

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 03, 2020
FACULTY SENATE
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>
Summary of Discussion

Approved @ FS on 4/27/2021.

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

President Brakel: We are hoping that a few people walk in here in a few moments because it appears that we don't have a quorum, but we are going to start calling the roll.

Present: Brakel, Bruce, Case, Chou, Compora, Coulter-Harris, Ivana-Serna, Dowd, Edgington, Ferris, Garcia-Mata, Gibbs, Giovannucci, Gregory, Hammersley, Kistner, Koch, Lammon, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Metz, Molitor, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Reeves, Rouillard, Schroeder, Mann (substitute for G. Sheldon), Steven, Templin, Gilstrap (substitute for D. Wedding), Weldy, Zhang

Excused Absence:

Unexcused Absence: Anderson, Bailey, Barnes, Bigioni, Dinnebeil, Duggan, Frank, Gray, Hall, Harmych, Heberle, Hefzy, Insch, Jayatissa, Longsdorf, Lundquist, Maloney, Murphy, Niamat, Pakulski, Park, Phillip, Ratnam, Shlager, Stepkowski, Taylor, Thompson-Casado, Tiwari, Welsh

Senator Templin: We have a quorum, President Brakel.

President Brakel: We have a quorum, thankfully. You've seen the Faculty Senate agenda. There was a little change that was made after it was sent out, that there is no Program Committee report today, but otherwise it is the same. May I have a motion to adopt today's agenda?

Senator Kistner: So moved.

President-Elect Hammersley: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor, say 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Adoption of Agenda Passed.*** You've also received the Minutes of the February 4th Senate meeting. Are there any corrections to the Minutes? Hearing none. I'll entertain a motion to approve these Minutes.

Senator Dowd: So moved.

Senator Kistner: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor say, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** I'm going to ask for Senate's indulgence for a moment because Jim Anderson does have another obligation later, and so we are going to put him first here. He is going to talk to us about the possibility of the University becoming an ACT/SAT test optional University.

Mr. Jim Anderson: Thank you, President Brakel. Thank you to the Senate for allowing me to be here today. This is my second time in front of the Senate. I made it through the first time <laughter>. Yes, we are exploring what a test optional model would look like for the University of Toledo. I'm assuming most of you have seen The Chronic and are following all other stories where colleges and universities, both private and public have gone through a test optional model. Most recently our neighbors to our west in Indiana Ball State, The University of Indiana, IU, IUPI, University of Chicago, and others have gone test optional. So obviously it is gaining some momentum in the Midwest. So, we are taking a look at it. I'm here today to review some of that interesting data and perspectives, that is why I am here today. So what we are going to cover here in our short time, we are going to take a look at some common perspective. Now, these are some bullet points that I put down. You might share some of your own perspectives about the use of the test, its role in higher education, and so on. Then we are going to take a look at things from a student perspective or essentially, we are going to go through what a student would

look like when we do review. We are going to take a look at our current admission model and take a look at what a test optional model would look like. We are going to look at the data. Any of you that have worked with me know that we got to look at the data to be able to ascertain where we need to go, what we need to do, what blind spots do we have and what can we solve for. We are going to take a data informed approach, that is an absolute. So then we will round out for questions. Sound good?

So, let's take a look at some of our common perspectives. Again, these are just some high-level perspectives: ACT, SAT, enroll students etc. So over the years the test has become not necessarily synonymous, but has become part of that way for us to say whether or not a student would be successful in combination with other factors. I think most would agree that the test alone was not necessarily the predictor of student success; there [are] a lot of factors wrapped into that. More schools, as we talked about in the beginning are adopting a test optional model. For those of us that are looking for a test optional model, there are plenty of examples to point at. There are plenty of websites out there and that sort of thing.

Senator Dowd: You say "more schools." Can you give us a percentage of the number of universities that actually have this, rather than an increasing number? What percentage actually have test optional?

Mr. Anderson: Yes. I have not done the percentage, but there is a website that I believe I've got with me - if not, then I can look it up - it lists every school in it that have gone test optional, and to the degree that they have gone test optional.

Senator Dowd: Just for perspective, you said the percentage of the total number of schools?

Mr. Anderson: There is about a thousand out there right now that have some form of calculus when it comes time to the test.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: We know that there are certain aspects of the test that invoke a social, an emotional and even some cases, a financial barrier. Although the test is woven into our K-12 system in Ohio, additional tests do come. With that, it requires a student to seek out a waiver which is again, another identifier that the student doesn't have the means to be able to afford that. Students don't always come forward because there again, we are asking the students to prove that they don't have the money. I chose my words cautiously on the bottom. It says, "standardize assessment does have its place." So we do have multiple assessments here. We have ALEKS Placement test, for a writing test, we've got Accuplacer Placement test, not administered here, but as part of other high schools, that sort of thing. So we do have some standardize testing to be able to guide us through when we are potentially having a student who doesn't have a score. I'm going to pause there. If there is anything else you would like to share, this is still very much a conversation. Again, this is something that we are reviewing, so this is an opportunity for your input. Yes?

Senator Mann (Substitute for G. Sheldon): I am wondering if there been a study done of the thousands that do have the old admission to see how the students admitted without the tests actually do?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, there is some research out there. It is emerging because this is rather new, but it [has] become such broad-based. But yes, there are some schools that are seeing some positive results because of this. It is not what most would have thought where we are just opening things up and we are losing some of the quality indicators of what students comes to us with. Again, I can send the link to some of that research. It is research so it is people on both sides of it right now, but there is positive research out there that has been studied.

Prof. Kristen Keith: Jim, it is my understanding that the SSI formula...ACT, SAT. I think components of those were to identify students who were academically at risk. If we were to go to the test-out option, is there an alternative way to identify who those students are?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, there is. So the Ohio Revised Code provides for multiple standards to signify whether or not, what we're talking about here is that there is a flag in the SSI file called Remediation Free. Typically, that is leaned on the ACT or SAT and that's been cross-blocked to deem a student remediation free. But there is also in the Revised Code that also allows us variables such as GPA, such as the Accuplacer test, ALEKS test, and Writing test. Other indicators are in that table that allow us to be able to determine whether or not a student is meeting remediation free. And digging just beneath that table, it allows universities a lot of lead way in determining what is or isn't remediation free. That is compiled in our SSI file to the State. So, we feel that we can look at other things when determining whether or not a student meets or doesn't meet that standard.

Unknown Speaker: Do you know how this would impact our rankings in, say, US News Reports or anything like that?

Mr. Anderson: We are working on common perspectives now.

Senator Gregory: So one thing to maybe consider, I know our college, for example ask you to exhibit either your scores or just your GPA. In some ways we've kind of implicitly accepted that model, I think, by allowing students to select GPA instead. But I was curious of, I've been reading about this and tracking this debate as it's been playing out in California.

Mr. Anderson: Yea.

Senator Gregory cont'd: The new test course study that everybody's been waiting for that just came out, which sort of surprisingly stated that, that debate, as I understand it was framed as the test scores are biased against underrepresented minority applicants and hurts their efficient chances. And then somewhat surprisingly the faculty survey that just came out suggests that actually it may help the students because they might otherwise get rejected because their high school grades alone are not high enough. I don't know. But I was kind of curious to know if you all had thought about that California report? Is it too new, or if UT has kind of a response to that? I know...student population.

Mr. Anderson: Let me work through because I've got an example, and if we can just put a pin in that where that might help us because we are looking at our data with that same lens. What is it going to do with diversity? Is it going to help? Is it going to hurt? Those sorts of things. When can a test help or hurt you? Remember, we are talking about there's a lot of ways to talk about this. Some people are saying some institutions, Illinois, I believe, has gone test block. They don't even want to see it. We are saying it is test optional. So the student has the ability to choose how they want to petition the University for admission. So if a test is going to improve the student's chances, then we encourage them to submit. If perhaps that [it] is not going to factor into their calculation positively, we will say, submit your best case. Right? We plan on standing up enough information for a student to be able to make that choice. Again, [I'll] take one more question and then we got to move on. Good. Okay, let's take a look at this from a student perspective. This is kind of bringing us to the example to what we are seeing. So, we've got a student – this is actual data; not actual names - [name] Jessie. Jessie just got an English GPA of 3.40, math GPA of 3.43 - this is all four years adding up the math and doing a GPA calculation – and then a science GPA of 3.77. The high school GPA, if you average it out unweighted is 3.68 and weighted is 3.85. The class rank is 23 out of 293. Take a very good look at this student. We are not going to take a vote here, but this looks like a very highly qualified student, right? Jessie is definitely a student we want to take a look at. Then we have Jaime. Jaime²² got an English GPA of 1.83, math GPA of 1.0, and science GPA of 0.77. Her high school GPA unweighted, is 1.66 and the weighted GPA is 1.71. The class

rank is 247 out of 317. Not a highly performing student, right? All right, here is the review: Jessie's test score is 12 and Jaime's 26. So you see that if we require a test score ambiguously across the board then we have student's in Jessie's case where it can penalize them. But otherwise, Jessie represents a very good, a very strong applicant, and likewise, Jaime. But because it is a required field right now in order to complete your admission, there are groups that it does impact. I've got a question upfront first.

