

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 7, 2017**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>    Approved @ FS meeting on 11/21/2017

---

**Summary of Discussion**

**Chief Jeff Newton, Campus Safety: UT Chief of Police**

**Dr. Melissa Gregory, University Tenure and Promotion Guideline: Presidential Fellow**

---

**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-Elect:** President-Elect Rouillard called the meeting to order; Executive Secretary, Fred Williams called the roll.

**I.     *Roll Call: 2017-2018 Senators:***

**Present:** Atwood, Barnes, Bjorkman, Bonnell, Bouillon, Brakel, Bruce, Chattopadhyay, Denyer (substitute for L. Haughton), Dinnebeil, Duggan, Emonds, Frank, Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Hammersley, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy (substitute for G. Gilchrist), Kippenhan, Kistner, Kovach, Leady, Lee, Lundquist, Maloney, Menezes, Modyanov, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Said, Schneider, Spongberg (substitute for D. Krantz), Steven, Tucker-Gail (substitute for J. Hoy), Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding (substitute for S. Ariss), Weldy, Williams, Wittmer, Woolford, Xie

**Excused absences:** Compora, Duggan, Ferris, Hefzy, Jaume, Lecka-Czernik, McLoughlin, Monsos, Ortiz, A. Thompson, White

**Unexcused absences:** Edgington, Hall, Schroder, Sheldon, G. Thompson, Willey

**II. *Approval of Minutes:*** Minutes are not ready for approval.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Welcome to our sixth meeting of Faculty Senate for the 2017-2018 academic year. President Amy Thompson is currently attending the Mid-American Conference Leadership with fellow Senator Holly Monsos this week and therefore, will not be at today's Senate meeting.

I will read President Thompson's Executive Report: "The Faculty Senate Executive Committee would like to thank all of you who attended the faculty forum last week with Representation Ramos. This was a well-attended event and many important issues in higher education were discussed. Special thanks to President-Elect Rouillard for helping us improve our faculty engagement efforts. In Spring Semester, we will have another faculty engagement workshop. We will announce the date of this event in the near future.

At our October 24<sup>th</sup> Faculty Meeting, President Thompson asked for volunteers for three university committees. She would like to thank those who volunteered for these committees. Senator Michael Kistner and Dr. Kevin Eagan will serve on the Parking Committee. Past-President Mary Humphry and Dr. JJ Sheu have agreed to serve on the dining committee. Senators Tom Atwood and Brenda Leady will also serve on the Bookstore Committee. At today's Faculty Senate Meeting, Senator Atwood will deliver an update on the Bookstore Taskforce created to help accomplish our goal of a faculty assessment regarding access and affordability.

At our last Faculty Senate meeting, the issue of campus safety and the UT free speech policy came up. Senators expressed concern about ensuring our students, faculty and staff have received the ALICE training for an active shooter on campus. President Thompson has asked Chief Jeff Newton to speak at today's Faculty Senate meeting as a follow-up to that conversation.

In terms of our regular policy updates HB 66 continues to be a topic of discussion at the State House. The House Higher Education committee accepted a new substitute version of HB66 this week. Here are a few of the changes from the previous version.

- Removes ODHE and IUC as the co-chairpersons of the study committee, but not as members of the committee.
- The Speaker and Senate President will appoint three Members each and designate one from each chamber as the co-chairpersons.
- The amendment speeds up the process for appointments to 30 days following enactment of the bill.

The bill is expected to be amended further during the next committee hearing. The expected amendments are as follows:

1. Add two, ex-officio, non-voting students to the study committee.
2. Require the study committee to review the faculty composition at each institution based on employment status, including tenured faculty, full-time tenure track faculty, full-time non-tenure track faculty, and part-time faculty.
3. Specify that the members appointed by the Senate President and House Speaker must include minority and majority party members.

Again, if you are interested in testifying or providing a written statement please contact the UT Office of Government Relations.

Many of you may have read several of the published articles and editorials regarding the loss of the UT PA Program's accreditation. UT has been pummeled in many of these articles and opinion pieces. One editorial published in the Toledo Blade on October 31<sup>st</sup> entitled "UT Needs a Culture Change" was particularly disturbing and crossed the line in its comments regarding our university. This article makes accusations that we are "cheating our students" out of an education. The article further suggests we are a "mediocre university" with "poor morale" and the only way we are going to improve is to bring in highly paid world renowned faculty. Perhaps one of the most offensive comments in the article is calling UT "Bancroft High". We already

have world class faculty and mediocrity is never accepted at UT. Enough is enough. This is a clear example of fake news.

The loss of accreditation for the Physician Assistant program is an anomaly. To project this one unfortunate situation as emblematic of the rest of UT's programs is not only inaccurate, it's unfair and can actually adversely impact our students in finding jobs and in the recruitment of highly sought after faculty.

As a comprehensive university, the real story is the number of programs that UT has that are not only in good standing with their accrediting agencies, but have been so since their inception. This is a result of the expertise and dedication of faculty and administrators who understand the importance of providing an excellent learning environment for our students.

President Sharon Gaber and her senior leadership team are taking the Physician Assistant program's situation very seriously. Comprehensive actions are being taken to correct the problems outlined by the program's accrediting agency and to ensure that its students are given every available opportunity to receive an education that will help them succeed beyond the classroom.

In response to this article, President Thompson with input from members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee wrote a response to the Toledo Blade Editorial that will hopefully be published. A copy of this was sent to you in the meeting materials... Articles such as these devalue our student's degrees and can even hurt their job searches. Comments targeting our hard working staff and faculty are offensive and should not be tolerated. Now is the time for us to come together and not let the misperceptions of the media divide us. UT is strong and we will continue to shine regardless of the publication of biased media. Together is better. Go Rockets!"

Are there any questions or comments? Well, in that case we will move along with our reports. First on the agenda is Provost Hsu. I didn't see him come in.

**Vice Provost Ayres:** Dr. Hsu is running a little late. He is coming from the deans' meeting that was held on the Health Science Campus. May I ask that you perhaps rearrange the agenda a little bit?

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Yes, I will do that. We can move on to undergrad curriculum proposals with Dr. Cappelletty.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** All right. This week we have one new course proposal and nine course modifications that the committee is recommending for approval. I'm going to break these into two parts to facilitate hopefully this week. We are going to first focus on the new course proposal which happens to be Computer Sciences which is an Acrobat course. It is using Adobe Acrobat as a lecture-based course. Students will be able to create, edit, and share via PDF files in a simulated workplace environment. It is a three credit hour course and what was listed in the syllabus looked appropriate for the contact time that was listed. Is there any discussion on the new course proposal? All in favor of voting on the new course please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you very much.

**Senator Hammersley:** I would like to make a comment. It seems three credit hours for learning how to use the Acrobat is excessive. I will not stand in the way of approving it, but I bet-you everybody here is using Acrobat and it didn't take us three hours to do it—it's just a thought.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** I won't discount that, but they are also using it at a higher level than what we are using it as. They are going to be creating---

**Senator Hammersley:** I'm talking about the actual composition changing and---

**Dr. Cappelletty:** They are going to be creating documents, forms, and so forth.

Okay, the course modifications: I'm going to start with the two Honor courses because we have Dr. Pryor and Dean Appel here from the Honors College to address any concerns or questions that anybody might have. So again, what is happening at my committee level is simply the changes to the title of the course and catalog descriptions. The Core Curriculum Committee will be addressing the issues of these courses being humanities. Since Dr. Monsos is not here this week, I don't believe that's being brought before Senate this week. The changes are the title changes which they dropped the "Innovation" for Ideas and Society I and II. The catalog description is a little bit longer because we are allowed more description in the catalog with these names. I know conversation has gone on between the Honors College personnel and Dr. Lundquist in the English Department as it relates to some of the changes that may affect her department as honor students may be taking more composition based courses. Does anybody want further dialogue?

**President-Elect Rouillard:** I just have a couple of questions. You said the "Innovation" part is being dropped from the title, right?

**Dr. Pryor:** Just a point of clarification. Honors 1010 will now be "Ideas and Society" and then Honors 1020 would be "Innovation."

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Okay.

**Dr. Pryor:** We are just splitting that sequence up.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Okay. My other question is, are these TAG courses? Do I understand correctly, they are TAG courses?

**Dr. Pryor:** We are in discussion with Angela McCockney about handling the TAG courses since it is going to be humanities. The bottom-line for this curriculum shift is in many ways to be more truthful about the function of this path, and it has always been it. It originally emerged from a Great Books program. But somehow, and I am still not quite clear how it happened, you have it as composition. There are changes at the state level about who can teach comp. classes and while these will continue to be intensive courses, our faculty expertise is in the area of interdisciplinary humanities, so it is much more reflective of what we...

**President-Elect Rouillard:** So that makes it entirely appropriate for you to add, but I thought that TAG courses and OTM courses could not be Honor courses, am I mistaken?

**Dean Appel:** There's been discussion about that on how that is interpreted because any non-honor student can actually take an Honors course with the permission of the instructor. So I am going compare statewide with other Honor programs to try to figure out how to approach that and make it uniformed.

**Past-President Humphrys:** As far as the Honor courses being in OTM, the state has really pushed back against that because they feel OTM courses need to have kind of a generic general audience.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** But I don't know if that applied for TAG as well.

**Past-President Humphrys:** I don't know about the OTM part...

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Do we want to handle all the modifications as one vote?

**Group of Senators:** Yes.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Before we do that, along the lines with Senator Hammersley's comment about the previous computer science course, 1510 has three new topics and the topics go one week at a time, so essentially, it is equivalent to adding three weeks to the two credit course, which is not quite in line with what we typically require for a change from a two credit hour.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Well, the three topics as I recall from the syllabi were added, but the number of weeks off of which things were being delivered is expanded out. The contact time I think stretched a little bit for all the material to allow the students to actually perform each of the content areas—that is how I interpreted.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** It looked like they were doing a topic a week, but I defer to your examination of the syllabus.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** So the Computer 1510, title and credit hour change, Digital Imaging is going to three credit hours. We also expanded the description and changed the title. Computer 2530, Intermediate Adobe Photoshop, this is actually sort of cleaning up some missed business. Back in 2011, the title and description were changed and approved through Senate, but did not appear in Banner, so they are bringing it forth again to get a new vote on the books to move it through. So they've already made the changes and have been teaching the changes for several years now, so that's what going on with Computer 2530. NBC 3320, this is a course that had previously been taught to both Pharm D students as well as VSPS students. With the new Pharm D curriculum, the Pharm D students will no longer be taking this, so it will just be for the VSPS students. They've expanded out the content to broaden what they are delivering to the VSPS students to better prepare them for post graduate training and potentially employment. So they are expanding out the material within the course. The next four courses PHPR 3450 and 3460, 4450 and 4460 are all part of a six course laboratory series for the Pharm D students. Inadvertently, the fifth course in the series at the graduate level, I did not realize I was using an inactive course number and so the registrar has requested that we change that number away from the one that is already archived in the system as inactive. In order to keep the course theories sort

of numerically making sense, we are changing all six courses in the series to end in a five as opposed to ending in a zero. So it is simply a course number change for those four courses. Are there any questions? Are there any comments?

**Senator Bonnell:** *Motion to approve.*

**Dr. Cappelletty:** All in favor please signify by saying, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions?  
*Motion Passed.* Thank you.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Thank you, Dr. Cappelletty. Next, we will ask Provost Hsu to give his report. Provost Hsu, are you ready to give your report now?

**Provost Hsu:** Absolutely.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Okay.

**Provost Hsu:** I had two meetings on the Health Science Campus and I thought my third meeting today was there too, so I kept waiting and waiting and no one showed up<laughter>.

I have several items that I want to report to the Senate. One, we had a very successful event to help celebrate our new tenure or promoted faculty members. We had 53 faculty members who achieved tenure or promotion that participated. UT News will be publishing an article next week with the names of the faculty we honored at this special event as well as a photo of the group. I don't know if you are aware, but Dr. Gaber brought a new tradition to the University — this is the third time we have held a special tenure and promotion reception where each promoted or tenured faculty member is asked to select a book that made a difference in their lives. Each faculty member has an opportunity to pick one book that had the greatest influence on their lives or careers and the library will include that book in the University library collections with a book plate inside of the book cover with the inscription “This is in Honor of the Achievement of Professor so and so”. The book will become a permanent part of the library's collection.

[Applause]

**Provost Hsu cont'd:** The second item I want to report to you is, I've been trying to find new ways to interact with faculty on an informal basis. The first group I met with last year was the Distinguished University Professors group and I intend to meet with them each year. For the first time, last week I met with a group of new tenure track faculty members, 12 of them were from the main campus and several were from Nursing. I will go to the Health Science campus and meet with the College of Medicine and Life Sciences faculty separately because apparently they have a similar size group. It was good to hear what the new faculty had to say, and learn about the challenges they are facing. I would encourage all of you as tenure track faculty to reach out to our new faculty and help to make their career a success. They are very enthusiastic about teaching and their scholarly work.

The third item I want to give you an update on, back in September I talked to you about offering a Winter Intersession pilot program. This is not yet a formal winter intersession, but a pilot program. This week the registrar will send out an email blast to all students, letting them know that we now have 10 classes we are offering this Winter Intersession and that the classes include

both undergraduate and graduate courses in various formats – including face-to-face, online and blended. As I mentioned the last time we talked about this initiative, this is going to be an experiment. We are going to collect data and then provide it to the Faculty Senate for evaluation so we can plan for the future as to whether it is a good idea or not to move forward with this.

The fourth item, many of you know that this fall we started to use Faculty 180 reporting software for tenure and promotion. So everyone that went up for tenure and promotion used this online system. I am pleased to report that the system is working well in spite of the fact that we had some problems; there were no problems that Dr. Ayres and his team were unable to resolve very quickly. We also have a steering committee for Faculty 180 with representatives from Faculty Senate UCAP for both campuses. This group is working with the Provost's Office advising us on how to implement it, not only for this academic year, but also helping us to plan for moving forward. Based on their suggestion, we have decided that we are going to expand the usage of Faculty 180 during the next academic year. So in addition to using Faculty 180 for all faculty who are going up for promotion and tenure, we will also ask all faculty who are going through tenure review to use Faculty 180 beginning in the fall of 2018. So all faculty members who are going through their first-through-fifth year review will be required to use Faculty 180. I am pleased to say that it is a very convenient system, in fact, I talked with some of you who served on either CTC or DTC, and the feedback I received is that despite the fact that you can't spread everything out on your desk, it is working really well because you can stay home in the comfort of your living room and review all the dossiers. You can have access to the online system 24 hours a day, so you don't have to go to a room where it is normally locked to get access and where if more than one person wants the same file at the same time, you have to fight for it. So the advantage of using Faculty 180 for first year through fifth year review is that, especially for the first year faculty, if they use it every year, by their fifth year, they can spend 15 minutes and they are ready for their promotion and tenure. I think that was a great suggestion from the steering committee and we are working to implement their suggestion.

I would also like to remind you that all faculty members have access to Faculty 180 right now, so if you would like to start using it, you can log on and begin to input your materials. If you have any questions, please reach out to Dr. Bill Ayres or email [Faculty180@utoledo.edu](mailto:Faculty180@utoledo.edu) and you will receive a response very quickly. I can foresee sometime in the not too distant future, that post-tenure reviews, ARPAs, etc. will eventually go online with Faculty 180, so we prefer that the sooner you are able to become familiar with the system, the better that will be.

I see that Dr. Melissa Gregory just walked into the room. She's been leading an *ad hoc* committee that was appointed by the Faculty Senate to develop a set of tenure and promotion guidelines for the university. I see from the agenda that Dr. Gregory is going to provide the Senate with a presentation on her work. Dr. Gregory conducted an enormous amount of research on best practices of tenure and promotion guidelines at 40-50 universities across the country. While conducting her research, she found only one institution that did not have a set of guidelines online, so the majority of the universities across the nation have their policies available online. Dr. Gregory consulted broadly with faculty and administrators throughout the university and has already talked with them about the many suggestions that were made by

faculty, deans, and others. I want to thank Dr. Gregory for her efforts and for the great work of the entire committee. I know that President-Elect Rouillard served on the committee. I want to thank everyone who served on this committee.

This concludes my remarks. I would be happy to answer any questions, but on the other hand, I know that you have a very full agenda this afternoon.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** No, there's time. Are there any questions for the Provost?

Well, in that case we will move on to the next item on our agenda, which is Dr. Larissa Barclay, who is the Chair of the Academic Programs Committee. She will walk us through some of the program proposals along with some comments from those programs themselves.

**Dr. Barclay, Chair of Academic Programs Committee:** So our committee received a proposal for modification for the Honors program. Primarily, the Honors program is recommending a modification to decrease the number of current minimum of credit hours from 33 to 27. You will see as I go through the modification as to what courses they were actually looking to make changes to. The proposed effective term for this will be Fall 2018. So as you see on the screen here, as I stated previously, the current minimum credit hours that are required are 33, the proposed minimum credit hours are reduced to 27. Listed here, you see the current courses that are required for certification for a degree for the Honors College program. Listed here are the proposed course changes for certification or for the degree program. As you see in the present courses, you have Honors 1010, 1020, 2020, 2030, 4950 and 4960. The propose courses include Honors 1010, 1020, 2010, which is a modification, 2020, 2030, which is current, 3010, which is a modification as well as 4950 and 4960, which are currently required. The revised program was developed during the academic year 2016 – 2017 by the faculty of the Honors College with input from the Honors Advisory Council, comprising the records from all the colleges conferring undergraduate degrees. The consensus goal was to open new avenues for students to graduate with their Honors College medallion. The proposed new honors program: One, continue the tradition of students meeting some of their honors course requirements through JSHC courses as well as through Honors courses in their academic colleges. Two, retain flexibility for their colleges to design their undergraduate honors experience to accommodate their particular curricular requirements. In the process, all colleges are finalizing the semester in accordance with the new state directives. Three, provides JSHC students with two options for earning their JSHC medallion. There are two tracks; you have the blue medallion requirements, which are nine credit hours. The requirements for the blue medallion include courses, Honors 1010, 2010, 2020 or 2030 and Honors 3010, 4950, or 4960, plus the 18 hours from their home college. The second track is the gold medallion requirements, 15 credit hours are required. The courses that are recommended are Honors 1010, 1020, 2010, 2020, or 2030. As you see the notation here, they may take both required multicultural courses from JSHC. Honors 3010, 4950, 4960 and Honors 4950 and 4960 or Honors 3010 and either Honors 4950 or 4960.

**Senator Keith:** Can you go back to the previous page?

**Dr. Barclay:** Yes.



**Senator Keith:** I do not understand the distinction between having to take 3010, 4950 or 4960 as well. So you have to take one of those and then you have to take one in the next group, but it says you have to take two in the next group. It seems to me that the requirements are 1010, 1020 and [you] have a choice on the third line, but ultimately, you have to take 4950, 4960 and 3010, am I wrong?

**Dr. Pryor:** Your choices in a gold medallion, you can take 3010 and either 4950 or 4960.

**Senator Keith:** But how does that add up to 18 hours then? Oh, it's 15 hours. But then the last line---

**Dr. Pryor:** We've tried reformulating this all sorts of ways to make it as clear as possible. Basically, so right now we have as a seminar developed and it's going to be 3010 till we figure it all out.

**Senator Keith:** So the fourth line really is just confusing, right?

**Dr. Pryor:** Yes.

**Senator Keith:** So if you get rid of the fourth line then it will still say what you want it to say where you have a choice in 4950, 4960, or 3010 etc.?

**Senator Lee:** Essentially, you have to take two.

**Senator Kippenhan:** Where it says, "plus so many hours in your home college," is that at the honors level in your own college?

**Senator Rouillard:** Yes.

**Dr. Barclay:** President-Elect Rouillard, do you have a question?

**President-Elect Rouillard:** No, that was the same question that I had.

**Dr. Barclay:** Were there any other questions?

**Senator Lundquist:** A lot of these just look like numbers to a lot of us, are there course titles?

**Dr. Barclay:** I'm not sure; let me scroll back.

**Dr. Pryor:** Well, they would've been entered into the system. This is just an appendage because sitting on the Program Committee myself, sometimes when the reports come in—and we just had this happen about a month ago—everything is just scrambled together.

**Senator Lundquist:** Can you tell us the course titles?

**Dr. Pryor:** Sure. Honors 1010 and 1020, it will be Ideas & Society and Innovation & Society. Honors 2010, 2020, and 2030—2010 is the new course that was passed at the last meeting, that's the Multicultural Toledo course. Then 2020 is our Multicultural Literature class with the U.S. focus. The 2030 is the Multicultural Literature with non-U.S. focus. Then 3010 was the new course that was passed at the last Faculty Senate meeting which is the Community Engagement class. Then 4950 and 4960 are seminars.

**Senator Lundquist:** So the seminars are courses that would have evolved in the process?

**Dr. Pryor:** Yes. Those are the numbers, for instance right now we are currently teaching...

**Dr. Barclay:** Were there any other questions?

**Past-President Humphrys:** I just have one. Have you had any indication from the Core Curriculum Committee about your request to change those Honors 1010 and 1020, is it humanity courses? The only reason I ask is, will that be a big deal? Does that put a wrench in any of this if, let's say it wouldn't happen?

**Dr. Pryor:** Certainly from a student perspective, and I said this before, *[Indecipherable]* humanities, these courses 1010 and 1020 historically came out of the Great Books program. They will remain humanity courses. I have forwarded all this information several weeks ago to Dr. Monsos, so she knows about all of this. *[Indecipherable]*. We think it is best for the students. *[Indecipherable]*.

**Senator Keith:** I have a question about this. Is a thesis still required? Will they be taking it at the departmental level?

