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

President Brakel: I have 4 o'clock, so I will call the April 13th Faculty Senate meeting to order and ask Secretary Nigem to call the roll.

Present: Anderson, Bailey, Barnes, Bigioni, Brakel, Chaffee, Chou, Coulter-Harris, Day, de le Serna, Duhon, Edgington, Elgafy, El-Zawahry, Giovannucci, Gregory, Guardiola, Hall, Harmych, Heberle, Insch, Jayatissa, Kistner, Koch, Kujawa, Lawrence, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lipscomb, Metz, Milz, Modyanov, Molitor, J. Murphy, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Wood (substitute for Pakulski), Pattin, Perry, Ratnam, Reeves, Smith, Stepkowski, Steven, Taylor, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Tiwari, Topp, Van Hoy, Wedding, Welsch, Zietlow

Excused Absence: Duggan, Garcia-Mata,
Unexcused Absence: Ali, Case, Chaudhuri, Gibbs, Krantz, Longsdorf, L. Murphy

Senator Nigem: We have a quorum, President Brakel.

President Brakel: Thank you. Thank you, Secretary Nigem.

Senator Anderson: Jim Anderson is here.

Senator Nigem. No problem. Anyone else that has joined in, please just put your name in the chat to me and I'll take care of it. Thank you very much.

President Brakel: Okay, so you received the agenda and we've edited it, taking off the March 16th Minutes. There was a problem with the recording and we are almost done for approval, but I felt like we needed one more pass on it within the office before we get it out to you guys. But we do have the agenda now before us - you see it on the screen – and I'll entertain a motion to adopt the agenda you see on the screen.

Senator Kistner: So moved.

President Brakel: Thank you. We need a second.

Senator El-Zawahry: Second.

President Brakel: Thank you. In the chat put 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain.' Just as a reminder, if you are not speaking to mute yourself. We have adopted the agenda. *Adoption of Agenda Passed.*

You have before you the Minutes of the March 30th meeting, our last meeting. Are there any corrections or changes to those Minutes? Hearing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve the Minutes of the March 30, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Kistner: So moved.

Senator Lipscomb: Second.

President Brakel: Thank you. All in favor say 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain.' That motion has carried. ***Motion Passed.***

All right, with Senate's indulgence, I need to go down right now to 'Other Business.' This is the fall student bill payment in de-registration. I promised I would get these individuals up and out quickly today. So I am going to turn this over to Vice President, Matt Schroeder, who is no stranger to us and I think he is going to introduce Michael Dennis and I think Sheila as well.

Vice President Schroeder: Thank you, President Brakel. I appreciate the opportunity to return to Faculty Senate. This month we like to talk about changes that are in the process of being made as it relates to the student payment process for fall of 2021. On the Webex, and I will ask both Shelia Stewart and Mike Dennis to turn on their… I don't know if many members of Faculty Senate had an opportunity to meet Shelia. We were able to recruit Shelia away from Wayne State almost a year ago. She has served as our Bursar since that time. Has done a fantastic job, you know, making changes or putting changes in place to not only, I guess, better align our processes to our peers, but also really taking into account the overall student experience. Then many of you have met before Mike Dennis, the Treasurer of the University, a member of the Finance team as well along with Shelia. We wanted both of them to come and spend some time with Faculty Senate to review our current payment process and the changes that we are working to put in place for the fall. So Mike and Shelia, I'll turn it over to you.

Mr. Mike Dennis: All right. Thank you, Matt. I will share my screen. Can everybody see that okay? So thanks for having us. We have done this presentation at SLT, at Grad Council, and at the Dean's meeting. For some of you, this might be the second or third time you've seen this. But as Matt mentioned, we are going to change our fall payment process coming up this fall. Just kind of giving it some overall context, you know, we've had a hard time getting payments in and we've kind of generated an accounts receivable issue over the last seven or eight years. We looked at our current process. It is not very student friendly. It's not very administrative friendly. There's a lot of manual work that goes into this process. We end up burdening a lot of students with late fees; sometimes two, three and four late fees. We are obligated that past due balances go to the AG's Office for collections. Once they go there, it is a whole different ball game for the student. The student is basically stuck from any future educations until that balance is paid off, so we want to prohibit as many student going there as possible. We do have a housing eviction process, which is not fun for us, or the students. We would like to limit that as well. We do have a whole team of collectors chasing down current balances and past due balances. And then we kind of looked at across Ohio at our peers to see what do they do, what is their process, and how could we be more in line with them? That is kind of where we are at. And what we came up with was hopefully, a more student friendly process, but we will drop students for non-payment at the beginning of the term rather than waiting for them to get deep into the term where they have a large balance that they can't pay off because there was not a lot of planning on the front end. This will eliminate the majority of late fees. It will eliminate 'ghost' students at the beginning of the term where, I think now, even in April we're still chasing down some 'ghost' students that register and have full intention on coming here, but just never showed up. So there are still those balances on the student account that we need to chase down and clean up. [This] Should hopefully lessen past due balances going to the AG's Office. It will eliminate for the most part evictions. We can pivot our collectors to chasing down past balances, not current balances. Maybe more importantly, this kind of gets us in line with our Ohio peers where other schools in Ohio require payment in advance before classes start. So we are going to kind of adopt that mentality, that philosophy. So here is just kind of a quick overview of what the schedule looks like. So registration

opened up a couple of months ago. Kids are actively registering. Student bills will go live on July 12th where they can go into their portal and see their bill. For the first time, maybe ever, or at least in a long time, we're actually going to mail paper bills to their home address so that the parents can see the bill, the student can see the bill. If it is a situation where, perhaps the student is not going to come to Toledo, but they get a bill, hopefully that prompts them to give us a call, unregister for classes and clean up that bill if they are not coming here. And then also it will indicate to them that, 'hey, I've got this large balance. How are we going to pay for this in a month-and-a-half?' So we'll send them out and hopefully that will provide an additional step to help to students or parents plan. So the fall term due date is August 20th. That is 10 days before classes start, just like every year, so it hasn't moved. That is a Friday. The drop for non-payment will be on August 23rd, the following Monday in the morning, and it will be for any balance over $500. So we may---

Vice President Schroeder: Mr. Dennis, can you break real quick?

Mr. Dennis: Yes.

Vice President Schroeder: There are some questions going on in the chat and I want to clarify a statement that you made. In July when we mail out those bills we are sending it to the student at the student's permanent address that we have on file. We are not sending bills to the parent. We are sending the bill to the student. Correct?

Mr. Dennis: We are sending it to their home address that they have entered into their portal-yes.

Ms. Sheila Stewart: Mailed to the student, not the parent.

Mr. Dennis: Right. Addressed to the student, but at their permanent address.

So the 23rd, that Monday morning, we will run a job, drop for non-payment, any balance over $500. We do have a small balance there because there are going to be many situations where students register for classes. They get their bill, they pay their bill, but then they may add a class or drop a class, which will incur maybe an extra lab fee or a course fee. So obviously, we won't drop those students and they'll get caught up at the next payment due date. So [again] any balance over $500. Then the term will start on August 30th, and then we'll run a second drop for non-payment on September 10th, which is census day. So anyone that has a small balance after the 20th due date or students that didn't even register until after the 20th - so they didn't have a bill prior to the due date - they would have until September 10th to pay that bill and then any fall balances over $150 would be dropped. It is our goal that on September 10th, the second drop for non-payment that there is no one on the list. We will be working the list prior to August 20th and then between August 20th and September 10th, we will be working the list heavily. The success coaches, Rocket Solution Central Treasury group are trying to get in front of these students and say, 'hey, you have a bill. Let's get a plan in place. Did you file you FASFA? Do you have scholarships coming in? – and try to get that balance taken care of. Students can utilize the Rocket Payment Plan, which takes the balance and divides it over four payments. The installment dates are there. So in theory, this should eliminate all late fees other than those that may miss an installment due date for whatever reason. So really what we are trying to do is move conversations with students that we would have in October and November when they have a large balance passed due, try to move that over the summer time so they have a plan in place when they show up on campus. So, we'll have a rather robust communication plan. We are going to enhance the Rocket Launch to hit this a little harder there, to reach out to Rocket

Solution Central, Financial Aid, Treasurers Office and we will help you come up with a plan to be able to pay-off that balance. So any questions here on the timeline? All right.

President Brakel: Again, we have several questions. They are popping in the chat here. [chat question] When students get dropped from a course and then re-register later, it becomes difficult to add them to the Blackboard register. Is Learning Ventures working on that?

Mr. Dennis: Who working on that?

President Brakel: Learning Ventures.

Mr. Dennis: We'll have to look at that.

President Brakel: Senator Molitor asks, how this change would affect our census numbers and state subsidy? Have you analyzed how this change would have impacted enrollment if enacted in previous terms?

Mr. Dennis: So students that have not paid a balance would not be included in our SSI calculation. They would be on census day, but they would not be included anyway. So, it doesn't really affect our SSI calculation whatsoever.

President Brakel: Okay. Professor Milz stated, what about grad. students who have not received their tuition waiver because of the paperwork have not been processed? Will they be dropped?

Mr. Dennis: Yes. So as a slide in case here, there a lot of work to be done by many different departments for this to be successful. These are kind of in order. So one roadblock that we have every fall is COGS processing paperwork. It is not necessarily the College of Graduate Studies, it's the different colleges getting the paperwork to GOGS. So for this to be successful, we really need to look at several departments. We are going to do a lot of process mapping. One of them is process mapping the GA process. So we have a meeting this week with Mary Maine to kind of map out that process being beginning to end to see what we can do to streamline it, digitize it, not have it be so paper intensive and see if we can streamline that process. Another one is international students, where first-time international students frequently don't show up until after the due date and can't register for classes until they go through orientation. We are going to process map that as well to see if we can streamline that process. And then financial aid as well with federal aid, because there' a lot of rules with federal aid, when it can be applied and can't be applied. We are going to do detailed process maps for those. We think those are kind of the three areas where we really need to dive in and see if we can streamline those processes, put good, reasonable due dates and milestones in place to get things done in time over the summer so that when the student shows up at the end of August, everything is ready to go and we can process their payments just like we normally would. This isn't just Treasury. There's a lot of departments that go into making sure that this is successful.

President Brakel: Assistant Dean Pollauf and Senator Barnes kind of piggybacked on this, about the second drop amount being so low. Why is it so low, the $150 amount? It is suggested [that] maybe $500 would be more appropriate.

Mr. Dennis: So we've had an issue with late fees. Currently, if you owe a balance of $50 or more, you would get a $100 late fee. We have since raised that to $150. So, if your balance is $150 or less, you would not get a late fee. That is why we set that threshold at that level. Plus, we would like them to want

to get that balance paid down and then not have to carry that balance over to the next term. We'd like them to have a clean slate going into the next term.

President Brakel: Senator Gregory asked, what does process mapping involve and what is the timeline for getting a more streamline system established and working?

Mr. Dennis: So we have three meetings on the books with Financial Aid, international students, and the College of Graduate Studies. Those are in the next six or seven days. Let's pretend, I am international student, what is the first thing I do? What is the next thing I do? What does the college do? Where does that go? I will map it all the way until it gets to the end so that we can understand every step of the process. So then we'll try to eliminate or streamline some of those steps. So one issue that we stumbled upon with international students is they have to take an ESL test. Well, we won't grade the ESl test until the faculty contracts starts, which is August 30th, the first day of classes. That creates a problem. We shouldn't have to wait until August 30th to test grade the test. So, can we get that test moved up or the grading of that test moved up so that it is graded and done prior to classes starting. So it is things like that we'll try to uncover some bottlenecks and roadblocks that if we can move them up or get them out the way it will help streamline the process.

President Brakel: And Senator--- go ahead.

Mr. Dennis: Well, I was just going to say, I know a lot of our processes still are paper. So there's actual pieces of paper flowing around the University. If we can get a workflow setup in the system so then we can do things through email or do it through Banner, obviously, that would be easier because then you wouldn't have to be at your desk pushing paper, we can actually do it wherever people may be.

President Brakel: Senator…asks that admission admits people until the second week of classes. How will this work with the new deadline?

Mr. Dennis: The classes start on August 30th, so if students enroll and register late they will still have till September 10th to make payment on their bill and obviously, as they register we will communicate that with them that 'hey, you're registering on the second day of class, the third day of class, or whatever it is – your bill is going to be due on September 10th.' If it is a case where they filed the FASFA, but they have not received aid, we will put in memo'd aid. So we will take into account aid that they received, but maybe not yet applied and therefore not brought those students.

Vice President Schroeder: Hey, Mike, how does the process work right now if a student registers after bills are due?

Mr. Dennis: Bills are due August 20th. If any student registers after August 20th, their bill would be due on the second due date, which is September 10th. So they will have up until that time to pay their bill.

Vice President Schroeder: But currently if a student registers this past fall, after the due date, their bill is effectively due at the time of registration. But, you are giving them a little bit longer to pay now, correct?

Mr. Dennis: Right. So currently, their bill will be due the next day. So, a lot of times they won't even know how much their bill is until they register and then they basically have 24 hours to make payment. So this gives them a little more leeway so when they register late they will have a couple of weeks to get plans in place and pay their bill.

All right, here are some quick benefits in the process: Obviously, improve cash flow, eliminate ghost students at the beginning of the term rather than the end of the term, we'll stop providing services without being paid (which often happens), we're effectively giving interest free loans to students for the term, eliminate majority late fees, reduces housing evictions, eliminate a lot of waiving of the late fees, hopefully it will create better deadlines for GA assignments and paperwork. We have quite a bit of fraud every semester that we have to root out, this will help with that. It allows our collectors to focus on other things and hopefully we will lessen students --- I mean, this is probably the biggest one, students will have to have a plan when they come to campus and not generate a large balance that they can't pay, and then they are stuck. So we rather have that conversation way up front. This is going to eliminate a lot of downstream activities that meant us and many departments do as well.

So, we put together this fall an opening taskforce. We had our first meeting last week. It is going to be a cross-functional team with all departments that have a pretty heavy fall opening workload. We had our first meeting last week. We have our process mapping meeting in the next four or five days. This group is going to meet every other week. This is primarily for us to understand what every other department is doing because we need to make sure that we are all in sync with our dates, their dates, what they're doing, what we're doing. Then obviously, the marketing and communication of all of this is critical to make sure students understand the new process. For new incoming student that didn't know this year's process, it is new to them so it probably won't be a big deal, but it will be primarily for our returners that are kind of used to the old way of doing things – now, there's obviously going to be a new way. We will be through Rocket Launch, through UT News, through direct communications to students. There will be a lot of communication going out to these students so they understand the process. Then probably 10 days out from the due date we will be running lists, working those lists, making sure our students understand the due date is coming. And then prior to that first drop, we will make sure that we get that list as little as possible. Then hopefully on the second drop, you know, there is a handful at best that may be ghost students, or somebody that slipped through, or they registered and they went to a week of classes and said, 'hey, you know what? This isn't for me,' hopefully, that second list will be much smaller.

President Brakel: So that answers Senator Barnes' question.

Mr. Dennis: Okay, any additional questions?

Vice President Schroeder: Mike, I want to thank you and Shelia for taking the time. The final questions from me to give Senate a little bit of context as it relates to the amount of students, and this is maybe taking Sharon Barnes' question one step further. But, on average or roughly at the end of the semester, and obviously there is a collections process that you exhaust for a couple of semesters before a student is turned over to the AG's Office, but typically how many students are being turned over to the AG's Office at the end of a semester? And again, that is multiple semesters in the making? And will this process, or is it the plan with this process to be able to reduce that number, Sir?

Mr. Dennis: So typically it is a little over 500 students get sent to the AG Office at the end of every semester. And again, we are legally obligated to turn those accounts over to the AG's Office. Just for a reference, last week was the fourth and final payment of the Rocket payment plan and as of Monday morning, we still have 912 students with balances, which is a total of $2M. So those students won't be able to register for summer, won't be able to register for fall until their individual balance is down to under $500. Then obviously with our new process, they will have to get that balance plus a new fall

balance taken care of. But many of those students either won't be able to pay off the balance and will embark upon collection efforts and then after we exhaust those, they will end up going to the AG's. We get questioned all the time, 'hey, there is a student that's been gone four or five years. They really want to come back. Is there anything we can do?' Once the balance is with the AG's Office, our hands are kind of tied, and they are in control now. So, we really want to prevent as many students as possible going to the AG's Office. Even if they stay internally with our collections; if they just make a small payment every month just to kind of keep their account a'ctive, we will keep taking those payments and they won't end up hopefully ever going to the AG's Office.

President Brakel: Senator Barnes, you have a question. Go ahead.

Senator Barnes: Thanks, Mr. Dennis. I just wonder on the second drop there that is at the $150 amount, are you anticipating that most of those students will be on the Rocket Payment Plan already?

Mr. Dennis: Yes. We get about 1,500 students –not as many as I thought –but we get about 1,500-1,800 students that go on the Rocket Payment Plan. There may end up being more under our new policy. The first due date, August 20th, you will either pay your bill in full or make the first of four installment payments on that first date.

Senator Barnes: So before they're eliminated on the second date, will your outreach include making sure that they know the payment plan is available?

Mr. Dennis: Oh, yes. Absolutely. We will push that hard over the summer. Even if you have, especially international students where sometimes it takes two weeks for them to get money out of their host country due to their banking rules. So if they can get on the payment plan, that buys them some time to be able to get money into the country and be able to pay their bill.

Senator Barnes: Well, that is great. I just hope that your communication strategy includes more than email or letters. I mean, are there going to be direct communications with them?

Mr. Dennis: Yes. On a previous slide I had Banner actually processing a banner module that we really need in place, and turned on, and live for us to utilize, because then we can send out targeted communications directly to students to do a lot of things: Make sure your address is up to date. Make sure your direct deposit is good to go. Make sure you have your title before authorization done. So there's a lot of things we can do with that processing module. We've been pushing IT hard to get that going. That will help immensely with getting communication out. So yes, there will be [communication] through UT News, Rocket Launch, through the international orientation. There will be some email, that is one of our strategies. So it will be a multifaceted strategy to try to, for the lack of a better word, pepper students with information about this.

Senator Barnes: I think the 'peppering' sometimes is part of the problem though, because they get overload, especially digital overload and then they don't read it.

Mr. Dennis: Yes.

Senator Barnes: So I wonder. Depending on how many people you are talking about, you know, you might have better approach with telephone directly. If it would be possible, but I don't know if it would be.

Mr. Dennis: Yeah, we can't call all 16,000 students.

Senator Barnes: No, I am not talking about 16,000 students are you? I mean, you just said 1500. But assuming not all of them are going to be dropped.

Mr. Dennis: No, there are about 1500 that go on the Rocket Payment Plan every fall.

Senator Barnes: So how many are we thinking are going to be potentially dropped at that second drop? I mean, to me, $150 is just not enough to lose a student for.

Mr. Dennis: Right, so we will be working the list between August 20th and September 10th to make sure hopefully that, that list is zero, or it could be a handful of ghost students that aren't here.

Senator Barnes: So that is what I am saying. Are you going to be emailing those folks? Are you going to be calling them directly? That handful that you are talking about right there.

Mr. Dennis: Yes. We will be calling, texting, emailing, everything.

Senator Barnes: Awesome. Thank you.

Ms. Stewart: Can I add also? We do text students before we do late fees and even our bills. So our Special Account Office is texting them if we have their information.

Senator Barnes: You would think that would work. You would think that would work.

Ms. Stewart: That does work a little bit more than the emails -- yes.

President Brakel: Okay, we got a packed agenda so we will have to begin to move on, but a couple of things. Don't forget as faculty advisors we have a lot of contact with students, so we can also help spread the news there. I see Linda Rouillard is asking a question here. Can any of the Cares Act money help these students where they most recently been approved as well? Senator Gregory, I see you are trying to get my attention as well, so you will be the last question of the day.

Senator Gregory: I just want to reiterate what Senator Barnes was saying. I think what I've been seeing behind Senator Barnes' comments, and I share it, if I am right, is a certain amount of anxiety about this being a very large shift in a moment when my understanding was that enrollment was absolutely critical. So, if enrollment is 'absolutely' critical and we don't exactly know how we are doing these processes and we are not going to get the chance to really do much of a test run before they are just implemented. Right? Mr. Dennis, what can you do to reinsure me that this won't affect our enrollment adversely, that we actually will be retaining students just the way we would had before, and we won't be getting 1500 people accidently dropped because they didn't get the communication? Is there anything you can tell me that makes me feel less anxious about this?

Mr. Dennis: Well, every year enrollment is critical. This fall is no different. So, yes, of course we want---

Senator Gregory: It's a little different, right? I mean, just coming off of COVID.

Mr. Dennis: Right. So of course we want all of our students to be retained and stay. We can't count them as FTs anyway if they don't pay. All we are trying to do is move conversations from November up to August so that kids come with a plan. Because college is expensive. It is complicated to pay for. So they need to come with a plan of how to be able to pay the balance. So that's part of our retention strategy. We

send 500 students to the AG's Office, so there's 500 students that can't come back. So if we can get that down to zero, now everybody can come back.

President Brakel: Right. Could you answer the question regarding the stimulus money? Can that be used to help the students for this coming fall?

Mr. Dennis: So last week we just sent out about $6.6M of HEERF money to, Financial Aid had a criteria. It was mostly Pell eligible students that received either $1,200 or $1,000. There were 758 students showing?

Ms. Stewart: Yes, roughly.

Mr. Dennis: And about 400 had acknowledged or gave us permission to apply that money toward a balance that they had. So, that was able to clear up many of the balances that students had. Obviously, if they had access, they would get that in a refund. There is word of more Cares money coming, but we'll work with Financial Aid, Matt and Dr. Bjorkman on how that will be disseminated. But, yes, any funds that go to students can be applied toward their bill if they have a balance and they give us authorization to do so.

Ms. Stewart: Right.

Mr. Dennis: I would imagine that this next round of money will be given out prior to the fall due date though.

President Brakel: Well, thank you for your presentation. We know there's a lot of work to do on your end and anything that faculty can do to help you to communicate that word, please do so. So again, thank you. Sheilia, glad to meet you here virtually.

Ms. Stewart: Thank you. Nice meeting you all. Bye.

Mr. Dennis: Thanks everyone.

President Brakel: All right, we are going to back up to the *Executive Committee report* now:

As you are aware, we have been working on revising our Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules for some time now, and that we last informed you that these documents were at the Board of Trustees for their input before beginning a second reading. I had a phone conversation today with Board of Trustees Chair, Al Baker and the Board is asking for more time to review these documents. Specifically, they want another legal review of the proposed changes. This legal review will be done apparently by the State legal team in Columbus. I pointed out that our Office of Legal Affairs reports to the State and not UToledo, but they still want this time to go directly to Columbus. Chair Baker assured me that they will continue to work on this matter as quickly as possible, but unfortunately, that means that we will not be able to approve the revised Constitution this year and the matter will need to carry over until next fall.

The Finance and Strategy meeting that I attended last Wednesday focused on fall enrollment. We are seeing an increase in the number of deposits from the Greater Toledo area market and a smaller number of transfer students due to limited enrollment at community colleges. Compared to other Ohio universities, we have been offering on campus visits while others have been doing virtual visits. These visits are to centralize undergraduate readmission processes within the admissions and enrollment operations. Merit scholarship dollar amounts will remain the same for next year, but there will be an

adjustment regarding need based awards, which will change each year instead of like a four-year offer. This will be based on the FASFA every year.

Also positive for next year is the direct from high school DHS confirmation for students within the colleges of Health and Human Services, Natural Sciences and Math, and University College are up and that four colleges are now performing the DHS average confirmation rate. Also admits continue to move in a positive direction, up 4.83% over last year.

We are also monitoring a proposed Senate Bill 135, as is the Ohio Faculty Council, which discussed it at their meeting last Friday. Our representation Dr. Allison Day will now report on this issue in that meeting.

Senator Day: Hi. Thank you. There's three things that I wanted to report from the last OFC meeting for you all. The first is – and I'll be quick about the first two – that we have been working on a white paper that is just going to go through a couple minor revisions and be voted on soon. The white paper is addressing the relationship between the Board of Trustees and faculty, and trying to create a sort of a best practices document so that we can have a more productive relationship between faculty and our Board, which as you can see with the whole Constitution issue, obviously it needs some work. So, that is going to come soon and we will send out information and a copy of that white paper as we finalize it.

The second thing that I just wanted to highlight is that there's a new initiative called Pitch X, which is going to be giving folks in Ohio public institutions basically hundreds of thousands of dollars if you sort of nominate folks that are doing tech commercialization or copyright work. So this is stuff around sort of innovation that they are trying to promote. This new program, and I don't have anything in writing because they haven't sent it out yet, but this new program, and when they send it out, I can send it to everyone here, but once you sort of nominate faculty then you'll be coached extensively over the course of a year. Then sort of at the end of that you do a 90 second pitch which creates like a high production video essentially, that you can then use to generate more income for your projects. So I will let you guys know more about that as I get more information in writing.

So, the thing that we spent a lot of time talking about is Senate Bill 135. If anybody has not read SB 135, I would encourage you to do so, because there's a lot in it and a lot of things that don't quite make sense in it. But, the Ohio Faculty Council is encouraging everyone to call up their State leaders and talk about their concerns with the bill if they have them. The Ohio Faculty Council has decided to sort of focus on the main areas where faculty can be most effective, and that tends to be things like curriculum and student enrollment. Some of the things that we are preparing testimony about and hoping to be able to deliver imminently as we are called to do so, are things in the bill such as the bill specifies that programs will not get approved if there's not a direct connection to jobs. So any program that wants approval at the State level needs to demonstrate that they are directly going to affect someone's ability to get a specific job. So the Ohio Faculty Council is going to push back against that, to argue that four-your colleges are not about training, but about preparing people for careers. There is a second chance voucher program in the SB 135, which is this idea that if a student drops out of a four-year public institution like UToledo and then completes a degree at a community college, UToledo would have to pay that community college fees. So it is this idea that the student somehow dropped out of that public university because they weren't given a chance. The university wasn't sort of doing its job by passing the student. There is also a push in SB 135 for a MBA program at community colleges, which the Faculty Council has several reservations about.

There is also a proposal for program suspension that has a low completion rate, but they don't provide definitions about what a low completion rate means, so there are all sorts of problems there. Then there are also some free speech problems in SB 135. There's some language around faculty not being able to speak outside of their area of expertise in the classroom. This is sort of a question of, well, who decides what is your area of expertise and what is outside of it, right? Then finally, there is a question about money that's going to pay for a lot of this bill. So these are sort of the talking points that OFC is putting together. The union is also putting together another set of talking points. So these are some of the things that OFC is working on in relation to SB 135. I think that is just a short version of things.

President Brakel: Right. And this bill was proposed by a senator who, as I understand it, used to be on a board of trustees for a community college and now is in the senate, and so that is why those are being proposed.

Senator Day: And they thought for a while that it wasn't going to get much traction. And now they are worried that it actually could be pushed through as an amendment with the budget. So it could be pushed through actually in time for the next school year. So there's some worry there, so people are really being asked to share their reservations and concerns about this bill with your state legislatures and leaders.

So Senator Barnes, I don't know if your point was about the BA. Was that the part about the community colleges are being encouraged to develop non-applied BA program for a bachelor's degree… There are concerns about that. Was that your question?

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

President Brakel: All right, so that concludes the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report. Does any other Executive Committee member have something they'd like to add?

Senator Heberle: I just wanted to say I'm going to drop an announcement in the chat about the Save Ohio Higher Ed. forum this Friday at 3 o'clock on a Zoom call about the student debt trap. So if you are interested in knowing more about student debt, the questions we were just raising and also questions about Save Ohio Higher Ed. is trying to cultivate a discourse of education. Higher education is a public good to re-publicize it, so-to-speak and de-privatize it, so-to-speak, to lower all those tuition bills that students can't pay that we are all worried about right now. It is Friday at 3 o'clock. So I will drop that in the chat and you can register for that if you are interested. Thanks.

President Brakel: Any other comments from the Executive Committee? Any questions or comments from senators? Hearing none, we will move on to the Provost report.

Provost Bjorkman: Okay, thank you, President Brakel and good afternoon everybody. I hope your final weeks of the spring semester, believe it or not, are going well. It's really hard to believe that we only have two weeks of classes left this semester and final exams will be held in three weeks. This is the third semester, as you all know that we completed since the beginning of this pandemic. And thanks to the incredible work and efforts of our faculty and staff, we have worked together as a campus community to navigate this health crisis and still focused on the success of our students. I'm very proud of everybody for that.

In about four weeks on May 8th, the University of Toledo will hold its spring commencement with over 2,800 graduating students. As you know, we are actually going to do this face-to-face with all of the

precautions. It won't look like normal, but it will be face-to-face and our students, I know, are very happy about that.

Since the beginning of the pandemic in March of 2020, we will successfully have graduated about 8,000 students, including our spring and fall 2020 graduates and our upcoming spring 2021 graduates. So in the midst of the pandemic, our faculty and staff have helped over 8,000 students cross the finish line to graduation which is terrific. That means that in spite of the pandemic, you've changed the lives of these students in significant and meaningful ways.

This past weekend I attended the 12th Annual Midwest Graduate Student Research Symposium. It was held virtually this year again. Our Graduate Student Association did a really great job of organizing the event. There were over 100 registered participants from universities all around the Midwest, and over 50 seminar presentations and poster sessions. Many of our own graduate students presented their research, scholarship, and creative activities at the symposium with about a 3rd of the sessions featuring our own UToledo students. I was impressed with the scholarship that our students presented and with how they have continued to make progress in their academic programs in spite of all the challenges over the last year. I want to express my appreciation to all those faculties who served as judges during this symposium, and to all the graduate faculty for their ongoing support of graduate student success.

You may also have heard the news that one of our undergraduate students, Jacob Connelly, a junior in the College of Engineering has been named a recipient of a Goldwater scholarship. This is one of the most competitive honors in the fields of science and mathematics for undergraduates. He is also a student in the Jesup Scott Honors College and was selected from a field of more than 500 applicants. So that is really terrific. As part of his co-op program in Bioengineering, Jacob is engaged in groundbreaking research on neurodegeneration in the labs of David Kennedy and Steven Haller in the College of Medicine and Life Sciences. So, congratulations to Jacob Connelly, and also to Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Haller for this achievement.

This is also the time when we get to do fun things, like recognize faculty for excellence in teaching, research and service. I want to announce that the recipients of this year's Edith Rathbun Outreach in Engagement awards have been selected. They include Joan Duggan, Professor in the College of Medicine and Life Sciences; Joseph Hara, Senior Lecturer in the College of Arts and Letters; and Sujata Shetty, Associate Professor in the College of Arts and Letters. The recipients of this year's Outstanding Teaching awards have been selected. They include Eric Chaffee, Distinguished University Professor in the College of Law, Chelsea Griffis, Associate Lecturer in the College of Arts and Letters, Trieu Le, Associate Professor in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Greg Lewis, Senior Lecturer in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Susanne Nonekowski, Distinguished University Lecturer in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and Kasumi Yamazaki, Associate Professor in the College of Arts and Letters. Congratulations to all of them. The recipient of this year's Outstanding Advisor award for faculty is Amit Tawari, who is with us today, Associate Professor in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and the recipient of this year's Outstanding Advisor award for professional staff is Robin Van Hoy, Assistant Director of Student Services in the College of Engineering. Announcements for the recipients of this year's Outstanding Research awards and the Faculty Mentoring award will be coming out soon.

In the past, we have always held a nice celebration of all of these awards and I am looking forward to the fall when hopefully we'll be able to celebrate in person with a special event that honors all of our award recipients from this year and last year, including our Distinguished University Professors, our Distinguished University Lecturers, MAC Fellows, and other award recipients. I'm hopeful that we can hold an event in the fall for all those we did not get to celebrate during the pandemic in 2020, and then hold another recognition event for this year's recipients.

So, for now, would you join me in a virtual round of applause as we recognize these faculty and professional staff for their achievements?

[Applause]

All right, I also want to thank all of those who helped us to raise over $1. 3M during our fourth annual Day of Giving that was held last week. The campaign was really a huge success. We had over 3,300 donors, which is a record number of donors and total gifts. These gifts will help support students' success in many programs at the University, including the Rocket to Rocket Emergency fund that has awarded over $200,000 to approximately 300 students since the beginning of the pandemic.

I also want to mention that the University held two vaccine clinics earlier this month on April 1st and April 5th in partnership with UTMC for faculty, staff and students that resulted in over 1,600 vaccinations. This past weekend on Saturday, we held a vaccine clinic again for students, faculty, and staff that resulted in 650 more vaccinations, and our next vaccine clinic for faculty, staff and students will be held this week on Thursday, April 15th in the Student Union from 11 a.m. to 8 p.m. I hope you will please help us get the word out and encourage your colleagues and your students to register and get vaccinated. Widespread vaccination will really help us to get back to a much more normal campus environment in the fall, and it also helps to protect our community.

So, before closing my remarks today, I want to thank all our faculty, staff and administrators who worked so hard to pivot more courses back to a face-to-face mode for the fall semester. This was an enormous task. We had to do it quickly and with little notice, and I truly appreciate the significant effort that was involved in all the hard work people did.

In closing, I have two announcements to make. First, the Office of the Provost and the Office of Competitive Fellowships are co-sponsoring a virtual workshop for information about the Fulbright program for administrators, faculty members and professionals. It will be held by WebEx on Tuesday, April 27th, from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m., and four more Fulbright recipients will be there to answer any questions people might have. So if you want to RSVP and learn more about this event, please go to the Provost's website for a link to the workshop. And also please hold the date for President Postel's State of the University Address. It will be held virtually on Monday, May 3rd at 3 p.m. This will be an opportunity to review the past year with Dr. Postel and look ahead to the 2021-2022 academic year. Additional information about the event and the WebEx link will be sent out very soon. So with that, I thank you and I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

President Brakel: Questions for the Provost? Hearing none. Provost Bjorkman, we thank you for your report. I'm moving on to the Curriculum Committee, Chair Edgington.

Senator Edgington: Okay, thank you very much, President Brakel. So today we have three different sets of proposals to bring to you. I'm going to start with our new course proposals.

Our first one is **Economics 1155, Principles of Macroeconomics with Data Applications**. "This is an important new class for the dept. of economics as we now can offer students an explicit applied prin. of macroecon. course with data applications for those students that tell us they find econ. "too abstract". The university has also recently created a new data science major/minor and data analytics major/minor and a 1000 econ. principles course like this gives those majors a way to fulfill their social science elective while also gaining more data analysis experience. Moreover, this course could also serve as an introductory course where students will see if they like the data applications component of the course and consider further the new interdisciplinary data science/data analytics majors/minors."

Our second course is **SOC 2660, Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the US**. "This course is a sociological exploration of American racial and ethnic groups. Emphasis is placed on the social construction of race and ethnicity and patterns of intergroup interactions. The historical experiences of selected groups are examined with emphasis on structural inequalities."

Senator Edgington cont'd: So those are two course proposals for today. Are there any questions or comments on these courses?

President Brakel: We will move on and we'll vote on all this at one time.

Senator Edgington: Okay.

President Brakel: To save time.

Senator Edgington: I'll move down here then to next our course modifications. We have ten that are coming from different programs across campus. **ENG 1110, College Composition I**. The "Course not repeatable for credit. Change to prerequisites (add HS GPA as option). NOTE: University move to test-optional necessitated adding a non-test placement score to prerequisites. Decision was made after consultation with the Provost Office."

ART 1030, Multi-Cultural Art Appreciation A Lived Game of Contemporary Art. The "Course can be offered Fall/Spring/Summer. Change to catalog description ("Not for major credit in Art, Art History or Art Education"). NOTE: Course is not a studio and is not eligible for use in Art, Art History or Art Education majors. "

THR 2660, Acting for the Camera I. "Modified prereqs: adding THR 2600 as an option. NOTE: The only change being made to this course is the adjustment to the pre-reqs. Any other displayed changes is the addition of information that was missing and required to submit to adjustments to the pre-reqs."

GEPL 1010, Human Geography. "Change to course title (People, Places and Society). Change to long and short title. Course is not repeatable for credit. NOTE: A comprehensive, national study in the discipline of geography suggested that having a more descriptive title with key words reflecting the content of the course is helpful to undergraduate students."

GEPL 1100, Environmental Geography. "Change to course title (Environmental Sustainability). Change to long and short title. Course is not repeatable for credit. New CIP Code. NOTE: A comprehensive, national study in the discipline of geography suggested that having a more descriptive title with key words reflecting the content of the course is helpful to undergraduate students."

BIOE 1010, Professional Development. "Course can be repeated for up to 2 credits. New prerequisites (see next column). NOTE: The students need to take ENG 1110 to create a better resume and to improve their communication skills. BIOE 1200 is assigned as pre-req because the students need to understand the fundamental concepts covered in Bioengineering before going their first co-op."

BIOE 4410, Bioengineering Design Project I. "Course can be repeated for up to 4 credits. Modified prereqs. Updated course syllabus. NOTE: The students needs to complete more courses to complete the design projects. Thus, additional prerequisites are added to the course."

BIOE 4420, Bioengineering Design Project II. This "Course can be repeated for up to 4 credits. Modified prereqs. Updated course syllabus. NOTE: More courses need to be taken before starting a design project."

BIOL 1120, Survey of Biology. This "Course not repeatable for credit. Removal of prerequisites (ENGL Composition). NOTE: The Biological Sciences Undergraduate Affairs Committee believed that the previously listed English composition course prerequisites were not required for student success in BIOL1120 and students may in fact be blocked from taking BIOL1120 in a timely manner if the prerequisites were left in place."

Finally, **MIME 6810 (4220), Assembly and Joining Processes.** "Removal of doctoral level cross-listing. Addition of undergraduate cross-listing. Course is not repeatable for credit. NOTE: It's chosen as one (1) of four (4) required courses for Certificate in Manufacturing Program."

Senator Edgington cont'd: Are there any questions or comments on those ten course modifications?

Senator Molitor: I suspect those bioengineering courses are not meant to be repeatable for credit. I'm going to check with the program to confirm. I don't see why they would want to have multiple occurrences of these courses on a student's transcript. I think they misunderstood what repeatable for credit meant.

Senator Edgington: I'll go back and check to make sure my end as well, but I'm pretty sure it is on there, but I'll check as well. Just let me know before I send them forward.

Senator Molitor: Yes. Will do.

Senator Edgington: Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, then I am going to move on to our third batch. I am going to stop sharing this screen. We have again some bulk modifications. We have some coming from Nursing and some coming from Recreation and Recreational Therapy. So much like the last time, in order to kind of move through these quickly, I thought we'd do them this way.

So for Nursing, the first list of courses are listed here. Really, the big thing Nursing is doing is updating their course syllabi for all of these classes that is on file to better reflect what's going on with the content [of] the course. So all these courses here have an updated course syllabus.

NURS 4610, NURS 4520, NURS 4500, NURS 4370, NURS 4360, NURS 4400, NURS 4340, NURS 4300, NURS 4100, NURS 4110	Updated Course Syllabus

Senator Edgington cont'd: The next set of courses have new prerequisites for the course. Those are all prerequisites within Nursing, so it doesn't affect classes outside of that program. The next two courses are a change to the credit hours for the course. Then finally, the final course is adding summer as a possible term for instruction.

NURS 4400, NURS 4300, NURS 4100	New pre-requisite
NURS 4340, NURS 4110	Change to credit hours
NURS 4340	Addition of summer term

Senator Edgington cont'd: We then have a number of courses from Recreation and Recreational Therapy, and the big change here for all of these is course name. So you see the first list of courses here. They're changing the name for the course and those changes are represented on the Excel sheet.

RCRT 1310, RCRT 3710, RCRT 4000, RCRT 4330 (5320), RCRT 4340 (5340), RCRT 4450, RCRT 4780, RCRT 4770, RCRT 4850, RCRT 4780, RCRT 4820 (5820)	Course Name Change *NOTE: Course title is being updated to appropriately reflect content being taught and for student certification*

Senator Edgington cont'd: The next batch are changing the long and short title for the course.

RCRT 1310, RCRT 3710, RCRT 4000, RCRT 4330 (5320), RCRT 4340 (5340), RCRT 4450, RCRT 4770, RCRT 4850, RCRT 4780, RCRT 4820 (5820)	Change to long and short titles

Senator Edginton cont'd: The next batch is asking for the course to be processed at the graduate level. I've included the graduate numbers there for that.

RCRT 4330 (5320), RCRT 4340 (5340), RCRT 4820 (5820)	Course to be cross-listed at graduate level

Senator Edgington cont'd: The next batch, these courses will not be repeatable for credit.

RCRT 4330 (5320), RCRT 4340 (5340), RCRT 4820 (5820)	Course to be cross-listed at graduate level

Senator Edgington cont'd: RCRT 3710 is changing the core credit hours for the course.

RCRT 4330 (5320), RCRT 4340 (5340), RCRT 4820 (5820)	Course to be cross-listed at graduate level	RCRT 4330 (5320), RCRT 4340 (5340), RCRT 4820 (5820)	Course to be cross-listed at graduate level

Senator Edgington cont'd: The next batch is changing the catalog description.

RCRT 3710	Change to credit hours

Senator Edgington cont'd: These courses here are adding a new prerequisite which will be senior or graduate standing and acceptance in the Recreational Therapy program.

RCRT 3710, RCRT 4450, RCRT 4780, RCRT 4770, RCRT 4850, RCRT 4780	New prerequisite: Senior or Graduate Standing and Acceptance in the Recreational Therapy program.

Senator Edgington cont'd: Our next list of courses is adding a new prerequisite, which is acceptance in the Recreational Therapy program.

RCRT 4330 (5320), RCRT 4820 (5820)	New prerequisite: Acceptance in the Recreational Therapy program.

Senator Edgington cont'd: We then have a few courses that are now going to be offering experiential experiences as a possibility for the course.

RCRT 3710, RCRT 4780, RCRT 4770	Course will offer experiential experiences.

Senator Edgington cont'd: This course will be offered in the spring semester now. The next two courses, they are eliminating the offering in the spring. The final course they are eliminating both fall and spring offerings.

RCRT 4330 (5320)	Course to be offered in spring
RCRT 4450, RCRT 4850	Elimination of spring offering
RCRT 4780	Elimination of Fall and Spring Offerings

Senator Edgington cont'd: Those are our modifications for Nursing and Recreation and Recreational Therapy. Are there any comments or questions on those questions? I can go back to the Excel sheet if we need to look at a specific course.

President Brakel: Hearing none and seeing none in the chat, let's call the question.

Senator Edgington: If you are okay with the two new course proposals and our course modifications, please put 'yes' in the chat, 'no' if you object and 'a' if you abstain.

President Brakel: That has passed. *Motion Passed.*

Senator Edgington: Thank you very much.

President Brakel: That brings us to the Program Committee, Chair Lawrence.

Senator Lawrence: One second here while I share my screen. We have a short, questionable, straightforward list. I'll just run through all of them so then we can discuss them and then we can vote.

On program modifications, we have a proposal from the **EMT Paramedic Certificate**. We discovered the certificate was never fully approved by Faculty Senate in the Office of the Provost and Registrars. In order to obtain these proposals, they are sending it through as a program modification because it is already in the system, but we just need to formalize that.

The next one is the **Sustainability Minor**. They are switching out EES 2010, it is no longer being offered. So they moving in EES 2020 to replace that course.

The next one is **Electrical Engineering Technology**. This is the concentration in Medtronic. We have previously approved this. This is just a modification to correct the selection of required courses in the program in robotics, which wasn't reflected in the original proposal. So they submitted just a correction of that into the corresponding plan of study.

The last program modification is the **BA in Psychology**. It doesn't change any of the requirements, however, freshmen students have been entered into as pre-psychology as a designation and then moved into the degree after, I believe, the first year. They are removing the pre-psychology requirement and designation. Students will be admitted directly into the degree, which is common for many other degrees, including every other one in the College of Arts and Letters.

Then we just have two new program proposals. We have a new **Certificate in EMT Basic**. This is a certificate of 7 hours. There are actually three options or pathways that students can select on a mix of courses depending on their background and their degree, but it is a collection of 7 hours.

And then we have a new **Minor in Software Engineering**. This is 18 hours. Pretty straight forward. It is a list of five courses that total those 18 hours in a very simple basic plan of study.

Senator Lawrence Cont'd: All of these proposals come after review and approval of our committee and we recommend endorsement by the Faculty Senate. Any questions?

President Brakel: Hearing none and seeing none in the chat, please call the question. We have senators voting already, 'yes.' Those program changes have been approved. *Motion Approved.* Thank you.

Senator Lawrence: So that completes the work of the committee for this academic year.

President Brakel: Okay, thank you. Thank you for your work. Next is Core Curriculum, Chair Gregory.

Senator Gregory: We don't have curriculum for this meeting President Brakel.

President Brakel: Okay, I thought you had something. Well, next is the Elections Committee, Chair Molitor.

Senator Molitor: Thank you, President Brakel. As you are aware, the final elections for Faculty Senate, UCAP and the University Committee on Sabbaticals are ongoing. An issue was brought to our attention that the Elections Committee would like to address. Until this year, the College of Medicine and Life Sciences sabbatical process did not involve the University Committee on Sabbaticals. After the College of Medicine conducted their own internal review of sabbatical applications, approved sabbatical applications went directly to the Provost and did not go through the University Committee on Sabbaticals. This past year, the Provost asked the College of Medicine and Life Sciences to start including the University Committee on Sabbaticals in their process. The College of Medicine and Life Sciences modified their faculty handbook, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in December 2020 and is effective starting with the upcoming 2021-2022 academic year. Moving forward, any sabbatical applications approved by the College of Medicine and Life Sciences will go to the University Committee on Sabbaticals and then to the Provost, just like every other college on campus. This means they will need a representative to the University Committee on Sabbaticals.

Unfortunately, Appendix 2A of our Constitution does not provide the College of Medicine and Life Sciences a seat in the University Committee on Sabbaticals, and the Elections Committee was not made aware that the College of Medicine and Life Sciences would need a representative to the University Committee on Sabbaticals. However, the Elections Committee believes that the College of Medicine and Life Sciences should have a representative on the University Committee on Sabbaticals if their sabbatical proposals will be reviewed by the University Committee on Sabbaticals. We are asking the Senate to approve a process by which we can receive nominees and elect a representative for the College of Medicine and Life Sciences to the University Committee on Sabbaticals.

As you may be aware, the Faculty Senate serves as the electorate for UCS representatives. We are currently electing UCS representatives for Education and Law. The Elections Committee would like to propose a process by which the Faculty Senate can elect a representative to the University Committee on Sabbaticals from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences before the end of this academic year. Unfortunately, we are passed the nomination ballot phase, and so we no way of allowing the College of Medicine and Life Sciences faculty to vote on nominees. Instead, we would request that the College of Medicine and Life Sciences Dean's Office identify any College of Medicine and Life Science faculty that are eligible for service as a UCS representative and would be willing to serve if elected. I believe you have to be a tenured faculty member who has had a sabbatical to be eligible to serve on the UCS.

According to Article 2A, we limit the final ballot to five nominees for one open seat,. However, we are not allowing the College of Medicine and Life Sciences faculty to vote for their nominees, so we are asking the Senate to allow more than five nominees if the College of Medicine and Life Sciences finds more than five faculty who are eligible and willing to serve. If the Senate approves this proposal, which deviates from our Appendix of the Constitution, this list would first be vetted by the Faculty Senate representatives from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences and forwarded to the Elections Committee by this Friday, April 16th. Once the Elections Committee receives this list of nominees, we

would send out a special ballot to the Faculty Senate this Monday, April 19th. The ballot would close on Friday April 30th to provide members of the Faculty Senate the usual ten business days to select one of those nominees to serve and represent the College of Medicine and Life Sciences on the University Committee of Sabbaticals for a three-year term starting next year.

I apologize if this explanation was confusing, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Duggan: Senator Molitor, this is Joan Duggan from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences. Just a FYI for an update. We have a total of six faculty members who are currently active faculty here in the College of Medicine and Life Sciences, who had a sabbatical who would be eligible.

Senator Molitor: Okay, thanks for the update.

Senator Duggan: We have not reached out yet to ask them if they would agree to serve or if they would let us put their name on the ballot. So, we will do that. The worst-case scenario, we won't get five out of six people to let us do that, but just to let you know we got six.

Senator Molitor: Okay, thank you and I appreciate that. Any other questions or comments? From the chat, Senator Lee is asking to review the process for electing new senators for next year. They are being elected right now, and anybody in a college that has an open seat should be voting now. Senator Lee, you are from Nursing, and I don't believe Nursing has an open seat. You will not receive a Faculty Senate ballot for your college.

Coming from the Elections Committee, we would like to submit a motion to approve the process I described to select a UCS representative from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences. If approved, we will obtain a list of nominees from the College of Medicine and Life Sciences Dean's Office and have the Faculty Senate select a candidate from this list. Vote to 'yes' to approve and 'no' for disapprove. Thank you.

President Brakel: And that has passed. *Motion Passed.* Thank you. All right, that brings us to the assessment process, so Alana.

Dr. Alana Malik: Thank you for having me here today. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Alana Malik and I'm the University Assessment Director. I work closely with the University Assessment Committee to manage the process of assessment across campus. I usually come and give an update every spring, and I wasn't able to do that last year because of COVID, so I'm really excited to be here today to give you an update on what the committee has been working on.

So one of the first things, if you are not aware, we have a new policy. It was approved earlier this semester that outlines the purpose of assessment and then also gives some more details about scope and who's involved. So, if you go on the policy page today, you'll to be able to find the assessment of student learning policy that's now in place. It doesn't change anything that we've already been doing. It just puts it in writing so the people understand how it works. Some of the Committee's goals for this past year were to reinforce that relationship between good curriculum design and assessment of student learning because they go together. This was an extension of the project that we asked folks to do last year with the curriculum mapping. If you remember, a year ago in January, the UAC asked folks to start looking at how to map their academic major program curriculum if you weren't already asked to do that through your accreditor. So that was something that we started and worked on last year and has now extended into this

year. We also wanted to think about how to help people think about assessment more longitudinally and not just, 'oh, I do this report every year and then I don't think about it again,' because we've had some feedback in the program review process of which assessment feeds into that as you see on this graphic here. That we provide evidence to the program review process and in that process, we've had feedback from the external reviewers that our assessments are where they could be, or should be compared to our peers. So we wanted to help people see that connection more clearly. So with that, we made some changes to our process over the past year. One of the big ones was we weren't able to do our retreat in January, COVID didn't really help us with that. So instead what we decided to do is meet individually with the deans and find out more about what their individual needs were with their specific colleges. So we went ahead and did that this spring. Then just for your information, these other things have not changed. They're just things that you may not be aware of. But the evidence that we create in our process at the program level then feeds into program review and then at the college level, those evaluation summary reports of what's happening in each college, there's actually now a question on the college annual report template that the deans are asked to complete that relates to assessment and how they're using assessment of student learning data in their strategic planning. Then at the institutional level, when we look at all of our data across programs we provide a summary to the Provost. It's on our data this year. It was what we learned through those deans' meetings.

One of the other things that we worked on, had I been able to come and visit with you last year, you would have learned that this was a project that we did over the summer last year and we are gearing up to get it done. We completed our template changes last summer and then worked with the Center for Creative Instruction to translate those into our assessment tracking tool online. So, hopefully, you'll like the changes because we think they streamlined it and made it a lot easier for folks. So, one of the things, first of all is the assessment plans. The major changes here are that we are asking people in this first table to look at are your learning outcomes observable and measurable. Then the other information is all the same from the previous template for the plans and that data that you already have entered into the system, we'll pull back over into the new plan template. So all you'll need to fill out on this one is just whether or not those learning outcomes are observable and measureable.

Next, we've also created a co-curricular definition. It is on the screen there. We want you to make a distinction between curricular program learning outcomes and if you have co-curricular experience for you students, we want to make sure we have that distinction. So that is a separate table that's been added to the assessment plan. Essentially in the past we had our service areas like Student Affairs and Academic Support Services. They were doing their own version of an assessment plan and report, and now we've combined the two together so there's only one.

Next, responding to that concern about folks just doing this thing from year-to-year, and not really thinking about assessment in a multi-year way. We asked people to tell us when you're planning on reporting on each of your program learning outcomes. Some people think that they need to report on every outcome every year and that is not necessarily the case. You're welcome to collect data on multiple things every year, but you don't necessarily need to be reporting on it every year. So this allows us to have you tell us when you're planning on providing a report on each of your outcomes. And then under the "sources" there, that's where we are making the connection back to your curriculum map. So, where are those key points in your curriculum that you're looking at students work to identify whether or not our students are meeting those learning outcomes?

The next new piece is tying this whole process back to program review and then also introducing the idea of a short form vs. a long form for reporting. So a short form is just over the previous academic year. It is a snapshot of what happened in that year. Then the long form allows you to look at multiple years' worth of data. It will actually self-pre-populate the data from the previous short form reports and allow you to report on multiple years and look at data over a longer time period to kind of digest the information a little bit differently. So with that, knowing that everyone does program review and for some of you, you have accreditation that also you need to be thinking about. We want you to come up with a schedule of when do you just want to be reporting on the previous year? When would you like to look at more than just one year? And then hopefully line that data up so that you're able to tell your story of what's happening with your students in preparation for either program review, or one of the other options on there. Then there's also the option you see under 2026 and 2027, I don't know if you can see it because it is pretty small, but there's also the option to say none. So, if you've been working really hard on your assessments from year-to-year, and now you're in the year where you're trying to manage program review or trying to manage a big accreditation visit, we're going to allow you to take a year off and once every seven years so that you'll be able to concentrate on that project rather than trying to do both.

So, then moving on from the assessment plan, I'm going to briefly show you some of the changes for the report. Everyone is going to be doing a short form report this year because we don't have enough data in the system yet for anyone to be dong a long form. This is when you go to fill out your assessment reports this year, this is what you'll see. This information actually will, if you change it here in your report, this is telling us what you are planning on reporting on for this year, when are you planning on reporting on this learning outcome in the future years. If you update that in your schedule, it will actually update your plan for you, so you don't have to go in and enter the information twice. Then a lot of this information in table form is what we were asking in previous years, but not in the form of a table. So we are hoping that this will help make it a little bit easier to understand what we're asking for. So again, telling us who are your students, whether or not the measure is indirect or direct, if they're embedded in a course, and if that measure is part of a capstone experience.

That next column is talking about expectations. What were you expecting your students to achieve related to this outcome and then give us your results? This last column, the flag column is actually a new thing that the UAC members wanted, which is a flag that helps you think about when you get to that long form in a few years. What you were thinking about at the time that you filled this report out. So it is an indicator for your future self when you look at your data over time. It is a stoplight. Green mean that your data that is coming in as you would expect it. You don't have any concerns about the outcome. Yellow might mean something like, hey, we made some changes. We started to get new data this year and we're not sure of our changes are working yet. We need some more time to think about whether or not what we're doing is working. I'm going to make that yellow so it is kind of a 'watch thing.' Then red, obviously is something that would be the highest priority. Then we also have a few more, just a couple of qualitative questions. The first one is just basically helping us understand the information that you've shared in the table of results. Then we want to know a little bit more about who you're sharing your results with. And how they are making decisions about curriculum and other improvements, and then how you're using those assessment results to make changes in your program. And then of course, closing that loop back from the previous year if you've made any other adjustments. A lot of this information is one, just good planning and then it's good for you to remember year-after-year what's happening, but it is also data that is helpful for our higher learning commission reporting that we need to do as an institution.

So just briefly, there are a few helpful websites. We have some professional development tools. We've updated our resources online. When I talked about curriculum mapping, if you're like, oh, shoot, I forgot about that; we should be on that, all of the curriculum mapping resources are on that website. We also have information about how to develop learning outcome statements. You are welcome to check that out. Then the links to update your assessment plan and reports are included there as well. If you don't know who your liaison is, here is the list for each college. President Brakel, I'll make sure to get this to you so that you can disseminate it to everyone. So that is it. Does anyone have any questions?

President Brakel: Yes, in the chat. We have Senator Barnes ask, on the short form, could we put more than one course number in the who column?

Dr. Malik: Yes, for sure.

President Brakel: Other questions? I don't see any in the chat and I don't hear anybody. Thank you for your presentation.

We will move on to a familiar face, Professor Gibbons who used to be in Faculty Senate. For those who don't know him, he is a Professor of Law and he's also been working in the Research Office on Research Misconduct. So I'll turn it over to Professor Gibbons.

Professor Gibbons: Thank you, President Brakel. I appreciate being here. I will try to be relatively brief because I notice many of you have heard this discussion, either at the Graduate Council or Research Council. It seems like everyone at Faculty Senate serves at least one other committee.

First of all, I would like to thank everyone. I see many of my committee members here at Faculty Senate who has agreed to serve on the Research Allegation panel, the Inquiry panel, and/or the Investigation Committee. It is throughout your outstanding service we can maintain the integrity and quality of research at the University of Toledo. I have been the Research Integrity Officer now for roughly two years, and it is time to review the policy. I only have time to go through some highlights. I am going to ask the Faculty Senate to distribute the proposed draft. I'd like everyone, if possible who have concerns to get back with me so when I present these at the next meeting, hopefully the meeting after that is Research Council, I'll get appropriate feedback before it goes to senior leadership.

First of all, the miniature changes are going to be two types. One is definitional. Our current policy has many abstract terms with no definition. So with any definitions, the definitions and changes were designed to create into a blindness very closely with the Office of Research and Integrity of the Public Health Service for the National Science Foundation and Interpretation of policy of the rules for research misconduct. So the first major issue is, we have to clarify when does the student do research, subject to research misconduct policies and when does the student redo research for class. We hopefully have done that well. If it is internal, it would be within the University normal classroom materials. It is not research misconduct if it is designed to be disseminated outside the University. It is research misconduct when we can't tell. I, or my successor will meet with the appropriate dean, or program, or department chair to discuss this and hopefully come to a resolution.

Very quickly, here is an example of a place where we've added additional definitions. For example, if you notice that on my left, there is no definition of what plagiarism is. If you notice on the right hand side that has the amended definition, there is a very detailed definition of plagiarism and the definition was taken from materials created by the Office of Research and Integrity of the Public Health Service. Again, we've

tried to avoid creating anything new, merely bring ourselves so we are parallel to the existing federal regulations that we have to follow anyway. But yet, wrong definition of plagiarism. But hopefully, it clarifies and everyone feels better about the difference between disputes of authorship, and captive disputes over data and when something actually is plagiarism.

We've added something new, spoilage. Minor modifications grammatically fit into our policy out of Public Health Service regulations. If a faculty member intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly destroys data and had the opportunity to maintain the records and did not, failed to produce them, and/or failed to create them, again, assuming there's an obligation to do so, it has to be a significant departure from accepted practices. Assuming this is true, this can be evidence of research misconduct. But a certain point, if you have no data, it is impossible to prove if something is or is not research misconduct. If the faculty member had an obligation to maintain data and did not do so, the Committee can shift the burden, produce the data back to the faculty member.

Senior faculty members, we've added a nice long definition that clarifies a few problems and hopefully it takes into account the various titles and positions at different colleges and programs, particularly within the Health Science Campus so that roughly equals or equal. Again, the goal is to bring the number of people eligible to serve and hopefully does so and maintain a high quality of faculty members serving on these committees.

Sequestration, I have been surprised by how much power I have in terms of sequestration. In theory, I take over a lab. I lock up refrigerators - and people tell me I literally do, do this - and we take over the lab and we take over the machinery, [but] the equipment is not available until we get everything off of it that we need. This critically places obligation on the research integrity officer to minimize the impact of sequestration on the respondent once the research is in the lab. I walked in, as you are aware, faculty members share equipment. If I need to get a piece of equipment, it may not be available to several faculty members until IT, or the other appropriate office has removed the data, or the materials that we need. The goal is to instruct balance we need for research investigation, as well as research as a process in the University.

Who pays? It is now and will be increasingly expensive to do research investigation. Some people on the Committee couldn't understand exactly how expensive these can be. We are not talking my salary. We are talking about maintaining sequestration materials at minus 80 degrees Fahrenheit; taking over refrigerators in different departments, maintaining the record, having court reporters. This shifts the burden, or makes it clear the burden for research investigation. Other than the salary of the RIO and the administrative assistant to the RIO, can be shifted back to the college or program as appropriate.

Faculty are doing more and more interesting sponsored research. Often the terms and conditions of the research are different than the UT policy on research misconduct. If a faculty member chooses to accept a grant or sponsorship, and that grant or sponsorship contains terms that are different from the UT policy, UT as a matter of contractual obligation will follow the terms of the new policy or grant. So again, if you choose to accept a grant from a local agency or foundation and it has research misconduct terms in it, UT could possible follow those terms.

Right now we have a process. In a normal case, a minimum of nine faculty members will consider the allegation of research misconduct. At the assessment phase, three faculty members will consider only the issue. Does it basically meet the definition of research misconduct? It then goes to an inquiry phase where

three faculty members will consider does it meet the definition of research misconduct, and is there sufficient evidence to justify moving it to an investigation. At the investigation phase, three to five faculty members will make a decision on the merits. Is there sufficient evidence proved by preponderance of the evidence research misconduct? It is harder and harder to find sufficient number of faculty members willing to serve. If you think about your individual area of research and how many people who could evaluate whatever you are doing, you probably have a relatively small number. Then if you think, a number of them will disqualify themselves because they are in your department, in your college, or serve on committees, or you had a professional relationship [with], you are on PI and Co-PI and grants with, and/or other relationships that may have created an appearance of a conflict of interest. It (the number of committee members) gets to be fewer and fewer. My proposal is to change the assessment initial stage which is, does it meet the definition of research misconduct? My proposal is to follow what other schools do and eliminate that step. That step will now be done by the research integrity officer. The research integrity officer, when he/she receives a complaint will simply decide does it meet the definition of research misconduct? If it meets the definition of research misconduct, it will go to the three faculty members who will determine whether or not this should be investigated. If it does not meet the definition of research misconduct, the RIO will then report in very general terms to the Research Council why he/or she did not meet the definition of research misconduct. The Research Council can then overrule the RIO and say it should go to the Inquiry Committee, or the Research Council can say, thank you and it does not move forward. Again, the full focus here is simply if it meets the definition, it then goes to faculty members. Again, that allows three more faculty members who potentially are now eligible to serve on the Investigation Committee. My goal is to get an investigation committee of five people so there's diversity of skill set and diversity of points of view regarding research misconduct and regarding the subject matter, as opposed to what we have been doing recently, panels of three. We need to have a larger pool.

We are doing more and more collaborative work with other institutions. National Labs, we are doing collaborative work with ProMedica and many other research institutions. Clearly, sometimes the research may involve UT and another institution. This change of policy would clearly allow UT to appoint members of faculty from the other institution to serve on the Inquiry panel and on the Investigation Committee. That means both sides are comfortable with the process. Again, the goal throughout this process with the appointment is that the majority of members serving on the committee will always be a senior UT faculty member. We can have observers if they just want to sit in and report back to their institution, or they can serve as voting members. We also have a problem with the Inquiry panel right now. The Inquiry panel interviews Professor 'X,' the respondent. Professor 'X' says, 'I didn't do it. It was my postdoc.' The way the policy is currently written, I go back to the Allegation Committee, who then decides whether or not it meets the definition, and then potentially have to constitute a new inquiry panel. I would like the possibility, if there are no conflicts of interest, if Professor 'X' says, 'I didn't do it. My postdoc did it,' there are no conflicts of interest with the members of the Inquiry panel, with the postdoc, to allow the Inquiry panel to continue and maintain jurisdiction over the inquiry rather than having to potentially create a new panel. Clearly, if the postdoc objects to a faculty member saying, 'Professor 'X' hates me' and there's a conflict of interest, then a new inquiry panel may have to be created.

The final stage is the Investigation Committee. The Investigation Committee is responsible for making findings a fact and also responsible for making recommendations to the deciding officer, who is usually the provost, asked whatever sanctions there should be. Again, there is a provision here that would allow for collaboration with other institutions to serve on the Investigation Committee. The faculty member

would have the right to object to the members of the other institution for conflict of interest, the same way he/she objects to faculty members at the University of Toledo.

Something we did not appreciate until COVID-19 came out. We have had to replace members of committees because of later arising conflicts of interest and possibly issues of health. This allows the research integrity officer, if somebody cannot serve on a committee, rather than create a brand new committee and start from scratch to basically replace that person. At the investigation stage, there is a written transcript maintained, or there is video, or audio recordings. If we have to replace someone, he/she would then have to be put up to date with materials and they may continue, rather than again, starting from scratch in the beginning. This clarifies the ability of the research integrity officer to do so.

New allegations against the respondent. The Investigation Committee can generate new allegations either against the current respondent or they might discover a new respondent. This again, change the rules. Since they already did the investigation, they already to had the hearings, rather than going from scratch and starting a new investigation committee, allows the process to continue under the current committee.

Definition of preponderance of the evidence, not important.

Last, but not least. The Investigation Committee is obligated to make recommendations to the deciding officer as to the sanctions, if any. There is nothing in our rules that gives the committee any guidance. Accordingly, I recommend in the policy that we adopt the guidance provided in the code of federal regulations for the public health service. And basically, these are service of factors that the committee should consider when making a recommendation. Again, I am sending you this. I realize it is much too much to read in a matter of a few seconds. But, basically these are factors that should be considered for making recommendation. Ultimately, the policy is suggesting the primary goal of the sanctions is to restore the respondent to becoming a responsible member of the research community, which may mean his or her grants must be signed off by the department chair because there was a problem of research misconduct on the grant application. Or, they must have a senior person work with them like getting the supervisor of the lab to make records until the department chair or someone else is comfortable that they have learned how to be a responsible member of the research community. Obviously, in certain cases, some cases the recommendation may be to terminate the person. Again, the goal here is the policy, is to restore the person to an active…member of the research community, rather than sanctions for the sake of sanctions.

There's also one other thing. We've had occasions where there's research misconduct, but the penalties that the person has already undergone or the restrictions the person already has in place are sufficient so nothing else is required. The committee would be allowed to say, we think what is in place by the department is sufficient. The Provost or deciding officers do not have to do anything.

Again, finally, there's been some good place by the provost in the past, not our current Provost. Provosts have made decisions and did not communicate with the Committee why the Committees' recommendation was rejected. We're having a stronger friend of policy, the provost may do whatever he or she likes, but they have to get back with the Committee and explain why and give the Committee an opportunity to respond if possible. Ultimately, it is the provost, the deciding officers' decision, but the Committee spend a lot of time and a lot of effort and they should be able to get another opportunity to respond to the provost concerns.

We now have a policy for admission of research misconduct. Sometimes faculty members realize when they get the allegation, they screwed up and how they screwed up, and they do not want to go through this full process. They would be quite happy to admit research misconduct, accept responsibility, have whatever sanction the provost or the deciding officer chooses to in place and move on with his or her career. We have no real policy in place. This gives a very definite policy. Again, the language mirrors the language used by the Office of Research and Integrity of the Public Health Service.

Finally, statute of limitations. We don't have one. The current policy as written by UT, if you did something, and you're currently a faculty member and 100 years ago, you we an ex-faculty member, do we have jurisdiction over it? The proposal is to follow what the federal agencies do, which is a six-year statute of limitation. If you are ever greeting it, or you are constantly reusing the falsified, fabricated, plagiarize materials, then the statute of limitation will thus keep running. If there's critical public health or safety exception, the statute of limitations can be waived depending on what the issues are.

The last, but least is the expression of some members is there should be no statute of limitations for plagiarism because plagiarism doesn't require new data. One of the reasons we have statute of limitations is faculty members generally do not have to maintain data more than six or seven years. He, or she may not have the data to prove that he or she did not engage in research misconduct, which again, I just shifted the burden of evidence. I apologize. In the case of plagiarism, if you show the work preexisted the faculty member's writings, the lack of evidence apparently is not significant. Again, this was suggested by members of Research Council.

I want to thank you all for your patience and please, I am on the web under Research Integrity Officer. Most of you know me as Llew Gibbons. Please send me your comments about this. The full policy is going out. This potentially affects every research active member at the University, as well as their graduate students, even undergraduates are participating in research at the University. Thank you.

President Brakel: Thank you. Now, a couple things that came up in the chat. Senator Jayatissa asks, can you define senior faculty member who will be the non-senior faculty members?

Professor Gibbons: If I had my way, it is basically hardly anyone. Realistically, if you are research active – okay, not literally by the definition. If you are a research active faculty member who has equivalent of a long term contract with UT as a lecturer or the equivalent position, or you are…with a tenure track position, you are probably going to be a senior faculty member. I'm not sure I totally answered the question. One of the problems we have here is that every college has its own definition of titles, and ranks, and who qualifies for who. We try to make the objective as possible.

President Brakel: Thanks. Senator Jayatissa also asks, does your committee also engage in copyright laws?

Professor Gibbons: The Committee only cares about copyright when the infringement of copyright rises to the level of plagiarism. The University has, I don't think it's been approved yet, Dr. Thompson, or somebody else can correct me, a policy dealing with this piece of authorship that's floating around - it may be posted on the web, that would deal with copyright infringement that does not rise to the level of plagiarism under the policy.

President Brakel: And Professor Gibbons, you mentioned that you will send the research policy to me and we'll get that distributed out to everybody?

Professor Gibbons: Yes.

President Brakel: Will you also share this presentation with us?

Professor Gibbons: Yes, I will. There's some slides I didn't show because we didn't have time to, but I will full PowerPoint slide deck. Again, if there are any questions, please contact me, email me. I really want this to be the policy that works for everybody.

President Brakel: Thank you.

Professor Gibbons: Thank you.

President Brakel: I will also say that in addition to emailing Professor Gibbons with regard to your comments, if you don't mind copying President-Elect Terry Bigioni on that. You know, we are getting near the end of the semester here, starting to make that transition there on your comments so that over the summer as this continues to play out, if he needs to bring up something that he can represent your concerns as well. Thank you.

Professor Gibbons: Thank you.

President Brakel: So that brings us then to 'Items from the Floor.' Is there anything we need to say for the good of the cause?

Senator Kistner: Move to adjourn.

Senator Niamat: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor, please put 'yes' in the chat. Thank you. We stand adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Kimberly Nigem   Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard   Faculty Senate Executive Secretary