Senator Raphael-Mata: I have two comments. One is, how frequent are these cases because I think that these extreme examples are probably, my guess is, very low frequency. Second, what universities would argue that they do a holistic approach of admission and they would consider these cases, specifically when they see the discrepancies and they will take a second look at them?

Mr. Anderson: So yes on both cases. So we will pull both of these students out of our review file. No, there are not thousands of students like this, but it is more common than you think. But at the end of the day, I think there is a key in there, which is that the student had to had gotten to review first. The way that we are speaking to students could have kept, maybe in both cases, those students out. But we would agree that Jessie is the student that we would want to talk to, maybe not as much with Jaime. But nonetheless, there is a story there because there is a big disagreement between the data that we have. So why talk? We want to talk to them. If we are putting up a fence saying, we can't talk to you unless you do this then we are not getting to the holistic review.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I'm just wondering if we were to just base this on GPA alone, how could we access any kind of inflated GPA? I mean, when I am looking at this right now, I mean, why would a student with such a high GPA only test 12, when a student who is clearly on the cusp of failing score outrageously high? So I am just wondering how could we access this? I mean there are so many high school students who are coming here. How could we access which high schools might be inflating the GPA?

Mr. Anderson: So relative strength of high school is a term that we use in admission quite often. There are some other things that can go into that calculus. So we know, oddly enough through the testing companies, what their college going rate is. We know to some degree how rigorous those high schools are based on the number of AP exams those students take and things like that. So we can adjust for that, the relative strength of the high school where a GPA might be suppress, but an ACT score would be higher. Then let me put some more data in front of you. I want to make a point. So both students came from a relatively similar high school- different backgrounds, but relatively similar high schools. That is an important thing to know, right? Plus, class rank is also an important thing to know and that help give some perspective too.

Senator Steven: A critical piece of data that is missing is how well did they do at UToledo?

Mr. Anderson: I'm glad you asked.

Senator Steven: Because what we find in general with our department is that if we see the student on the left, that is the test score which is a better predictor option.

Mr. Anderson: Yes. Let me get to that. I think there was one more question in the back, but if you hold on to that we will have some more time here in a moment. So currently we look like this. This is what our admission standards are on the web. This is what we look like. So we admit on a 15 ACT or an 830 SAT at 2.75 or better. A student who falls outside of that gets into the holistic review and then there is a pretty rigorous deny if it is below 14 or lower and a 2.7. So that is the way the system is setup now. So the students that are coming to you now are coming through these three holistic review as a channel, these three channels.

Senator Insch: So I am just curious that the reason why we are having this discussion is that you want to incentivise more people that are on the outliers of the statistic to apply to UT? Because I would guess that both Jaime and Jessie were accepted at UT.

Mr. Anderson: They are in review.

Senator Insch: So our acceptance rate is fairly low to start, so I would suspect the people that we are not accepting are fairly few and farther outliers than [having] a higher GPA or a high test score. They probably have a low GPA and a low test score. Would that be accurate?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, on the whole. But we do go through and we take a look at things like their core GPA vs. their elective GPA and things like that. We do take things apart. We also do take apart the test. ACT comes in four parts. Sometimes the student would the science part of it, which we know more students score higher on the science part than math and English. So when we look for those things, we do find that there are students that don't meet that test and they don't get in. So, it varies. There's a lot of combinations and permutations. So that is why I am hazarding to say 'yes' and 'no' because there is a lot of grey inside. But yes, I will agree with you to that extent that we do want to have a broad pool petition for admission. Not advocating that we change the students, but that we broaden our pool so we do consider more students for admission. Not necessarily that we admit more students down the line. Right?

Senator Insch: Do you know how many people enter holistic review on a given year?

Mr. Anderson: That is a great question. I did not pull that for you. I would be hazarding a guess if I did say, but I can get that for you. Let's take a look at the data. I know my audience here; you are chopping at the bit for this. I've got it broken down by college. The orange line [is] our student who reenrolled after one year. The bottom line is their GPA rate. So blue is they did not return. Orange is they did return. This is an end count of just shy of 3,000 students. So this is our admit pool for 2018, and did they return in 2019. The data shows that at that 3.0, if you give me this 2.75 that there is a highly likelihood of success. In fact, it gets up to 80% and 90%. Now, we have this broken down by each college and each college has a slightly different signature, whether it is 2.75 or 3.0. There are some colleges where you start to see they take off at a 3.25. But we've got the percentages. We've got the percents by colleges of what a student would do their first year. Now we know that there is a million of things in there for student success. I fully can see that. But, when we are taking a look at the relative predictive nature of the test in that calculus, we drop the test down here and said okay, if we just took them on GPA alone, what would they look like? And then we know that the further away that you get from the moment of taking the test, more of the oneness of student success falls on you as an individual moving through the system.

Senator Dowd: Your next slide, the corresponding slide for the SAT and ACT, is that done?

Mr. Anderson: No, I did not pull the ACT and SAT.

Senator Dowd: Because you are using this GPA as predictor, did you look at whether ACT scores, for example are the predictor of retention?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, we can. And actually I'll venture to say that when we apply this, we're looking at it as predictor. But this is a hind side look right now. So this is not a 'what if.'

Senator Dowd: No, no. This is 2018 data. Did you look at the 2018 data with regards to ACT predicting if they return the next fall?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, and it makes the same line. Now, there might be some variance back there where you would see some differences in this slide, the **write review zone**. But after that, it just clearly out paces it whether or not the ACT or SAT scores are in that calculation.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: What would a model look like should we decide to go in this realm? So just like I showed you in the beginning or a couple of slides ago, the left side is what we're doing now. If a student submits a test they will progress through exactly as they would- scholarships, all that stuff, at least for institutional aid would still apply the same way. If a student did not submit a test, they would have a slightly higher GPA threshold to get over than they would have a test. You see that 3.0 here is where the breakpoint analysis is. Again, that is informed by data. This is a proposal and then the deny would go here to a 2.0 or lower. You can see how these two things move through. Likewise, when you look at scholarship cross blocks as well if you go through without a test score, the GPA requirement becomes higher and then we can adjust our scholarships and our scholarships awarding based on that. So we have a lot of that data cross blocked so that we can map that over. We could hypothetically switch it tomorrow and we can map all of that over because we ran the data.

Prof. Kristen Keith: So what about the students who are between having a high school GPA of 3.0 and high school GPA of 2.0? There's not yet either admitted or denied, so I assume you are reviewing that case. What would you be looking at if they don't submit a test score?

Mr. Anderson: So we are going to look at the relative strength of their core components of their high school career. So we look for things, obviously their consistency in their math, science, English. We take a look at, and it just depends, on what the school chooses to send in the transcript. We look at their class rank. They send attendance records. Some will send other things that they are involved in, in high school. We will look at whether they were in honors classes, AIBP classes vs. regular track classes. So there's a whole host of things that we can look at [such as] whether they have a rising trend so that they are getting better every year, or a declining trend that they are just flaring out. Sometimes we see that a student has a 'bad' year, so we ask the student to submit some more information. We ask them to submit an essay. We ask them to submit a testimony. We ask them for letters of recommendation from a counselor too so we can be able to pull things together. Sometimes we will have an enrollment counselor reach out, call them and understand their story. So there are all sorts of things that we do in that holistic review process to try and decide what is not there on paper or be able to decipher what is on the paper.

Senator Hammersley: What have the discussions been for a way for TPS students to have a greater number and be able to come to the University of Toledo that do not have the resources to take the ACT or SAT? Have you run, because we are interacting with them and it seem a fair number are going to Bowling Green, what effect that would have on our admission, the TPS related students?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, we can run a 'what if' scenario on it, but essentially it is our understanding some of the research is showing that we would see an increase in applicants of people petitioning for admission from TPS because of our openness to them choosing a particular track. In fact, one of those students was a TPS student that was up here.

