it resonates a little bit that you should be really on the mend. President Bigioni, I think you mentioned this, and this is explicitly stated in the CDC guidance. You should not have a fever! And really, to go back, you should be feeling much, much better. So that's why I like that term, 'heavily recovered.' There is still some evidence that's coming out that talks about, you know, you still can potentially spread that even after day five. So using your own judgement of, you know, are you feeling significantly better towards going out, wearing a mask, you know, leaving quarantine, I think is really an important judgment call there. The other thing I saw in the Chat was asking about face shields. Face shields are never meant to replace face coverings. Right? Some people are wearing those in addition to, and that's if you choose to want to do that, that's fine. But you should always be wearing a face covering and that's not meant to replace it.

President Bigioni: There is another follow-up question in the Chat from Senator Niamat who asks, who is the judge if someone is heavily recovered?

Vice Provost Amy Thompson: Yeah, I mean, that's a personal decision. We're not policing that, right? I mean, that's a personal call.

President Bigioni: Yes, that is certainly tough. Are there any other questions? Okay, then great. Thank you both. We'll move on to our next item of business, which is an update on how the Strategic Planning Committee is going; and that is Senator Jason Huntley and Anne Fulkerson. Please, the floor is yours.

Senator Huntley: Alright, thanks, President Bigioni. I hope everyone can see the PowerPoint slide.

Unknown Speaker: Yes.

Senator Huntley: So thank you for the invitation to update the faculty today about the strategic planning process here at the University. You will see that our committee broadly represents faculty, staff, deans, the Provost is on this committee, members of the Board of Trustees, and the UToledo Foundation. You'll see a wide range of constituents from across campus. There's 21 members, and myself as your Faculty Senate representative and then Anne Fulkerson are leading this charge.

So Dr. Postel, when we kicked this off in October, gave the committee these charges, which is to have a limited number of achievable and actionable goals. There should be defined metrics, instead of, for instance saying, we want to be the best. What can we actually do to obtain actionable goals? Second, whatever we identify should be supported by real and identified resources. The purpose here is that with the budget remodeling, the incentive-based budget, we should be able to identify resources to support our

achievable and actionable goals. Third, all of these should be able to be measured, directly measured. This feeds into institutional effectiveness. Fourth, we have to set goals that are tactical and that actively engage all members of the campus community. So that you know, Anne and I are meeting with many different constituents: Grad Council, Faculty Senate, etc. to help engage and talk about this process. And then fifth, we aren't coming up with something brand new. We're actually looking at the existing strategic plan, which expires here in June of this year. You'll also remember that Dr. Postel has his own key initiatives, and there's other strategic priorities that were identified by Dr. Postel and Provost Bjorkman. So again, it's not throwing anything out, but considering all options and trying to think strategically about who we are, where we're going, and who we serve.

Dr. Anne Fulkerson: Well, thank you again for inviting us today and giving you the opportunity to share our progress. As Jason mentioned, we are in the information and input gathering stage of the planning process. And as part of that, the week after Thanksgiving, we launched a university-wide stakeholder survey. Hopefully you all saw it and took it. But it appears that many people did. We are thrilled to report that despite the very busy time of the semester and calendar year, we have received over 3600 responses to date. Nearly half of those responses are from students, so that does skew the results a little bit. But that represents about 10% of our student body. And about 40% of our respondents are from faculty, staff and hospital employees. That represents about 25% of our employee population. Roughly 70% of respondents are from Main Campus and about a quarter are from Health Science Campus.

So, the cornerstone of any strategic plan is an institution's mission, vision, and values. In fact, the HLC not only requires that institutions have a strategic plan, but as part of that process, we regularly review our mission, vision and values for relevancy and to ensure that they still reflect the commitments and principles of the institution. So, with that, one of the first questions on the survey was how well does the current mission statement describe UToledo's overall purpose as an institution? Here are the results. At first blush, just looking at the frequency distribution of responses it looks like we're doing okay. Most people responded that it's fairly adequate or better. However, when you actually calculate a grade for these responses: A, B, C, D, and F, it comes out to about a C+, a high C+ grade. The question that the committee is asking is will a C+ propel us towards excellence or can we do better? Do we need to do better for an effective strategic plan and for a prosperous future? Another question on the survey was how well does the current vision statement describe what UToledo should aspire to be. The vision statement fares a little better, but still, it's a B-. And so the question is, is this good enough? Is that what we want to build our strategic plan and our future direction upon? Based on this input and looking at other strategic plans and mission statements, the committee decided to form a subcommittee to review the mission, vision, and values a little more thoroughly and to propose a revised set of mission, vision, and value statements that very clearly specifies the institution's purpose, identity, and direction. Jason will explain more in a minute about the planning process, but we're going to be holding a series of town halls as Provost Bjorkman mentioned, to gather additional input from the University community. And then also, to share draft proposals during this process. Before we move on to that, however, we also want to share with you at this point some preliminary strengths and barriers that were identified from the survey. This first slide here is strengths. It is not broken out separately by students, faculty, staff or hospital employees because there was quite a bit of consensus among all the respondents about what our strengths are. The most frequently mentioned strength was our beautiful campus and then it's very easy to navigate. Students really appreciate that most of the dorms are clustered together, really enhances their experience. There was also a lot of positive mention about the diversity of the student body and how inclusive our institution is. Again, this really enhances the institution. And although there are some comments about implicit bias and racism, by and large, most respondents mentioned that diversity was a real strength. Respondents also mentioned the variety of our academic programs. This can be both a blessing and a curse, but the students

really appreciate the wide variety of choices they have here at the University. They also appreciate the very good education they're receiving and mentioned very high quality of programs. They specifically called out engineering, law, business, nursing, health, the sciences and pharmacy. They also mentioned that it is really a strength to have a medical school and to be associated with a hospital where students can get additional clinical experience and expertise. Students appreciate the opportunity to engage in research. You'll notice here in a minute when I mentioned the barriers, there are some paradoxes here in the strengths and barriers with regard to research opportunities. But for those students who are participating in research, this again enhances their experience. Size and location were mentioned as strengths, as were affordability and our athletic program.

Jason reminded me that when HLC was here, they said, you know a student survey is legitimate if they complain about parking and campus dining – and this survey is no different. Nonetheless, these are, I think important to mention because if our focus or one of focuses in this strategic planning process is to be more student centered, then we certainly want to hear students concerns and be responsive to their feedback. I should also mention that parking was also mentioned not just by students, but by employees as well. So, that is something that we're looking at and we've also passed that information on to others at the University. Campus life was also mentioned in the areas around campus. Students really want to have more of a college town feel, have places to go and things to do. [They] mentioned about some of the areas around campus being a little bit 'sketchy' and wanting to develop those areas a little further. Taking advantage of our urban setting, students would like more public transportation, particularly downtown into areas of shopping. There was some mention about our facilities needing some upgrades. Some mentioned about student centeredness, that students aren't always necessarily put first. So that was seen as a barrier as was high acceptance rates. This last item here, too much emphasis on research, rather than teaching. This was more mentioned by students than employees. And just to put that in a little bit of context, again, students who participate in research feel that, that really enhances their experience. But when students have what they view as maybe a negative classroom experience, they jump to the conclusion whether it's accurate or not that perhaps research or other priorities may be getting in the way. Here were some items that were more specifically mentioned by employees. Faculty in particular mentioned very heavy teaching loads. That's very difficult to balance with the high research expectations. So, if we continue to have very high research expectations, they would like more support for research and writing grants. And along with that is this notion that, as an institution, we might be trying to do too much that we're a mile wide and maybe an inch thick. We really need to focus on our strengths and find the right balance. With that also, for all the things that we want to do, a need for additional funding and resources, low pay, high turnover, particularly in leadership positions need for more accountability. Although athletics was described as a strength and something that really enhances the student experience, many people felt that we aren't getting enough out of our athletic programs for the investment that we made, that we want as an institution to benefit more from those programs. Our commuter image is a barrier and also lack of employee diversity.

Senator Huntley: Thanks, Anne. So these are certainly initial kind of thoughts and areas for us to focus on and think about. We wanted to roll out for all of you, what our timeline is. So from now through June, we're actually going to work on a Phase 1 of our approach. After looking at and consulting with some experts in this field, we realized that this is a very tight timeline. So, we're proposing to roll out a one to two year again, very milestone metric driven strategic Phase 1 plan. Again, as Anne mentioned, our first goal is to reimagine or re-look at the mission, vision and values. We'll be doing this through town halls and we have a subcommittee that is going to look at that. In the town halls, we also hope to identify some themes, goals, pillars for that one or two-year plan as well as to start to lay the foundation for the longer term plan, which I'll talk about in a second. But again, we hope to finalize that by June, have that

presented to the Board of Trustees and use that as Dr. Postel has discussed, as a more tactical way to think long term. We then hope to engage the committee and continue this planning process, engage the University community through the second phase, which launches in July and should wrap up by December. This is very intentional to wrap up before we start doing the budget planning for the next fiscal year. So if we wrap this up by December with longer phase goals, for example, for three to four years, we, then again can identify financial resources to support those partners, metrics and ways to improve the institution long term. Again, we think that this aligns very well with the budget planning process and that can be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval with implementation in July of 2023. The point here is that we will be engaging the campus community as well as the outside community initially here for this Phase 1, this one or two-year approach, and then more long term in this Phase 2 approach. So, we will be soliciting your feedback.

These are the subcommittees we have now. This is very tentative, so we don't want you to think we're limited to this at this point through the town halls. We're hoping that each of these subcommittees gather different ideas here, different opinions from the campus community. We have a subcommittee that's based on redesigning the mission, vision, values, which this also includes what our image is and what our brand is. We have a second subcommittee that will be focused on performance. Again, institutional effectiveness and ways to make sure that our students are successful. Then this also involves, as you can imagine, partnerships, whether through the alumni, through the Foundation, through the City of Toledo, Lucas County, etc. We have a third subcommittee that's really focused on the people that help drive this University. This, of course, includes you, the faculty, but also the students that we educate as well as a staff that help support all of us. These are the three subcommittees. Again, this will likely change over time, but for now, these are the groups that are listening during the town halls. This is the important slide. Here's what we have scheduled already next week and you'll be seeing emails from Marketing and Communications coming out later this week about town halls. Importantly, I've highlighted here in green for faculty. Next Wednesday, we'll be having a Health Science Campus faculty town hall at noon. And also on Wednesday, the 26th, we will be having a Main Campus faculty town hall at 4 P.M at Stranahan. The others are listed here for your reference. Again, there will be a series of emails to highlight this. Again, to be clear, the focus during Round 1. is to get ideas on what our mission, vision, values are and try to identify some important goals that we can flush out in this planning process. After we get these kind of ideas identified in Round 2. we'll be vetting those and making sure that we are on the right track with the community. That will happen in early March. You'll also see that we have a town hall setup with the community. We're planning those with alumni, with UTMC, the UT physicians, and other constituencies. So, with that, we'd like to just encourage you again. Hopefully you have time to attend the town halls. I know we just got done discussing the importance of masks and we realize that COVID is still a concern. However, the University is open for business, right? So these town halls are going to be held in person to help facilitate discussions. We are going to also be holding some virtual town halls for those that are nervous about having large numbers of people in a small confined space. Please be honest with us and share your opinions. Of course, we always have the email address open as well our website, where you can add anonymous opinions. But we encourage your feedback. So, thanks for your attention, if anyone has questions, Anne and I would be happy to answer those.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. Any questions?

Senator Stepkowski: I have a general question for you both. Can you tell us what do you expect to accomplish? Let's say, you will have this meeting, this meeting will raise questions or will raise some issues and how are we going to execute, summarize, or make some steps to implement it? Can you share your vision?

Senator Huntley: Thanks, Senator Stepkowski. That is a great question. I mean, that's also a tough question. I mean, we're trying to solicit feedback. We're trying to listen to the community. Again, Dr. Postel has a very clear vision for what he's identified as tactical measures that we have to tackle right now. For instance, increasing enrollment. Not just for the sake of increasing numbers, but for the fiscal stability of the University, right? That's one example of some of his key initiatives. I mean, certainly those are open for discussion. Those are important for the long term viability of the University. I mean, we're soliciting feedback to get a better handle, again, of what do you need as faculty to feel supported and to be successful here. What do we need to do to make sure that our students, not only once we recruit them, but once they're here, to make sure that they're successful so that when they graduate, they have a positive experience, and they donate back to the university? We're trying to think from start to finish: engaging the students and making sure they're successful, recruiting the best faculty, keeping and retaining them here, making sure that they're successful. Same with the staff making sure we recruit and retain the best staff. Engaging with the community. Trying to think outside the box in terms of partnerships. Again, not just here in Toledo, but in Lucas County, throughout Ohio, parts of Michigan. I mean, the list goes on and on. I think it's too early, Senator Stepkowski to really give you definites. But again, if you look at the list of the people we have on the committee, we have a number of constituents from across the University, whether it's from the Alumni Foundation, the Board of Trustees, faculty, staff. I think we need to listen carefully and also think about again, who we are, why we're here and who we serve. I hope that answers your question, Senator Stepkowski. It's just, it's hard to say right now.

Senator Stepkowski: Thank you.

Senator Huntley: Anne, did I do a good job with that? Do you have anything to add?

Dr. Fulkerson: You sure did. No, I mean, I think you summed it up very well. At this point, we don't have any predefined conception of how this is going to look at the end. We want it to be a very inclusive and collaborative process. So, at this point, we really are looking to get everyone's input. We are asking our steering committee to attend as many of these town halls as possible. We'll have several note takers on hand. We're looking to just get the perspectives of all of our constituents, and we'll take that back and distill it down. We'll be communicating through UT News and then the future town halls to bring back ideas to get further feedback.

Senator Huntley: I think the challenge is, one more comment, is to identify reasonable and rational goals that have metrics. Right? Otherwise, it's hard to think about how you get there. So, hopefully you all have the solutions for that.

President Bigioni: Lots of money<laughter>.

Senator Huntley: By recruiting how many students, President Bigioni?

President Bigioni: Yeah. Are there any other questions?

Dr. Fulkerson: I think there was a question in the Chat about nontraditional students. Yes, I think we'll be looking at all ways to increase enrollment including more nontraditional populations, particularly as we know, the direct from high school pool of students is expected to decrease in the near future.

President Bigioni: Okay, are there any other questions? There's a comment in that chat from Provost Bjorkman. We have a transfer office open for the non-traditional and non-DHS students as well. Thanks for that. Okay, hearing no other questions. And, of course, there will be town hall opportunities to talk more, so everybody needs to take advantage of those. But thank you both for the presentation and the update. I really appreciate hearing more about this. So, thank you.

Senator Huntley: Thanks.

President Bigioni: Okay, let's move on to our next item of business, which is a Constitution and Rules Committee report by Dr. Mark Templin. Dr. Templin, the floor is yours.

Dr. Templin: Hopefully, everybody can see what I've shared. What I'm going to show you is new language that we have received based on the conversation that President Bigioni talked about in his report. The first one of these is Article II G. If you remember, Article II is all of the express powers of Senate. I left all the various versions in so that you can see what we've talked about in the past. It should be an 'old friend' to you at this point. But the new language is in blue. We were waiting on a little bit of language to come from Legal. I put that in. That just came yesterday and that's in purple. So, II G now reads: "To solicit input from the faculty in accordance with university policy and legal regulations on the performance of the provost, vice provost(s) and deans, at least once every two years (including those who serve in these positions on an interim basis longer than two years), to improve accountability and improve administrative performance." So, that is that one. Any questions? I can't see the Chat while I'm sharing.

President Bigioni: I'll monitor the Chat. There are no questions in the Chat as of yet.

Dr. Templin: Okay.

Senator Barnes: Can I ask a quick question?

Dr. Templin: Sure.

Senator Barnes: "To solicit input from the faculty," that phrase applies to the Board. Yes? Or, it is that we're, the Faculty Senate are soliciting input from the faculty at-large?

Dr. Templin: Right.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

Dr. Templin: Other questions? All right, moving on---

President Bigioni: There is a question in the Chat from Dr. Pollauf. It says, is there any consequence if the input is negative?

Dr. Templin: No. I mean, the idea is to ensure the accountability and improve administrative performance. So, some of the input would be positive. Some would be negative. The key is, in terms of the way the input is solicited needs to be in accordance with University policy and legal regulations. So this is our standard, once every two-year administrative review process and it generates both positive and negative input from the faculty.

President Bigioni: Are there any other questions?

Dr. Templin: Moving on. The other one basically is a great simplification. So, red is the original language. Green was what we talked about back in December. And blue is now how it reads based on over the break. This is "Subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees of the University, in the event of possible ambiguity where the spirit, meaning, or conditions of interpretations of any provisions of this Constitution, its Bylaws, or its Rules, the meaning of such provision shall be determined by a simple majority vote of the Faculty Senate members present and voting at a regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting at which a quorum is present at the time of the vote."

President Bigioni: It may be useful to scroll up just a little bit to see the top of the green. So the change really was the substitution of the word “authority” for “supervision of and control.” And then the deletion of the second paragraph, which was not meant to be there.

Dr. Templin: Right. Questions on this change?

Senator Barnes: I have a question. What's the relationship between the first part of it and the second part? The first part sounds like we're saying, everything we're writing here is subject to the authority of the Board of Trustees, full stop. Is that right?

Dr. Templin: I think what it's really saying is if there's something in an interpretation of something that Faculty Senate takes action on, if it's against the Board of Trustees Bylaws or Rules, or whatever, then the Board of Trustees can take direct action to tell Senate, no, you can't do that. But, if not, then it's up to Senate to clarify for itself what the ambiguity is and, you know, to clear up the ambiguity. That's the way I read it.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

Senator Anderson: I realize in the original language, it said “regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting.” To me, that would mean like, what we've already scheduled through April. So, it seems like it would leave out if Senate wanted to call an emergency meeting over the summer, because that's not a regularly scheduled meeting. Then if you simply had ‘scheduled meeting,’ it seems like it would open up as long as you notify about this meeting, that is a scheduled meeting. I don't know if that's the way it reads or not, “regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting.”

Dr. Templin: Well, yeah, to me regularly scheduled, we have met in the summer before. In other words, there's a regular process for how those meetings are scheduled. I don't think it precludes something from the summer, but if you say it's a scheduled meeting, you know, let's say I have a nefarious intent and I just want to schedule something and then 5 minutes later have the meeting or something, that wouldn't be fair. So, “regularly scheduled” to me, means that it follows the processes that we traditionally followed.

Senator Anderson: Okay.

Senator Steven: Hi. I had a question about the evaluation change. Actually about the process of evaluations. I don't recall seeing anywhere in the documents any recommendations as to how these are going to be carried out and who would be carrying out these evaluations. Is that true? If they are absent, do we need to add something?

Dr. Templin: Senator Steven, are you talking about II G?

Senator Steven: Yes, evaluations of deans, etc. Is the process of that evaluation written in the Constitution or in the Bylaws somewhere?

Dr. Templin: No, it's not. But historically, the Executive Committee has taken on that responsibility.

Senator Steven: Okay.

Dr. Templin: So if we wanted that, it wouldn't be a constitutional matter. That would be in addition to Bylaws. I was kind of surprised by that. You know, just decided not to mention it early on. Like, we have a lot of committees: The Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, the Faculty Senate Committee on Constitution and Rules and so on and so forth. It is probably, I don't know, eight or nine of them. One that we don't have is the Faculty Senate committee on administrative review. That committee does not

exist. So these reviews have been done by the Executive Committee. And you're correct, there's very little parliamentary language. I don't think any exists other than II G, to suggest how those should occur. The Executive Committee has documents that it uses for that purpose, but they are not here.

President-Elect Insch: I also kind of wanted to add a little bit of that. Part of the conversation was, and I think President Bigioni and I kind of agreed that we need to be a little more overt in what that is. So part of our task going forward, once we get this passed because the issue now is getting this Constitution passed. And then from there, then work on actually putting that in a little more formalized way. Whether we set up an existing committee, add a new committee, or something like that to do it, or make it... back to Faculty Senate Exec. But, that's clearly an area of improvement that we need to do. President Bigioni and I both agree; we need to do that fairly quickly so we can get this in place. But right now we are thrilled that they left the language in there. They are okay with us doing it as long as it's predictable and fair. And so you're absolutely correct. Right now the rules are kind of hidden in process. It happened in the past and we need to make that more overt going forward. I think that's certainly the intent of President Bigioni and myself.

Dr. Templin: Right. Those changes would all be Bylaws and/or Rule changes, not Constitution changes. Because once, you know, let's say we vote on this in the affirmative and the faculty at-large ratify it, then II G says, okay, we can do it, then later we can go back into the Bylaws and make it clearer just how II G should work. But that's a whole-another set of meetings.

President Bigioni: Are there any other questions on either of these two articles? Sounds like everyone may be satisfied.

Dr. Templin: Thank you everyone.

President Bigioni: Dr. Templin, do we need to adopt that new language as a friendly amendment to the new draft of the Constitution?

Dr. Templin: Well, I sent out the language to the committee. I sent out the draft, except for that little bit that was in purple that we didn't have. And I'm considering it as a friendly amendment to what we've been working on. I didn't hear anything to the contrary from the committee members. So, I'm assuming we're all on the same page with this being friendly amendments.

President Bigioni: So, no vote is necessary, or a general consent to approve?

Dr. Templin: No vote is necessary on those changes. Now it would be a motion. When we vote, it would be a motion from a committee so no second would be necessary. It would just be that last language.

President Bigioni: And that would be the second part of our discussion today?

Dr. Templin: Right.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. So that'll do it for this part?

Dr. Templin: Yes.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. Thank you very much. So we can move on to our next item of business, which is Dean Mark Merrick from the College of Health and Human Services. He is going to talk to us today about a reorganization that's happening in his college. Dean Merrick, the floor is yours.

Dean Merrick: Thank you. Is everybody able to hear me okay? I've had a little audio troubles from home today.

President Bigioni: Yes, I can hear you.

Dean Merrick: All right. Excellent. I am going to go ahead and share my screen here if I am able. So you should be able to see my screen here. First of all, I want to thank everybody for their time today. I'm going to tell you a little bit about why we're here. The College of Health and Human Services is undergoing an internal reorganization. And as part of the process for doing so, you seek the consultation of the faculty through Faculty Senate Executive Committee. We presented this to them back on December 10th. In the process of doing so, one of the things that was identified was that the process we used for our reorganization was very well received and thought of as potentially a good example of shared governance. We were asked to bring that before you, and just talk a little bit about what we did and how we did it. So that's the genesis of why I am here today.

So, to kick that off a little bit about the need of the college. Here is a photo of a shadow box that actually hangs on my wall in my office. It is stationary or coasters from our college over the last oh, 12 to 15 years. We're now on our fifth or sixth iteration of what our college looks like. We have a college that has been reorganized many, many times in recent years. And that is, as you might well imagine, created lots of operational as well as identity problems for the college. At the time that I was hired in as Dean, which is just about 18 months ago, I came into a college that was facing really some very significant, organizational leadership, resource and pandemic related challenges. At the same time of doing that, I was a brand new Dean to the University. Although I am an alumnus, I've been away for quite a while in other stops along my academic journey. The problem that we had in the college was that unsustainable organizational structure and some cultural isolation in silos. Let me describe that just a little bit. The current organization of our college is that we are organized into schools rather than departments; and in our version of that, a school is an interdisciplinary department for all intents and purposes. Our four schools at the time that I was hired in, we had one chair. We had another chair who was serving in an interim role. I had an associate dean who was acting interim chair for a third school, and we had a fourth school that had no chair at all as the chair to that school had left the University under some difficult circumstances between the time that I signed my contract letter and actually started my job. So, I came in on July 1, 2020. [There were] four schools. One chair. A very large budget cut that involved the sweeping of 18 faculty and staff lines in the college. And no particular plan on how we were even going to be operational in the near term, let alone what we should look like going forward. So the end result of that, really, on my first day on the job created an emergency organizational structure of the college that promoted my interim chair to chair of that particular school, and then have each of those two chairs then act as an interim dean for a second school at the time, and tried to consolidate the small pool of secretarial support that we had across those four schools, and kind of made it work to at least get us operational for the 2020-2021 academic year. During that year, we knew that this was a temporary structure and that we would ultimately need a permanent structure. To do that, we really recognized that there was a significant partnership that was going to be needed. We faced a whole college problem that needed a whole college solution. This was not one that I wanted to impose from the Dean's Office, but really one that I wanted to partner with our faculty. To do that, the first place I started was with my Dean's Cabinet just to get a little advice and a little bit of historical context for the college. Immediately following doing that, I reached out to our college council leadership to really sort of define where we were, to find the problem as I saw it, and talk about potential solutions. That potential solution was really a partnership with our college council to create a structure to get feedback and to actually propose a plan. So, in doing that, we did a couple of things. One of the first things that I did once we had settled on our college council being the right vehicle to get this input is we asked the college council to organize a series of meetings with different constituent groups from the college, with faculty, with staff, with faculty with different types of appointments.

For context, we have a somewhat unique college structure. We have both collectively bargain and non-collectively bargain faculty. We have nine-month faculty and 12-month faculty. We are spread-up across both campuses. So we had a lot of different moving parts in the college to try to get input from. Once we decided we're going to form a variety of different committees, I provided some guidance in the form of a guidance document. And we've shared that document with you in your materials today, just so you can take a look at what that looks like. In that guidance document, I identified the need, talked a little bit about a desired process, a desired product, and a desired outcome. And again, you have that as supporting material. The goal here was not for me to define what we're going to look like, but instead lay out the parameters of the problem: The things that I thought we had some flexibility to work on, and the things that I thought were hard stops to work on. Then ask our faculty to work within that framework to propose a structure for our college that would best meet our colleges need. To do that in the process, you know, it was a very significant faculty role in the process of this. Our college council formed work groups. Those work groups then formulated a multitude of plans that they brought forward as potential ways to organize as us. The college council and executive committee then worked to vet and consolidate those plans. [We're] ultimately down to two plans. I asked them to bring multiple plans forward from my review and discussion with the council with the idea that if we have a couple of plans, we don't put all of our eggs in one basket. We get to think a little more creatively about the problem and also provided me an opportunity to give some feedback and talk about pros and cons, strengths, weaknesses, and what was doable and maybe not doable with the resources we had. Ultimately, we narrowed those down and took that back to the faculty to obtain a vote for their endorsement of one of those plans. My role in the process was to set up in terms of the initial guidance. What are the boundaries? What are the guardrails that we need to stay within doing so? Talk frequently and openly with our college council about where they were in the process, questions that they had. Ultimately, I provided feedback and refinement to the plan they brought forward. Once we had the endorsement of the faculty, my next goal was to take that through the rest of the process, which includes presenting that plan for review by Academic Affairs, the Registrar, Institutional Research, Finance, those offices for their implications and ultimately to shepherd it through the University's approval process, which included going through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Our final steps now are the approval of the Provost, the President and ultimately, the Board of Trustees. We anticipate doing that here yet this Spring. So, with that said, before I jump into the next slide, Senator Jenny Reynolds is also here, and she was Chair of our college council at the time. So, Jenny, is there anything you'd add about the setup or the process before I get to where we finished up?

Senator Reynolds: No, I think you've captured it, Dean Merrick. I think highlighting like you said, [the] diversity in our college and making sure all groups, faculty, staff, their voices were heard and that we utilized different methods for obtaining feedback. So anonymous surveys, we sent out repeatedly. We did everything virtually, but face-to-face town halls or audio conference calls, we kind of utilized those methods too.

Dean Merrick: Thanks. I think this thing, the take home message on our process was, it was a shared process. It was a process that really embraced the identity of our college as a team and as a family with the idea that any changes that we make impact all of us, and we should look at all of us to get input into that process. Going forward, the outcome is our faculty endorsed and we had a Dean's Office informed structure that really had very widespread support. To be honest with you, [very] almost surprisingly widespread support. We didn't have a significant set of dissension, and I think that's because everybody recognizes that this is our plan. It's not my plan. It's not the council's plan. It's all of our plan. And it has the fingerprints of everybody on that plan. Ultimately, the outcomes that we are converting from, four units with a school name to three units that we use department names because that's just a little easier for folks to understand and navigate around campus. We don't always have to be the exception and explain

that 'school' means 'department.' We have, I think, improved alignment of our programs. We have one program that is moving out of the unit that it is in and it is realigning with a set of programs that it was aligned with at one point in time. The discipline for that program really aligns better with those other programs professionally in the terms of licensure and accreditation and the way that they practice. You know, that's our Speech Language and Pathology Program that will move into what now becomes our Department of Exercise and Rehab Sciences along with Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Athletic Training, Rec. Therapy, Respiratory Care, a number of patient care providing fields where that was really a good fit for them. We also went through a process of selecting department chairs. And per the University's policy, the selection of a chair is done by the dean with consultation with the faculty. I reached out to our faculty to solicit nominations for people that might be interested in serving as chairs. I interviewed and sat down and had conversations with each of those folks along the way. And ultimately, I brought forward a candidate in each of those departments for commentary from the faculty to gauge both their support and the pros that that person might bring to the position, as well as any concerns faculty might have for them, ultimately naming the chairs. Then those chairs work with the faculty of each unit to actually come up with the names for each of those units. So, we will, going forward, have a Department of Population Health, Department of Exercise and Rehab Sciences, and the Department of Human Services. I think we're pretty excited about those and really eager to get through the final stages of this process so we can implement this new structure for us, for the coming fiscal year on July 1st.

So I think that that's really about everything that I had to present today. I'd be happy to field any questions or comments along the way about that.

President Bigioni: Okay, great. So I have to applaud you, your drive to be as transparent as possible and share all this with the Senate and the broader community. So, thank you for that. Are there any questions for Dean Merrick?

Senator Steven: I had a quick question. I just quickly looked over your diagram of the flowchart of personnel in the college. I noticed that you went from five secretaries to six secretaries. You have an increase in the number of secretaries. We've been dealing with issues in our Department of Biological Sciences, that we have only one part-time secretary. So, we're wondering how we can do what you're doing to get more assistance. Any advice?

Dean Merrick: Well, a couple of things to keep in mind. Number one, is we have proposed that in next year's budget. Next year's budget is not yet approved, and we'll get there as we get there. Hopefully that will be something we can arrange, but that's our proposed structure. The other thing to keep in mind is, in our college, we have multiple different programs in each of these departments. So we have somewhere between, I didn't do the math on these, my apologies, but probably seven or eight at a minimum. And probably nine or ten at a maximum, different programs in each department. We need multiple secretaries to be able to support those multiple programs. The other thing to bear in mind is our college has 21 accredited programs with 16 different accreditors. So, while many colleges have things like one accreditation visit every few years or every five or 10, we typically have two or three every semester. So the workload in supporting those accredited programs look a little bit different than it does perhaps in other places. So, I think our needs there look a little different. At the very least, I'm hoping to leverage that description in our budget conversations, going forward.

Senator Steven: Thank you. That makes sense.

Dean Merrick: Any other questions or comments that I can field from anyone?

President Bigioni: Hearing none. I think everyone is satisfied. So, again, we really appreciate your sharing what's going on in HHS with us, and we look forward to a brighter future in your college.

Dean Merrick: And so do we. Thank you much. And again, thank you for the time to partner and present before Senate here. I think dialogues like this are helpful to everybody.

President Bigioni: Absolutely. Thank you again. Okay, so we can move on to our next item of business, which would be the Faculty Senate Constitution second vote. And so, we can call back Dr. Mark Templin to guide us through that process.

Dr. Templin: So, let me share my screen again here. So on a vote, the Constitution, when we vote we treat it like a consent agenda. So, in other words, we have Article I. is the Scope, Article II. is Responsibilities and Jurisdiction, Article III. is Membership Eligibility, Article IV. is Executive Committee, and V. is Faculty Senate Bylaws and Rules, VI. is Special Meetings of the Faculty, VII. is Non-Member Rights, VIII. is Shared Governance, IX. is Amendment, X. is Interpretation, and XI. is Reconsideration. There are those 11 Articles.

If anyone wants to put one of those in abeyance and talk about it, we take that off the table momentarily and vote on the others, and then come back to the Article that has been momentarily tabled. If we hear no one wants to table any of the Articles, then it's just a vote on all the Articles as they are. When it comes to Bylaws and Rules, those we do not need to do Article by Article, we just have a vote for the Bylaws and a separate vote for the Rules. So, it's the Constitution that we spend a little more time with. Does anyone wish to remove an Article from – now, this is an Article in the Constitution – from consideration?

Senator Steven: I had a concern about Article III, Membership.

Dr. Templin: Okay.

Senator Steven: Just the fact that it says, “no administrative faculty.” The one problem I see with that is that there are some administrators that I think are eligible, like, we think of people such as directors of the Photovoltaic Center, Lake Erie Center, Plant Research Center. They are considered administrators, but they are faculty members. Does that mean they're excluded as Faculty Senate members? One thing that may solve this issue is just to put the word “central” in front of “administrative faculty” instead of having just “administrative faculty.”

Dr. Templin: We talked about that some time ago. So, it was department chairs. There are other administrative faculty who are hooked, you know, tied somehow to specific departments, which would be like, directors and people like that. Sometimes directors have PSA appointments. If they are both a faculty member and a director, if they are at the department level, they would be eligible. If they're at the college level, then no. So that's the distinction there.

Senator Steven: I see. So you're saying, it's not necessarily excluding these directors, this wording as it stands?

Dr. Templin: Right, because it's whether the person is tied to a specific department and representing their department, or if they are at a college level, or at the central administration level.

Senator Steven: Sounds good then.

Dr. Templin: Other Articles for potential leave to the side for the moment? President Bigioni, if you would conduct the vote. President Bigioni, if you would conduct the vote?

President Bigioni: Sure. So in principle, we could do this by general consent. But since it's our Constitution, would it be better to do it by voting in the Chat?

Dr. Templin: That probably leaves more of a record – Yes.

President Bigioni: Okay. All right, then. Let me put a line of demarcation in the Chat real quick here. We will now vote on the Constitution as brought to us by the Constitution Committee. If you would like to vote in favor of this Constitution, please put yes in the chat, and no if you do not approve of this Constitution.

I think it is unanimous, and I think we have enough votes to meet quorum and make that a valid vote. The second vote on the Constitution is affirmative, and so we have approved this version of the Constitution.

Motion Approved. {50 yay; 0 no; 1 abstain} Thank you very much everyone.

Dr. Templin: Thank you. Now, we need a second vote on the Bylaws and then another vote on the Rules. There'll be a brief pause while I get the Bylaws and Rules out here. This is the Bylaws so everybody is familiar. The Bylaws cover how Senate conducts itself. It has, like, size and apportionment of Senate, terms of Senators, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, all sorts of guidance there; officer duties, meetings, voting, log and calendar, Faculty Senate committees, implementation and reconsideration in the University faculty, election and removal of officers, election to other bodies in college governance instruction for newly forming colleges. So, if we get a new college, there's some guidance in there for that. Then Amendment - how do we amend the Bylaws is the final Article there.

Because it's Bylaws and not a Constitution, the amendment process is easier. So we don't have to vote on it Article by Article. We can vote on it in its entirety. So, President Bigioni, please.

President Bigioni: Is there any discussion to be had, or should we move straight to a vote? Does anyone have any comments? Okay, hearing none then, let's proceed to a vote. So you see before you the version of the Bylaws document that's presented by the Constitution Committee. If you approve of this---

Senator Anderson: President Bigioni, do you want to put a break in the Chat for the vote?

President Bigioni: I did. Maybe there's some lag, but I did put a break in there, at least in mine, which is the one that I'll copy. We should be okay.

If you approve of this Bylaws document, again, brought from the Constitution committee, then please put a yes in the Chat, and no if you don't approve of this document.

Again, it looks unanimously in favor. We'll get the tally later, but there looks to be a sufficient number of yeses to make that a valid vote. **Motion Passed.** {47 yay; 0 no; 0 abstain} Okay, great. Thanks, everyone. That's document number two of three done.

Dr. Templin: Okay, let me see here. This is the Rules document. This has to do with basically the Rules of certain committees. Article I here has committee rules and it talks about all the Senate Committee on Academic Regulations, Student Affairs etc. And then Faculty Senate election rules are number two (2). How do we conduct elections? There is a lot of different elements to that. Then Article III is election of University Committee on Academic Personnel and University Committee on Sabbaticals. So, there's some special rules in there about that. That goes for a while. Rule amendments, how do you amend a rule? And then Article V is reporting responsibility, which means that various committees need to report back to Faculty Senate, there's actually a requirement to do so. I believe that is it. Questions about Rules? Again, we can have a vote on the Rules as a whole.

President Bigioni: Are there any questions or comments?

Senator Steven: Dr. Templin, can you scroll to section, where are we here? There is something on the Committee on Faculty Welfare, which I'm not sure exists. I'm not sure if that was deleted or not in this. Section 4, I think of the Rules.

Dr. Templin: That would be on the first page?

Senator Steven: It's the second page, I believe. No, third page.

Dr. Templin: There's Section 5 and Section 4. Section 4. goes on for a while, so is it in the beginning or--

Senator Steven: When I'm looking at my copy of it, it was previously C, and it was crossed out. [The] Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs?

Dr. Templin: I think we've deleted that.

Senator Steven: Okay.

Dr. Templin: C is now Senate Committee on Student Affairs.

Senator Steven: Let's see. Yes, and so directly above that was all deleted?

Dr. Templin: I believe so.

Senator Steven: The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs?

Dr. Templin: Yes. I believe we left it in there for a long time. As I remember, it had to do with, it was language that was in from, I think, Health Science Campus, a Constitution they had prior to the merger. We left it in there for a while, because we didn't know if it was still active or not. Then, I think it was last year we---

President Bigioni: Can I interject?

Dr. Templin: Yes.

President Bigioni: So the previous C was Faculty Affairs. That committee still exists. But the Welfare, let me look back at my document. The Committee on Faculty Welfare, as you point out, no longer exists. Half of that section was removed because it was obsolete, but the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs does exist, and so that shouldn't have been removed.

Dr. Templin: Okay.

President Bigioni: So according to the document that I sent out, Senator Jayatissa, I think it was, was asking about the documents that I sent out. I believe it was November 9th or something like that, if I recall correctly, that I sent out the marked-up documents. In fact, can I just share my document briefly?

Dr. Templin: Sure. Let me un-share here.

President Bigioni: Okay, I don't know the... Thanks for catching that, Senator Steven. Can you see my document?

Dr. Templin: Yes.

President Bigioni: Okay, so this is, just to go back up here to see where we are, Section 4. Article I, Section 4, subsection C. Right here. Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. And so that committee still exists and in fact, is chaired by Senator Jason Huntley. This text right here remains, and then from this “From non-union faculty,” onward was removed because it pertains to the Committee on Faculty Welfare.

Dr. Templin: Okay.

President Bigioni: So C still exists, which means Student Affairs is D, and so on.

Dr. Templin: Might I suggest we hold off on voting on this tonight, and I'll get with you and we'll square the two documents because apparently my scissors got carried away.

President Bigioni: Okay. If I just email this text to you, could you insert it and have the Cs and Ds update or would it be a mess?

Dr. Templin: I could do that. Just sensitive to time, we only have eight minutes.

President Bigioni: It is the last thing we need to do barring items from the floor.

Dr. Templin: Well, maybe if you did items from the floor and send it to me and I'll work on it while there's discussion, I can do that.

President Bigioni: Okay, then. Maybe I'll stop sharing this. It's served its purpose. And again, everyone should have that document in their inbox. All the senators should have that in their inbox. I guess I don't know what the procedure is for skipping to items from the floor and coming back, but do we just do it?

Dr. Templin: Exercise supreme executive power.

President Bigioni: Okay. While we're waiting on this quick edit, does anyone have any items from the floor?

Senator Duhon: I would just like to make an announcement from the Libraries. We have a new program I'd like to announce and you may have already heard about it from your colleagues or through other groups, such as Grad Council or Research Council. There's a new opportunity for the University community made possible by the University Libraries in a deal that we signed onto this year with Cambridge University Press through our consortium, OhioLINK. This new deal expands the number of journals accessible, which were not accessible before in our library catalog. It amounts to Cambridge's entire suite of some 400 journals covering a wide range of disciplines. And it includes an added benefit. This is the probably the most important part. The waiver of article publishing charges, which can be very expensive for authors to cover open access publishing, this is one of the benefits made possible by this read and publish deal. It will be applicable to the corresponding author of a manuscript. This deal, the benefit is available, not just to university and faculty, but also to undergraduate researchers. I do have more information I can direct you to. The simplest thing would be to just direct everyone to the Library's website to the colorful slides that we have, the slideshow. You'll look for the one on Read and Publish with Cambridge University Press as part of OhioLINK. If you just click on that, you'll arrive at a library guide that will give you a lot more information. We have a special email box set up for to take questions and provide support.

President Bigioni: There is a question in the Chat from Senator Jayatissa who asks, can you do it for other publishers too? Does it involve any cost to UT?

Senator Duhon: This is a singular deal right now. It's a three-year program just with Cambridge University Press. The Library actually covers the cost. It was sort of a model switch from subscription to read and publish. So it's still the Library paying for it, but the benefit is to potential authors to have their publishing charges waived, which is something long coming.

President Bigioni: Well, that is great news.

Senator Duhon: I might put the Library guide URL in the Chat.

<https://libguides.utoledo.edu/cambridge-university-press-open-access>

President Bigioni: Okay, great. Thank you. Are there any other items from the floor?

Senator Anderson: I had heard talk that for next year's budget that it's only going to allow for one to two new teaching assistantships for the year. Has anybody heard anything about that?

President Bigioni: Can you elaborate? One or two more teaching assistantships per department, per college?

Senator Anderson: Yes, per department. Just one to two new teaching assistants.

President Bigioni: I have not heard that. Can anyone speak to that? Perhaps Provost Bjorkman?

Provost Bjorkman: President Bigioni, I am happy to do that.

President Bigioni: Thank you.

Provost Bjorkman: The allocations for the graduate assistantships were made recently by COGS. Amy I saw jumped off so she can't really speak to this, but I can tell you what happened. So, as you all know, we are under quite a budget crunch. And so what happened was, they set aside the funding that we know we need for committed research assistantships that already have funding that we have obligations for matching funds to provide. They set that aside. They took the remainder of the money that COGS had for assistantships. They asked each college to present, propose an RFP, if you will, for how many assistantships they would like to have. They had a faculty-based committee, all graduate faculty who sat down with the data and the requests and made the allocations out to the colleges. Every single college basically received a cut because there wasn't enough money to go around. We do understand that's a problem. We're trying to look at some options. I don't know how this is all going to play out, but you are correct Senator Anderson, that in the initial allocations, there was very little extra for allowing for a lot of extra graduate students besides the ones that are currently being supported. We know that's not a very good approach. It's not a great sustainable method, but that's where we are right now. Until we know more about our budget, that's all I can really tell you at this point.

Senator Anderson: Thanks for the information, Provost Bjorkman.

Provost Bjorkman: You're welcome.

President Bigioni: Are there any other items from the floor before we go back to the Rules document?

Senator Barnes: I have a quick announcement. The Women's and Gender Studies Department, the Eberly Center, and a couple of other entities [The Department of Art] are sponsoring an exhibit that will be on the 5th floor of Carlson Library. It's called Focus on Abortion and it is photographs and interviews by the artist, Roslyn Banish, from a huge variety of people about their experience with abortion. We don't yet have a flyer, but the exhibit, we hope to have up and running by the end of the week. So, we'll get

some publicity out as soon as we know we can get it up and running. Hope to have you encourage your students and to drop by yourselves. Thank you.

President Bigioni: Thank you. Any other items from the floor? Okay, then.

I see Dr. Templin has successfully made the edit and put the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs back in its rightful place. So we can proceed with any other discussion on this and then, of course, a vote. Is there any other discussion on the Rules document? Okay, hearing none, let's proceed to a vote.

Let me put in a demarcation before anyone votes. Senator Niamat, you can vote again after I put that in.

The demarcation is in there, so please go ahead and vote yes, or no as to whether or not you approve or disapprove of this document, the Faculty Senate Rules document.

It looks again, unanimously affirmative. I believe there are sufficient number of votes to make quorum, so that would be a valid vote. That document is approved. *Motion Approved.* {43 yay; 0 no; 0 abstain}
Thank you very much everyone and thanks Dr. Templin for putting that together so quickly.

Dr. Templin: Thanks to the Constitutional and Rules Committee!

President Bigioni: Absolutely.

Dr. Templin: It's been a lot of years.

President Bigioni: Yes. Thank you to you and the Constitution and Rules Committee for all the hard work! That was a heavy, heavy lift. We're in the homestretch now. And so we should talk very briefly about what comes next.

First, the Elections Committee, we'll be talking soon because the ratification vote from the faculty as a whole will be done by the Elections Committee in the usual way that elections are done, just with a different question. Dr. Templin, do you want to talk about your forums?

Dr. Templin: So while the Elections Committee is gearing up, I'm going to hold at least two forums. If Senate would like me to have more, that's fine, but in the past, we've done two forums with Grad Council. I'm thinking it's going to be an electronic forum so that people can -- now, this would not be senators necessarily. This would be anybody in the faculty who is voting on ratifying the parliamentary documents. They could come into the Chat or into the electronic meeting and ask questions. So, I would set it aside. A lot of times we did 90 minutes, like little 90 minute segments and we tried to space it out -- like, courses tend to be Monday, Wednesday, Friday or Tuesday, Thursday. So we do a Tuesday and a Wednesday, in both afternoon and morning. Just trying to get as much faculty members' questions answered as we can. Then, hopefully, that would be the month of, probably we can wrap that up about February 15th, and then the Elections Committee could do the elections sometime late February, early March.

President Bigioni: Then once the Constitution, Rules and Bylaws are ratified by the faculty, our work is done and then it goes to the Board of Trustees for their final stamp of approval. It would likely be the summer Board of Trustees meeting, and we would be done officially at that point. So that is what happens next. Any other comments, Dr. Templin?

Dr. Templin: No. I just thank everyone for staying with me.

President Bigioni: Well, thanks for you staying with us after all these years. We really appreciate all of your work, and of course, all of your committee's work too. That is a high level of commitment from everyone. So, we all thank you.

Okay. Barring any other questions or comments. Does anyone have any other, well, I suppose Items From the Floor was the last thing we were doing? Hearing none. This meeting is adjourned.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Kim Nigem
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary