

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 26, 2022**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @ FS on 09/06/2022

---

**Summary of Discussion**

---

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

**President Bigioni:** Secretary Nigem, are you ready?

**Senator Nigem:** Yes, I am ready.

**President Bigioni:** I have 4 o' clock. I will hereby call the April 26, 2022, meeting of the Faculty Senate to order. I ask Secretary Nigem to call the roll.

**Present:** Anderson, Baki, Bamber, Barnes, Bigioni, Bornak, Brakel, Case, Chaffee, Chou, Compora, Coulter-Harris, Day, De la Serna, Duhon, Edgington, Elgafy, El-Zawahry, Garcia-Mata (Fayoumi- sub), Gilstrap, Green, McBride, Guardiola, Hall, Hanrahan, Harnych, Huntley, Insch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Lammon, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Metz, Milz, Modyanov, J. Murphy, Niamat, Nigem, Pattin, Perry, Ratnam, Reeves(subs- Natal & Lee-Smith), Reynolds, Rouillard, Shan, Smith, Steven, Teclehaimanot, Topp, Van Hoy, Vesely, Wedding,

**Excused Absence:** Hefzy, Pakulski

**Unexcused Absence:** Ali, Chaudhuri, Duggan, Kujawa, Stepkowski, Welsch

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

**President Bigioni:** Thank you. The next item on our agenda is the adoption of the agenda. So you see the agenda before you. If there are no objections, we will adopt this agenda. Okay, hearing none. We adopt this agenda. *Agenda Adopted.*

The next item is the approval of the Minutes from our previous meeting on April 12, 2022. Does anyone have anything to add or correct to those Minutes? Okay, hearing none. Unless there are any objections, we will approve those Minutes. Hearing no objections, those Minutes are approved. *Minutes Approved.* Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the *Executive Committee report*: I'll begin by [just] referencing our Executive Committee meeting on the week of the 12<sup>th</sup>, so that would make it Thursday, April 14<sup>th</sup>, there are really two topics of discussion in that meeting. The first was the discussion of the meeting that I have already addressed in an email that I sent to all of you, so I'm not going to say anything more about that.

In fact, if there are any other issues, some of you have already had the opportunity to ask me questions via email, and so that's the appropriate vehicle to do that. If there are any other issues associated with that, then we will cover that in the 'Other Business' agenda portion where we are talking about the Senate elections. Part of the reason for that is we still have a lot of business to cover in this meeting and so it's important to keep this efficient. The other reason is to respect the time of Chair Al Baker. He's been kind enough to join us and his time is valuable, [and] so I don't want to interfere with that.

The other item that we discussed in that meeting was the elections themselves. And again, I've created a slot for that in 'Other Business' to talk about that. The upshot is that we need to make a decision about how the election will proceed, the timing of that, in order to seat the new Senate. So, we will talk about that in detail in the 'Other Business' section of the agenda.

You also have already received the results of the ratification vote for our Constitution. And, of course, we are very pleased to see that. It was overwhelmingly affirmed: Out of 326 votes cast, 316 were 'yes' votes, and only 10 were 'no' votes. ***The Revised Constitution Passed.*** That revised Constitution is now ready to advance to the Board of Trustees meeting in June. And so we will discuss putting that on their docket for that meeting for their final approval. So, thank you everybody for participating in that and making that a success.

There was also sort of a side point that came up that became a little more apparent with regard to the Medical College, COMLS. I'm not going to say a lot about it at the moment, but President-Elect Gary Insch and I have spent some time talking about it. The issues that we need to do a better job of engaging with COMLS, that's become a little more apparent to me. Partly, my fault because I didn't do as good a job of engaging with COMLS. We just hadn't really thought through mechanisms and we're beginning to do that so that we can get better communication and better involvement. I'm sure President-Elect Gary Insch, when he becomes President Gary Insch, will have a lot more to say about that as that topic develops.

The last thing on my report is the Provost meeting. I was not there because I was out of town last week, but I did get the rundown on the topics discussed and so I'll do my best to relate them to you. But of course, Executive Committee members who were at the meeting can contribute to that report. The first point was that Academic Affairs doesn't look like they will hit their target for next year. And of course, we are familiar with a lot of the underlying issues there, enrollment problems being the number one issue. That's generally related to demographic declines in Northwest Ohio, particularly with DHS students. So, that's not new news to us, but an ongoing challenge that we're continuing to grapple with. Adding to that, there are other serious challenges posed by the legislature and overzealous parents; and we see this in the news quite often with this sort of new social agenda being politicized and foisted upon education. That is not a helpful thing. We've heard about that from Senator Rouillard's OFC reports over the year, but that continues to be a challenge.

COVID, of course, is fading. But the effects of COVID linger with regard to education, because now we have a lot of students who are underprepared because of the remote learning that they were forced to do over the course of the pandemic. So that may result in some retention issues. And so, we have to be well aware of those issues going forward as we get those underprepared students.

There was also some discussion of the challenges between the bad press that we get from The Blade from time-to-time with the good messages that MarComm is trying to send out. That's a continuing challenge. It would be nice if The Blade could get on our side a little bit more and support us in what we're trying to do; for as President-Elect Gary Insch has said, "The sons and daughters of Ohio, we're doing our best to help them and The Blade is not really helping us."

There was also some discussion of the strategic plan, but since Senator Jason Huntley and Dr. Anne Fulkerson will be joining us later to give us an update on that, I will leave that to them. There was discussion about the departure of Amy Thompson. Amy is going to be the Provost at Wright State University. That is fantastic news for her. But, of course, we are going to lose her and so that leaves a big hole to fill. So, we're very interested in how that will be done. It is a big hole and big shoes to fill and so there's a plan to fill that position with an interim, because it just can't remain vacant. It's too important of

a position. Apparently, there will be a meeting later this week to make progress on that. There were questions about remaining unspent money from the reinvestment plan, but ultimately, that is just swept into the budget hole. There's not much to say about that. There were discussions about the R1 vs. R2 status, and apparently we are closer to R1 status than we think. If part of that is the way that we did our accounting for research money and when we do it, I guess better, according to the rules of the assessment, we come much closer to meeting the requirements of an R1. There's also a social mobility index that apparently we do very well on providing the tools for students to gain that social mobility. There was also questions about cuts to programs. Inevitably, you know, this is sort of a constant topic of concern. Naturally, the answer to that question is that those decisions will be made at the college level, which I think it's appropriate because that's where the curriculum resides and that's where the decisions would be best made, rather than at a higher level. That is the last topic I have on my list from the provost report. Are there any Executive Committee members that would like to add to that, or make any corrections to my summary of the meeting I missed?

**Senator Barnes:** I think that the social mobility index was something that was in the works and [they're] still working it out. I think President-Elect Insch maybe knows more, but my memory is that we were projecting that it would be good for us, recognizing what we do with and for our students.

**President-Elect Insch:** Right. So apparently the assessment body that does that, they're creating a new classification. Like, we are already classified as a community engaged University and so they are adding another classification that identifies universities that qualify in the social mobility metrics that they are putting together. It is clear, that is one of our major missions. Provost Bjorkman felt that we would do very well in that, and that would be a classification that we could get as well. So, correct, Senator Barnes, that's something that they're thinking about and is something that we would apply for or be recognized for down the road.

**Provost Bjorkman:** That is correct, President-Elect Insch. They're still developing the criteria for it, so we're anxiously awaiting that. It is something we definitely intend to look at.

**Provost Amy Thompson:** This is Amy Thompson. If I could jump in? Interesting data. As part of this, the third wave group has issued ratings in the State of Ohio and UToledo is ranked fourth out of all the public institutions in terms of our social mobility index already. So, that looks at things like, you know, our Pell eligible students and also calculates our tuition and our earning potential once a student graduates. Denise Bartell actually shared that information with many of us. So I think I agree with that. I think we're positioned very nicely to move up in that index once those classifications are more flushed out in 2023. But, I think it's something very, very pendable for the University of Toledo.

**President Bigioni:** Well, thanks to all of you for filling in those gaps for me. Okay, are there any other additions or corrections from Executive Committee members?

**Senator Krantz:** If I could ask a piece of information? We all know about the Higher Learning Commission for accreditation, primarily the undergraduate curriculum. Who decides on R1 status? Where does that come from?

**President Bigioni:** That's a good question.

**Provost Bjorkman:** The Carnegie Institute does that, and they have specific criteria that they look at. Actually, I know Anne Fulkerson is on the call. I don't know if you want to address that, Anne, briefly.

**Anne Fulkerson:** Yes, sure, happy to. The Carnegie Institute was recently at the Indiana University at Bloomington, and is now going to be moving to the American Council of Education. They do the R1, R2 classification every three years based on publicly available data from iPads and a couple of different NSF surveys. So, it's not something that we have to apply for; it's just something that they do every three years.

**President Bigioni:** Thank you. Are there other questions? Okay, then, hearing none. It is my great pleasure to introduce Chair Al Baker, who is now completing his second and final term as Chair of the Board of Trustees. And so, I give the floor to you, Sir.

**Al Baker, Chair of the Board of Trustees:** Thank you very much for those kind words, President Bigioni. I appreciate the invitation being extended to me. I would like to make a few comments. As I wind down my tenure as the Board Chair, I want to have this opportunity to express my appreciation for the work that our faculty does and all of our folks within the University. But particularly the faculty, in doing those things, that raise the level of our University and also raise our students up. So, I really appreciate that and I appreciate the opportunity to say that to you today.

For all of us, it's been a very challenging two years, which is the length of my term. We lost a president and we gained a president. That is said easily, but it's much more difficult than, of course, you might realize. As you may recall, we dodged the RFP bullet for our hospital during that timeframe. We successfully navigated a once-in-a-century pandemic. And through it all, we persevered. I think that because of the things that you have done as faculty and as the leaders of the University, you made us make it through those challenging times very, very successful.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank President Bigioni and Past-President Brakel for all the work that they put in, in updating the Faculty Senate Constitution. I know that was a lot of work, and we also had members of our Board involved with that. And I'll like to thank publicly, Trustee Mary Ellen Pisanelli and Trustee Will Lucas and Vice Chair Steve Ciucci for the work that they did in getting this thing nailed down. We will have it done in June. Working together, I believe that we have an updated document that everyone can live with. And as I understood it earlier, President Bigioni, you indicated that it has already been passed. So, the Board looks forward to receiving it and doing a like result there.

Finally, for me, it has been a true honor and privilege to serve as Chair of both the Medical University, which some of you may or may not know, I was Chair, some, 15 years ago and also to be Chair of my own alma mater. As I keep my term as Chair, I still have three additional years to serve. I think I'm going to be a member of the Board of Trustees - for either the Medical University or the University of Toledo - for 20 years when it is all said and done. So, it's been a 'labor of love' for my alma mater.

I just appreciate the opportunity to express my great feelings for the University, and also for the work that you do on campus with our students. You are what make our students and our University run. Thank you!

**President Bigioni:** Well, thank you and thank you for all of your support over, certainly, the past year when I've been working with the Board on the Constitution. But, I really appreciate all your help and support over this past year. It's been a long road and it's great to finally see the end of it.

**Al Baker, Chair of the Board of Trustees:** Yes.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, are there any questions for Chair Baker? Well, it sounds like a quiet group. Okay, then, I guess that makes very efficient use of your time. We very much appreciate you joining us. And, I guess, congratulations on the successful completion on your tenure and we look forward to the coming years of a great relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees. Thanks again for coming and sharing your time with us.

**Al Baker, Chair of the Board of Trustees:** And thank you for having me.

**President Bigioni:** Thank you. So our next item on the agenda is the provost report with Provost Bjorkman.

**Provost Bjorkman:** Good afternoon, everybody. I don't know about you, but it's hard to believe the final week of classes is already here. I know it's an incredibly busy time for our faculty and our students. It's also a very stressful time. And as classes end and exam week begins, our Rocket Health Coalition is hosting a number of activities this week to help our students de-stress as they prepare for final exams. The schedule of those events is available on the Rocket Health website. Those activities will be held on both the Main and Health Science Campuses.

I want to provide you with a brief update of the outcomes from the April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board of Trustees. I'm pleased to report that the Board approved our recommendations for 64 candidates for tenure and/or promotion. I want to say, congratulations to those faculty for their impressive achievements in their teaching, their research, and their service. The Board of Trustees also approved our recommendations for four candidates to receive the Distinguished University Lecturer award. As you know, the Distinguished University Lecturer is the University's highest permanent honor, bestowed on a lecturer recognizing excellence in teaching among our non-tenure track faculty. This year the four faculty members who were named Distinguished University Lecturer are Jillian Bornak, Associate Lecturer in the Department of Physics and Astronomy, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics; Jacalyn Flom, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Management, Neff College of Business; Heather Robbins, Senior Lecturer in the School of Exercise Science & Rehabilitation Services in the College of Health and Human Services; and Nilgun Sezginis, Senior lecturer in the School of Population Health in the College of Health and Human Services. So I really want to congratulate those faculty for their impressive achievements.

This is also the time when we get to recognize faculty for excellence in a number of areas, teaching research and service. I'm pleased to announce the recipients of this year's Outstanding Teacher Award. There were six: Kevin Gibbs from the College of NSM; Renee Heberle from the College of Arts and Letters; Michael Kistner from the College of Arts and Letters; Jody Morris from the College of Health and Human Services; Kathy Shan from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics; and Jenell Wittmer from the Neff College of Business and Innovation.

I'm also pleased to announce the recipients of this year's Outstanding Faculty Research and Scholarship Award. They are: Rupali Chandar from the College of Natural Science and Mathematics; Amit Tiwari from the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences; and Bryan Lammon from the College of Law.

And finally, the recipients of this year's Edith Rathbun Outreach and Engagement Award are Ashley Pryor from the Jesup Scott Honor College; Robert Salem from the College of Law; and Sandrine Mubenga from the College of Engineering.

The recipients of this year's Outstanding Adviser Award are Bina Joe from the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences for outstanding faculty advisor; and Beth Denzel from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics for outstanding staff advisor. And the recipient of this year's Faculty Mentoring Award is Eileen Walsh from the College of Nursing.

I just want to say, that's my lot of shout outs for today. But, I want to congratulate all of these faculty who are being recognized for their outstanding achievements in those areas. I also want to mention briefly the great success of our inaugural Student Success Summit that was held on April. 8th. We had over 140

faculty, staff, and students who participated in the virtual Summit. It was really heartwarming to hear students share their experiences at UToledo, and how they had been positively impacted by the Equity Champions program and other retention and graduation initiatives we've implemented over the past few years. If you're interested in receiving additional information on the Summit, please don't hesitate to contact Denise Bartell in the Office of the Provost. I look forward to the next Student Success Summit during the next academic year. I also want to give a shout out to the staff and students in the University's TRIO Student Support Services program for a highly successful annual review by the US Department of Education. Our TRIO program excelled in meeting all the federal required objectives, including student persistence rate, good academic standing, and degree attainment for the 2020-2021 academic year. And I want to congratulate and thank our TRIO staff and students who have worked really hard to achieve those results.

Also, I want to mention to you that there will be a virtual Fulbright workshop for faculty later this week. It will be on Thursday, the 28th from 9 to 10 a.m. It's a virtual workshop. It will provide information on opportunities for faculty involvement with Fulbright. There will be several virtual workshops this week for students who are interested in learning more about Fulbright opportunities for them. The registration link and information is on the main page of the Provost website.

Before I conclude my remarks today, I do want to thank President Bigioni for his leadership of the Faculty Senate over the past year. President Bigioni, I've appreciated your leadership and enjoyed working with you this year, and I thank you for your service to the University. I look forward to your ongoing contributions. And, I want to congratulate Gary Insch for his election as President of the Faculty Senate for the next academic year.

And finally, I hope you will be able to participate in the best time of the year. Our Spring Commencement ceremonies are next weekend, starting with our doctoral hooding and graduate commencement on Friday night, May 6th, and then our two undergraduate commencement ceremonies on Saturday, May 7th.

Thank you and I hope this final week of classes and final exams next week go well, and my best wishes to each of you for a great summer ahead. Happy to answer any questions.

**President Bigioni:** Thank you. And thank you for the kind words. I truly enjoyed working with you too. And, that goes back many years now, but I continue to learn a lot from you. I appreciate it. Thank you. Are there any questions for the Provost?

**Senator Krantz:** If I may? This is David Krantz from Natural Science and Mathematics. Provost Bjorkman, in previous Faculty Senate meetings, we had the basic information about a potential merger between Natural Science and Math and Arts and Letters. Several of us also serve on NSM Council. We had an extended discussion in the last Council meeting and have been talking with other faculty members in their home departments. Could you please give us an update on approximately the timeline, and the process, and how input from the faculty will be brought into the discussion?

**Provost Bjorkman:** Yes, Senator Krantz, I would be happy to tell you. What I know at this point is that this is a very early conversation. It has not gone very far down the road. Obviously, the two deans of those colleges are having a conversation, but at this point, there's been no formal structure set up. They're going to be doing that. And obviously, as they know and I know very well, there has to be a lot of input from faculty in that conversation. I don't think this is going to be a quick timeline. I think it is going to be a carefully thought through thing, and it may or may not happen. I don't think I can tell you anything about a specific timeline yet, because we're just not very far down the consideration road on that. But I do thank you for the question. And yes, it's an important question, I think.

**Melissa Gregory, Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Letters:** Provost Bjorkman, I can add to that if you would like me to.

**Provost Bjorkman:** Yes, please, Dr. Gregory.

**Melissa Gregory, Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Letters:** So I just wanted to clarify that we've been asked, the Dean of NSM and I have been asked, to do a self-study, and we're working on that this summer. So this is in a very exploratory phase. This has not been delivered to us as an instruction or mandate. It's more just, you know, looking at advantages and disadvantages, pros and cons. We are inviting faculty to participate in that conversation as well.

**Provost Bjorkman:** Thank you, Dr. Gregory, that was helpful.

**President Bigioni:** Are there other questions for the Provost? Okay, then, hearing none. Thank you again. We will move on to our next agenda item, which is a Core Curriculum report from Dr. Scott Molitor.

**Dr. Scott Molitor:** We are requesting approval for one course inclusion as a US diversity course. I just want to bring it up real quick so everybody can see it. Let me share my screen. I apologize for the delay. Can everybody see the slide? Is the slide showing?

**President Bigioni:** Yes.

**Dr. Scott Molitor:** Okay. So the course we're requesting approval for is LGL 1500, Legal Aspects of Poverty. They are requesting approval for a diversity of US culture. According to the definition of US Diversity Courses, "They can examine," among other things, "the economic and political issues of distinct cultural communities." These cultural communities can be defined by class among other attributes. And therefore, given this definition and the content of the course, the Core Curriculum Committee unanimously approve this course for Diversity of US Culture. And we are asking the full Senate to approve. Since this is coming from Core Curriculum, we don't need a motion.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, is there any discussion before a vote? I put a line of demarcation in there if you want to conduct the vote, Dr. Molitor.

**Dr. Molitor:** Okay. If all in favor, please enter yes in the Chat box.

**President Bigioni:** The votes continue to come in, but it looks clearly like the vote is affirmative so that passes. *Motion Passed.* Okay.

**Dr. Molitor:** Thank you very much, and I appreciate the Committee's work this year. Thank you.

**President Bigioni:** Thank you. Thank you for stepping in for Senator and now Dean Gregory. We really appreciate that.

**Dr. Molitor:** Thank you.

**President Bigioni:** And thanks to your committee. The next item on the agenda is an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report from Senator Anthony Edgington.

**Senator Edgington:** Thank you very much, President Bigioni. I will share my screen as well. Today, we have four courses we are bringing to you. Two new course proposals and two course modifications.

The first one will look very familiar because it is the one we just talked about, **LGL 1500, Legal Aspects of Poverty**. I'll give you the course description: "A significant part of the United States population lives in poverty. Students will learn to think critically about how poverty intersects with issues of diversity,

political discourse, macro-ethics, and societal concepts of economic justice. Students will ultimately gain effective communication skills to participate meaningfully in social discourse about poverty. Students will explore a range of legal and policy issues affecting the ability of low-income people to access the most basic necessities of life. We will examine (1) the substantive law governing access to necessities; (2) human rights theories of poverty; (3) the effects of market forces on poverty; and (4) how poverty affects work, education, criminalization, and access to justice. This course aims to give students a solid grounding in both the content and impact of the laws and policies governing poverty in America.”

Our second new course is **COMM 3330, Consumer Culture and the Media**. “The examination of practices, techniques, tools and strategies used in advertising and public relations campaigns and the subsequent impact these campaigns have on the growth of a contemporary consumer culture. In addition, this class will research the theory and techniques, historical underpinnings, and the overarching power structure of a capitalist media system.”

### Course Modifications

**ART 4020, Time, Motion, Space.** “Course repeatable up to six credits. Modified prereqs (eliminate ART 3010; add ART 2010 or ART 2020). Updated syllabus. NOTE: The previous pre-req course (ART 3010) is not taught regularly. The basic skills covered in either ART 2010 or 2020 give students the needed information and preparation for this course and are routinely taught each spring and fall term.

**COMM 1010, Communication Principles and Practices.** “Course not repeatable for credit. Change to catalog description (elimination of "not for major credit"). Updated syllabus. NOTE: This introductory course often is a gateway course for students who decide they want to change their major to COMM and it is now being incorporated into the core curriculum for the three proposed concentrations.

**Senator Edgington cont’d:** Those are our four courses that we are bringing to today. Are there any questions, comments or concern with any of those four courses? Hearing none. Since this comes out of a committee, we can go straight to a vote. So in the Chat, please put ‘yes’ if you approve these four courses, ‘no,’ if you do not approve, and ‘a,’ if you abstain.

**President Bigioni:** The votes are still going, but slowing down. But so far it is unanimously in favor.

**Senator Edgington:** Wonderful.

**President Bigioni:** So, those courses pass. Motion Passed.

**Senator Edgington:** Wonderful. Thank you very much and I would also like to thank the committee. You see their names there for this work they've done this year. I believe we hit about 100 courses that we reviewed at one point or another. So, thank you to the committee. And thank you to all of you for your work as well.

**President Bigioni:** Wow. Well, thank you and your committee. We really appreciate your service. It's not easy work, and we appreciate that all of you are willing to do it. Thank you. Okay, our next item on the agenda is the Programs Committee report by Senator Patrick Lawrence.

**Senator Lawrence:** Okay, you should see our report for this week. All of these have been reviewed and are approved for consideration by Faculty Senate from our committee. There are five new program proposals. Actually, each of these is a new concentration within an existing degree. Let me just run you through the details. We'll go through all of them and then [I'll] address any questions. So we have three parallel new concentrations related to the BA in Communication Studies. Digital Communication Concentration, Interpersonal [Communication] Concentration, and Organizational and Strategic



Communication Concentration. All of these are 120 hours; minimum major credits, 36 to 42. They all add modified or new courses that are listed there: 2500, 3500, 3800, 3620, and 3750. All of those courses were approved at the last Faculty Senate meeting. And then we have two proposals from Computer Science and Engineering. Again, these are both new concentrations of existing BS degrees. One of these is in Microelectronics Security Concentration; one is Assured Digital Microelectronics. New concentrations; a minimal of 131 hours. All of these proposals, by the way, have a plan of study, learning objectives and curriculum mapping all in place. The two Engineering ones, add a new course, EECS 4050, which was approved at the last Faculty Senate meeting. This is our report. Are there any questions before we proceed to a vote?

**Senator Anderson:** This is Senator Anderson. I have two questions. One, for the Computer Science and Engineering, is accreditation reasons why the minimum is 131 hours for those two programs?

**Senator Lawrence:** Let me just check. If there's somebody here from Engineering or Computer Science--

**Dr. Scott Molitor:** This is Scott Molitor. The 131 hours includes three hours of our mandatory co-op program. So, in terms of courses, the credit hours is 128. And yes, historically, 128 was required in order for us to fit in all our... accreditation requirements.

**Senator Anderson:** Okay. And then the second question. What will be the math required for those two Computer Science and Engineering programs?

**Dr. Scott Molitor:** I believe the math in the Computer Science and Engineering degree programs is four semesters of calculus through differential equations. And then I believe that linear algebra is also required for that program.

**Senator Lawrence:** Thank you.

**Dr. Scott Molitor:** You're welcome.

**Senator Lawrence:** Hearing no further questions, we can proceed to vote, 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain.' And I, too would like to take this time to thank my committee: Ashley Pryor, Samir Hefzy, Gerald Natal, David Giovannucci, Alexia Metz, Ainsworth Bailey, Richard Welsch, Steven Peseckis, and Jillian Bornak. We got through 65 new or modified program proposals this academic year. Thank you.

**President Bigioni:** So, the votes, the yeses have it with just a couple abstentions, and no nos. So, all those proposals are approved. So, thanks to you, Senator Lawrence for your leadership on this committee, and of course, all of your committee members. Having chaired that committee, I intimately know how much work is involved. And I appreciate all of your hard work. So, thank you very much.

Okay, our next item on the agenda is 'Other Business,' beginning with a presentation by Senator Jason Huntley and Dr. Anne Fulkerson on the Strategic Planning Committee process and update.

**Senator Huntley:** All right, I hope everyone can see the screen. Can you see it, President Bigioni?

**President Bigioni:** I can.

**Senator Huntley:** Great. Thanks everybody for your time. We'd like to give you a quick update on the strategic planning process. Just to give you an overview to go back in time. We started this process in late October. You remember there were nominations from faculty, staff, students, Board of Trustees, Foundation, a wide representation from across the University. We then formed our Strategic Planning

Committee. All of you received via email surveys in late November, December as did the broad campus community. Using that information then, we had a series of town halls to dig deeper into the path for the University, concerns, areas for growth etc. What we're here to talk about today is a new proposal for mission, vision, and values. You saw that in the UT News; we requested feedback. We've had some slight revisions to that; I'd like to propose that today. And then also some plans for where we're going. To be clear, there's two phases to the strategic planning process. We've decided to do a Phase One, or [a] one-year strategic plan to kind of reorient and realign where we're going, gather some data, build some momentum, finalize things. And then a second phase, which will be launched in December, which will be a four to five-year plan. Now importantly, this Phase Two is a longer term plan [and] is intentional. It will complete by December so that it aligns with budget preparations, beginning in the spring of 2023, and preparing for the academic year 2023 and 2024. So that is the timeline. And I'll turn it over to my Co-Chair Anne Fulkerson.

**Dr. Anne Fulkerson:** Thanks, Senator Huntley. And thank you, Faculty Senate for the opportunity to join you today. As Senator Huntley mentioned, back in the fall we conducted a university-wide survey and held a series of town halls to assess our current mission, vision and values, and gather input on strategic priorities. The current mission, vision and values were great; it was fair between B- and a C+. There was quite a bit of consensus that they do not authentically describe who we are, how we're distinct, or set a very clear direction for the future. So, we were asked to dig a little bit further and consider some modifications to these statements. And just before I reveal the draft statements, I want to provide a little bit of context to some of the comments that we heard in that process. We heard that while we should aspire to have a national and international reach, that we need to return to our roots a bit and really re-commit to our local and regional community. We also heard that we need to define what it means to be a Rocket. That's part of what makes us distinct -what is the value proposition of the University of Toledo education. And, we heard about the Dorr Street divide. That is how we need a mission, vision and values that really unites and includes both campuses, UTMC and UTP. Then we also heard that, to be our very best and to serve students and patients we really need to commit to being an inclusive people first culture, where we act with integrity and where we're responsible stewards of our resources. So, with that, we'll share with you the draft mission statement. And feel free to jump in if you have any questions or comments. However, it might make sense to wait till the end because if there's anything that you don't see in one statement, there's a good chance that it might be in a following statement. So here's the draft mission statement. One of the things that you'll notice is that it retains the language about improving the human condition. That's our core purpose as an institution. And, that seems to be the most memorable component of our current mission statement and something that folks seem to be really attached to. This draft mission statement also includes our academic Medical Center as well as a focus on our learning outcomes, leadership, research and innovation, patient care and engagement with all of our communities.

Our draft vision is quite a bit longer than the original. It specifies in much more detail the impact that we want to have. The short version of the vision statement is that we will impact the present and shape the future through our actions and discoveries. And then we layout what this looks like. So, first and foremost, we want to prioritize student success, health and wellbeing. We want to create a diverse community, built on foundations of respect, inclusion and belonging. As I already mentioned, we want to embrace a people first culture where we are known for outstanding student experiences, alumni, engagement, patient satisfaction and as an employer of choice. We talk about the core competencies that we want all of our graduates to achieve when they leave here: critical thinking, acting with ethics, collaborating, communicating effectively, working in diverse environments, applying their knowledge and skills, and having the ability to solve real world problems. We want to build on our distinct strengths, and we have many of those, and invest in areas that are really going to increase the University's impact.

We re-commit to our dedication to research, innovation, discovery and creative works, and our partnership with all of our communities to advance mutual success and create opportunity for all. We want to inspire a love of life, long learning and commitment to serving others. And then lastly, we invite others to join us in our mission to improve the human condition and investing in our work. Then we lay out seven values that we also define to direct the way in, which we plan to carry out this mission and vision. So you may have noticed in a couple slides back, our current values, we have five. Those are just a list of nouns. So here we've gone into more specificity about what each of these values truly means. So, first and foremost, we're an academic institution and academic excellence and having our highest standards of achievement is at the top. Again, that commitment to research, and innovation, and discovery, and teaching and creative works. Being people centered and prioritizing our students, faculty, staff, patients, and alumni. Inclusion, where we foster belonging, equity and respect for all as part of our commitment to valuing diversity of people and ideas. We value our community and our commitment to advancing the public good. Not only in our local area, but across the state, nation and globe. We also value being trustworthy and having integrity. This is more than just acting with honesty. It also includes transparency and accountability, which ties in with the last bullet, and that is efficiency and effectiveness. We really value our responsibility to be good stewards of our student and state resources and to act with fiscal stability, sustainability and responsibility. So, with that, Senator Huntley, do you want to go on from here or if you want to stop for questions?

**Senator Huntley:** So, for those of you wondering, I mean, the reason we really spent so much time with 3600 survey results and having 14 town halls is these are really the destination that we're aiming the University towards. And if we don't know where we're going, then it is really hard to draft a strategic plan. So, this should really should be the map and set the course for where we're going over the next four or five years.

**Senator Jayatissa:** Did you say we didn't have a mission before?

**Senator Huntley:** We actually did have a mission before and we presented that earlier in the presentation.

**Senator Jayatissa:** Then why do you think this is important?

**Senator Huntley:** So, we again through surveys and through town halls identified a number of gaps, a number of things that weren't covered. The mission, vision, values weren't very specific. It didn't really define who the University was and where we're going, especially thinking about students here. If I can go back a few slides. Here's the previous mission. "Students obtain a world class education and they become part of a diverse community of leaders committed to improving the human condition in the region and in the world." We had questions about, what is the human condition? Define that. What is world class education? I think you see in the new mission we've tried to spell that out in much more detail. I hope everyone can also appreciate as Dr. Fulkerson said, here is our previous vision, quite succinct and here are our five values. Again, which are very succinct. And the new mission, vision, values, again, we spelled out a number of targeted priorities. Right? Here is where we're going. Here's what the University of Toledo is. And similarly with the values. This is what everyone is committed to.

**Senator El-Zawahry:** This is Senator El-Zawahry. Thank you very much, Senator Huntley. This is very wonderful. I think this is more inclusive and it presents everybody in the University diverse groups, the students, the faculty. I think this is a very wonderful draft and very wonderful work. Thank you.

**Senator Huntley:** Senator El-Zawahry, I really appreciate your comments. Thank you, sir.

**President Bigioni:** Are there other comments or questions?

**Senator Huntley:** Briefly, one more slide here. So again, the mission, vision, values set the stage for where we're going. This is, to be clear, still a work in progress. All 22 members of the committee are also again digging through data, thinking about where we should go. Here's where we are tentatively aiming. Goal number one, as you know, part of our fiscal challenges lie in the fact that we are dealing with low student populations. So, the first goal is really centered around increasing student enrollment. But doing that in such a way that it is very deliberate. We're enhancing the recruitment experience; thinking about recruiting beyond the Toledo or the Northwest Ohio region. But thinking nationally about recruitment, making sure we think strategically about need based scholarship, not just merit. Offering scholarships to those in need and then doing again enrollment in very targeted and honest ways. Second of all, when we recruit students here, making sure that we can retain them. Creating a student centered culture that prioritize a student success. And that includes things like, increase internships, increase co-ops, increase, advising. You heard Dr. Bjorkman talk about success coaches and equity champions. All of that is rolled into this to make sure that truly the University of Toledo was a transformative student experience and we are the University of choice. Third, establish University of Toledo as the employer of choice for faculty, staff. And, there are clear pathways for development, advancement, retention as well as rewarding those who have great customer service, who are publishing, receiving grants, excellent educators, etc. The fourth goal, building strategic partnerships, looking beyond the University. As I mentioned earlier, reconnecting with our region, with the state, with growing areas of economic growth and development; applying the expertise we have here at the University to solve national/international problems. And then again, expanding on internships, co-ops to really give our students hands on experience to get jobs. Fifth, thinking about the long term institutional health, fiscal efficiency, operational effectiveness. And then sixth, expanding research, innovation, and scholarship by again, incentivizing funding publications, scholarly activities, education, etc. So, again, this is just a draft. We haven't settled on these. As you can imagine, we have lots and lots of other sub-aims, sub-goals that go underneath this, strategies to help do this. So, at this point, we'd appreciate any feedback. You can always email us through the Strategic Planning website and share any comment, or again, you can look on our strategic planning website and see different representatives. You can certainly communicate your thoughts to those representatives. Thanks for your time. We appreciate any more comments or questions.

**President Bigioni:** Great. Any questions?

**Senator Barnes:** I have one, Senator Huntley. First of all, thank you for what I know is, I don't even know how ridiculously hard this work is. So I assume it's as hard as it sounds, to both of you. And then I'm curious about whether the work that you did came purely and solely from the surveys that you pulled out in the town halls that you had. Were those the only two sources of information for the work that you did?

**Senator Huntley:** Yes, Senator Barnes, thanks for that question. Let me start off, as you can imagine, you're right. This is a very complicated process. We received 3600 survey results; most of those were actually students. So you could view that perhaps under a different lens, given that it's going to be very student bias, or very student heavy. The town halls, again, we had different attendance numbers in each of the town halls. We tried to have those on both the Health Science Campus as well as the Main Campus [with] faculty, staff, alumni, etc. etc. So we again try to view those as they are snapshots. Again, given the representation on the Strategic Planning, the 22 members that represent faculty, staff, students, deans, Board of Trustees' members, alumni, we take that into consideration. And then the other component we do, Anne and I, as well as the committee members, are reaching out to the experts in those areas, to Dave Meredith, in terms of retention; recruitment, Denise Bartell; student success, you know, the Provost. You

can imagine, each of the offices and the experts around campus we're also reaching out to those and we're kind of using a holistic approach to really carefully think about what does success look like for the University in the future. I don't know if that answers your question, Senator Barnes, but it is complicated and we're trying to be very thoughtful and deliberate about what we're doing.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you.

**Senator Anderson:** In your plans of recruiting out of state, have you looked at anything to address the cost differential with the out of state tuition?

**Senator Huntley:** Do you want to take that one, Anne?

**Dr. Anne Fulkerson:** Yeah. That is something we're looking at right now. My understanding is the Board just recently voted on minimizing the out of state surcharge for a sub population of undergraduate students. It's a little more complicated to expand that to graduate, all graduate programs. So, we're looking at specific populations and programs where that makes most sense.

**Senator Anderson:** Thank you.

**President Bigioni:** There's a question in the Chat. Will this document be shared?

**Senator Huntley:** Yes. Again, we provided a preliminary mission, vision, values, and the University of Toledo News, and then that's also up on the Staging Planning website. The revised mission, vision, values will also be on our Strategic Planning website. The draft goals for the strategic plan will not be shared because again, this is a snapshot in time today. It could be different later tonight, tomorrow, later this week. So, it's a moving target. We want to again, be very open and transparent about where we're going, if there's things we're missing, things we're a little bit off target. Please email us and let us know, but mission, vision, value, absolutely, we'll, we'll send that out.

**President Bigioni:** And for all of us 'lazy' people, could one of you put the URL for the Strategic Planning website in the Chat?

**Senator Huntley:** You can Google it.

**President Bigioni:** I know. That is why I said, 'lazy.' Thank you. It looks like there's some more questions in the Chat. How do these goals align with this discussion of becoming an R1, from Senator Day?

**Dr. Anne Fulkerson:** I'm happy to take that one on. That was a question that we got early on in the process. We know that we're an R2 institution, but the question was, how close are we to R1 [and] what goes into that classification? So, we've done quite a bit of research on that. The latest classification was just announced at the end of January of this year, and we are very close to the threshold. And, what we have learned is that I think, President Bigioni mentioned was that there has been some under counting in the past, just based on some lack of availability of some data. For example, some of the metrics that go into the classification include the number of doctoral research degrees, includes STEMM research and development expenditures, non-STEMM research and development expenditures, and post Docs and research staff. And one of the things that we learned was that we don't have a really good way of identifying research staff. Also, those research staff have to have doctorates and we don't always capture and maintain degree information on all of our employees. So we're identifying some of these gaps. And, we've actually done statistical analysis where we recreated the classification methodology, and we can see on each of these metrics what it would take for us to cross the threshold. Interestingly, we're very strong on the STEMM metrics. If we are ever to achieve R1, where we would need to bolster our efforts would

be in some of the non—STEMM areas as well such as the humanities and social sciences. I think that's an interesting perspective. It demonstrates the importance of all of our areas in the University. And again, this is not something that we apply for. It's just knowledge about how this classification is done and certainly, has some benefits being R1 in terms of being able to attract students, additional research funding, and so forth. So it's certainly worth looking into. Does that answer the question? There isn't anything there that we settled on; it's just part of the context in which we're having the conversation.

**President Bigioni:** So I was going to ask a follow-up question that you touched on because the R1, R2 issue is not very well understood, I think. And so, what would be the benefits? You've already touched on some of those, but are there any costs? Are we giving up anything? What would be stopping us from making that decision to go R2 to R1?

**Dr. Anne Fulkerson:** You know it really isn't necessarily our decision to make. The classification will be made if we achieve the metrics, we would become R1, whether we want to or not. So there's no additional cost to us. If it's something that we intentionally wanted to pursue, then I would say that we need to direct perhaps more resources into non-STEMM research and development expenditures and into those non-STEMM doctoral research degrees.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, thank you. There are some questions piling up in the Chat. The next question is from Senator Rouillard. What are the specific populations that are being considered for this out of state tuition differential?

**Dr. Anne Fulkerson:** We haven't gotten into a lot of detail there yet. We just know that it's a complex issue that can't be across the board. I think it's going to be up to involve each of the colleges and programs to chime in on. I know that there's talk about lowering perhaps the threshold of the high school GPA for undergraduates as a possibility. But for graduate populations, there are some programs where it might make more sense to minimize that out of state surcharge and others less so. For example, for our medical students, I don't know that it would make as much sense to weigh that out of state surcharge there. So, we're still collecting input on that.

**President Bigioni:** There is another question from Senator Day, but I am going to Lipscomb just to give everybody a chance. How will strategic planning interface with budget modernization? Will resources be available to achieve the plan?

**Senator Huntley:** I mean, budget modernization will take effect July 1<sup>st</sup>, so we certainly have designed and carefully thought about the strategic plan and our goals based on what we already hear. You all have heard here at Faculty Senate from Matt [Schroeder] and his team, right? And so we are all aware of the budget challenges right now. So, to talk about investments is tough given the deficit. But I think certainly in the future, if we can increase enrollment, increase retention. You know, you've heard about those numbers and how that works out and we perhaps go in the black in terms of budget. Then, we have specifically, you know, we're aligning things with the strategic plan to prioritize investments, such that we do invest in growing areas, perhaps move us to R1 - investing programs where there is demand for jobs etc. So, if that answers that question.

**President Bigioni:** And a related question from Senator... Why do non-STEMM investments make a difference in R1 status?

**Dr. Anne Fulkerson:** That is a good question. So, again, we've reverse engineered the Carnegie classification. We're able to perfectly reproduce a scatter plot of about 300 different doctoral institutions in our position on it. And what we find is that we are very competitive on our STEMM metrics, the

STEMM R &D, the STEMM doctoral degrees. But we're weaker on the non-STEMM. The way that the model works, they do a principle components analysis; and the way the model works is that it is multiplicative rather than additive. So, it is like the benefit of diminishing returns. So, if we were to add, for example, \$10 million in STEMM R&D expenditures, our position on that scatter plot does not even move noticeably at all. But if we were to add \$10 million in non-STEMM R&D, we shoot up over the line into R1 territory. So part of the reason is, it's because it's where we are weaker currently. And if we were to add \$10 million to our current \$2 million of non-STEMM R&D, then we're increasing it 500%, right? Whereas if we add \$10 million dollars to \$50 million of STEMM R&D, we're only increasing that by 20%. So, it is a matter of proportions.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, very interesting. I'll note that Provost Bjorkman added a link that addresses Senator Rouillard's question in the Chat. So, Senator Gilstrap made a comment based upon your comments. I don't know if you'd like to address it -- the research SSI should be open and non-grant research projects. I'm not sure if that's on target or not.

**Senator Huntley:** I guess I am not understanding the point.

**Senator Gilstrap:** Sorry, I can clarify. So when we had Matt Schroeder's team in last time to discuss the budget, I directly asked, you know, we're setting aside 25% of our SSI for research projects and I asked how folks in Social Sciences and Arts and Letters -- I'm in the College of Business -- could get access to that type of grant money? The reply was, it is allocated based on your grant productivity. So, if you are not doing grant based research, you don't have access to that SSI pool. That was the response. And so I'm just suggesting that perhaps, you know, if we're going in the R1 direction and we need to fund research in Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences that we open that pool up, or reconsider how it is allocated not solely based on grant productivity.

**Senator Huntley:** So, perhaps Frank Calzonetti could better comment on this. But my understanding is most of that money is set aside for internal grants to fund lots of different research, scholarly projects, creative activities. So, perhaps Frank Calzonetti should speak about that.

**President Bigioni:** My understanding of it is different, but, you know, I'm no expert on the topic either. It was my understanding that it was more for facilities sort of purposes. But I don't know. Perhaps, Provost Bjorkman could set us straight or somebody. I don't know.

**Provost Bjorkman:** I can just comment. I mean, you're talking about two different things. If you're talking about the set aside that's in the IBB model, that was decided by the Steering Committee. That was going to be the set aside for supporting research activities. If you're talking about funding opportunities, there are EFA grants, there are other kind of things that are run through the Office of Sponsored Programs. People apply for those all the time and they are not all STEMM, not by a long shot. So, I would suggest you look into those. There are other opportunities for non-STEMM funded research out there, either in education or in all kinds of things. There are a number of federal funding agencies that fund things besides STEMM. So, I encourage you to talk to the folks in the Office of Sponsored Research. They are well aware of funding opportunities that come up. There are tons of them, so I would suggest that you go talk to them.

**President Bigioni:** This has been a good discussion, but we don't want to abuse your time too much. So, perhaps, Senator Barnes' question in the Chat could be the last question. Many years ago authorities at the State level really attacked our Humanities PhDs. Is there communication with the State about the potential of reinvestment in non-STEMM programs?

**Senator Huntley:** Yeah, I'm sorry, Senator Barnes, I don't know anything about that. My understanding is that the University's money is ours and it can be invested as we see fit. Again, in growing programs or those with potential to grow. Again, I'm sorry, I am not aware of the State coming in and telling us we can't grow PhD programs.

**Senator Barnes:** Well, they actually rescinded the English Department had a PhD at one time. My PhD is in English from UT and we no longer have that degree. That was a decision made not by the institution, but by the State. So, it just seems like we have an opportunity to convince folks that that line of thinking was a bad way to go, and that it would bring a lot of prestige, more research dollars, more all kinds of other good things if they allowed us to have those programs. I just think it's an opportunity here to use this information to help us grow.

**Senator Krantz:** So Senator Barnes, what is the timeframe for this action on the part of the State? And do you remember what their interpretation was for rescinding that?

**Senator Barnes:** I think the programs were small. The same arguments we're hearing now about budgeting, right? If BG has this program, why does Toledo need this program? My degree, oh, God, I think I got my PhD in 1999 or 2000. So, around 20 years ago. The English Department degree was cut after that. So that's about the timeframe I can [recall]. We have to find somebody who's got a longer tenure than me to really maybe know the answer.

**Senator Huntley:** So perhaps, Dr. Bjorkman, I hate to 'throw you under the bus here,' but could you maybe make some comments about that or what's coming?

**Provost Bjorkman:** Well, I don't know exactly the date of that. I don't remember it, although I was here then, but I wasn't paying much attention at that time, but to other things. I will tell you that State legislature passed a requirement that every five years we have to go through this for low enrolled programs. We have to respond to them, and we're going through that right now as you probably heard. So every five years we have to do that. They send us a list of programs and courses that are either duplicates or low enrolled, etc. and we have to respond to that. We have to do that, I forget when the deadline is. But, that's coming up so we're working on that now. We did this five years ago. I remember it well, because at the time I was a Dean and I had to respond to several of them that were in my college. The deadline is September – thanks for the reminder. So, that's a normal thing. I don't remember what happened with the PhD programs. I have no recollection of that. Dr. Gregory, if you do, please jump in.

**Melissa Gregory, Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Letters:** I just want to say, it's too long I think for today's meeting. But I did at one point, go down the 'rabbit hole,' cause even though I am currently Dean, I do love me a good archive. And I actually got into the archival records for this, because I was curious to see how it happened. I was interested to see the State discussions regarding the closure of the English PhD, and also the State discussions, and the internal discussions regarding the History Department's decision and ability to retain its PhD. And so, if you would ever like me to summarize that for you, I would be happy to get into some detail with you from my archival adventures. I do want to say, though, that I think higher education at that moment was in a much different space than it is right now. And so, while there are some overlaps and the kinds of conversations we're having, I also think there are some really distinct differences. So, anyway, like I said, I trolled the files if you ever want a longer story.

**Senator Krantz:** Provost Bjorkman, as a follow-up to that, are there any programs at UT that are presently being scrutinized, are potentially in danger?



**Provost Bjorkman:** Well, I don't know if they're in danger. We have a long list of things we have to look at. There's no question about that. You should see the spreadsheet. So, we're looking at it.

**Senator Krantz:** Well, part of the reason I ask now where, you know, this is the last Faculty Senate meeting and the faculty are less engaged through the summer. And if we have to respond, there is kind of a timeline here.

**Provost Bjorkman:** Yes, Senator Krantz, I know, but the State sets the timeline, we have nothing to say about it.

**Senator Krantz:** I understand that. Sure. Certainly.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** May I please make just a very short statement as an addendum to Senator Barnes talking about the English PhD program? I graduated in 1995 here at the University of Toledo with my PhD. And at that time, from 1990 to 1995, the five years that I was here, that program was just excellent. There was high enrollment between masters and doctoral students. There were dozens and dozens of wonderful professors offering just a myriad of wonderful courses. Then when I left and went to CIA, I heard in about 2000, 2001 that that PhD had been eliminated. I was kind of brokenhearted to think that I had spent five years here in a program that was now no longer. It was a wonderful program with very, very high enrollment, and just excellent professors and just a massive array of different types of courses. So, I just wanted to put in my two cents for that PhD English program. I wish it would be revived. Thank you.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, so we should wind this down. I appreciate everyone's time, especially since this whole process is so time consuming. We appreciate you taking a little bit of time out of what little you have left to share it with us. So, thank you, and I guess we'll probably see you again in the fall. All right, thank you. Thank you both for your work and you're sharing your time with us. The next item on the agenda is the Senate election. We have a little discussion and a decision to be made. So I'm going to preface the discussion with the fact that we've normally conducted elections such that this final meeting we seat the senators. And while that is not a requirement of our Constitution, the timelines with regard to how those Senate elections are done is part of that and we wanted to respect that as much as possible. But of course, we had other things going on, two different things going on. One is the conduction of the Senate Constitution ratification vote, but also this transition in the leadership of the Elections Committee. And quite frankly, the elections process was far more complex than we had thought. We very much appreciate all the help that Scott Molitor provided in helping that transition along, but it was still quite a heavy lift. You know, everyone is volunteering their time and doing the best that they can. And, you know, no one decided that we should end up late on our elections. But that's just how it worked out, despite the best efforts of everyone involved. So, let me share where we are so that we can advance this discussion and come to a decision about how to conclude the elections. Hopefully everybody can see that now<Image in view>. So, right now, of course, we've completed the ratification vote and that was a good learning process. But there were delays in that process because of the need to negotiate things with the Senate and then educate the faculty before having a vote and so on. So that pushed things back. But nonetheless, we learned we were able to conduct the nominations, which are ongoing and they close this Friday on the 29<sup>th</sup> [April 2022]. And once we have those nominations then we will contact everyone who's been nominated to verify that they're willing to be put on the election ballot. Hopefully that can be done fairly quickly. So there are two plans. One, is to conduct the elections this semester, concluding them in May. And the other is to postpone that elections process until August - I'll get to that point in a moment. So, this was the subject of our Executive Committee meeting two weeks ago. So we decided that

the two options are viable options and that we should put it to a vote of the Senate to decide which path to choose.

**Faculty Senate Election Options**

	<b>PLAN A</b>	<b>PLAN B</b>
Nominations	Close Friday 4/29	Close Friday 4/29
Elections	Open Monday 5/9 Close Friday 5/20	Open Monday 8/22 Close Friday 9/2
First meeting of new Senate (to elect new EC)	Tuesday May 24 <sup>th</sup> or Tuesday June 7 <sup>th</sup>	Tuesday September 6 <sup>th</sup> or Tuesday September 13 <sup>th</sup>

So the first (**Plan A.**), would open elections on Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup>, so, six days from now, and leave them open for the prescribed two-week period, or at least 10 working day period, closing on the following Friday, which is May 13<sup>th</sup>. Now, here's a little snippet of an academic calendar, and May 10<sup>th</sup>, I believe – I have to double check this – but I believe that is typically the last day on contract where we have to submit our grades by. So that vote would extend past that contract period, three days. And so the question is, is this acceptable? Is this a plan that we would like to pursue? And if it is, then we can complete that election process by that Friday the 13<sup>th</sup>. And then hold a special meeting, a short organizational meeting, just to seat the senators and elect a new executive committee. Two dates were suggested to hold that short organizational meeting, May 24<sup>th</sup> or June 7<sup>th</sup>.

**Plan B.**, the nominations would close Friday as normal, and then we would take those nominations and assemble ballots from them. But, we would not conduct elections on those ballots until August. So the first day that we're back on contract, and here is a snippet of that calendar, there is a week before classes that will begin August 22<sup>nd</sup>. Then that would run for 10 business days, closing on September 2<sup>nd</sup>. From that, we would assemble the new Senate, the new senators and seat them in our first Senate meeting of the new year; and that could be on the 6<sup>th</sup> or the following week on the 13<sup>th</sup>. I worked that out with Quinetta, and both options seem to be available to us, because we can work that out with Grad Council because we have to be on alternating weeks. So those are the two plans. And the consequences of the two plans is no matter whether we seat the new Senate in May, or late May, early June, or this fall, all existing Faculty Senate Committees would remain intact, because they wouldn't be replaced until the new Senate is seated. And of course, all of you senators would remain seated until the new Senate meets and the new senators are seated to replace everyone whose terms are expiring. And, of course, the -- I didn't note it here. I neglected to note it there -- existing Executive Committee would also remain until the new Executive Committee is seated. So that's the rundown on how this would work. Those are the two proposed plans. We could have some discussion about it, or we could just go ahead with a vote on it. I'm not sure if there's a lot to discuss, but perhaps I've neglected a point. Before I open that up to any kind of discussion, I should ask Senator and soon-to-be President Insch if he would like to make any additions to what I've said.

**President-Elect Insch:** No. I think you've kind of laid it out the way it is. So, it's just kind of how we're going to get it done. I mean, we have to look forward so we got to figure this out. We're just trying to see what the faculty feels, just go ahead and let it run over the summer, or we just do it in the fall very quickly, or if we think we can get enough people to vote right at the end of the semester, and hopefully they will, and try to get the new Faculty Senate in place over the summer. I don't have a preference either

way. I would really just like the Senate to figure out what they feel is the best interest of all of us and being able to represent the faculty. So, thank you, President Bigioni. You did a good job as always.

**President Bigioni:** Thanks. Okay, any questions or comments? And I can't see the Chat, so if anyone puts anything in the Chat, perhaps somebody can read it. President-Elect Insch, could you take care of the Chat?

**President-Elect Insch:** Sure. I don't think there is really any comments in the Chat. Just some general support for Plan A, as I'm reading it.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, may I can somehow get my Chat to come up here. I think I succeeded. Okay, so if there's no discussion required---

**Dr. Molitor:** President Bigioni, this is Scott Molitor.

**President Bigioni:** Yes?

**Dr. Molitor:** I know I am not a current senator or a member of the Elections Committee. But I do feel the need to state that Plan A is not viable because there is no way you're going to be able to fill out the final ballots in two days over the weekend. If you want Plan A to work, you're going to need to push the final ballot back at least a week so it would open Monday, May 9 and close Friday, May 20.

**Senator Rouillard:** I think that Dr. Molitor is quite right, because those ballots need to be verified by the Elections Committee to make sure that everybody who is eligible to be nominated, and only people eligible to be nominated are on it. I think that Plan A, calling for a first meeting of the new Senate on May 24th or June 7th risks not even having a quorum to conduct business.

**Senator Krantz:** To build on Senator Rouillard's comments, all of the faculty for the next two weeks are going to be focused on finishing out the semester and our time is minimal. If we only had 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the faculty voting on the Constitution, you're probably going to have minimal engagement on this issue as well.

**Senator Lee:** This is Carrie Lee from the College of Nursing. After I promoted timeliness, I recalled our college is on a different calendar because of our requirements with the Board of Nursing. So this is our exam week. We're already like, ahead of that schedule with our nine-month faculty finishing sooner than the rest of the University. Just something to consider in terms of the previous point about participation.

**President Bigioni:** With regard to that point, the beginning of your fall semester, does that line up with the rest of the University?

**Senator Lee:** Yes, for fall. we have a week off between our summer and our fall. Most of our faculty teach 12-months, but we do have a cohort of nine-month faculty.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, thank you. Any other comments or questions? Some good points.

**President-Elect Insch:** Well, I think that Dr. Molitor's point is probably valid enough that we would probably want to move Plan A, to the 9<sup>th</sup>, and then move that back to the 20<sup>th</sup>.

**President Bigioni:** I can redo this. In principle, it could be, begun as soon as the ballots are settled. But, you know, with this being almost the worst case scenario, I don't know that that really means much, a few days, a couple days here or there. With regard to the quorum point, it's a fair [point]. But one could take the approach that, let's say we try it, the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting don't make quorum. That would just kick the

meeting to September 6<sup>th</sup>, if I interpret that correctly. And so we end up with sort of a hybrid A, B. Any other comments?

**Senator Wedding:** I don't see how we can do Plan A. Senator Rouillard's point is well taken. We need to verify the ballots and get this thing well organized and we will do that if we go to Plan B. I think Plan A, is going to be a 'hurry-up.' We're going to be trying to get people to come in here and vote and you're going to be moving these things more and more into the summer. And, I think that's unfair to people who have had vacation plans and are out of town. I think you ought to be Plan B, when we'll have everybody here on campus.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, thank you. Other comments? Shall we put it to a vote?

**Senator Wedding:** I'm having trouble with my computer. Would you put me down for Plan B, please?

**President Bigioni:** Certainly. I don't know if we need a motion to go to a vote if it's coming from me. It's kind of coming from the Executive committee. So it is coming from a committee. It seems like we don't need a motion. So unless anybody objects to that, we can go ahead and vote. Senator Wedding, I'm putting in a vote for you.

**Senator Wedding:** Thank you, Sir. Thank you very much. You'll be 'paid' later.

**President Bigioni:** Please, no<laughter>. Okay. Looks like we virtually have a consensus on B. So we will go with B. There may be a couple more votes trickling in, but we've miraculously reached a consensus, I think. So I appreciate it everyone. Unless there are any other questions or comments, we will close this out, go with Plan B. I guess we will make an announcement about that, just to keep everyone informed. We'll have to think about the September 6<sup>th</sup> vs. the 13<sup>th</sup> question. Perhaps Dr. Molitor, if you're still on. If we close the vote on Friday, September 2<sup>nd</sup>, is it realistic to seat the senators that following Tuesday, the 6<sup>th</sup>?

**Dr. Molitor:** If you close the ballot on Friday, September 2<sup>nd</sup>, you will know the results instantly, unless there are any tie breakers. You could send out email invitations Friday evening, and people would be able to read their emails on Monday if not before. And then it's just a matter of whether the meeting is going to be in-person or if it is going to be virtual. I assume if it is virtual it would be easier for somebody to attend on a short notice.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, one question I have is, if someone has already agreed to appear on the ballot, how often did they change their mind in which case it may prolong things?

**Dr. Molitor:** That's a good question. In my experience, I have not encountered that unless somebody decides to suddenly retire or leaves to take a new position. That does happen. But I've never seen anybody agree to appear on the final ballot, get elected and change their minds.

**President Bigioni:** And presumably, you'd just go down to the next?

**Dr. Scott Molitor:** Yes, you would go to the next candidate on the list.

**President Bigioni:** Okay, quick process.

**Senator Compora:** This happened before, President Bigoni. I was Chair for two years, and it happens a lot more often. People agree to be on the ballot and turns out they end up with a teaching conflict. So, it's, it's not a zero chance.

**President Bigioni:** Do you also agree though, that seating everyone that following Tuesday is realistic?

**Senator Compora:** It is. I think it is based on my experience.

**President Bigioni:** Terrific. So I noticed that people are noting that Monday, September 5<sup>th</sup> is Labor Day. I don't know if that would affect anything. But, okay, it seems like we have a plan, Plan B. I appreciate it. Thanks everyone. So then the next item on the agenda is just items from the floor. Does anyone have any items from the floor? Okay, then hearing none. Perhaps I have one simple item from the floor. It's simply, thank you! Thank you to everyone who has contributed over this year. I know a lot of this work is sort of thankless. So, I need to say, thank you. Faculty Senate is often not an 'easy' job, and particularly the committees, the committee work that gets done behind the scenes making the 'sausage.' Right? We all learn something from the process, but it is a big dedication of everyone's time. And I really appreciate everyone's commitment to this institution and making it a better place. So thank you, everyone. I've learned a lot and I highly recommend becoming president one day. I'll leave it at that and declare now this final meeting of the 2021-2022, academic year adjourned. Thank you, everyone! Meeting adjourned.

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Kimberly Nigem

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