**Dean Appel:** Not all the colleges actually have an honors course at that level. We are working on making sure we're introducing these courses and developing them within the colleges that don't have those. It varies from college to college. But, yes, a thesis is required for capstone or artistic achievement, which is very different depending on the program, but, then they [do] have a mechanism in place to recognize the thesis capstone or artistic achievement courses.

**Senator Lundquist:** Is it the students' choice whether they take the blue route or gold route or is that the colleges'?

**Dean Appel:** Well, that depends on the college. The colleges right now are doing their own curriculum review on which track and what that track will look like. So for example, Engineering has already decided that they are going to the blue track which will require Honors 1010 and 3010 because that would be best for their students.

**Dean Appel:** So the students will have a choice in some of the colleges and Arts and Letters aren't quite there yet, and we don't have much flexibility in how we do it.

**Dr. Pryor:** We are initiating that conversation and those are the documents that I sent the Curriculum Committee. At this point, it will be my recommendation that we stick with the gold track in our college because that's what we have been doing, but it is a conversation.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** So actually the big difference between the two tracks is taking the multicultural course in your college or not in your college, right?

**Senator Ohlinger:** It is allowing more space for courses in your own academic college that are Honor courses which was a big component of it as well.

**Dean Appel:** Yes, because there is nothing in the blue track that says you have to take 2010 and 3010. It does have minimal words, so each college will define their blue track.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Okay.

**Dr. Barclay:** Are there any other questions?

**Senator Bonnell:** Well, what is the question? What are we being asked as Senate to evaluate here because I feel that I have no frame of reference what-so-ever as a senator to evaluate anything you talked about for the last 15 minutes? I think it is wonderful to have such an honors program, but for a lot of us, pointing out the content what these courses are, I have no idea based on these course numbers and I haven't looked in the catalog to see what these courses are and what the content is or whether this is in line with what other colleges and universities do, what distinguishes an Honor student from somebody that is not an honor student. What is our due service? I understand there is a conversation going on here, but I really don't understand the context on what we as senators are being asked about this. Are we approving change to the Honors program?

**Dr. Barclay:** Yes. So the recommendation was made by our committee to approve the modifications as submitted by the Honors College, which is why I am presenting it before senators today.

**Senator Ohlinger:** It might be helpful that I give [you] a historical context to this. The Jesup Scott Honors College as a college is relatively new. Before then there was an honors program, but really the honors program existed in academic colleges and they basically set their own requirements. This is kind of a step to really standardize it somewhat. It is just not a single track; as you can see, a couple different tracks still provide some flexibility. When you look at the consortium of what makes an honor college, this very much fits into line with the curriculum, hours, and expectations, capstone and thesis. This was really a step coming from the Honors College. So it is relatively new I guess because we didn't have an academic college before, just a program.

**Dean Appel:** This represents actually a higher than average level of many characteristics of an honors program nationally. So the average is 10% of the total credits required for graduation, 27 is above that for an average 123. Many honors programs or colleges in the country do not require thesis, capstone or artistic achievement, and that's always been a hallmark of this college and one of its strengths. The honors courses are distinguished by being multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary depending on how you talk about it. Then they tackle content in more depth and/or breadth than a standard non-honors course would, and that is true. The interdisciplinary is the characteristics within college courses. If you go out to the academic colleges and to their programs, their honor courses challenge the students in depth and breadth of those academic subjects. So you see the honors college portion and then there are the respective academic college portions which are being reviewed now in individual colleges and provide the remainder of the honors colleges...

**Senator Bonnell:** These changes give colleges and students more flexibility and ways to expose them to create their own honors program.

**Dean Appel:** Yes, because there's been this history of it. Several college professional schools on campus are very much demanding of curriculum requirements for certification primarily. It is difficult for all of them to do, have as many choices or mesh as many courses outside of their academic major as for example, Arts and Letters will be able to do it. So that was the inspiration, the flexibility while we're maintaining a really high quality experience.

**Senator Bonnell:** I am just wondering in the context of why these changes are being proposed, and what the point of it was, and [what] question do we have to answer?

**Dean Appel:** Fair question.

**Senator Lundquist:** So is it the philosophy in the Honors College and by extension, the university that an honors student that goes to the Honors College should have a humanities based honors experience?

**Dean Appel:** Yes, in fact, we give that encouragement. The value to any of the students in our program of that two sequence humanities course is that they get much more experience in critical thinking, deep reading of texts, they get communication practice, creativity because the nature of assignments we can do in the smaller classes. Those are all skills whether you want to call them soft skills or life skills or whatever—students then take with them into each of their respective academic programs. To such an extent that it represents honors directors from Nursing, HHS, and Engineering. The Honors directors value those skills and so we feel that is a foundation for students in all disciplines and it can serve them well as they go out to their majors. We have been impressed by that very common perspective.

**Senator Lundquist:** In addition to the 1010 and 1020, there is also the multicultural course selective humanities credit.

**Dr. Pryor:** The new course, Multicultural Toledo, we are working towards getting a gen ed. social science. But the other two literature based courses, UT diversity requirements, but they have a more humanities...

**Senator Bjorkman:** So to clarify, the specific proposal here today is to change the minimal number of hours from 33 to 27 and then introduce two new tracks, the blue and the gold medallion.

**Dr. Barclay:** Correct. Those two tracks are listed here for your review. The blue medallion track is nine credit hours, plus the 18 hours in their home college. The gold medallion is 15 hours and 12 hours in their home college.

**Senator Ohlinger:** *Motion to approve.*

**Senator Gail-Tucker (substitute for J. Hoy):** *Second.*

**Dr. Barclay:** All in favor please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions?  
*Motion Passed.* Thank you.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Thank you, Dr. Barclay. Next on the agenda, we have Dr. Mark Templin who **will** give us an update on the Constitution and Rules Committee.

**Dr. Mark Templin, Chair of Constitution and Rules Committee:** I am here today to give you an update on what's happening with the current Constitution, Appendix, and the rule. I met with the Executive Committee back in, I believe it was the first week of, September to talk about what was needed. The Executive Committee gave me a charge and I passed the charge on to the Constitution and Rules Committee members and then I started working on the Constitution. I sent this draft out to the Constitution and Rules Committee electronically, I want to say it was the middle of October, the 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup> of October. Then the "roof fell in on me" and that's all I really got done, except a little bit of tweaking with what I am calling, the bylaws. My students went out to schools and I have thousands of lesson plans to look at, and so, that's been taking my time for the last month or so. So, what you see before you is really a draft of the simplification of the current Constitution. So Article I starts with the scope. Its scope is basically, what is Faculty Senate and what does it do. Then Article II refers to its responsibilities and jurisdiction. Then it moves on to who is eligible to be a senator. Then we are going to have this thing called an executive committee. Then Article IV is basically saying that Senate is going to have this thing that is called bylaws and rules. The reason for that change is that it is more consistent with Roberts Rules of Order that you have. It affect Faculty Senate as a board and boards have committees and boards are bounded by bylaws, and so, we have a group that's constituted itself which is the university faculty in setting up a board to govern itself. The board is going to function by the bylaws and the rules are rules for committees and so that is the distinction, that the bylaws govern the board and the rules are instructions for committees. Article VI have to do with what I like to think about as "what happens if it all goes horribly wrong"—this is who can call a special meeting—the president of the university can call a special meeting or the president of Faculty Senate, and so that is in there as an option. Non-member rights, that's the same as the current Constitution and then there's the statement on shared governance, which is very important. Article IX is about, how does an amendment of the Constitution happens. Article X is interpretation, which was in this current Constitution. So in the event of an ambiguity in the interpretation of any provision of the Constitution, its bylaws and/or its rules,—you can say it's the appendix for rules. The meaning of such provision shall be determined by a simple majority vote of the Faculty Senate. Then there's Article XI that has to do with a referendum and it is actually taken by the Senate in the name of University faculty and it may be reconsidered by the University faculty in accordance with the referendum procedure established by Faculty Senate and its bylaws. And then I started to map out some amendment history so that anybody in the future who wants to look at this and get some sense of where this document has been through time. They will be able to go back and find previous burden of documents. This is what I gotten done. Currently the appendix that is going to be bylaws is now 26 pages long and I am waiting through that. I felt like it got to make sense to me and then I'll explain it to the committee and get the committee to see where the holes in my thinking are, and so that is where we are at.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Are there any questions or comments?

**Senator Kippenhan:** So when you are saying 2/3<sup>rds</sup> majority vote, would that be a majority vote of those present during a Senate meeting or would that be an electronic vote?

**Senator Templin:** Which place are you referring to?

**Senator Kippenhan:** You have it in multiple places—there’s a 2/3rds majority vote and there’s a similar majority vote. Is that senators present at the Senate meeting or would that be an electronic vote of all faculty?

**Dr. Templin:** So that’s one of the issues. If you look at the current Constitution as written, it’s a written vote of the entire faculty. Now, it passes through my mind that was changed to an electronic format a few years ago, but it is not here. So if Senate practice that, that there is some electronic procedure, that’s one of the things we need to capture. Those are the kinds of things when you start trying to change this, we are going to have to direct someone to them bylaw to say, it is going to be 2/3rds as written in this bylaw. The problem is that bylaw doesn’t exist right now as such. I’m sure if we go back through the Minutes there is going to be something. I’m sure there is guidance in the Minutes that says this is what we actually do, but that is one of the things that the committee has to track down. Now, the question is, the existing Constitution has a way to amend the Constitution which says written vote, do we want to do that or is the new process the way we are going to follow it?

**President –Elect Rouillard:** Is there anything else?

**Senator Giovannucci:** I know it’s an awful lot of work. Thank you for taking this on. I worked with you on other constitutional things and it’s a lot of efforts---

**Dr. Templin:** Yes, you were part of the three-year plunge that we took in Grad Council.

**Senator Giovannucci:** With this, this requires changing the Constitution as well as the so-called “Appendix” and bylaws---

**Dr. Templin:** Right.

**Senator Giovannucci:** I assume both of those things will have to be approved by the whole body, all the faculty, right?

**Dr. Templin:** Yes. As I said, this is just an update. We are not anywhere remotely close to a vote on anything. It hasn’t been approved by the committee yet. This is just “let’s talk” and then figure out what we want and get some direction for the future.

**Senator Giovannucci:** So when does those come to vote? Is it going to be part in some way or are you going to approve both the new Constitution and the new bylaws at the same time?

**Dr. Templin:** I think it is going to have to be Constitution, bylaws, and rules. Because the rules themselves are really important because the rules are things like U-CAP and the University Committee on Sabbaticals—there are some important rules there about how those function as well. I had thought we were going to do the Constitution and then do the bylaws and rules separately, but there is only one way to do it which is to have the faculty as a whole approve this in principle and then just continue to work on the status... until faculty have seen everything and then go for one final last vote. So we could do a hybrid kind of model. I don’t want to open up a constitutional crisis by having a new constitution and old appendix because that is going to get really confusing really quickly.

**Senator Giovannucci:** Thanks.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Is there anybody else? Okay. Thank you, Dr. Templin.

Well, that brings us to “other” on our agenda, which is the Campus Safety and Free Speech update by Jeff Newton.

**Jeff Newton, UT Campus Chief of Police:** Thank you. I promise I will be brief. I understand there were some questions on what UTPD and the University of Toledo is doing as it relates to active shooters, the ALICE training, and also increase teachers itself. I will touch on some of those, but first, thank you for your great work. I attended every Rocket Launch this Summer and I started out with we, the Police Department operate as if you did a careful evaluation of all police departments in Ohio and selected our department, and the reality is, we are here for the students, but the students are here for you. Thank you for the great work that you do. Also, I was going to share with you about what Dr. Hsu mentioned regarding promotion and tenure and books that make a difference. My wife is a part of that and she selected a book by the famous Doctor, Dr. Seuss. She contemplated between that and “*Old Places You Go*.”

Anyways, just a little overview on kind of what we’ve done to prepare for the worst case scenario. So you know we have a pretty robust ALICE training program here. We had it for several years. We started out with two instructors—I know Dr. Barnes. This goes way back and we really muddled through some of this stuff because when these situations started occurring, no one really had any answers. So now we have---

**Senator Barnes:** You just called me old, didn’t you <laughter>?

**Chief Newton:** No, I didn’t.

**Senator Barnes:** You see my reaction time is slowing down <laughter>.

**Chief Newton:** No, but we go way back<laughter>.

I remember speaking to a group of faculty, it was the College of Arts and Sciences at the time and the dean insisted that all faculty members were there. I don’t think all Arts and Science faulty members were ever in one room at one time, except I think during this talk that I gave. It was right after Northern, Illinois. One professor said if somebody comes into our classroom and start shooting, what do we do? I really didn’t have a “great” answer for that, but I remember telling the professor, you need to do what you think you can do to make yourself and your students safe. It kind of was the right answer, but, it probably wasn’t enough. So we did the ALICE training programs, which is a national training model. We started out with two instructors and now we are up to seven. We are doing a lot of work also on the Health Science Campus. Our latest training instructor is the director of Housing Security. He is doing a real cool program over there where he is taking ALICE and tailoring it to the healthcare environment; which there’s going to be some issues that those folks face when it comes to making decisions about what to do with patients if they have a situation occur in their hospital’s work environment—and we are seeing that this is certainly occurring in healthcare facilities and hospitals. We had a really strong ALICE push last year by Dr. Gaber. As many of you know,

somebody may have “twisted your arm behind your back and shoved you into one of our ALICE programs,” but we thank you for being there and promoting that. We had a great year in 2016. It was a little less this year, and I think a lot of it was because we did have so many people get on board in 2016 and you don’t have to have it every year. What we do now is we several of us, I think nine open ALICE sessions—some in the Fall and some in the Spring, kind of divided up. It is open to the public around all the different campuses and anyone can come and attend. In addition to that, we will also do one for your program if you have a departmental meeting and we certainly do a lot at the beginning of school at the orientations. We also did training for the RAs. I know we did...assistance over at the Health Science Campus and several others from the programs asked for the ALICE training. So I am kind of looking at the numbers and I am noticing that our open program is not getting much attendance because usually we are getting to people when there are meeting for some other purpose. This is something to think about in the future, even if we may have to think about doing it a little bit differently, but I still want to make sure that we make it available. It is tough; it is tough to get folks out. Usually tying the trainings to a program with some other meeting is our best vehicle for the ALICE trainings, but I really believe that this training could potentially save your life. If you think of some of these shootings, if you really think of any of them, some of them like the Vegas one, I don’t know if there was anything anyone can do because these folks probably had no idea where those shots were even coming from until they saw the muzzle fire. The other shootings like the one in Tampa, Florida in the nightclub—you wonder if every single one of those persons would’ve had ALICE training and new of options, how many lives could have been saved? I think some could have been saved for sure, not all, but certainly some. We do have a lot of confidence in the program and I think it works and I think it gives you options, and hopefully, you feel that way too. In addition to that, we actually have done a number of trainings and exercises. Our most recent one was on the Health Science Campus where we did a NED in July with employees and that was kind of building off of training that we had done the previous year at the Simulation Center. We did a full scale exercise in the Simulation Center with students and faculty participation—I know Dr. Kovach was there and Dr. Rega over at the Health Science Campus really helped prepare us for that training. We did it in 2016 and we wanted to take it into the work environment. When we did a NED, it was really low-key, kind of a walk-through such as “what would you do,” just educating staff, and we did it at 5 o’clock in the morning. The interaction with Dr. Rega was very interesting at the Simulation Center. They have the Simulation Center set up and they have a team of students that are there practicing in one of the rooms. There are patientcare things going on and they have the ability to provide injects into the Simulation room of what’s going on with the patient. So we are there with Dr. Raga and he was observing and he says, let’s do the active shooting inject and let’s see what the students will do—this was before we really had a strong program of ALICE on the Health Science Campus—and so we did. He Simulated shots because they have audio. He did the code “violent” which is an active shooter and he gave them all the information. It was about five students in there that didn’t do anything, they just froze. They had one person acting as the active shooter and that active shooter just kind of walked-through and breached the door then the situation was over. So we had kind of a pretest and posttest there. Dr. Raga is currently making this a permanent part of the Emergency Medicine Residents Training—they do things; they take action; they secure the door; and they move



patients if they can because they know the things to do. We believe in it and we think it really works.

Another thing that you may or may not have noticed, it's kind of a self-feature, but all the doors on the Main Campus are numbered. So in a big building like University Hall, there are tons of doors and [now] there are stickers on the doors to let you know what room is what, which is important information for us. If somebody is not familiar with University Hall or not familiar with East, West or South and it seems like there are a hundred doors in the building—it is very helpful for us if somebody has those numbers, so we can pull that information up in our dispatch and in our cruisers.

The next idea is kind of a faculty driven idea that came from Dr. Kovach along with Dr. Raga—the idea is to have tourniquet first-aid stations along with AED's. So all the AED placements on campus, we will be looking at a project where we put a little packet in there with tourniquets. It might be some online video something where we have to try talk about how to apply a tourniquet and it will be some instruction in there. What we found is that applying tourniquets to stop bleeding, it would be usurping to know that. We are working towards a program where we will have the tourniquets at all the AED stations across campuses. It really started in Columbine. The idea was that you really had to go to a scene and secure the perimeter and wait for the heroes, the swat team to kind of come in and save the day, meanwhile people were dying there, which was not a good idea. Some tactics changed after Regina Tackett. It was called Quad response where you would wait till the first four officers arrive at the scene and you go in as a team and address the threat. Then it changed to directive threat, so now each individual officer first on the scene goes right up to the front. We don't wait, and if someone is injured, we go past them because we have to eliminate the threat, that is the number one priority. We are going to be trained starting in January, all first responders will be trained. We are also part of this, it is called Rescue Taskforce and it's a partnership with Toledo FIRE. As an officer responding directly to a threat and Toledo FIRE arrives, instead of waiting on the sidelines for the scene to be secure and we know for sure that there is no more active shooters, which is what FIRE particularly do, they are going to go into those warzones and into those hot zones partnered with someone from law enforcement to save lives, so that is a huge step forward. There are departments out on the West coast that are doing this now and it is starting to kind of creep its way East, but I think this is going to be a big step forward in our ability to save lives if we are ever faced with those situations, and that is a countywide initiative. So this is a little bit on where we are going with active shooter and ALICE training situations. Does anybody have any questions on that specifically? Great.

Next, I am going to talk a little bit about freedom of expression. This has definitely been a hot topic, not just nationally, but here at UT kind of quietly. I have done main presentations for senior leadership on this—one with the presidency leadership team where I talked about emergency preparedness, specifically with kind of protest activity and/or freedom of expression. Kind of building off that initial presentation, we did a table talk with senior leadership on protest activity on a difficult situation related to that. Dr. Hsu has asked me to do a presentation which I have done with the provost staff and many of the deans were there too. We are working closely with Dr. Cockrell in Student Affairs and he's going to do great things. I gave him that same

presentation and he also came into the meeting looking at our Freedom of Expression policy. It looks like that policy is up for renewal in 2018. I don't know if it's going to go that long because we are looking at it right now and its heading to some changes and some tweaks will likely be made. However, I don't think necessarily anything radical, but some schools are taking a little bit more kind of a radical stance. You may have read OU had just put out a new policy, I think it is in draft form, but they implement it on an emergency basis. This policy is essentially banning protest activity inside buildings and we will see how that stands. A year ago, OU, this was Spring semester in 2017, was protesting the presidents' position on immigration policy. There was a group of students, a big group, I think about 70 or more that were in their student union in a sit-in and ultimately, it lead to 70 arrests because it was announced to please leave the building. So 70 arrests were made and the first case went to court and it was thrown out by the judge and all cases were dismissed after that. There were no conduct charges at all. It was kind of a block out at OU, I am sure in retrospect, they would've handled that situation a little differently. So the reason the judge threw it out was because they ordered the students to leave the student union because it was closed, it was like midnight, and they ordered them for that reason and those who failed to leave were arrested. They found that it was a situation a couple of years ago—it might have been a Black Lives Matter protest that occurred in student union and they didn't apply their policy consistently, and that is also why the judge threw it out, which is probably why OU changed their policy and said you cannot protest in buildings. It is a hot topic and we will see where it goes. A little bit more kind of our readiness for that, we have a couple of officers that are assigned to somebody, it's called Mobile Field Force. It is a large group of officers, a large group of 100 state officers that can be deployed at any kind of civil arrest or protest type of activity where it can likely be some issues. So our office is involved in that and we have that kind of capability resource if you ever were to have a big event that would require that type of resource, but I hope that doesn't occur.

Ohio State and Cincinnati, they've been in the paper quite recently because this guy, Richard Spenser, a white nationalist is kind of going around and is making his tour of the country speaking at universities. Universities before rejected him initially, then they ended up allowing him to speak at their college. Their security bill was about \$600K. Auburn denied him, he sued and won, and ultimately ended up speaking there. Then you have Ben Shapiro who is kind of conservative pundit, he spoke at University of Berkley, but this is after the Milo... incident, and again, another \$600K bill for his security. Now, Shapiro also spoke at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville just recently and as I understood it, the bill was like \$4K. When these folks come to the University of Toledo I am not worried. I don't have any specific extent of capability to secure that type of event. My stance is, come one, come all—it is our job to figure it out. I don't want a \$600k security bill, and I think it can be done for much less than that. One thing that I've shared with the deans is often times we post we will have a speaker and sometimes that speaker can be controversial, so please reach out to me or my staff and we'll plan for that event. I will not get a little more hypersensitive than that, but feel free to reach out to me. Just to let you know, we are not going to come and take over your event, that's not our goal. We have done this in the Law center for some of the lectures series and/or post-lecture series and we will have that police present, but we prefer for your staff to kind of be that first touch in case if

someone gets kind of out-of-line. We will be there to back you up in case your efforts fail, but we want to work with you in those situations.

It is probably worth mentioning briefly, our policy was changed in 2015 due to a provost lecture series and at the...event there were some protestors that were outside of that. It was a small group, not many, and I don't think it was necessarily planned. They had signs and the question was, can they have signs inside or not have signs inside? The decision came down from "God" or someone above—me that they could not and they said, okay—they were very corporative. They worked with FIRE, the free speech group and the university paddled us and said, no, you should not have done that and ultimately, we agreed to revise the policy. Those are the types of things that we are going to have to make decisions on if we do have a speaker that comes because we do not have anything in our policy that says, "you can have this/you can't have this." If we don't have it in the policy then there might be some ability to make some of those rules or latitude to make some adjustments. There is no reason not to have it in the policy. I think it was a lot of thought that went into that when it was initially drafted. That is all I have. Does anybody have any questions on the freedom of expression or really anything related to police and campus safety because don't get an audience with this group much. I do appreciate talking to you—it has been some time. But it great to be back in front of Faculty Senate.

**Senator Maloney:** I have a thought.

**Chief Newton:** Yes.

**Senator Maloney:** Every first Friday at noon, I think there may be a lovely announcement that comes out, but it is kind of garbled. It is great to have this speaker system, but, do you think that it will be used in the event of an emergency? If it is, you can't understand it.

**Chief Newton:** Well, It is unfortunate and a lot of times it is depending on the position on campus. There was a pretty comprehensive kind of acoustic testing done to place the speakers around campus, however certain days it can be very echo-ey or garbled, there's no question about it. That is tied with the Lucas County tornado warning system, and you are right, it is tested along with the county at the first Friday every month at noon. We send UT alert of text messaging out at that same time.

**Senator Maloney:** Is it a plan to use it for a communication mechanism?

**Chief Newton:** It has been used. We've used it before. The good news is we haven't used it in a while—that is good news.

**Senator Maloney:** Because otherwise you will use the texting.

**Chief Newton:** Yes. It just depends. I got to say though, the...PA's is kind of like the "sky is falling down" kind of situation in a sense. Now, we can go out and hit one pole. When I was at Scott Park we had a stabbing out there many years ago and luckily, it hasn't failed, but nonetheless, we have one. ...system to indicate there was an emergency... We have used it in the past, but not very much.

**Senator Bonnell:** I just want to make a comment in front of everybody here, thank you for what you do. Somebody clearly here at the University was being cyber stalked very incredibly disturbingly. We went to our local police force who shall remain nameless, Ottawa Hills, and they said basically it was nothing they can do for us. But your team within a couple weeks had tracked the individual down and put a warrant out for his arrest. It brought in incredible piece of mind to this individual. I just want to thank you and your team because you made a huge difference in that person's life. I appreciate that from all of us.

**Chief Newton:** Thank you for that. Just so you know, for me, the bar is very high. If you look at police work right now around the nation, you have to take nothing less than excellent police work. The bar is very high, that is the expectation. The assumption is yes, and if we can't do it, a better be because it is illegal, unethical, or against our mission.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Thank you very much.

**Chief Newton:** That was way longer than I thought it would be, but thank you.

[Applause]

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Thank you very much. We have Dr. Melissa Gregory who is going to do a presentation on the draft policy on promotion and tenure.

**Dr. Gregory:** All right. So I will try to be efficient. I am here to talk to you about the university level tenure and promotion guidelines. I understand that you all received a draft that was circulated. I have some remarks that I want to share, just to give you a context history for that draft so you can understand what it is and how it is hopefully intended to operate. So at the University of Toledo, we do not actually have a university level tenure and promotion guidelines. If you go to the provosts' website, you will see lots of forms related to tenure and promotion and you will see Peg giving a speech at a tenure and promotion workshop, which is really well attended. But what you won't see is an overarching document that offers a sense of our shared expectations and our shared standards. Now, when Dr. Hsu asked me to look into this, I admit I was kind of surprised because I have spent a majority of my professional life here at this institution, so I didn't realize that not having tenure and promotion guidelines was a "thing." So, I decided to research that. Let me just explain to you the research that I did: The first thing I discovered was by not having these guidelines contradicted advise from all of the major bodies to which we might turn for advise on best practices. So AAUP and in and AUB, they all assume that these things are in place. The next think I did, as Dr. Hsu mentioned, I took a survey of 40 public comprehensive universities, so, these are all universities that are public with multiple professional degree programs, they are peer or aspirational institutions. I made sure that 50% of them had faculty unions, but that was not a major defining factor. And what I discovered as Dr. Hsu said, only one that I know of didn't have university level tenure and promotion guidelines—95% did, which really places us outside of the "norm." Now, these guidelines vary pretty widely from school to school; some of them was incredibly elaborate and some of them were fairly broad, but the point is, they all had a document. So at the same time I was doing that, I was also doing a couple of other things. One of them was I was shadowing meetings with Dr. Hsu about tenure and promotion here at UT—some of those meetings were advisory and review boards

meetings like I went to UCAP. Some of them were meetings at individual colleges who were having questions or problems with their tenure and promotion processes. Then I was also reading all of the departmental and college elaborations across the University. So, I've read all the unit elaborations that we have. Here are some things that I noticed: I think we have a little bit more faculty vulnerability than we should and I think we could address with a good strong endorse faculty written document. Things like human error, administrative turnover, we've got some career...and stagnation, and lots of professors that don't go up to full. When administrators change sometimes, they are tempted to put their stamp on the tenure and promotion process and that could be very anxious making, right? Again, if we had a really strong faculty written document in place, that will be in place regardless of how administrative individuals change, right? Another thing that I noticed is we lack a shared understanding of certain core concepts. I think following the breakup of the College of Arts and Sciences, individual unit elaborations have sometimes got kind of idiosyncratic—they are drifting further and further away from each other. In ways that I don't necessarily think that has to do with disciplinary particularity. Certain definitions, things like peer review, external referee, and professional activity are not really shared. I thought that my definition of external reviewer was shared by everyone and it turns out, that is not in fact the case. I think it would be good for us to figure that out. Another weakness as far as I am concerned is that the medical on the Main Campus processes are not very integrated. I think it would benefit us to think about ways in which we might create more of an overlap and shared understanding. In March 2017, I brought a proposal to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to draft the guidelines as a collaborative faculty effort. The Executive Committee formed a committee and it has some members that are here such as Dr. Templin and Dr. Relue etc. We worked on these guidelines through June and July of last Summer. As we drafted and revised, our goals were primarily to protect faculty, to stabilize university culture, to establish shared standards, to enhance the fairness of the tenure promotion process, and to remain consistent and complimentary to the Collective Bargaining Agreement. We were very sensitive to that as we were drafting and revising. In August we actually finished up with the complete draft. For the past two months I have been kind of circulating this draft and getting some feedback from relevant campus committees, counsels, and individuals. It went back to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, it went back to deans, it went to Dr. Don Wedding for AAUP, and we sent it to individual colleges for feedback, and that's the draft that you now have before you or you got from Dr. Thompson.

Now, what I would love to see happen is that today over the next two weeks we could constitute a first reading of this draft with the opportunity for comments or feedback to be sent to me or to Dr. Thompson. At the next Faculty Senate meeting I would love to come and take questions if there are questions that need to be hammered out, obviously at that point assuming that everything is going very smoothly. Then send out a final draft for review by December 1<sup>st</sup>, which then the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would recommend to the full Senate a vote of endorsement by December 5<sup>th</sup>. So that is what I was hoping for, and obviously, it depends of the kind of feedback that the draft gets. President-Elect Rouillard, we don't have a ton of time, but do we have time for a few questions today?

**President-Elect Rouillard:** No, I think we have a few minutes.

**Senator Gail-Tucker:** I saw the makeup of that committee and that committee is not reflective of all colleges on campus, particularly as it relates to professional programs. I am curious why it was made up that way, and why it isn't more reflective of the university population?

**Dr. Gregory:** I have two answers to that. One, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee actually made that committee. I did not actually compose the committee, so I guess I am passing the buck with that one. I don't have the fine grain understanding with what went on with that conversation.

**Past-President Humphrys:** I was president at the time. It was a matter of, in speaking with Provost Hsu, we thought it was representatives from every college and that this particular document would have taken maybe a lot longer in terms of the actual writing. It was to be done over the Summer. So the idea was that we would have someone from the Medical Campus and have representatives that understood how AAUP worked. Then the idea was to bring it forward so everybody can comment on it, so this was more or less the process of trying to get something down in writing. I think there were a lot of factors that kind of contributed to a smaller group.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** And if there are things in this draft that you find that's not reflective of your practices or your college, now is the time to bring forward those comments so those can be incorporated.

**Dr. Gregory:** I will say I did request that the committee... because I was worried about the group and making sure we actually did hammer out a draft to beginning to end. I will also say, keep in mind, on page 4 of the guidelines it explains the relationship of everybody else's elaborations. One way to think about this is that the university level guidelines establishes broad values and norms and that the unit elaborations defines standards in much greater detail, and yet increasingly specific. One way to think about this is disciplinary reputation from everything go college is not necessarily as much at stake when we are simply trying to establish what is an external review like, do all the different colleges have radical different ideas and what that is or could we come to an understanding at Faculty Senate about what that means rather than necessarily needing everyone.

**Past-President Humphrys:** That is a really good point. Just so we are clear, this is not taking the place of an actual college elaborations. This is a broad overview just because we felt that, and as well as you indicated, everyone should have this. It does serves as a good foundation.

**Senator Bruce:** Is it a problem if we circulate this to our internal UT committees for promotion? Do you have a problem with that?

**Dr. Gregory:** I do not. Let me make this point, all feedback should come in.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** As a member of the committee, I also like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Gregory for her excellent direction. She did the... job on this draft and we are very appreciative.

**Dr. Gregory:** Thank you. We all worked hard.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Thank you. So we will continue this discussion of this draft.

[Applause]

**President-Elect Rouillard cont'd:** Senator Atwood has a few words on the Bookstore committee.

**Senator Atwood:** As you know one of the goals of the Executive Committee is to work with the bookstore to evaluate the needs of the faculty's and improve efficiency.

Members of this Taskforce include

Senator Edith Kippenham

Senator Brenda Leady

Lucy Duhon, Scholarly Communications Librarian  
Jessica Morales, Collection Management Librarian

To date, this taskforce has discussed several ideas and we are making the following recommendations

1. We are recommending Department Chairs to schedule departmental information sessions with the bookstore, either at regular faculty meetings or as a separate meeting with faculty who select books. This can be done by contacting Colleen Strayer, General Manager, email [sm573@bncollege.com](mailto:sm573@bncollege.com) or phone 419-530-251

2. We are recommending the Provost's Office to expand the Bookstore's presence during New Faculty Orientation and make the information session a mandatory, not optional, presentation.

3. We are recommending that the Bookstore to create a BlackBoard module on textbook purchasing for students that would be required (similar to other BB modules) in all FYE courses. We additionally are recommending that this module be available during Rocket Launch so that students and parents are better prepared for textbook purchasing before classes start  
Looking ahead,

1. We will be organizing a panel presentation by senior faculty on how to appropriately select texts for courses, including personal best practices with interacting with the bookstore.

2. We will be organizing a few open information sessions from the bookstore prior to the spring semester book order deadline that all faculty could attend.

3. We will be developing a brief survey to assess reasons why faculty do not use the bookstore, how texts are selected (by committee or by individuals) in departments across campus, determine what format faculty use (e-book, print, open access), if faculty would find a B&N workshop beneficial, and if they fully understand the behind-the-scenes process of textbook ordering.

Are there any questions?

**Unknown Speaker:** Have anybody looked into the website of the Bookstore and how to order textbooks? I find that very timely and slow.

**Senator Atwood:** I think having these information sessions will help fix those problems.

**Unknown Speaker:** Do they fix them on our side?

**Senator Atwood:** I think the point of the information sessions is to tell them what you don't like about those interface issues and see if they can fix those issues. Maybe they can better explain how to better navigate.

**Senator Leady:** There are choices that you can make whether to displays on a page are not, and until you talk to the Bookstore about what your options are to list with your textbooks, you wouldn't even know that those are options.

**Senator Schneider:** One insight that has been made to me repeatedly by a number of faculty that actually provide their course number, what their book number was, and their experience with students when they went to the Bookstore-- I've talked to Colleen about this-- one of the problems is that we are purchasing them by Barnes and Nobles. Let's say a faculty member says I am going to have 24 students in a class, this is a required text. The Bookstore then looks at the historical sales for that course in the order books according to the historical sales and they order a percentage of that historical sales. So the faculty member says that I have 24 students and the students needed the first day of class, the students get down to the Bookstore probably a half an hour before the first class and there are no books. And there are no books for that student because they order based on the historical sales. So those students rather than wait on the Bookstore to get more books in, they get their books off of Amazon, and if they have prime they don't have to wait. So then the historical sales for that book drop even lower and then the next semester it is even more a problem. I know a lot of faculty members are very frustrated with that system. I understand that Barnes & Noble's doesn't want to have to return books that they can sell. We got to come up with a better way with matching student needs and the bookstore needs.

**Senator Atwood:** Right. I agree and I think that is the whole premise behind having this healing relationship. To have them at faculty meetings at the departmental level and at the college level. I think it is important to have those discussions with Colleen.

**Unknown Speaker:** The Bookstore has quite a markup on the textbooks, has it ever been discussed or is it anything we can negotiate or do they set the rule? If they do set that rule then of course students will go to Amazon.

**Senator Atwood:** That is a Colleen question.

**Unknown Speaker:** But is it something that we can bring to her as a concern?

**Senator Atwood:** Yes, but I don't know the answer to that.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** All right. We will tell President Thompson that we actually finished [one minute] early.

**Senator Barnes:** I have a quick comment. This needs to go to a committee to be looked at. I have a student today that owes \$900 on her bill, whose Rocket Card was cut off so she has no access to food. Her card is also no longer working on her residence hall, so she has to get let in the dorm by other students. She went to Financial Aid to see what they can do and the person said, if you can't afford school then maybe you need to think about whether you should become a back to school or not. Maybe that person



just had a bad day, but this issue has come up before about students not having access to food or not having access to---

**President-Elect Rouillard:** What about the Rocket Emergency Fund?

**Senator Barnes:** But it is not an emergency, this is a tuition bill. The emergency fund cannot be used for tuition.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** But if that person does not have money for food then that rocket emergency fund can be used for that.

**Senator Barnes:** Well, she is getting access to her dorm , so she can cook in the dorm when she is let in. We need, as an institution, a better response to this phenomenon of cutting people off. She is three semesters from graduating and she owes \$900.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Also that is something the Faculty Senate Exec. can also discuss and we will.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you.

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Is there a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:04 pm.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Williams  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary

