

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 10, 2018

FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 4/24/2018

Summary of Discussion

Dr. Willie Mckether, Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion: Tribute to Tony Quinn
Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller, Dean of the University College: Competency Based Education
Dr. Glenn Sheldon, Chair of the LGBTQA +Advisory: LGBTQA+ Advisory Board Update
Dr. Melissa Gregory, Presidential Fellow: Tenure and Promotional Guidelines

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

President Thompson called the meeting to order; Executive Secretary, Fred Williams called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2017-2018 Senators:

Present: Ariss, Atwood, Bjorkman, Bouillon, Brakel, Bruce, Compora, Chattopadhyay, Dinnebeil, Duggan, Edgington, Ferris, Frank, Gilchrist, Giovannucci, Gruden, Hall, Hammersley, Haughton, Hottell (substitute for S. Barnes), Humphrys, Jaume, Keith, Kippenhan, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Leady, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lundquist, McLoughlin, Maloney, Menezes, Monsos, Modyanov, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Ortiz, Parker, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Said, Schneider, Schroeder, Sheldon, Steven, A. Thompson, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Weldy, White, Williams, Woolford, Xie

Excused absences: Emonds, Gray, Hefzy, Niamat, Wittmer

Unexcused absences: Hoy, Lecka-Czernik, G. Thompson, Willie

President Thompson: All right, let us go ahead and get going. I will like to call this meeting to order. I will like to call our Executive Secretary, Fred Williams to come forward to call roll.

Thank you, Dr. Williams. Next on the agenda before we get into any of our formal business, as you know, I mentioned at our last Faculty Senate meeting that we had the loss of Dr. Tony Quinn. We asked Dr. Willie Mckether, a close friend to come and just give a tribute to Tony. If you would come forward.

Dr. Willie Mckether: Thank you, Dr. Thompson. Thank you all for allowing me to come share some thoughts. I am not sure what a “tribute” should look like, so I am going to talk a little about the Tony Quinn that I knew. First of all, we were really close friends. The first thing I will say is, even though we transitioned to working in administration, first and foremost, Tony was a faculty member. Tony loved the students. Everything he did, his work was really about the students. He and I would talk at lengths about when we first got here at UT, we spent so many years in the lab focused on getting published and getting grants and when we finally looked up, we began to see there are issues here with retention of students of color, particularly with the stemm fields. The question he will always ask is, “Whose job is it to address this?” Mind you, this was two administrations ago. His call to action, I would often times hear him say, “This is happening on my watch. How dare I work at the University of Toledo and not do anything about it. I don’t want history to be written that Tony Quinn was here and did nothing.” For him and for many of us, that was our call to action, and he did that by recognizing the work that he was doing would matter to

students, but it would not matter to his career. He would often times say, “Willy, the work that we are doing here is going to take our careers. We will never get full-professor because this isn’t about grants and this isn’t about scholarship, this is about service.” Then the question he would ask is, “What do we do? Do we have the luxury of waiting till they address the system while we have students who need our help now?” He fully recognized the work he was doing was really about helping students, and it did not matter to him that it was not going to advance his career. His primary concern was how do we help students. When I think about the time we spent together, we were close, but we had two sort of almost fall-outs, sort of. The one was when he would talk about doing research and then he’ll say, “Oh, and that “stuff” that you do” <laughter>.” I will say, “Tony, it is called anthropology, and that is what it is called.” He would say, “Well, Brother, I’m sorry, I don’t understand what you are talking about,” and that is how we always joked. The other “fall-out” was when we got to the point where we would go to conferences together. I can tell you on three occasions at three different conferences that he came downstairs and we were dressed as though we were twins <laughter>. I would say, “Tony, what are you wearing?” He would look back and say, “What the heck are you wearing?” We just had this great relationship. I think because of his passion for helping students it led up to [our] help to develop a number of programs: Brothers on the Rise, Multicultural...Scholarly Program, We are Stemm, and... He got involved with Willy Stokes. He resurrected a number of programs, and it was all about him helping students. Often times he would be at my kitchen table for hours, hours, and hours and the conversation would be, “What can we do or we have to be able to do more.” Often times it would be 8:00 or 9:00 o’clock and his wife would start calling—“Tony, where are you?” Eventually, he’ll say, “I have to go home,” but the next day on his way home, he would stop by again. It was through our passion, but more about his passion for making sure all students had/have an opportunity to be successful which is what he was really about. As a faculty member, that was his passion. When I tell people how we can best remember his legacy, I will say the one thing you can do for Tony is to make sure the things he cared for and worked for be continued. We need to continue to make sure that all students at the University of Toledo have an opportunity to be successful in the classroom as we prepare them for life outside of the university. I am going to stop here since this is a very difficult topic.



In Memory of Dr. Anthony Quinn

[Applause]

President Thompson: Thank you for that very beautiful tribute, Dr. Mckether. We will certainly miss Dr. Quinn, and I am glad we can remember him today. Before we move forward with formal business, all of you should have received the March 13 Minutes. Can I have a motion for approval? Can I have a *second*? Is there any discussion on the Minutes, additions, or changes? All those in favor of approving the Minutes, please signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

Executive Committee Report: Welcome to the 15th meeting of the academic year. After today’s meeting, we only have one remaining meeting for the semester on April 24th. At our last meeting, we will wrap up

some final business, call the new 2018-2019 Faculty Senate to order and hold our executive committee elections.

Before we get into any formal business, I would like to acknowledge the recent loss of Jake Judkins, a faculty member on the Health Science Campus and doctoral student in the UT Public Health Program. Jake was the Director of the Human Donation Program here and he will be sadly missed. One of his colleagues Dr. Linda Speer will deliver a tribute at our next meeting.

We have a very full agenda today so the executive report will be brief to allow time to present some recognition awards to some very deserving recipients.

Since our last meeting, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had a second meeting with the Constitution and Rules Committee and we have a third meeting scheduled this coming Friday. On today's agenda, Dr. Mark Templin will present some of the high-level proposed changes to the Faculty Senate's Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules documents that will be presented at next Fall's Faculty Senate. To ensure that the great work of this committee continues, President Elect Dr. Linda Rouillard has agreed to reappoint the chair and the committee members to continue next year in their current roles. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is very pleased with the work of this committee and looks forward to this coming to the full Senate for a vote and possible implementation.

The Faculty Senate final ballots have been emailed out, as well as the UCAP and UT Sabbatical Committee Ballots. These are due by Tuesday April 17 by 5:00 p.m. Please note, not everyone is eligible to vote for UCAP, as you may not have an opening within your college.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee would like to thank President Elect Dr. Linda Rouillard, Past President Mary Humphys, Executive Secretary Dr. Fred Williams and OFC Representative Tom Atwood for presenting at our two tenure and promotion workshops. We also would like to thank Diane Miller and Jared Holt from the Office of Government Relations for speaking at our Advocacy and Government Relations Resource Workshops. All of these workshops were well attended and provided some great information. This concludes my Executive Committee report. Are there any questions?

With that said, we have some very special recognitions at our meeting before we have the provost report. As you recall, a little while ago, I sent out an email requesting nominations for senators who really went above and beyond this year in terms of their efforts and their contribution. I have a very special award that I would like to give out before we move forward. They do not know they are getting these awards so this is extra fun. First, Dr. Fred Williams as you know has served as our Executive Secretary this year and he is also term limited so he will be rolling off Faculty Senate. He is always at all of our Executive Committee meetings. He is always ready to step in and help. He really is a very strong member of our Faculty Senate, and I would like to recognize him. We have photographers and so this is real, you are getting your picture taken. You just told me your walls were bare in your office, so here you go.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: Our next distinguished service award, again, this is peer nomination, goes to Dr. Diane Cappelletty, Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Most of you have probably observed the work that her and her committee has tirelessly done on behalf of Faculty Senate. You have reviewed so many proposals, and often I feel like we were under scrutiny to make sure that we were always reviewing these on a timely basis, and you have done just a phenomenal job this year. If you can please come forward, we have a distinguished service award for you as well. Thank you for your work. How many proposals this year?

Dr. Cappelletty: Over 200.

President Thompson: A lot of curriculum, right? Thank you.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: The next two awards are actually presidential citations. These are from me as the president of Faculty Senate. Both are going to individuals that I believe have really helped us move forward in terms of our Faculty Senate. I will like to call another young man up here, Dr. Mark Templin. Let us give him a hand.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: First, of all, Mark likes constitutional stuff, right? He has done a wonderful job with his committee. For those of you who really have not seen the documents, he went from one document to splitting it up into three. His committee has worked tirelessly and keeps meeting with us. We are moving forward. This is a ton of work. It is still going to be some work maybe in the summer and the fall semester, and so I really want to thank Mark for all of the work that he has done. It reads, "*This citation recognizes Dr. Mark Templin for his outstanding service and leadership to the UT Faculty Senate for the 2017-2018 academic year, as Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee.*" Thank you very much.

All right, our last presidential citation is for Dr. Sharon Gaber. Dr. Gaber is here with us today, so if you can come on up and come forward. Dr. Gaber has really been a wonderful president to work with. As the President of Faculty Senate, she has been very accessible to us; we can always email her and interact with her. She has really reached out and tried to bridge the relationship with Faculty Senate. I will like to read your citation here for you, "*The UT Faculty Senate presidential citation recognizes UT President, Dr. Sharon Gaber for her contributions in advancing shared governance with the UT Faculty Senate during the 2017-2018 academic year. Dr. Gaber has been very accessible and responsive to faculty input and has worked tirelessly to enhance partnerships with the UT faculty. President Gaber's leadership and dedication to the spirit of shared governance exemplifies the phrase, together is better.*" Let us give Dr. Gaber a hand please.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: It has been a privilege to work with you and we really appreciate all of the things that you have done to help Faculty Senate. All right, that is the fun part, right?

Next on the agenda, we have Provost Andrew Hsu with our academic update.

Provost Hsu: Thank you, Dr. Thompson. I have a few updates from our office. We have 43 faculty members who received tenure and/or promotion this year. It is actually a much higher number than last year and the two previous years. There is quite a bit of an increase from associate professor to full professor. For the last few years, we had an average of about 15 or so faculty members per year going up from associate professor to full professor, and this year we have 26. I want to thank Faculty Senate for co-organizing an associate to full professor workshop. As you remember, that is also an initiative in our strategic plan, and so it seems like we are making good progress in that area. My congratulations to all of those who have received tenure and/or promotion.

You recently received an email message from me again about a provost faculty fellow program. We actually have extended the deadline to this Friday, so if you or your colleagues are interested in contributing to student success and/or diversity on this campus, I will encourage you or your colleagues to apply. This is a great opportunity for you to make a bigger impact. We actually have some summer support for you to start working this summer on what to do next academic year. You will receive two course releases for the academic year for two semesters then there will be more summer support for the following summer so that you can help us coach the next generation since we are going to continue with this. Please help us include more faculty members. Dr. Melissa Gregory is a presidential fellow. She did such a great job this year, and we decided to extend that and have a set of provost fellows. The Chronicle of Higher Education survey that I mentioned the last time I was here, many of you have participated and I want to thank you. We want more participation. We got permission from Higher Education to extend the deadline one more week and so the deadline now is this Friday, April 13. For those of you who have received an email message from Chronicle Great Colleges for surveys@modernthink.net, please don't delete that email message. Finally, we have some changes coming out from the Provost Office. Believe it or not, we are going to have three colleagues retiring from the Provost Office and they are Peg Traband, Steve LeBlanc, and then Connie Shriner. These are all long serving faculty members and administrators with tremendous contributions to this campus, to programs, and to the Provost Office. I am going to host a reception for these colleagues on June 5. I know many of you are going to be off duty, but I would like to invite all of you. Please write that date down and come celebrate their achievement with us. The date is June 5 at 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the Grogan room in Savage Arena. I will be sending out more email messages to remind you of that. So since this is going to be my last Senate meeting for this semester, I am going to be away two weeks from today, I want use this opportunity to thank Dr. Amy Thompson as well as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members. I really enjoyed working with you. The Provost Office has collaborated with the Faculty Senate and we worked on many important initiatives and I really enjoyed the collaboration, especially from the Executive Committee. Thank you.

[Applause]

President Thompson: Okay, next on the agenda is Diane Cappelletty, who has some curriculum that we need to actually address first.

Dr. Cappelletty: Well, we were busy—34 new course proposals and 42 course modifications came in this last window. I would love to say that has us even, but about another eight to ten have since come in since we have closed this out, and so there is already work for next year. The only real conversations went as it related to some of the music or theatre courses. Most of their grading was done by attendance and participation, but they listed potential assignments as needed, which is really more of the stick rather than anything else. There was no intent to really do those types of assignments if/and unless absolutely needed. There was a question as it was related to the internship courses. They wanted a clearer delineation of grading for the internships, which anybody who does internships or co-ops knows it is very challenging to get an absolute grading rubric. The students go out and they are actually working with others and as long as they are sort of meeting their assignments for that particular internship, they earn their passing grade. We did not feel like we could overturn or ask for anything further than what they really had put into their syllabus based on those, but there was a little concern amongst the committee members for those courses. However, other than that, things were pretty well set and accepted. Are there any questions on the new courses that were sent out? Hearing no questions. All in favor of approving the new courses please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

This moves us to the 42 course modifications that we have in the system. Again, they were straightforward for most of them. Are there any questions or discussion on the 42 course modifications? Hearing no questions. All in favor of approving the course modifications say, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

[\[View Course Proposals and Modifications\]](#)

There is one other piece of business. Peg Traband had called me last week to talk about 800 courses that are in the system solely listed as recitation for their delivery methodology. These are three 4 credit hour courses that are listed solely as recitation. By definition, the recitation is supposed to be a breakout group that meets in conjunction with a lecture based course, so having those courses labeled as recitation courses is not necessarily appropriate in the system. What they put together, and I got the spreadsheet here, there are seven different areas and I will not say colleges because how it is broken out here is not necessarily by college. Some areas have around 200 proposals, both undergrad and graduate that fall under this category and other colleges have none. The Provost Office is asking to have these corrected by mid-May so that they can have the catalog updated and properly coded for the fall semester. We had a conversation that lecture probably is not necessarily the right term any longer because you may have a lecture-based course, but you can have a flipped classroom, you can have discussions, and you can have all kinds of activities associated with it that is not a straight lecturer style delivery. What they are hoping for is to send these out to each of the areas and by mid-May, the corrections are made indicating whether these are lecture plus recitation or just be a lecture-based course. There is absolutely no change to the course content; no one is asking anybody to change the delivery style or anything else along that line, just get it properly coded in the system and we will do math changes to this via sort of what we did with the amnesty document.

Senator Emonds: Since there was already discussion about the terminology, is there any way to change that? I have an outdated mode of delivery and my students are usually surprised that it is not a lecture in my class. Is there any way we can change these? Or do they have to be like that?

Dr. Cappelletty: At this point in time, I don't think that they are or we are prepared to make those changes. I know that we also have challenges as it relates to how long a laboratory course is per credit hour as well as experiential courses and how much content time per credit hour. I know that Peg indicated as we talked about some of that, that she will like to see those conversations happening while we're moving forward. I know they are going to happen between now and June, which is after she retires and then I defer to the Provost office to carry on the dialogue. It is something that needs to happen across all of our courses to get the proper language and definitions and our own definitions, and not necessarily state definitions for everything.

Senator Monsos: In this case, these definitions are the state definitions and so they will have to be changed with the state.

Senator Emonds: Right, but I was not talking about the definitions.

Senator Monsos: Well, there are classifications on how the subsidy is awarded.

Senator Emonds: Well, there are only two.

Senator Monsos: No, there is studio, lab, and a bunch of others. Given this definition, a number of the courses that we have classified as recitations probably are not.

Dr. Cappelletty: Because at the state level there is no definition of a recitation because they view recitation in conjunction with a lecture based course. You will be paid for the lecture, even though you might be doing a recitation along with it.

Senator Schneider: I will simply like to support...comments that lecture is no longer a method many of us choose in our classrooms. I understand these are the state definitions, so therefore, I think we should be on the state panel that creates those definitions so that we can create the state definitions that more appropriately advise our students on what kind of a class they are going to be taking.

Dr. Cappelletty: I agree. So at this point I guess I am asking, are we all right with moving these courses forward? I know we are really only responsible for those that are at the undergraduate level and there are a fair number at the graduate level. I am making an assumption; we can talk to Grad Council about the same issue as well given the fact that Senate does not do anything with graduate level courses or a fair number of them.

Past-President Humphrys: Just to make sure I understand. These decisions about whether the recitation or whatever, they are going to be made not by the Provost office, but at the college level?

Dr. Cappelletty: They are going to be made at the college level with the information back to the Provost office by mid-May. I will check with Grad Council as to whether they are moving anything forward or knowing what's on this list, and if not, then I will forward the undergrad courses to the colleges on behalf of Senate for recommending the modification to their classification, if that make sense. So all the support of me moving these forward to the departments, please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

President Thompson: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. We will go back down to Senator Monsos if that is okay.

Senator Monsos: So one of the new courses that you've just approved a few minutes ago is this one, 3280 Raised American Politics. They have also put that forward for Diversity U.S. and Culture category. The committee looked at that, and we were ready to act on it last time, but it was not actually a course yet so we could not. But it is now a course and so we can act on the core component of it. Are there any questions? All those in favor, signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

PSC 3280 Race and American Politics – recommend approval for Multicultural Diversity of US status.

Diversity of U.S. Culture

A Diversity of U.S. Culture course includes, but is not restricted to, an examination of the economic, political, philosophical, social or artistic life of distinct cultural communities in the United States. Cultural communities may include but are not limited to communities based on race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, beliefs and disability.

A student who completes the diversity of U.S. culture requirement should be able to:

- Explain the cultural relationships between dominant and non-dominant cultures within the U.S.
- Describe how diverse cultural communities contribute to the development of U.S. culture; and,
- Compare complex social structures within diverse U.S. cultural communities.

President Thompson: Next, Senator White, are you giving---

Senator White: Senator Randolph is going to substitute for me today, but if you need me, you can call me. Thank you, Brian.

Senator Randolph: Good afternoon everyone. Professor Barclay, who is our chair of the committee had a family emergency so Senator Don White was pressed into service and Don is not feeling well, so I was pressed into service. I had a two-minute notice on this, so please bear with me. We have a number of program modifications, but no new program proposals today. There were 30 of them in the attachment that you received earlier today. These are a variety of different changes to program, primarily there's about 1/3rd of them which are reductions in credit hours from 126 or 124 to 120 to align with the state mandate, and others have exchanges of one course for another or something like that. The Senate just passed some new courses that factor into this because the program modification was predicated on the fact that new courses are being added to that curriculum—I was watching and in fact, I think we got them

all so we are good on those. The committee is in favor of approving this list and we are putting it out as a vote in the whole, unless there are questions to anything that is listed in this list of 30.

President-Elect Rouillard: Senator Randolph, there was some confusion about a BA Communication program modification, has that been removed?

Senator Randolph: It was in the early version that went out a couple of days ago, but it was removed in the most recent version that you received. My understanding is that it is still awaiting college approval before it can come forward.

President-Elect Rouillard: My other comment is that the programs that are moving down to 120 hours, I have no objection to that, but I would like to correct the statements on some of these program modifications. The state has not required that we have a maximum of 120; it is only the bottom part of the range. Again, I have no objections with Programs wanting to move down to 120.

Senator Randolph: Thank you.

Senator Krantz: This is a possible minor correction that is kind of down at the bottom of this list. There is a program modification for biology, BIOL, and this came through NSM Council—apparently, there was an issue with curriculum tracking because it could not separate biology from biological sciences and biology from environmental sciences. If this is going to be translated into Banner in some form, there is some typos and there may be some misattributions in there, so I would just suggest somebody going back and vetting it basically. For example, if I remember correctly, the second sentence in there, concentration will be called BIOU, that is a typo obviously, but I am not sure if that particular set of words came from the Department of Environmental Sciences. I think that might had come from Biological Sciences, but I do not know for sure. Is there anybody else from NSM Council that remember the details of that?

Senator Randolph: Our understanding of that, the gist was that students coming in as freshmen were being confused by the fact that we offer two BS in Biology degrees out of two different departments. In the coding early on there were always a few students every summer who ended up with the wrong coding, and it created confusion, so, they are trying to create two codes so that the students come in under a different code, whether that is BIOU, BIOL, or BIOM.

Senator Krantz: The intent is absolutely a good thing; BIOL is from biological sciences and BIOM, which is an acronym for BIOM coming from the college's side. The intent is good.

Senator Kippenhan: The last sentence in that box has BION on the second to the last line and BIOL on the last line.

Senator Randolph: It is your understanding that is the set that is desired, BIOM and BIOL.

Senator Krantz: That is correct.

Senator Randolph: Very good.

Senator White: We wanted to encourage everyone to make sure you check with departments that you changed a course in their departments. Is there anybody from Respiratory Care here that can say whether or not hundreds of students are going to be coming into Math 2600 or is it a smaller number?

Unknown Speaker: They only have about 25 students per cohort.

Senator White: Well, that might add a section, but nonetheless, I think we can do that, and that is important for us to know, so I will approve.

Senator Randolph: If I can reiterate that, just having served on this committee for a number of years. Anytime you are modifying your program, and it impinges upon especially another college, it is very helpful for the committee if you get an endorsement from them, just an email that comes through so that we can see so it doesn't raise this kind of question on the floor of the Senate. We would appreciate that. Are there additional questions?

Senator McLoughlin: Going back to President-Elect Rouillard's comment about the adjustment to 120 credit hours. I think it is important that we kind of emphasize that because in minor, we have a proposal that reduce from 124 to 120, and it was the way the information was communicated, which is so important from administration down to the faculty. When we start to use this misinterpretation of a lack of clarity and you make it out that it is a state mandate, then the response from faculty is very different than, "hey, we are trying to reduce it down from 124 to 120." It is really a UT initiative of the strategic initiatives and not a state mandate. It kind of comes very heavy handed and it creates a poor reaction of the faculty and a lack of communication and trust between administration and the faculty in such a way that a state mandate would require us to do this. Myself as a program director, I do not really have a say of what my program looks like, what courses, and what credit hours. I am aligned with the state mandate, but now I am being told that I have to chop classes and get them down to 120 and that creates a little bit of a disconnection between administration and the faculty when we have this lack of clarity and communication style is problematic. I think it is a very significant comment you made, so thank you.

Senator Krantz: An additional note with exactly that statement. Within NSM what we have seen is typically a list of all programs that have scaled back to 120, usually from 124 or somewhat higher and what has been dropped out is the breath, the interdisciplinary, the outside of science and math. It is narrowing down your broader education to essentially what the core curriculum is.

Senator Randolph: Are there any additional questions or comments?

Unknown Speaker: Going back to the one issue with the triple EEES in Biology, that is actually the wrong department; it should be the Biology Department that is issuing out the program modification.

Senator Krantz: Yes, I thought that was the case.

Senator Randolph: This is taking directly out of the tracking system so it must have been a mismatch. We will get that corrected. Are there additional questions or comments? Hearing none. All those in favor of the 30 modifications, please signify by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

[\[View Program Modifications\]](#)

President Thompson: Thank you. Next on the agenda is Dr. Keith with our policy proposals.

Senator Keith: I have is a motion that’s coming from the Executive Committee, as we had quite a lengthy discussion about the research misconduct policy at our last meeting. Amy sent an email out on Saturday asking if you would consider the following motion. The motion is—I am asking you to endorse, not approve the current draft of the research misconduct policy. It was the draft presented at our last meeting with the changes that were made on the floor, which struck the language that said a person could serve on both inquiry and investigation panels subject with the approval of Research Council—“*with the approval of Research Council.*” Another little typo was suggested and we fixed that as well. I am asking you to endorse the current draft subject to the two provisions. I also sent you attached comments that the committee really did not have time to consider, so they are not part of the current draft, but we think those comments are worth looking at. Some of the comments the committee looked at and said, yeah, if we had more time, we would like to consider making this part of the policy and others came in after that. I also asked you at the last meeting to send me additional comments that you might have and I do not believe anybody did, but there is also a comment in there from a senator that sent it to me right before this meeting. Those comments will be given to members of Research Council and Graduate Council to take into account when they do their own discussion of the research misconduct policy. I did talk with Senator Van Hoy and Senator Relue, who is the chair of Graduate Council and a sitting member on Research Council, and they are willing to take our comments to their respected councils, but they are not really necessarily going to endorse all of them, but they are willing to ask their council members to consider them. The other provision is the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and this will have to be Mary or Linda, because most of us rotate off at our next meeting, but I am willing to help them do this, to find out when this policy will be posted and notify senators that it has been posted for 30 day review and I am willing to go through whatever is posted and give them a list of the things that’s been changed and the things that has not been changed. So subject to those two provisions, I am asking you to endorse the current draft of the research misconduct policy.

Past-President Humphrys: So we are just endorsing this, and it is going forward with all the things that you mentioned?

Senator Keith: Yes.

Past-President Humphrys: Then who looks at it after Graduate Council?

Senator Keith: Research Council. It goes to the senior leadership team, which is the president vice presidents, and then it will get posted for 30-day review. We will have the opportunity to comment during the 30-day review period, which is why once it's posted, we will let you know what has been changed and what hasn't been changed. Anything that has not been changed, we will forward the comments that were not acted upon to be part of the 30 day review.

Past-President Humphrys: I will love to *call the question* then.

Senator Kippenhan: Senator Schneider had her hands up.

Senator Schneider: I just have one proposition change. I just think it was a typo, under number 6, under the vetted by Academic Regulations Committee, "...of the administration." I think you meant "by the administration."

Senator Keith: Yes, probably. Where are you?

Senator Schneider: Number 6 under "...vetted by Academic Regulations Committee." That is all I want to say.

Senator Keith: That is right. I will make the change on my end. So, is there a *second*?

Senator Ortiz: *Second.*

Senator Keith: Thank you. All in favor of endorsing this policy, please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you very much.

[\[View Approved Research Misconduct Policy\]](#)

President Thompson: Thank you, Dr. Keith. Your committee has worked tirelessly in addition to other faculty senators on this. We certainly look forward to see what Graduate Council and Research Council has to say on this policy as well. All right, next on the agenda is our Constitution Bylaws and Rules update with Dr. Mark Templin.

Dr. Templin: So I looked for an appropriate slide format, and I found spilled ink on parchment <laughter>. This is going all the way back to August or September of last year. I just want to remind everyone what the charge is and the charge is these two bullet points out front, which are to update the

document's Constitution, Appendix, and Rules and to make the documents more user friendly. The sub-points under those are responses of the committee. For updating documents, we removed and changed language. The Constitution that we have right now was written around the time of the merger, so there is language necessary for the merger in there that is no longer necessary. We updated names and titles for various entities. For example, if you look in the current Constitution, it states "Provosts," plural—well, we no longer have that structure, so we are eliminating that. We are going to bring a "Band-Aid" legislation into the document. It has been recognized through the years that there are certain things that did not quite work, so previous senates have gone and done things to say, "well, what we really mean is this," and then they put that at the end of the Constitution documents. We are now bringing those in to the actual document rather than just keeping those with Band-Aids. The problem with Band-Aids is that you start losing track of them, so the more of them we can bring into the documents themselves, the clearer the documents will be. In terms of making the document more user friendly, we divided the provisions of the existing documents by themes and I will show you that in a second. We changed some of the provisions to make new documents more responsive to a changing situation, and we reduced the size of the Constitution to avoid constitutional crises. The more you put in the Constitution; the Constitution needs to go back to the entire faculty to be voted on if there is a change. In fact, you do not really want anything that can change in the Constitution because that is very time and labor intensive to change. What the next three slides are about is showing you just the articles. So rather get bogged down in all of the details, I just wanted to show you the big structure, which you can see by the article typos. If you went to the website, that is what we currently have and you'll notice there are 14 articles and we chopped that down to 11. If you print it out, it's about eight pages long, so we went from eight pages to three. For example, term is in there, officer, and duties, and so on, which those things could change, and if you contemplate a change, now you have to go back to the entire faculty to change those things. What we did over here, in Constitutions you should have described duties, so we have a scope, the responsibilities and jurisdictions, so, just how big is this thing called Senate and what should it be focused on. Membership eligibility is who is eligible to be on Senate and to be represented by Senate. The Executive Committee, the Executive Committee has to be named there because there are certain things that it does with the Board of Trustees and the president and so that has to be named, but we greatly reduced the reference to it in the Constitution. Article V says we are going to have this thing called bylaws and rules and those are going to be separate documents, but we are alerting everybody that the Constitution is part of a set of documents. If things go pear-shaped and the faculty as a whole is unhappy then there is provision there. Article VI is how you call a special meeting if you want to change things through direct democracy. The next two are basically freedoms, what are the rights of people who are not members of Faculty Senate, who are not senators—they can speak at Senate meetings and so on. Reaffirming the idea of shared governance is still in the Constitution. Amendment, interpretation and referendum are "how we make the smaller changes to the document?" Are there any questions about that before I move on? This is the existing Appendix; we are going to remove the word "appendix" to "bylaws." I had printed this off the website so it kind of did some funny stuff with formatting, but just so you can see; it had a lot about elections in the Appendix and implementation reconsideration of the actions taken by Faculty Senate in the name of faculty. College governance was here, which I'll talk about that in a second and then the amendment process carried over. It looks like it is a little longer, but it turns out that it is actually about the same size when you compare it side-by-side. Imagine you are a brand new senator in your college has elected you and you don't know how Senate functions—well, you really don't have to look at the Constitution, you can look at Articles I through IX and if you read them, you will get a pretty good idea

of everything you need to know to attend a Senate meeting and be functional, such as: what is the size of Senate, what is the term of senators, more clarification on what the Executive Committee does, what are officer duties, how do we hold a meeting, what does voting look like, the calendar of Faculty Senate, and what are the committees and what do they do. Then Article IX is the same thing as the old Article III and IV here. Then there is elections and the removal of officers, so if there are some problems or changes that need to be made, here is how we do that. Election of faculty and representation, this is people who represent Senate at the State of Ohio at the State House. To make it clearer, this is not UCAP and UCS and they are not technically the standing committees either. Article XII, this is because it is no longer a merger. The merger had college governance because this was in the context of merger, but we thought instead of linking it, we can pear-it down a little bit. College governance and instructions for newly forming college, in other words, it might be likely for college forums or something get reorganized, there should be some instruction in the bylaws to say what should the new college structure look like. Then finally, amendment. Are there any questions about bylaws? Okay, moving on. Existing Rules vs. Proposed Rules. Now, you will notice a lot of stuff that I think should have been in the bylaws are tucked away back in Rules. Think about this as rules for committees. If you are on a committee, what should the rules be? There are some committees that have many special rules, and this is rather lengthy, but if you are not on one of these committees then you probably will not need to read this. If you are on the Elections Committee, I am sure you know there are many rules on how to conduct an election. If you are on UCAP or the Committee on Sabbaticals, there are special rules for those committees. Article IV is how they change a rule. This maybe could go up because this is for all committees—what are the committees' responsibilities for reporting to Faculty Senate—we might think about moving that up for next year, I do not know. To some extent, we tried not to change too much substance, it is more reshuffling the deck and getting things so it follows themes and the sets of things. Are there any questions about the Rules? This is all scary stuff. The first time I have ever did a constitution was for the college constitution and everybody was glad that I was willing to take it on. Then Bill Gray, who some of you might know, comes up to me and say, you know, if you get a semicolon in the wrong place, our entire college's accreditation could be threatened. The sweat started breaking out of me <laughter>. The process from here, the Constitution requires 2/3rds vote of the entire faculty. It actually needs to be read twice at two consecutive regular Faculty Senate meetings in order to be received for faculty vote. The Constitution is received article by article and Senate votes on each article once at a time—2/3rds of you know this, but I do not know which 1/3rd does not <laughter>. Senate members may come with proposals from specific articles. Usually the way this works is it comes in the form like a consent agenda and any senator can say I want to talk a little more about article II or I want to talk more about article IV and we pull that up and talk about that or we can read the entire Constitution word for word. It technically should be read word for word, but it is possible to treat it as a consent agenda if Senate so chooses. Faculty members should see all three sets of documents at the time of voting if they are voting on the Constitution only. In other words, what is going to go out is the final form that Senate approves of the constitution and we are going to show them what the bylaws looks like. The bylaws and rules, Senate can change that with a majority vote, so that is not for the faculty to vote on, but simply Senate can change its bylaws rules later. We just felt that everybody needs to see what that is going to look like as a whole. Finally, it is a lengthy process and it could not be completed this academic year because if we start it now, it will go right up to the exam week, and that is just bad. The Constitution and Rules Committee members agreed to stay in placement next year to complete the process. In the fall we will be back and we'll fill out all of the details and 2/3rds of you will be here to vote on this. The last slide, I will like to thank my committee members: Bryan Bishop from

Pharmacy, Greg Gilchrist from Law, Wade Lee from Libraries, Temeaka Gray from Nursing, Abraham Lee from Health and Human Services, Jerry Van Hoy from Arts and Letters, Mohammed Niamat from Engineering, Don Wedding from Business, Robert Steven from Natural Sciences & Mathematics, Glenn Sheldon from Honors, and Prabir Chaudhuri from Medicine. Are there any questions about any of this before I end? Thank you. [\[View PowerPoint\]](#)

[Applause]

President Thompson: Thank you again. It is hard to believe that it has been since 2008 since we have updated these, so it is certainly needed and I look forward to having the document in place. Mark, thank you so much. Next on the agenda, we have competency-based education. You should have it; they been sent from Quinetta, a competency based education fact sheet.

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: Good evening. How is everyone doing? Thank you for inviting me to give you an update about CBE at the state-level as well as the University of Toledo level. About one-year ago, the Ohio Department of Higher Education allowed western governors to enter the state and provide competency-based education to our adults. They offer four programs, a couple thousand students, and the governor and the chancellor at that time really wanted all colleges and institutions in Ohio to have a chance to provide CBE. They created a taskforce, a steering committee that was open to all universities and colleges to participate—18 universities and institutions are participating on the steering committee. I am co-chair with Christine Models from Sinclair Community College. We also have representatives from ODHE; we have representatives from the IUC; we have representatives from the Ohio Community College Association, plus anyone else who want to participate at any given time. The charge of the steering committee is to make competency-based education understandable for institutions and provide tools and resources for those colleges and universities that want to implement. They hold special sessions for maybe the registrar to see how does this work in the registrar's system etc., which is something that is ongoing. We meet about every-other-month as a big group. We also meet a couple times a month through conference call with just the executive committee, which is ODHE as well. They are not mandating that everybody do CBE, they are just recognizing this is a different way for adults to learn that meets the needs of those who have the time to learn as much as they can during a special timeframe. It is a different pedagogy. This is kind of where we are at with online education 20 years ago, although, CBE has been around for 40 years and it is very common among a number of other things. About two years ago, I was charged with looking into CBE for the University of Toledo, so I traveled, went, and did a number of different things. We also decided at the state-level that western governors could provide this, but we felt that other colleges and universities could also provide this at a better way, and that is where The University of Toledo came in. There were also degrees that were not offered by other CBE institutions and we had some degrees that we thought might be a good fit for competency-based education. In January of this past year, the provost organized and called to faculty and staff to serve on the CBE taskforce for The University of Toledo. Bill Ayres and I co-chaired that and we have the following members: We have two dedicated instructional designers, Rachel Barnes and Michael Douglas, Jill Logan from IT is there, Beau Case from Libraries, Mary Humphrys who represents faculty, Linda Lewandowski from the College of Nursing, Sherry..., Shannon Newman, Senior Director for Academic Affairs and University College. We also have...from IR. We have Kim Pollauf because of the degree we decided to look into that sits in

University College and I know that Dean and I can work with her. We also have Julie Q from the Registrar Office. We have Stephanie Sanders from Enrollment Management and Jerry Van Hoy and Gina Roberts from Financial Aid. As you can see, we have a big...system because competency based education also works with every system. We decided to be strategic and deliberate and take our time to develop quality courses to pilot in the fall. These courses will look somewhat like an online course to begin with because we need to see how the systems work with it, right? We are working with Blackboard to help with helping us to set it up in the Blackboard system. You do a lot of scaffolding because when you do competency base education, it is not that you just go through a course as fast or slow as you can, but you go through till you master something and then...If you don't master it, you go back and re-learn it probably in a different way. You are also requiring them to master it at a certain level; it is not just going through and saying, oh, I passed this with a 70. You determine the mastery level, 90 or 95 and then that must be met before new material is released. We are in the..., we are making a lot of decisions and we're taking our time to make decisions because we have the Provost Office involved, Registrar, Enrollment Management, and Financial Aid. We are trying to look and as I said, we sent it to all the internal and external things that we have that might go with the competency-based education. We just started meeting weekly. Blackboard will be here to do consultation May 8 and 9th with faculty who have agreed to participate in this pilot project. We will also be doing faculty-wide competency based education. They will be doing that in May and they will be doing that in the fall because we recognize may not be here. It is good timing for the training for faculty involved because we are just finishing finals week. We have some answers and we have many questions. We are trying to bring everybody to the table in time to make those decisions. We have support of the president, provost, and the Ohio Department of Higher Education. It is nice to feel that we have that support. It is a nice initiative and it is the right thing to do for a certain set of population who can handle this type of pedagogy. Not every course or degree should be this way, but I think we've chosen one of the best ones. There is no individualized degree study that is competency base education served in the United States, so this would be the first one as well. So that is where we are at. I welcome any questions. I know we are on a tight timeline.

Senator Relue: Students who want to progress faster can progress faster for completing the course [*Indecipherable*] ...Can they take it longer?

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: Absolutely. It depends of the subscription model that you have. Some folks have a six-month subscription model, and you take all you can in six months and then you subscribe again. We have not decided exactly what to do with a semester base or a subscription model, but some would just say, if you do not get through it, subscribe for another six months or four months. There are many different models out there. It is also called different things such as self-pace. You hear many different words out there. I would say as many different words you have to describe it, there are as many different ways that it is. There is the purest CBE and then there is ones that is CBE-ish.

President-Elect Rouillard: First, I applaud you for doing this as a pilot for selecting courses to try it out with and I think that make more sense. I do have a question on the flyer that you sent out. On the last section on the first page where it says, "*how do we ensure quality?*" There is a sentence that says, "*third party partners are used to validate competencies and assessments,*" is that going to be part of the model here at UT?

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: No, we do not need that. We have quality matters and we have subject matter experts. Some do that in some of the community colleges and some do outside vendors, but we do not.

President-Elect Rouillard: But quality matters does go outside of the university, which goes to peer faculty.

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: But that is something we already do.

President-Elect Rouillard: So you are not doing any other kind of third party?

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: No, we are just bringing in our current partner of Blackboard to help with the scaffolding within the Blackboard system.

President-Elect Rouillard: So Blackboard is not going to determine what will be taught and how it will be taught?

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: No. They may provide suggestions if there is an assessment like, have you thought about doing this and have you thought about this. Learning outcomes have to be the same because it is the same course, so you cannot modify any of that and if there is, they will go through regular process of course modification.

President-Elect Rouillard: Which are the specific courses that you targeted?

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: Right now, we targeted three. Do you want to help me out with this, Mary?

Past-President Humhry: I think it is adobe, photo shop, and then Microsoft documents.

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: So those are very competency based courses, right? Those are good ones to start with, and so the individualized plan that we were looking at, we are building its own plan of study. So right now, it has a marketing piece to it, and that is again, something in this region. Research has shown that would be a good major to offer in Northwest Ohio and Ohio.

Past-President Humhry: I know the courses you just mentioned are offered here, so what is the restriction of a student who is not participating in CBE, can they take CBE courses?

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: At this time, it would not probably be a good thing to do a mixture in the pilot. We are still looking into the accreditation issues. Bill and I are looking with HLC to see how these CBE courses. Right now if you are competency-based education and you are not accredited, you are not eligible for financial aid. For the first few years, we will not be eligible for financial aid because we are

building a program, and you do not get the program approved until you have the program. Some things are going to be slow. We know that those in the past had taken three to five years to develop CBE programs when they usually done with a grant and staff of, four or five. That is not our model, but I am sure we can do that, and we can figure it out to see what else we can build as we move along. Bill, do you have anything to add?

Vice Provost Ayres: No.

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: Jerry, do you have anything to add?

Senator Van Hoy: No, I think you covered it pretty well.

Senator Krantz: You alluded to the...by the state towards western governors a couple of years ago, are these type of programs by institutions of the state...? Are they displacing them? What is the status?

Dr. Barbara Kopp Miller: So if you were to ask...have many adults around and we can share with western governors. Western governors is often very specific with...this. It is not a discipline degree, so it is not...I think if you would ask the colleges in..., they pick up a certain type of student that we would not get. Do you know what I mean? They meet a...niche that we currently do not meet so they would not gravitate to us. I did some research and there are four public universities that offers CBE that are accredited. The University of Michigan is accredited, so we talked with them and had interviews and things, and I have not heard that come up. Great questions. More to come and I will be glad to come back if you will like periodically. I am meeting monthly now with Amy and so as she goes into past presidency just so she can hear what's going on with this as well as University College because it keeps growing as well. I will keep her up-to-date and she can share with the Faculty Senate. Thank you.

President Thompson: Glenn, if you can come and update us on the LGBTQA Advisory Committee.

Senator Sheldon: If you can just pass these out, and yes, I picked purple on purpose. There are a lot of things on here that really don't need a lot of explanation, so maybe we should start lower, and then go back to the campus pride which is probably what most people know the most in. We are working on alumni affiliates with our sub committees. We have five subcommittees on our Advisory Board. The Advisory Board has grown very large. There are several members here today and about triple the number that are not on Senate. We are working with identifying alumni because obviously, that is a fundraising opportunity and resources that we have not tapped into. We have created the first ever LGBTQA student scholarship fund, which is named in honor of a former UT student and my late partner. We are not giving a scholarship away this year, but next year we hope to, and that is partly because we have not met the minimum that we needed to for the foundation to be able to allow us to give it away. Next week we are getting a check from the Holiday...Charity Gala who have LGBTQA, and initiatives and some funding, but I do not know how much that check is for. We are also planning a fundraiser this summer to raise funds for that. A lot of this is going to show how much I delegate because there is a services strategy plan and I did not know much about it, but, it is going forward and that is good news. I wanted also to point

out that if you do have students who identify as LGBTQA, and the student group is no longer called spectrum, it is called Prism. I had about 20 seconds to try to find them online and the easiest way was to Facebook, which I know many people are leaving for specific reasons, but I will find other ways to locate them. If you go to Prism UT on Facebook, you will find their website. One of the things that we have done is we formed a social group of LGBTQA, plus the Advisory Board. Our last meeting this semester is Friday, April 20, at Sip Coffee, which used to be Cricket West, am I correct.

Group: Yes.

Senator Sheldon cont'd: Thank you. I am not a coffee house person. We want to remind you that with the LGBTQA, that we use the “A” for allies. Our advisory board is made-up of many allies who do not identify with what we call the “inner circles,” the alphabet soup of identity politics.

Senator Kippenhan: I just wanted to let you know that Sip Coffee has an excellent tea as well.

Senator Sheldon: Thank you. I guess I am just not a hot beverage person. I have been there before and I will be there for this one. I want to invite all of you to come, but I not only invite you to come to the social group, but also if you will like to join our Advisory Board; we welcome allies and anybody who identify anywhere on that spectrum. Gender-neutral bathrooms, I know that Alaska barely defeated a transgender bathroom law yesterday. We will have more here at UT, more gender-neutral restrooms. We are working towards having that built into capital planning. The safe places, I call it “advanced” on here, but it is not really advanced, we updated it. If you have an old safe place sticker, we are not going to take it away from you. A lot of you were probably trained under the old one-hour training model, but the new model is three hours. It is much more relevant and much more current. It can be divided into two sections, not two equal 90-minute sections. If you think you want to review that or if you do not have a new sticker, you can get the sticker in a three-hour training class. If you consider, it also takes three hours to train the trainer in safe places, so please consider that as well. This last one just came across my desk just the other day. I do not know about you, but this time of the year, I get so many emails. I did not have time to look at it, but evidently, we are certified through the healthcare quality index, however we do not have a representative on the LGBTQ Community Advisory Board and so that is something that the board is going to take up. It also talks specifically about Health Science Campus, which has always been a concern to the board that the Health Science Campus has not been included enough—maybe we have not reached out enough or vice versa. They are specifically looking for Health Science Campus representation at certain events. There is a contact there on the handout. You will be able to do that if you wanted to do that or you can just get in touch with me and I will put you in touch with people who you are supposed to be in touch with. Briefly, this is what we call a campus-pride index and The University of Toledo has never done one before. This is a system that LGBTQA, plus students utilizes to some extent or another to determine what undergraduate schools they may attend. We actually got a 3.5 out of the 5. I put the URL on here. You can go in here and see specific breakdowns of all kinds of issues. As I pointed out on the handout, we got a 3.5 out of 5 and I learned that actually there are negative numbers. A 3.5 out of 5, I thought was not terribly bad, although there is room for improvement. The highest score was in counseling and health and student life, and the lowest score was LGBTQ recruitment and retention. If you get a chance to look into this more, I would encourage you to do that. One of the items that I didn't

notice, I think Faculty 180 may help identify faculty who do work in LGBTQ areas because that is one of the places that we did get a low score. But the people who worked on this, and this is the one thing I have to mention about not just this overall campus pride index, but everything that the Advisory Board does with the help from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Residence Life, and OMSS. We have become more collaborative than ever in trying to pull these things out and I think that may be one tool that helps us pull out that faculty are doing much more work and advocacy in those areas. That is all I have. Are there any questions or comments?

President Thompson: I just want to say one thing. With the new provost fellows that were announced, do you want to talk about that?

Senator Sheldon: I wondered rather to put it on here or not. It was something that our committee simply supported, but you probably have more information than I do. If you want to come up here and take my place, you are welcome to.

President Thompson: No, no, no, Dr. Mckether had sent out that. There is supposed to be two positions and they are going to be focusing on diversity, the provost fellows. One of the areas that he encourage for people to apply for is right in this particular area.

Senator Sheldon: We are very encouraged with that. You and I were part of the ad hoc committee that started looking into this. The Advisory Board was a little bit hesitant because 2/3rd of the Advisory Board is non-faculty, so they really did not understand what this meant and the impact it could have. I think it is a very positive step and it is a very step for also increasing our campus pride index.

President Thompson: Are there any questions for Glenn? Thank you so much for your leadership.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: Okay. Last, but not lease, Dr. Melissa Gregory, presidential fellow. Can you update us with anything new?

Dr. Gregory: I always come in the last five minutes. Thank you for allowing me to come back to several Faculty Senate meetings, I appreciate that. I am here once again to mention the proposed university level tenure and promotion guidelines. This document was draft in the summer of 2017 with a cross-college committee. It was pre-circulated in the early months of fall 2017, and it finally made it to Faculty Senate by November 1. At that point, it was determined that it needed some further revision and feedback from the various colleges, and that process was initiated and lasted through the end of fall semester till the first several months of the spring semester. It went back to Faculty Senate in kind of a finalized form on March 22, which was about two weeks ago. Now everyone had the chance to see it for a couple of weeks, and senators had an opportunity to bring it back to their constituents. We had a couple of conversations with colleges, and that matter got resolved, and it didn't actually change the document. The document is the same as you saw the last time. I received some feedback from the College of Medicine kind of last

night and this morning. I was getting some emails from multiple parties, so I wasn't sure where that conversation ended up, so I thought I would come since I am on the schedule and see if there are questions that I can answer.

Senator Sheldon: I was going to shoot you an email, and I am sorry I did not because this is a minor point. In reading the creative writing course or the creative arts portion, in creative arts we do not have peer review journals.

Dr. Gregory: You are right; if you look at the guidelines, they actually break that down. There is a section that talks about venues of note, and it actually does try to address that creative activity issue.

Senator Sheldon: We tried to use the phrase "editorial," but that might be a little problematic.

Senator Hefzy: Question, where does this go from now?

Dr. Gregory: Well, the hope was that we could ask Faculty Senate to endorse the guidelines as university policy and then it will be implemented in the fall for the 2018-2019 academic year. The guidelines suggested people going up for promotion need to announce that to their chair I believe by the 3rd week in March. Someone said, does that mean anybody who hasn't done that yet can't go up for tenure and promotion next year and I said, of course, not; the guidelines have to be in place for next year to even ask the people in March to announce to their chair.

Senator Hefzy: So this would be for year 2019, not 2018.

Dr. Gregory: I think ideally it will be fall 2018, although if there are colleges that feel they need more time with it, I suppose that would be potentially considered and it would be something discussed.

Unknown Speaker: *[Indecipherable]*

Dr. Gregory: I been trying to get out of a question that I been asked a couple of times, which the guideline has a statement which recommend that faculty who wish to seek tenure and promotion notify their chair and dean in March. This is merely to give chairs adequate time to make sure they can find external reviewers, but obviously, anyone who wanted to seek promotion and tenure in the fall 2018-2019 year would not be punished if they have at this point not told their chair several weeks ago. Does that makes sense?

Senator Maloney: I am not that familiar with Faculty 180, but I thought one of the factors, Dr. Gregory, was that it could notify your chair.

Dr. Gregory: Well, I think it is basically practice. If you want to go up for promotion, you should notify your chair, and you should do that in a timely manner. Are there any other questions?

President Thompson: So one of the things that I am going to ask maybe Joan to speak to this, sorry Joan, but we got some emails about asking to wait to delay. Is that what your faculty want to do?

Senator Duggan: Yes, very much. We had a College of Medicine executive meeting a couple of days ago and we want to bring this to Council, our council meeting is on the 20th. We will send out the documents as we usually do for the council meeting. Our people would like to talk this over face-to-face, so we are asking for the vote to be moved back until the April 24 Faculty Senate meeting?

President Thompson: So obviously, that is our very last meeting. Just so you know, from a business standpoint we got probably around 30 minutes for us to be able to do business at the last meeting and then we will conducting elections. I am going to throw it back to the floor of the Senate, anybody has any objections to allowing them to have that extra time and putting it on the floor for a vote of possible endorsement at our last meeting? Anybody has any issues with that?

Group: No.

Dr. Gregory: I should mention, Amy, if the meeting where you are plugging feedback is the 20th and the next Faculty Senate meeting is the 24th, then that is a very tight turnaround and I think for feedback. I would just ask if that feedback is coming, that it be given to me pretty much immediately right after the meeting happens. Maybe you can prioritize the points that are most important, and that would help me to identify issues right away.

Senator Duggan: We did send out the document in February and we had...a meeting and you all were very respectful, but essentially all of the changes that we talked about were in place. We want to make sure everyone looks at it.

Dr. Gregory: And I understand that. I would like it if you all had that time. I just want to remind you that it is kind of a compressed timeframe, and I am okay with that if you all are okay with that.

President Thompson: And I think our whole goal here is to try to have everybody get on board and we want everybody to have many opportunities. If we have to push it back, as long as you can meet Dr. Gregory's line of getting feedback. That is acceptable.

Senator Duggan: We will have David Giovannucci get in touch with you right after the meeting or you are welcome to come.

Dr. Gregory: Whatever is more efficient and whatever is more convenient for you. I will be happy to do that, so maybe both. That sounds good to me and so I will be back. Thank you all for putting up with me.

President Thompson: Can we give her a hand?

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: Well, thank you, and I am glad we can make that work. That brings us to the end of the agenda. Are there any items from the floor?

Senator Relue: We have our second symposium...is going to be Friday from 3-5:00 p.m. in the auditorium. The focused this time is...

President Thompson: Are there any other announcements?

Senator Kippenhan: The Toledo...Chemicals Society...speaker is Wednesday night in Fieldhouse 2100, Climate Change will Affect You. We are asking for all non-sciences to please attend so that the students can be buddied up with...can get more extra credit by attending.

President Thompson: That sounds terrific. Are there any other announcements before we adjourn? Can I have a motion to adjourn? Any opposed? Any abstentions? Meeting adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

V. Meeting adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Fred Williams
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.