Senator Hammersley: The other side of that is, well, we are not doing remediation. What are we asking to have happen that may be uncontrollable, a cost or need to put them in - if they are in - math classes so that they are in extra help to get them to the appropriate level in college? Part of it is the experience of them coming to college, and being on your own, and having to have an ability to put yourself in a standardize workload that they may or not had to do before. It has to do with their background environment or what is going on with their colleagues while they are in high school. So I

guess our concern is we want students to succeed. We want to be available and admit them here, but once they are admitted, we have an obligation to get them to get through.

Mr. Anderson: So we are doing a lot of things. I'll say the test doesn't test for those things. So the number doesn't show you all of that. The reason why I chose my words carefully in the beginning was I said that norm testing does have its place. We are not suggesting that we remove ALEKS, or that we don't have some write placement test, or that we don't look at their high school GPA and consider that when they are being advised. My team can then pull that data so that you have a high school GPA on simply English if we don't have what we need to there so that we can get them in the right class. That is the worst case scenario is to have students not succeed. Like I said, I've been staring at this data for a long time so I've had a chance to really get comfortable with it. But looking at our 2018 data with our 2019 results, shows us that student success; we have increase retention and graduation rates with the standards that are up there. So I don't perceive that by allowing a student to be able to choose that we would drastically alter that or be overly concerned. We're more so concerned with retention that we are right now. We are highly concerned with it right now and we need to continue to push in that direction. I have one question in the back.

Senator Molitor: So one of the consequences of this potentially is if no colleges change their admission model than you basically are admitting potentially extra students to University College who will not be able to declare a major, and we know the outcomes for those students are not great.

Mr. Anderson: Well, I mean, the outcomes for the students are right where they are. Right? But if you isolate them down to University College, yes, then you get more not coming back. What I would say is, as we are working through this, considering this is that we do take a look at the numbers for each college and program. Some programs could get comfortable with not having the test score based upon their student success over time. Other programs, I mean, would certainly open the door to other programs still requiring tests. That is very common to have that be a part of it. No, I would not want to have an essentially an open, but closed University. I think you are servicing a great point, that I don't think anybody here would be satisfied with this approach and be closed behind the scenes. I think we want to push on that. The research can help us there on what our students have done, dropping that test score out, and then looking what the success metrics are, and then really just taking a scalpel to that and determine which programs really must need the test. That is 100% okay. Some of these things we have talked about already. Many of these we have talked about already. We've developed cross blocks and we've looked at the data. We've looked at the data over years of information to be able to accurately cross block the lack of test score and what that would do and what the high school GPA would need to look like. Some of our top awards still require a test score. If you are going to get our top-most award, we want to have you work for it and we want you to show that through a test score. Other awards don't need to be. We have some donor based funds, we know that. College based funds could still require the score. We know that the NCAA rule still apply. So right now we've got a grid format on our web so [if] a student looks at their high school GPA and test score they can see what scholarship that they can get. That's good. It has some transparency in pricing and a student can see, okay, well, if the bill is this and I qualify for that, I can make this work and I will take the next steps. What we will like to do is stand up a calculator for a student to be able to work through. Not too elaborate, but enough for students to be able to work through a couple of options: What their need base award would look like. Currently, we don't show what a need base award would look like. What a merit base award would look like. And help inform them on by going through some of that; that would help inform them on whether or not they should submit the test score as part of their petition for admission. So again, we want to inform the student on the best route possible because once they choose, it is no going back and saying, 'oh, wait a minute; I didn't get what I wanted. I am going to go now and do the other route.' So we hope to be able to stand up that type of information so the student can do that. Some the examples that are out there, Ball State has a very robust example of that

calculator. However, no offense to any Cardinals in here, but essentially you can't get any of their awards without a test score, even though they signal test optional. It is not the environment that we want at the University, so we are looking to dig deep in our data to be able to explain it. So if you go out there, do give it a couple of runs on the calculator and you'll see what you get.

So, some of the things that I know you are concerned about and things that we need to consider: How do we ensure continued student success? We have that question in many forms around the audience today. That just simply says that the high school GPA is going to be more heavily scrutinize. More weight is going to be put on that high school GPA. That is how we are going to ensure continued success, that, and if a student chooses to submit a test score, which we believe based upon other institutions of similar size, about 75% of the students still chooses to submit test scores. If you look at our average test score of 23 and if I were to put up the distribution - the score centers in front of you - you would probably want to set your score if you were at or above the average to see where that is going to help you, and if you were at or below the average, you probably wouldn't. Then we are going to go and we are going to dig deeper into your GPA. Again, the last thing that we want to do is have an effect on our positive memento with retention and graduation. I was here before you months ago giving a pat on the back to all of you because of the positive trends that we have seen in our retention and graduation rates. So what does that mean for my academic program? Senator Molitor, we talked about that in depth. You will have the option. I ask that option be data informed. I am happy if we go in this way, I am happy to work on the data with you and walk through what that means and take a look.

Unknown Speaker: A number that will be very useful to know in the graph that you show is especially in the high GPA ranges. In the fraction if the students drop, is that currently with a low ACT score?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Unknown Speaker: Because that would give you more information about this decision. Of course, it will correlate with a higher GPA, but is there a negative correlation between the higher GPA that drop and the lower test score?

Mr. Anderson: This stuff is fun, isn't it? We want to research the heck-out of it. It is fascinating work. We talked about how this affects scholarships. We can cross block that. Certain scholarships can still require the score and will be transparent about that and a student will be able to find out that information if they need to. Will this affect our ranking? So that question has come out. We did some research on that and we said that the impact would be flat to potentially increase our overall average and how that calculates into that. Without getting into the U.S. News report - we did some research on it - the percent that they weight your score centers is on a sliding scale. So if you are submitting 100%, it gets weighted at (we will just say) 'x'%. If you have 75% of all of your students sending the score, that percent then goes into the calculation and is back down. It adjusts for that. And like we talked about earlier, we are not the first school that would consider this, so that is in the calculation. I'll look for more moves from them as this movement continues and I have to address how other schools are receiving and reporting scores. We are all working very hard on our profiles and how others view us. For the benchmarks that we've got right now, we don't see that having an impact.

Senator Edgington: So we understand when discussing this you have enrollment issues and we want to increase the applicants. Right, that is basically it?

Mr. Anderson: In part.

Senator Edgington: Yeah, in part. Have you considered any other Ohio university doing the same thing that are dropping or making it optional for SAT and ACT, because those are our closest competitor? If I am a student in high school and I heard UT has made ACT and SAT optional, my first impression would

be UT is making it easy. If I have a high enough GPA and my choice is between Ohio State, Cincinnati, and the University of Toledo, I would think UT is going to attract those lower quality students and maybe I don't want to go there, right? So you are losing some students on the high end trying to attract students on the low end. Does that make sense?

Mr. Anderson: Yes. I mean, I can't rule that perception out. I can't say no. Right. But what I can tell you is that in Ohio State, all their branch campuses are test optional. Wright State is test optional and there's a couple of others in the State that have done it. Many private institutions have done it. Of course, they are trying to gather enrollment as well. Lourdes has done it right down the road. I have been in contact with colleagues in Indiana and IUPUI and they confidently went this way. They did consider the optics of it, but they haven't seen that impact.

Senator Edgington: My colleagues and we have discussed that the Enrollment Management Office has never talked with faculty. Faculty members I don't think are involved in the recruiting in the sense that a lot of things we do and the talking points your office put out there's been somewhat a disconnect. I think we feel we are doing exciting things that we are teaching very good classes and students are happy. But then when you guys talk to outside people or talk to potential; what is really doing with recruiting per se... maybe you need to really talk to faculty on that, that is my impression. Would that help to bringing more quality students if they are excited about our program and about our education, whether than trying to recruit students. I'm not saying that this test optional will recruit lower quality students, but we are in front of ACT 14/15, if you are 142/13 maybe don't report it and we will still admit you. I think we are thinking of trying to draw more students... [Indecipherable].

Mr. Anderson: Sure. And I am taking the feedback about trying to stay coordinated on our messages -I got that. You know, as far as the quality base, even with the standards that we have right now we have seen an increase with high school GPA and we have seen an increase in our test score. We have seen an increase in our retention and we have seen an increase in our graduation. Those four things that we've seen an increase of with given what we have right now. So, if we consider that to be competitive then we are doing that. We are not dropping. We are saying that you have the option and that option can help you in petitioning for admission for the University. We are still reserving some areas. We still need to require the test score and students will have to meet those high benchmarks so the profile of your program is intact because we still are going to talk about [openly] that those are going to require hitting those benchmarks, specifically Engineering is one of those where that almost must be and we need to take a very close look at it.

President Brakel: One final question.

Senator Dowd: Now, this is coming from Enrollment Management. Given we are talking about substituting one academic standard for another, I am just wondering, what has Provost Bjorkman recommended about this? To follow-up on the initiatives that Senator Edgington brought up, this is an academic issue. It is not an enrollment issue. So, has the Provost weighed in on this? And if not, then perhaps the Executive Committee during your next conversation you have you might ask Provost Bjorkman how she feels.

President Brakel: Well, I can partially answer that question. It was actually a month ago now that I was called to meet with Mr. Anderson and the Provost to discuss this. [I was told] This is something that is being explored. That same day I talked to the Executive Committee about it and we then, at that same meeting, had President Gaber there and we discussed it with her. It was also another topic of our discussion that President-Elect Hammersley and I had this past week with Dr. Gaber as well. So that conversation is going on and it is being looked at, but not signed off yet, to be the right answer.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Senator Hammersley: One thing we wanted to do is have everybody in each college think about the effects on your college of what this potentially could do. What problems you have now with individuals coming in and not being able to succeed and will this require funds to be put into something else? But it should be looked at in every college to see how you would respond to it.

Mr. Anderson: Yes. We will let the data not just necessarily take us there, but help us to make that decision. Data informed, but not data driven. So, absolutely. Thank you. Great questions and research that I need to do, and great feedback. We are asking. We are gathering input. It is an academic issue, right? How we bring students to the University and how we help them along and put them in the best way possible to be successful. So I truly understand that happens in your classrooms and has an effect on your programs and your colleges, that sort of thing. So the last thing I want to do is put you or others, our students primarily in a position where they can't be successful. I know we share that common vision. So thank you. Thank you very much.

President Brakel: Backing up to the *Executive Committee report:* The Scantron Committee met again on February 20th at which time it was decided to proceed with the pilot of the Remark system. This Remark system is more robust compared to the other potential software system titled...that was under consideration. The Remark software will run on the new copy printers, which are in the process of being rolled out this Spring. The pilot study of the Remark solution will begin this summer and continue into the fall semester. The current Scantron will eventually be moved to the Carlson Library as the Print Shop winds down its current operation. The Scantron system will still be available during the pilot of the Remark software solution. If the Remark software pilot goes well, Remark will eventually replace the Scantron service.

The Constitution Committee Chair Mark Templin, President-Elect Jeff Hammersley and I met with Provost Bjorkman and Faculty Relations, Kevin West to discuss the Office of Legal Affairs' review of the Constitution. Their suggestions appear to be rather minor such as clarifying which President, President of Faculty Senate or President of the University. There were a couple places where consistency between the Constitution, Rules, and Bylaws was a little inconsistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Those types of things needed to be addressed. I asked Chair Templin to have his committee review the changes ASAP and he is working on those. Legal Affairs then wants to double check those edits and we'll need to meet with the Board of Trustees representatives. We are still pushing to get a vote of the Constitution and all that yet this year. We've got our fingers crossed. Hang on. It is going to be a 'fun' spring.

The Executive Committee met on February 21st where we discussed the Senate Office operations. Cathy Bukowski, who serves as the Assistant to the Library Dean is assisting us with Minutes and other operations in that Office during Quinetta's leave of absence. We will report that both Quinetta and baby Charleigh are doing fine and are at home. As I stated at our meeting two weeks ago, please contact me directly if you need assistance from the Faculty Senate Office.

We also discussed the Constitution topic with President Gaber in this meeting agenda. I also attended a meeting last week regarding credit base micro-credentials as being spear headed by the Office of Graduate Studies. There are a lot unanswered questions regarding micro-credentials. Some good ideas on how to proceed were discussed such as examining potential markets for micro-credentials and what key words appear in job ads that might make an applicant with the micro-credentials stand out from other applicants. This discussion will continue for the foreseeable future as there are many different issues and concerns that need to be resolved.

This concludes the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report. Does any Executive Committee member have anything they would like to add? Any questions? We are moving on then. I don't think Provost Bjorkman is here.

Unknown Speaker: She is unable to make it.

President Brakel: Okay, thank you. So that brings us to the Curriculum Committee report.

Senator Edgington: So today we have seven new course proposals and 18 course modifications. So for the new course proposals, the first one is **Theatre 5260**. This is a cross listed course with Theatre 4260, Visual and Performing Arts. The description is: "Promoting the Visual and Performing Arts will provide undergraduate and graduate students with an advanced look at the theoretical and functional practice of publicizing and advancing visual and performing arts organizations, ranging from consumer behaviors and analysis to campaign communications and strategies."

Theatre 5250, Administration and Management of the Arts. Also crosses the course with 4250. "Administration and Management of the Arts will provide undergraduate and graduate students with an advanced look at the managerial, structural, and operational functions of visual and performing arts organizations, translating traditional business practices into the language of the arts."

RCBS 3200, Introduction to Critical Care. The description is: "An introductory experience in the theory, initiation and practice of providing non-invasive and mechanical ventilation in a critical care setting."

HIST 4050, Muslims, Christians and Jews in Medieval Spain. The description is: "This course will provide an overview of the political and cultural history of medieval Spain while allowing students time and space to grapple with primary sources and historical arguments. The class will investigate the concept of Convivencia or "living together," tracing its development in the works of historians, and evaluating whether it is a concept that can adequately be applied to medieval Spain."

FLAN [number?], World Cultures through Literature and Cinema in Transition. The description is: "This course introduces students to World Cultures through selected translated texts and films from various European, Latin American, African, Asian, and Middle East cultures. Among the themes considered are race, gender, class, immigration, and colonialism. Taught in English. 3 credit hours."

ART 3910, Outsider Art and Community Practice. The description is: "This course will study the role and advantage of community-based "Supported Studios"; art studios facilitated by practicing artists specifically attuned to the needs of people with disabilities. Students will study the history and contemporary positioning of such creative spaces and the relevant pedagogical imperatives inherent in the delivery of services. Students will also research evolving definitions of "Outsider Art" and "Outsider Artists". A variety of methods of study, including visiting working Supported Studios will be employed."

CHEM 1300, Principles of General Chemistry. The description is: "This is an accelerated course with selected topics from general chemistry including matter, units, ionic compounds, molecular compounds, aqueous solutions, precipitation reactions, acid-base reactions, oxidation-reduction reactions, concentration, enthalpy, calorimetry, polarity, Lewis structures, dipole moment, and intermolecular forces. This course is for students who major in science, engineering or other fields which require CHEM1240."

Senator Edgington cont'd: Are there any questions about any of the new course proposals?

Unknown Speaker: Can you make it larger?

Senator Edgington: Yes. You should have this in your email as well. You can bring up the Faculty Senate email that President Brakel sent out yesterday. Any other questions on new courses?

Senator Insch: I'm curious. Our Theatre Department doesn't have a graduate program, correct?

Senator Insch: I am not aware.

President Brakel: That is correct, but there's a move to create an Arts Administration certificate at the graduate level. I think that is why those courses have been proposed.

Senator Insch: [*Indecipherable*]...matching up, but it is actually an account for credit towards the degree in the Masters of Public Administration. Is that correct? I'm assuming that is what MPA means.

Senator Gregory: My understanding is, yeah, that class will be fitting in the MPA program which is run out of Political Science.

Senator Edgington: Other questions?

Unknown Speaker: I am a little bit confused about the intersession course. How do they decide what is acceptable to move on? You can't cover everything that you can cover in a regular session.

Senator Edgington: Let me see if I scroll down here to the last one which is CHEM 1240, which is the modification that we will take a look at later. This is what they put for that course. The new course, "CHEM 1300 is offering an alternative way to register for this course, CHEM 1240 and therefore the prerequisites needed to be changed for this course. Students who not earn a C in CHEM 1230 now have a chance to still take CHEM 1240 without falling behind. They can take CHEM 1300 over winter intersession and earn their way into CHEM 1240 such that they stay on schedule." I know that it doesn't address the content that your question is getting into. If there is someone from Chemistry here that can answer that, or maybe from that College that can answer that. I know the syllabus does address what is going to be talked about. I know the course description up here says[it] also addresses what we talked about. I will admit, I don't know what is dealt with in CHEM 1230 and how this build off of that – I'm not sure.

Senator Edgington: Any other questions? If no other questions, then we will go ahead and take a vote. All those in favor of accepting these seven new course proposals say, 'aye.' All those opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

The 18 modifications.

We will start with **THR 4150, Theatre Studies.** The modification here is: "Removal of prerequisites (THR 3110 and THR 3120). "The current prerequisites on this course are courses that the Department of Theatre & Film are no longer offering. We request that there be no prerequisites for this course."

THR 2050, Theatre Practicum II. The modification here is: "Name change: Theatre Shop Practicum. "During advising there has been some confusion about thinking that Practicum I and Practicum II needing to be taken sequentially when they do not need to be. We would like to change the names of the courses to remove that confusion. No other content of the course will be changed."

THR 2000, Theatre Practicum I. The modification here is: "Name Change: Theatre Production Practicum. "During advising there has been some confusion about thinking that Practicum I and Practicum II needing to be taken sequentially when they do not need to be. We would like to change the names of the courses to remove that confusion. No other content of the course will be changed."

RCBS 3230, Cardiopulmonary Diagnostics II. The modification here is: “Change to credit hours: reduction from 3 to 2 (one credit Lecture; one credit Other "Field Experience"). Course can be repeated for up to 4 total credits. Change to catalog description. Change to prereq (minimum grade of C for all prereq courses). Restricted to majors in respiratory care. "Formerly this course relied on laboratory experience where students performed simple pulmonary maneuvers on each other. Lab equipment is now defunct, and program budget does not allow replacement of the equipment. Area hospital managers have agreed to allow the students to come observe the procedures they would have performed in lab. Due to the decrease in contact time, we have decreased the course to 2 credits instead of 3. ”

PHPR 4220, Medication Therapy Management. The modification here is: “Name change: Patient Centered Care. Change to long and short titles. Change to catalog description. Offered Fall semester. Co-requisite added: PHPR 4350. Restricted to "P-2 status in the Doctor of Pharmacy program, PHPR 4350: PSD-3 (co-requisite), or permission by the course." Change to CIP code. "Course name change is to reflect the course content modifications that help prepare students for pharmacy practice."

MSL 4020, Company Grade Leadership. The modification here is: “Added prerequisite: Open to ROTC Cadets who have completed both MSL 3010 and MSL 3020.”

FLAN 4160, Teaching Colloquia. The modification here is: “Course is being cross-listed with FLAN 5160.”

EXSC 4990, Independent Study in Exercise Science/Physical Education. The modification here is: “Change to course name: Independent Study in Exercise Science. Change to long and short titles. "This course title is a holdover from the past, when Exercise Science (Kinesiology) had an affiliation with the physical education degree program (a degree which is no longer offered as a major at Utoledo). As such, we are requesting the removal of "physical education" from the course title."

EXSC 4860, Clinical Exercise Testing Lab. The modification here is: “New prereq: KINE 3520 Minimum Grade of C- and KINE 3530 Minimum Grade of C-. New Co-Requisite: which is exercise science 3850. "The only change is to change this course to a corequisite to take along with EXSC 4850. Originally, it was labeled prereq but these courses are taken at the same time.

EXSC 3580 – Human Pathophysiology. The modification is: Title Change: Exercise Pathophysiology. Change to short and long titles. "This proposal is requesting a change in course title from Human Pathophysiology to Exercise Pathophysiology, as this title will be a more accurate/specific reflection of the course objectives."

EXSC 3240, Concepts of Exercise Fitness and Health Strategies. The modification is: “Change to course description. Change to course prerequisites (see proposal). Changes linked to program modification.”

CHIN 1090, Chinese Culture. The modification here is: “Seeking Core Curriculum designation (Non-US Diversity). "Similar courses (ARBC 1090, FREN 1090, GERM 1090, JAPN 1090, SPAN 1090) are all in the core humanities. ARBC 1090, JAPN 1090 are in non-US diversity as well"

EEES 4920, Senior Geology Seminar. The modification here is: “Change to catalog description. New prerequisite: Senior standing or permission of the instructor.”

CHEM 1110, Elementary Chemistry for the Health Sciences. The modification here is: “Prerequisite Addition: SAT Math, Minimal grade 520, academic level (NOTE: Nursing requested that the SAT math equivalent be listed in the prerequisites.)”

PHYS 4440, Physics Applications in Medicine II. The modification here is: Name change: “Medical Physics II. Change to short and long titles. Change to course description. (NOTE: The current course title and catalog description are too generic. Request to change both to better align with the offered coursework content.)”

ASTR 2010, Solar System Astronomy. The modification here is: “Course is not repeatable for credit. Course prerequisites modified (addition of tests scores and revised MATH classes; see proposal). (NOTE: This pre-req will direct students who should be in ASTR 1010 into the correct course. It matches exactly with a similarly updated ASTR 2020 pre-req also submitted with input of Math, and Student Services)”

ASTR 2020, Stars, Galaxies, and the Universe. The modification here is: “Course not repeatable for credit. Course prerequisites added (test scores, MATH 1320 or MATH 1330 or MATH 1340). (NOTE: Changes to help students place into correct course)”

CHEM 1240, General Chemistry II. The modification here is: “Prereq Change: CHEM 1230 with grade of C or CHEM 1230 with grade of D- AND CHEM 1300 with a grade of C) (NOTE: The new course, CHEM 1300, will offer an alternative way to register for this course CHEM 1240 and therefore the prerequisites needed to be changed for this course. Students who do not earn a C in Chem 1230 now have a chance to still take Chem 1240 without falling behind. They can take Chem 1300 over winter intersession and earn their way into Chem 1240 such that they stay on schedule.”

Senator Edgington cont’d: Those are 18 course modifications. Are there any questions?

Senator Molitor: Yes, under Theatre 3150. They requested removal of all prerequisites. I don’t know if that is their intention to let any student in the University take that course or if they want to limit it just to Theatre majors or some specific subset of major.

Senator Edgington: That is good question. Is anyone from Theatre that can answer that question?

Senator Gregory: I’m sorry, repeat that one more time.

Senator Edgington: The concern is that by removing the prerequisites on this course here, Theatre 4150 now leaves it open for any student in the University of Toledo to take that course. Is that the intention? Because up to the bar any student can register for the class right now, where in the past you would have to have those two prerequisites.

Senator Gregory: I can’t answer.

Senator Edgington: I can find out. We can hold on that one. Any other questions about the course modifications? See there is [are] no questions, we’ll go ahead and take a vote. First of all, the modifications, we will take Theatre 4150 out of the list of courses. I will get verification on that and will present it to you at a later date. So we now have 17 course modifications. All those in favor of the other 17 course modifications say ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? We have one abstention. Thank you all very much.

President Brakel: I think that brings us back to academic dishonesty. There’s been a committee that’s been working on this for the last year-and-a-half or so. Senator Dowd is going to present some information about that. This committee is out of the Provost Office, not out of the Senate.

Senator Dowd: There were two documents distributed to you: The existing University policy on Academic Dishonesty and proposed revisions. I am here to talk about the proposed revisions. Just as

some background, there are two other members of the committee in attendance today: Dan Compora and Mary Humphrys. Feel free to shout-out or interrupt me if I get anything wrong or if you want to add anything. This committee was established Spring of 2018. I think the first time we met, Mary, was it April of 2018?

Prof. Humphrys: Yes.

Senator Dowd: We met at least once a month since then; sometimes a couple times a month. I'll talk a little bit more about this later. The revisions that we are proposing -I want to emphasize this - this is not a final product that's been distributed to you. This is a progressive stage where we need to hear feedback. That is why we are here. If you want a quote from Lucy Churchill, "This is not the end of the process. It is not even the beginning of the end of the process, but maybe it is the end of the beginning." That is where we are at with this. Our first meeting we started talking about what we're going to do. We basically guessed that it was going to take about two years before we could actually get what could be considered a reasonable draft. This has been a very big project. We are bumping on two years. This is the existing policy on academic dishonesty. If you look at this policy, I want to summarize it. President Brakel was kind enough to distribute this to you. I want to thank the Executive Committee for giving me sometime today on the agenda. But if you look at the existing policy, it is about one page of text. This summary is almost as long as the actual text dealing with misconduct. There are eight items identified as misconduct: One is the definition of plagiarism, but it doesn't go on to say anything about what happens if you plagiarize. There are five statements dealing with essentially cheating on an exam. There is one statement dealing about damaging property. Then there is one statement that students are not allowed to use the same assignment for multiple classes. That is the extent of identifying academic dishonesty. The policy then goes on to give you three statements on sanctions: What if a student is responsible for dishonesty? Then there is one statement saying, well, if the student doesn't agree with the determination, they can appeal it. I'm going to return to this in just a minute. The policy says a student can appeal the decision, but they don't appeal it. They file a grievance. It is a world of difference between an appeal and grieving something, which I will get to. Just as a background, the last word on all academic grievances, grade appeals, misconduct, dishonesty, plagiarism - anything naughty that happens in an academic environment, the last word is the Academic Standing Committee. Now, I hope most of you have never heard of this committee because it has to pass through about five levels of review before it would get to this committee. This committee handles all graduate cases and depending on the discretion of the Provost, they can send undergraduate cases to the committee. I've spent 15 years as the chair of that committee and I was on the committee for about 18 years. I'm not silly enough to say I've seen everything. I've seen rough cases. Probably very similar to those of you who've served either on the Standing Committee or the Student Grievance Council. There is no joy on these committees. The reason why I am bringing this up is [because] this policy is not operational in so many different ways. That summary that I've provided it doesn't give guidance to the Standing Committee. I can't speak for the Student Grievance Council, but it probably doesn't give them guidance either; not the level of guidance that it needs to adjudicate these cases.

This is the draft policy that was also distributed to you. Again, not in final form. But as you'll can see, we took it from one page of text. This version is probably 10 or 11 pages. The original version we had was up to 24 pages. That was a little too much. Now the committee that's dealing with this is a provost-level committee. It was out of the Provost Office because this was going to take multiple years. You can't have an ad hoc senate committee stand more than one year. So, it came out of the Provost Office, but more than half the members of the committee were appointed by the Faculty Senate. Now the faculty members on this committee all have extensive experience dealing with academic dishonesty and academic

misconduct, either extensive experience with dealing with it in the classroom, Joe Jake and myself deal with the adjudication cases at the University level, department chairs, and the administrative appointments-these are the individuals who deal with academic dishonesty and academic misconduct in their administrative offices, in the adjudication process, or processing the cases, or dealing with it after it's been adjudicating. In other words, implementing sanctions. The individuals on the committee, it is a very strong committee. Lots and lots of experience. Now, one of the things that's taking us so long is that these are all very complicated issues. We really do sincerely need your feedback. Everyone in this room knows what it is like to serve on a long-standing committee and you are talking to the same people over and over again about the same issues. We need to have feedback on this. Are we getting it right? Because honestly, we got to get this policy right. If we get academic dishonesty and academic misconduct wrong, if we make a mistake, if the policy isn't fair, if there's isn't equitable treatment, or if there isn't due process, when we make a mistake, we are going to affect someone's life forever. So, the stakes are very, very high on this policy. We need to establish a lot of things that are absent in the existing policy. Now, I don't want to send a lot of time complaining about what is not in the existing policy. We can spend the remainder of the time talking about the revisions that we are making to the policy and what we want to add to the policy. This is just a summary. It is a summary of the general concepts of what we've been doing.

My first issue. When is an appeal not an appeal? Well, when an undergraduate student at this University appeals an academic dishonesty decision. They don't appeal; they grieve it. Now I sat on an appeal committee. My heart goes out to the members on the Student Grievance Council because I think they had a much more difficult situation. I'll explain in a second. If I were to accuse a student of academic dishonesty and the student says they don't accept it, what the existing Academic Dishonesty policy says is the student can appeal, but they do that by filing a grievance against me. If you look at the Academic Grievance policy, this is kind of messed up. The Grievance policy which is supposed to handle these appeals there is not a single mention of academic dishonesty, academic honesty or academic misconduct. Serving on the Academic Standing Committee for so many years, I've spent thousands, millions of hours it seems in the Office of Legal Affairs. Every single case I was in the Office of Legal Affairs dealing with something. An issue of a grievance, if you read the Academic Grievance policy, students, once they file a grievance against you, they don't have to say anything. They may be invited to say something, but they don't have to. So if we are talking about applying academic misconduct with a grievance issue. If they file a grievance against you, you have to defend your decision for the academic sanction based on academic misconduct. But the student is not required to actually defend their actions. Now, this is kind of twisted when you talk about academic dishonesty and academic misconduct. It is the faculty member who is on the defensive. It is the department chair if they reveal the decision. It is a college committee. It is a college Dean that has to defend the actions when students do not have to try to explain a way why they are being accused for academic misconduct. Now when I said my heart goes out to the Student Grievance Council, they don't have a policy basically backing them up on what they should be looking at. They are trying to take a grievance policy and have it applied to misconduct. The revisions that we are proposing will actually broaden the Undergraduate Student Grievance Committee to give them the authority that they've been actually having to do on their own for so many years dealing with academic dishonesty. The graduate level, which by the way, the only reference to policy misconduct at the graduate level are two or three sentences buried in a completely separate policy – that is it. Now, I don't know at the Student Grievance Council, but the Academic Standing Committee over 15-18 years we've developed our own procedures and it worked out. But it doesn't have policy behind it either. I'll come back to that.

Expanding the examples of academic misconduct – Like I said, the existing policy doesn't cover what faculty are dealing with today. Of course, it has to include stuff like cheating on an exam for plagiarism.

But what about the simple fact that so much academic misconduct is not just that? Any action by a student that adversely affects another student in an educational environment, that is academic misconduct. Standing up in a middle of an exam and start screaming just so you can disrupt the other class, that is misconduct. falsification of data, falsification or fabricating data, falsification of documents, fabricating documents, that is academic misconduct. It could also be something as simple as falsely accusing someone else of academic misconduct- this is academic misconduct. When the committee started to do this, we went through an expanded list of what misconduct was and wasn't. Dan or Mary, how long was that? Was it three or four pages long?

Prof. Humphrys: Yes.

Senator Dowd: Now, we didn't include that in the policy. We are going to include that in... document and talk about it in a group, groups of misconduct. But we went out and we looked at other universities and what they are doing, their policies, and the examples of academic misconduct. The policy now doesn't say that academic misconduct is simply plagiarism, cheating on an exam, or damaging property. It will list examples, but we are very careful to say these are only examples because whatever list we today could come up with in terms of academic misconduct, if we talk with another faculty member they can come up with a different list. So the policy is a lot more flexible in terms of what is actually misconduct.

Senator Molitor: One recommendation I would have is to reference Student Conduct policies because we have issues sometimes. For example, you gave the example of somebody standing up and screaming or disrupting a class. They may argue that is a student conduct issue and not an academic misconduct issue and they have a whole different process of---

Senator Dowd: I agree. I get that, but honestly, you can't. It would have to be separated. The reason is we would neither have to refer to student conduct, but we can't say both. The policies have to be broken up. Their actions. How are they going to be charged? Student or academic? That is not covered by a specific policy.

President Brakel: We still have two other presentations.

Senator Dowd: Okay. I've got to hurry up. Equitable treatment – What is terribly missing and what is terrible about the existing policy is that policies have to establish rights. Students have rights. Faculty have rights. It is not established in the existing policy. A student have a right to a hearing. They have a right to speak at a hearing. Guess what? So do faculty members. They have a right to bring an advisor to a hearing. The current policy doesn't mention this. Now, for the Student Grievance Council, is there anyone here who served on it? Is it common practice for someone to bring an advisor in, an advocate?

Senator Kistner: It has not happened yet.

Senator Dowd: Now the Academic Standing Committee it happens about 90% of the time. So students need to know they are allowed to do that. Faculty are allowed to do that. We are talking about due process. So one of the things we've done in this current revision, for example if an undergraduate student doesn't like the decision and they grieve the faculty member and the Student Grievance Council makes a particular decision, the student could appeal it. They can appeal a college decision to the Student Grievance Council, but the faculty member can't. If the faculty member doesn't like the chairs' decision or college decision, they can't appeal it because the grievance was against them. One of the things that we are doing with this new policy is truly fair treatment. If a student can appeal the decisions- so too a faculty member. Now this parallel tracking of not just who can file an appeal, but the rights and the

responsibilities are throughout this document. We worked very hard to establish fairness. Let me see what I can skip.

Improved discussion of sanctions – The current policy only talks about involving the student for the assignment or the course. There's increase flexibility now. The short version: We allow other sanctions to take place, but the whole point is if a college committee makes the decision on academic misconduct, they have to respect the instructor's decision on the sanction in terms of the college committee should not be able to lessen the sanction imposed by an instructor of his/her own course. However, a college committee could impose a more severe sanction if that is consistent with the culture of their college. One issue is recidivism. I've been on Faculty Senate for about '400' years. I remember a meeting in Student Union on the Main Campus in 2003. Carol Bresnahan stood in front of the Faculty Senate and said, we need to setup a mechanism to try to identify students who are repeat offenders. If a student cheats in my class this semester, I have no idea if they have any history of getting caught cheating in other classes. The policy specifies that a mechanism needs to be put into place to identify this. If a student is found to be a repeat offender, harsher sanctions are (not maybe) to be imposed on the student. That would be decided by the Undergraduate University-level Committee or the Graduate student level.

The last two items there, all the details that I talked about today and about four hundred-million other details are not going to be specified in the policy. The policy is going to refer to the details. But details like that should not be part of a policy. They should be put in procedures. Because the chance of this committee getting everything 100% correct is probably zero. The University needs to develop policies on the adjudication process, the accusation process, and the sanction process. Establish the procedures, the policy has to say those things will be established. Now the way that we have worked is that the policy puts this on the Office of the Provost to establish this set of procedures. However, what the policy states is the procedures will be created, maintained, and revised by this Provost Committee whose membership is appointed by an equal number of people by the Provost, by the Faculty Senate and by the Graduate Council. There is a separation that has to occur. Only graduate faculty members can make decisions about graduate students. So there is another parallel that goes through this policy, undergraduate and graduate. There is no one university appeals committee; there has to be two. Because the graduate level you have to be a full member of the graduate faculty. But Faculty Senate will appoint members to the Undergraduate University-level Appeals Committee and Graduate Council will appoint the members to the Graduate Appeals Committee. The committee that actually divides the procedures for the entire University will be comprised of both Senate, Graduate Council and Provost appointments.

So, before I get the hook from President Brakel, again, we really need comments. We've been in talk to the same people, our committee members, over and over and over again. We need to hear if what we are proposing make sense. If you would, email any comments, suggestions, or criticisms to Mary Humphrys or you can send it to the Faculty Senate. The chance of us getting this done by the end of this semester is pretty low. It is not going to happen. However, it is an opportunity that if we get your comments, we can take the summer months to incorporate it. We are going on tour talking to the Senate and talking to Graduate Council. Someone from the crew will be talking to the deans, the other administrative 'big shots.' We need to talk to Student Services. Over the next few months, it is going to be more of this stuff.

President-Elect Hammersley: Senator Dowd, how would you handle misconduct with medical students? Not a medical malfeasance, but misconduct. Maybe they are doing research for other medical students. Are we going to incorporate them and state we are going to incorporate them undergraduate as a graduate program?

Senator Dowd: The College of Medicine uses the term undergraduate differently than I use today, and I recognize that. In general, yes. The College of Medicine students have to be covered by this policy. But the College of Medicine has two very strong policies that govern academic misconduct. You've mentioned research misconduct, and that will not be covered by what we are talking about today. That is actually covered by Research Misconduct 3364-7105. Anything with research will actually go to the research. Now, if the research with whatever they did and they presented it or did something in an academic environment, then you get to Senator Molitor's case where someone would have to make the call- Is this a research issue? Is it professional activity? Or is that academic? I know that is not a good answer, but I think it is 'the' answer.

President-Elect Hammersley: That is one of... *[Indecipherable]*...the Medical College and its policies as a component of the University.

President Brakel: We do need to go on.

Senator Dowd: Real-quick though. The College of Medicine policies - I don't think they have to go away. I don't think they need to be revised. I looked at those policies and incorporated much of that into what the committee did. The only thing is the University-level Appeals Committee, a student should be able to appeal a College of Medicine's decision to the University Committee. However, in some cases the implementation of any sanction before a Medicine student would have to go to the Dean of the College of Medicine. Not to the Provost.

President Brakel: All right. Thank you. Very quickly. We have two more topics and so I am going to probably ask at 6 o'clock to extend our time very quickly. But, Heather Lorenz, Amy Thompson, and it looks like Chief Newton as well are going to talk very quickly about the Coronavirus and UT's response at the moment.

Vice Provost Thompson: Thanks for inviting us. We did have a PowerPoint, but because of the time we want to have more of a conversation with you. So first and foremost, I want to say and assure you that this is not the time to panic. We've seen lots on the news and the media. This is a time for us to be prepared. So we are here today to kind of talk to you a little bit about what we've been working on at the University and some of the communications that you might have already seen come out, and some of the things that we are working on. So again, we are dealing with the Coronavirus, which is a novel strain. And so, what we know in terms of how it is spread and how it is presented is often very similar to influenza. So that is why you hear about shortness of breath, or a fever, coughing etc. In terms of where we are at, at our institution, we have actually enacted our incident demand system that is a very descriptive protocol for the way that communication and response happens. We also have similarly a team that is working on how to develop the operation plan. So I am sure that many of you have lots of questions. You know, what would happen if I be ill or sick? Or if I thought I had a student that become ill or sick? So one of the things that we are working on and we're hopeful it will come out hopefully tomorrow is a FAQ. It got about 25 questions on there that will hopefully be a good communication. One of the things that we want to make sure you are aware of is, if you are feeling ill or if you have a student feeling ill, one of things that we want you to do is make sure that you are calling ahead to your healthcare provider. Don't just show up at a hospital, at an urgent care. We are encouraging our students to call the Student Medical Center and they can work with them in terms of if they want to transport them to UTMC or a hospital of their choice. We want to ensure you that we are working around the clock to be prepared and be ready. I was just on a call as Heather was, earlier today with all the schools in Ohio and talking about a lot of the issues that I know you are concerned of. At what point do we cancel class, for example? So those decisions are being discussed collectively and also in consultation with some of our local and public

health officials and some of our higher education leaders as well. I want to introduce Heather and make sure that Chief Newton has some opportunity to make some comments as well and we will like to take some questions. But, do have some things that you want to add about the travel advisory that we've issued and kind of what's been happening with that?

Heather Lorenz: As Amy mentioned, we are working to provide a unified message to the University from the hospital's perspective as well as the academic campus perspective. So we are all working together with one unified command. As far as the travel advisories, I think most of you probably saw some of the emails that went out. And this is changing daily, so even if we put up our PowerPoint it may change this evening. So with the travel advisory it is the University's stance that we are following the CDC guidance. So, warning level three means that they are recommending no non-essential travel. The University is following suit with any University's sponsored travel. You will not be allowed to any country that is a CDC warning level three. And again, that means non-essential travel. You will hear some things about a level two, and that means that they don't want you to travel if you are immune compromised; if you have a compromised immune system and that again is a level two. So again, those things are changing daily so we can also maybe provide our presentation to the group since we don't have a lot of time to go over it. You will be seeing more information coming out from communications. Again, we have a PIO, our public information officer that is working with the group, so we are in direct line communications with our Marketing and Communications Department to help try to facilitate those. So while you've seen some information, we do have a website that we are trying to point people to, to try and answer those questions. Those FAQs will be posted on there. Hopefully, we can try to streamline that information, as well as we are working with our international students and our Center for International Studies. So they are tracking our University sponsored travel so that we are providing those resources to our students, and faculty, and staff that either have traveled or are coming back. So again, we are working on integrating with both campuses.

Chief Newton: Really not much to add, just one of your questions probably. How well prepared are we? Based on a call that I was on today that had a representative from colleges and universities, we are very far ahead of most. We opened up our Incident Command Center very early on in this. Some have not even done that yet; they haven't really contemplated yet. So while there are still a lot of big questions out there that remain to be answered, I think in terms of how universities are doing, we are ahead of most in this area. Yeah, there's been a lot of questions out there. There is a full incident command system that is setup that have representation at the Hospital and Main Campus. We want to try to have everybody represented and all the different scenarios kind of thought out. There's a lot to consider, but that is where we are at right now.

Vice Provost Thompson: One thing that I would like to emphasize just from being proactive is for each of you that can think about if the campus was to close, let's say for an extended period of time, a week or whatever that might be, what is your alternative to deliver instructions to students? So there are Blackboard shelves for all of our courses so if you've never taught online before, we are going to provide resources and direct you to them for converting your courses into Blackboard. If you are totally averse to using Blackboard, we also have other options like Zoom, WebEx, or if you wanted to do YouTube (a video and sharing it). There are lots of other ways you can interact with your students. But again, there's a great chance we won't even have to go there and utilize that. But the message we want to communicate for our faculty is, be thinking about if that was to happen, what would you do and what would be your contingency plan with your students.

Unknown Speaker: So one of the potential things that happen is shutting down the classes. It is something that has happened in a lot of countries already. With regards to research, what happens? I have

a lot of students working toward research degrees. If they can't come and do research and then they get delayed. So, is that included in stopping classes if we get to that point, or it hasn't been thought of yet?

Vice Provost Thompson: When we close we will follow the same kind of procedure that we do to like, for example a snow emergency whereas essential people on campus.

Unknown Speaker: And all my students have exceptions for snow days.

Chief Newton: Good for you. So there is obviously essential research that will need to continue. Even though the University closes, it is not going to be a complete 'ghost town.' There is still going to be some operations.

Heather Lorenz: And I think they will be tailored.

Chief Newton: Right.

Heather Lorenz: So it may be that we might cancel classes, but not close the University. So I think those are good questions. That is one of the FAQs that Dr. Thompson had already anticipated that question from a research perspective.

President-Elect Hammersley: I will speak to it from the physician point of view. The first is for all faculty, please get your flu shot. Given the age of our faculty, you get a double dose if you are older than 55, which is what I got because I am at the end of what it is going[indecipherable] to be, given to me by grandchildren down in Indiana. The first is, if you have the flu shot it solves a lot of problems. It prevents it in my wife, but I end up getting it because I got the single dose of it. It helps us if you develop a fever and develop symptoms down the line and have had contact with a student in 'Italy' or something else there. It gives us a lot of help. This is a handwashing contact to your face. Please get some sanitizer and use it. This is the Wuhan Shuffle which you bang your feet together. If you are going to cough in your elbow, we have some concerns about elbowing each other. Handshakes are out. Most importantly you are going to find that when people where masks, surgical masks are fine on the person that is expelling the material. The N95, which is sold out of Lowes and Home Depot here in Toledo is for inhaling small particles. N95 means that it is safe about 95% of particles down to one micron. If you had a rubber mask that has the little pink band on the canisters, that takes 100% down to one micron. The point being is that most of the time people aren't handled, but you will notice people in China wearing a mask and no eye protection. That is stupid. It lands in your eye and it drains in your nose and you are affected. So glasses will provide some stagnation, an overflow around, but it doesn't prevent this. So if you intend to wear a mask, you need to wear a tight fitting form protection. The mask itself is no use. When we go into our high level people of containment kind of situation with the CDC and we put on our personal protection gear to take care of you, eye protection shields are all very important. But when you see people running around with all these masks on and being so concerned, they are now stealing it from the emergency rooms. In Washington there's all sorts of requests from hospitals just to get masks, for example. Wash your hands. Stay away from people that are substantial... And if you are sick, please stay home. We'll have to get somebody to cover and there needs to be a policy too. Attending is spewing or the professor is spewing any kind of material, they need to just stay home.

Chief Newton: That is consistent with everything that we've heard. As part of that, I know the handwashing everyone kind of heard it is a personal defense. There is going to be some marketing efforts in providing additional education, reminders about the handwashing. Screen savers, signs in bathrooms, anything that we can do in various places.

Senator Bailey: Vice Provost Thompson, I have a message here from Buffy. It says, “Good afternoon, you are required by the end of the business day on 3/5/2020 to upload your vaccines @ influenza.UToledo.edu.”

Vice Provost Thompson: Who is that from?

Senator Bailey: It says it is from a Buffy.

Heather Lorenz: Buffy works for UTP, and that is probably –wait, are you a physician?

Senator Bailey: No, I am not.

Senator Molitor: He is from the College of Business. He shouldn’t have gotten the email.

Heather Lorenz: Yeah, I would think that might be---

Senator Bailey: An error?

Heather Lorenz: Yes, that might be an error.

Senator Bailey: It looks all official and everything.

Heather Lorenz: Health care workers are required to have a flu vaccine. So if you are a health care worker, you are required to have a flu vaccine so that might be an error.

Senator Bailey: Oh, okay.

Heather Lorenz: Buffy works for UTP. That is our University of Toledo Physician group, so I am assuming that is an error.

Senator Bailey: Okay.

President Brakel: All right, we are at 6 o’clock. We do have one more thing on our agenda. It is important because it is going to be rolling out here over the next couple of days. Can I have motion to extend our meeting for 10 minutes?

Senator Kistner: So moved.

Senator Compora: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor say. ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

Prof. Gilstrap: Hi, I am an Assistant Professor in the Department of Finance in the College of Business. We’ve done a review of our retirement plan with the administration to the administration. It sort-of has the control over the alternative retirement plan. Just a quick review if you haven’t thought about your retirement a little bit. When you come to the University of Toledo, you get to choose the option to STRS which is the Ohio Sponsored Retirement Plan, which has both the fine benefit and the fine contribution options, or you can go into an alternative retirement plan. This is something sponsored by TIAA, or Voya, or Valic. If you opt into one of these, this presentation only concerns that. But we wanted to roll this out in front of Faculty Senate because emails about this will start going towards the end of this semester to all faculty. So, the punchline is we saved a good bit of money for folks in this retirement plan by renegotiating rates down because we haven’t renegotiated this in a while. It is going to be a couple of sort-of inconveniences for just a very few people on campus as we are consolidating vendors down. But that is pretty much the punchline.

Basically, we've hired an outside consultant. Well, not just us, but all universities in the Ohio University Council have hired an outside consultant called... Retirement, and they are going through every university's retirement plan. Cincinnati, I think is done and Miami is close to being done. So, we're about the middle of the pack regard to reviewing our retirement plans of a committee of basically myself and faculty representation. Administrators has been going through the retirement plan last fall and into the spring. So, if we look at the alternative retirement plan, again, this is just people in NARPP, so this does not include anyone in STRS. 401a is our main alternative retirement point. We got it under 61 folks. Most of them are in TIAA or Voya and then we got a very small cohort spread them out, spread among acts of AIG (Valic) and nationwide. 403b which is an optional retirement plan, if you didn't know, you can shelter even more of your income from taxes by opening an 403b account. I think up to \$15,000 in that 403b account. So, most of this is done by TIAA, Voya, Ameriprise and a couple in AIG (Valic). So, basically the biggest change is going to be removing six providers here in the 401a, five providers in 4 through B, down to four providers. So, we are keeping TIAA-CREF, AIG (Valic), Voya and then we are actually adding Fidelity. So, if you are in one of these outliers then all future contributions would need to move over to one of our four remaining vendors going forward. So, this impacts about 63 people across campus in a 401a, out of almost 1,000. It impacts 160 in the 403b accounts. So, HR is going to be contacting these folks directly to ensure that when this rolls over in the beginning of July everyone that is impacted by this will be moving to one of the other plans.

So, our decision for doing this, we can significantly reduce our cost if we allocated more assets to a fewer provider. The state of Ohio only requires us to offer four vendors. So, we are spending a lot of back office effort sending out information to five, six, seven vendors every month. So, we are basically realizing the savings by having more assets under a few vendors and savings in the back office. So roughly we think that for TIAA, we are going to save about \$127,000. A similar number for Voya because they are about as large. So I think we are saving about a quarter million. If four people alter their retirement plan that...[indecipherable]. Again, the mostly negative impacted will be those 60 people coming out of the smaller providers and 160 in the 403b plan.

We also going to add a couple of new things that weren't in the plans before. We are going to add self-directed programs. So, if you don't like any of the investment options on our menus, you can just go into self-direct program is you'll like. We are adding 403b. The...option, we are going to have a quarterly review of investments by a retirement committee. So, if any funds start to underperform, we will pull them and replace them with something else. I think the most important thing is, before we were defaulting people into basically money market saving accounts and they made no selection on their retirement. Now we are defaulting them into life cycle funds where they tell us what they think the retirement date is and TIAA or Voya will allocate them early in their life to equity and as they kind of come into retirement we will allocate them more toward fixed income. Before we were basically putting folks into money marketing accounts, so this is definitely a change here. Again, if you are in any of these nationwide Mass Mutual, Lincoln Enterprise, you will be receiving a contact from HR about moving your future funds over. I think that is pretty much it. This will be on the website too if you want to review it.

President Brakel: Any questions? Thank you. Next from our agenda is Items from the Floor.

Senator Molitor: I just want to go back and address a question that Senator Dowd had with regards to the test optional admission. I don't know who has changed the admission standards more recently in the College of Engineering - it actually has been about four years now - but when the College of Engineering changed their admission standards, we were required by the Provost to go through and produce an academic program modification. So, we had to submit it to Faculty Senate to the Academic Programs Committee as a program modification where we wanted to change our admission standards.

Senator Dowd: That's right.

President Brakel: Thank you for that because I had raised a similar issue with President Gaber about this was going to be a presentation only and that we will be voting on that issue later. She said she didn't think it had to be voted on. I didn't press the issue at that moment. Thank you. Hearing none, a motion to adjourn.

Group of Senators: So moved.

Group of Senators: Second.

President Brakel: Meeting adjourn at 6:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Nigem
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary