

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 12, 2019
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 3/12/2019

Summary of Discussion

Dr. Karen Bjorkman, Interim Provost of the University of Toledo
Dr. Anthony Edgington, Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum
Dr. Terry Bigioni, Chair of Academic Programs
Prof. Don Wedding, Chair of Academic Regulations

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

President Rouillard: Good afternoon. I would like to call this meeting to order. I will ask Executive Secretary, Mark Templin to call the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2018-2019

President Rouillard: Good afternoon. I would like to call this meeting to order and ask Executive Secretary Mark Templin to call the roll.

Present: Andreana, Bailey, Bigioni, Brakel, Chattopadhyay, Compora, Edgington, Ferris, Emonds, Gibbons, Gibbs, Gilchrist, Giovannucci, Hall, Heberle, Hefzy, Jaume, Jayatissa, Keith, Kovach, Krantz, Lee, Longsdorf, Menezes, Molitor, Monsos, Nigem (proxy for A. Said), Ohlinger, Relue, Rouillard, Schlageter, Steven, Taylor, Templin, Tiwari, Tucker-Gail, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding, Weldy, Woolford, Zhu

Excused: Bouillon, Duggan, Frank, Gray, Kistner, Modyanov, Oberlander, Ortiz, Reeves, Sheldon,

Unexcused: Ariss, Dowd, Hammersley, Lecka-Czernik, Lundquist, Maloney, Murphey, Niamat, Schroeder, Stepkowski, Thompson-Casado

President Rouillard: Thank you very much, Secretary Templin.

Executive Committee Report: President-Elect Tim Brakel and I met with Dr. Gaber on January 24. We received an update on the Research Integrity Officer. Deb Boardley has been appointed to that position. We discussed the financial impact of this semester enrollment drops that will likely have about a \$3million impact, the \$50million in discounts and \$30 million in scholarships, and the announcement that BGSU is not currently pursuing its purchase of the Mercy Nursing School. We have also received updates from the co-chairs of the elections committee who report that rosters are being finalized. Tim and I are scheduled to meet with Interim Provost Bjorkman on 2/14 and President Gaber is scheduled to attend the FSEC meeting on 2/15 of this week.

Are there any other additions from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or questions from the floor?

President-Elect Brakel: Just one update. Remember Flapp Cockrell was at our last meeting we were at? They did meet with the IUC Council regarding the liability insurance. Apparently, the schools all over the place on the map are on it right now. Some thought the institution should pick it up and others were charging the student organizations. Others talked about a video that they had seen, but others had not seen. Flapp was trying to get some more information from the IUC representative in Columbus and that is what we presently know at this moment. So that policy that had been proposed right before the holiday break is still on hold.

President Rouillard: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments?

Senator Molitor: Just to clarify, you said that Bowling Green is no longer pursuing the Mercy program?

President Rouillard: Or certainly at this time is not pursuing that purchase.

Senator Molitor: Thank you.

President Rouillard: Our next item of business, well, actually it should have been the first item of business, is the approval of the Minutes for the January 15, 2019 meeting that were sent out to you by Quinetta. Is there a motion to approve those Minutes?

Senator Van Hoy: So moved.

Senator Ferris: Second.

President Rouillard: All those in favor of approving the Minutes of January 15, 2019, please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

Well, we will begin with the first of our reports today by Interim Provost Karen Bjorkman. Thank you very much for coming.

Interim Provost Bjorkman: Sorry it is so treacherous out there. I am beginning to think I am jinxed with the weather. I can give a small update to what President-Elect Brakel just mentioned about the IUC and the student fees. I did hear from Flapp this morning that he had gotten a little bit of information back from the IUC. There is discussion within IUC about trying to look into whether IUC consortium could come up with some sort of a blanket policy that all the universities could use. At this point, it is just a talking point and so we will see what happens with that, but I can at least give you that information [now].

The last time I met with you I have been on the job for one day. This time I've actually been on the job for almost one month. I will say it has been an amazing month. I've learned a lot. Some things I wish I hadn't learned, but there were a lot of good things as well. I think we are off to a great start and lots of good things to come. I wanted to share a little bit of "good" news with you. You mentioned enrollment. One bit of good news is about our spring enrollment in terms of retention. For the second consecutive year, more than 90% of our new students who were enrolled in the fall semester had continued into the spring. That is very good and I thank all of you for the work that you do with our students to keep them here. The undergraduate fall to spring retention rate is 90.5% for this academic year so far, which continues the positive trend that we're seeing as a result of lots of efforts to increase and support students' success. So that is really good and I am very happy to report on that.

The next step I wanted to mention to you is that we are embarking on a registration campaign for spring to get students registered for next fall. The Office of the President has put together a small team that consists of people from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Marketing and Communication, Enrollment Management, and the Registrar etc. They are working to figure out a plan to try and get as many students as possible registered for the fall semester during the time period of March 13, which is when enrollment actually opens to April 15. There is going to be a real push during that time period and you will be hearing a lot more about that. The deans have been asked to sort of come up with how they want to do it within their colleges and I am sure they will be consulting you on that. We are going to be needing your assistance as well. Please encourage your students to get registered for fall early. They will be just coming back from spring break when registration opens. We are hoping they will all come back rested, enthusiastic, and ready to go and we can help them get registered. Any time you have students who are having trouble getting registered because there are holds on their accounts or whatever, please let us know

how we can help. We are aware that is often an issue. We are trying to work some things with Financial Aid and others on how we can help those students get past their financial holds and get past their advising holds. We know there are a lot of stumbling blocks and we are trying to work to remove some of those barriers for our students. I will make sure to share more information with you later in the semester, but there will be a big push after spring break and you will be hearing more about that.

I wanted to share with you that our affiliation was renewed with the Louis Stokes Midwest Regional Center for Excellence. This is very good news for us to build pipelines for underrepresented minorities in trying to bring them here for either our graduate programs and also to raise the visibility of our institution with that group. We are looking forward to working with them. I know that Dr. Michael Weintraub and Dr. Lesley Berhan are going to serve as our institutional representatives for that group, and I am really looking forward to see what will come of that.

I wanted to apprise you that there is an international registration form on the Center for International Studies website. I want to tell you a little about this because I think it is really important for faculty to know about. If you are traveling abroad on university's business whether it be for research, whether it be for teaching or whatever purposes you may have for taking students abroad, we ask that you use this form to register where you are going. Here is the reason why. It is actually really a good thing because in going through the registration, first of all, it will give you links to all of the state department warnings, or advisories, or things that you might want to be aware of about where you are going. But the most important part of this is, as long as you are registered and it is official university business, you will be covered by a blanket travel insurance policy that is provided by the university for university employees. This is the kind of insurance, not if your flight is cancelled, but this is the type of insurance if you are abroad and you become very ill and you have to be medevac out of the country and back home. Or if, God forbid, anything were to happen to you then your family will not be responsible to pay for bringing you home. This is really important travel insurance and I am really happy we are able to offer this, but it can only be offered if people register and let us know so they can be put on that policy before they leave. If you have questions about that, please contact the Provost Office. By the way, I know when they first rolled this out it was combined with the students' Study Abroad page, and that was kind of an issue because it seemed like it didn't work. I know because I tried it myself and I was like, "what?" But now it has been split off and there is a separate form for faculty and staff to fill out and it is much more reasonable and much more relevant for what you would normally do. There may still be some things that aren't quite right. I know there is one the other day that I was going to send back for comment because I think we could tweak it, but I wanted you to be aware of it. If you have comments or suggestions that you want us to streamline and make it better, please let us know and we will do what we can to make those adjustments.

There was a question from the floor at the January 15th Faculty Senate meeting which was about the Winter Break and the cost savings. So I had to poke around a little bit, but I did finally get an answer for that question. I just want to share it with you. According to Facilities, the cost avoidance/cost savings for Winter Break this past December to January was about \$160,000.

I also wanted to remind you about several faculty awards that are coming up that are still open for nominations. These are wonderful awards. We have many deserving faculty. I am hoping that we will get lots and lots of nominations. The Outstanding Teaching Award and the Outstanding Advisor Award, both of those nomination deadlines are February 17th. The nomination forms for both of those are on the Provost's website if you don't have them. The nominations for the Outstanding Faculty Research and Scholarship Awards, those are due on March 1st. This nomination form is on the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs website. Please nominate your favorite researchers for that award. We are also looking for nominations for the Edith Rathbun Outreach and Engagement Award, which also has a deadline of March 1st. The nomination forms and information about that is also available on the Provost's

website. The winners of these awards this year will be recognized at the UT Outstanding Awards dinner, which will be held on April 16. This is a really nice event where we get to acknowledge all of the good work from so many of our faculty and staff as well as advisors. Also, the recipients of the Distinguish University Professors and the Distinguish University Lecturers will be recognized at that meeting as well so I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

Four brief announcements just to share with you: The University's first Annual Research Symposium, I mentioned this to you before, will be held on April 17th. There is still time to submit a proposal for that. Proposals are now due this Friday, February 15th, and so I encourage you all to put in a proposal and have a booth or poster presentation to talk about our community engagement that stems from the research and scholarship that our faculty do. We also need judges for the 10th annual Midwest Graduate Research Symposium which will be held here on April 6th in the Field House and in the Student Union. We are looking for judges in various areas. Graduate students, or any area of scholarship, or research are welcome to present at this and so we need a wide array of judges to help us with that. If you are interested in volunteering for that, please do so. Dean Charlene Gilbert is the keynote speaker at the symposium this year. If you are interested in serving as a judge, please contact Cyndee Gruden in COGS and she will be happy to help you get registered for that.

We have a few things we had to reschedule due to our little engagement with "mother nature" last week - which happened again today. We have rescheduled our February Future of Higher Education Forum which will now be held on February 13th from 1:00-3:00 PM in Carlson Library, Room 1005. The speaker will be Dr. Christopher Martin who is a visiting associate professor in the College of Arts and Letters. He is going to speak on: *'Walk before You Run: How Transparent Assignment Descriptions can Foster Greater Growth in Students.* More information about that is available on our Provost website. I also want to point out that those forums will be live-streamed so if you can't actually be there in person, you can view it. We also had to reschedule our farewell reception for former Provost Hsu due to the weather and that reception has been rescheduled for Monday, February 25, from 3:30-5:00 PM in Libbey Hall. I certainly hope you will be able to attend that.

That is all I have for today and so that conclude my remarks, President Rouillard. If anybody has any questions I would be happy to answer them.

Senator Molitor: Interim Provost Bjorkman, back to the topic of getting students registered for fall. On behalf of advisors, at least in my college and I suspect in other colleges, the change from the 10 hour increments for when students would register to a schedule that allows seniors, juniors, sophomores, and freshmen to register in cohorts. I do not know if this change has improved registration yield, but it definitely has caused a lot of headache for advisors. Now they have a whole bunch of students swarming them at one time and they just do not have time to meet with all of these students. I would request that you investigate whether this change actually did speed up registration, or if it just ended up creating frustration for advisors and students who cannot get to see advisors when they want to register for a semester. I think it may be worth it to consider going back to the previous registration schedule.

Interim Provost Bjorkman: Thanks for that input. I will take that back to the committee. Vice Provost Ayres, are you back there?

Vice Provost Ayres: Yes.

Interim Provost Bjorkman: You heard that, right?

Vice Provost Ayres: Yes.

President Rouillard: Senator Gibbons has a question.

Senator Gibbons: In terms of the international travel when we have to register and when we don't have to register. I was on one of the early committees for it and it seemed that UT was somehow providing financial support which then was considered UT travel at register. But at the last conference that I went to UT did not provide any financial support, but I was presented with a paper of UT's academic activities. Would that be considered the purpose of travel for university business?

Interim Provost Bjorkman: It would. You would be covered by the travel policy as long as you register for that.

Senator Menezes: On the same question. I generally travel for presentations and I need a visa to travel. Most of the time the visa requires us to show this insurance. Is there any documentation that would be available that I can have for that purpose?

Interim Provost Bjorkman: That is a great question. I don't know the answer, but I will find out for you.

Senator Ferris: Do you know when the distinguished university professors will be named?

Interim Provost Bjorkman: They have to be approved by the Board. I believe they are scheduled to come before the Board in April as I recall.

President Rouillard: Are there any more questions? Thank you very much, Interim Provost Bjorkman for coming in and updating us.

Interim Provost Bjorkman: Absolutely.

President Rouillard: The next report on the agenda is from Dr. Anthony Edgington, Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum. There was a course list that was forwarded with the agenda.

Senator Edgington: I hope you all had a chance to take a look at this. I just want to go through the new course proposals. We have ten new ones we are going to take a look at today. The first four all come from the College of Arts and Letters. These are all from the Foreign Language program, FLAN1970, FLAN1980, FLAN2970, and FLAN2980. The description here apply for all four of these courses: "We propose a series of special topics courses at different levels because we cannot list BGSU courses in our catalog or course schedule, and because any UT student wishes to take a BGSU course under our current collaborative agreement must still register for that course as a UT course. Rather than continually use FLAN3980 "Special Topics" for different levels of language courses taught at BGSU and taken by UT students who still need to register for the course here, we prefer to use corresponding numeric codes to indicate those different levels. This will allow for more descriptive and accurate student transcripts." So this is part of the new agreement between forming a program here at UT and BGSU. So basically these courses are being proposed so they can offer special topics courses at the 1000 and 2000 level as well. Is there anything else, President Rouillard that I need to mention about?

Senator Keith: I actually had a question about these courses. Are they setup to substitute for 1110 and/or 1120?

President Rouillard: They are the equivalent, yes. If you are taking Italian at BG at the first through fourth semester levels, those are the equivalent of our 1110 and 1120 and 2140 and 2150.

Senator Keith: So if a student, and I don't know if a specific course exists at Bowling Green, but if they were to take maybe a culture course in Italian and they transfer it in, would it transfer in under one of these special topics courses?

President Rouillard: No, because this collaboration is foreign language courses. Those can just transfer in as a regular transfer credit I do believe.

Senator Keith: So it is primarily setup to transfer in the Italian courses that are taken at Bowling Green as the equivalent of what we would be offering here?

President Rouillard: At the 1000 and 2000 level, that is correct.

Senator Keith: Well, then I have a problem with the credit hours because the first two foreign language courses are 4 credit hours and the intermediate are 3 credit hours, and so it looks like we're saying that 4 credit hours here are equivalent to 3 credit hours at Bowling Green.

President Rouillard: That is my mistake. I entered that incorrectly. It should be 3 credit hours. I can go in and correct that. Thank you for catching that.

Senator Keith: But can you? I mean, since these have been approved by, I mean, does it have to go back to the department and then the chair?

Senator Edgington: I don't believe it does. I will ask Cathy Zimmer to make sure about that, but I don't believe it need to go back to the department and then the chair.

Senator Keith: I just want clarification.

Senator Molitor: To provide flexibility on special topics, you can make it variable 1-4 credit hours, and then you do not have to worry about if BG changes credit hours and having to go back and submit another course modification.

President Rouillard: That is true. That would be another option. Thank you.

Senator Edgington: Alright, the next three courses all come from Health and Human Services. The first is SOCW3510 Interpersonal Practice with LGBTQ individuals: "This course will provide an introduction and overview of sexual orientation, and gender identity, and expand understanding of how to implement affirmative models of practice with LGBTQ individuals, families and communities. Course content will include: perspectives on gender, identity formation, impact of homophobia, biphobia, and transphobia, affirming interventions with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered persons, families, youth, communities and aging; and specific challenges facing LGBT communities such as homelessness, domestic violence, bullying, and policy."

SOCW 3520 Human Animal Interaction, Health, and Wellness: "The majority of households in the United States have a companion animal. This courses provides an overview of how human-animal interactions (HAI) and the human-animal bond (HAB) impact human health and well-being. Topics include: the social, physical and emotional/psychological impacts across the lifespan; therapeutic roles of animals; animal welfare and ethical considerations; and the connection between violence toward people and violence towards animals."

The third course is SOCW3530. The full title for this course is Health Care Social Work Experiences with Inter-Professional Teaming. This description is: "Student will be introduced to the unique demands of

health care social work (3 credits more content and more assignments). Student will utilize generalist skills developed in their BSW program to negotiate the interdisciplinary classroom by participating in real-world problem solving and simulations by joining students from across the University of Toledo campuses and the free clinic to learn how to be integral part of the health care with an emphasis on just service delivery.” The 1 to 3 credit hours from my understanding is that this course will meet once a week every-other-week. There will be some clinical hours to go with that as well, and that is the 1 credit option. The 3 credit option is online components that are supposed to take place between the classes of the two as well.

And then finally, we have three courses from Education. The first is SPED4270, Team Models and Community Networking. This description is: “This course will discuss the bases of instruction for students with mild disabilities as well as offer an analysis of a range of intervention models.”

We have SPED4070, Curriculum Models and Intervention Strategies in Early Childhood Special Education. This description is: “Atypical infant, toddler, and early childhood development will be examined. Specialized intervention techniques, their research and practice base and appropriate curriculum models will be explored.”

Lastly, SPED4210, AAC for Young Children with Disabilities. This course description is: “This course will provide an overview of alternative or augmentative modes of communication for children who are unable to meet their daily communication needs through natural modes such as speech, gestures or handwriting. They will provide a broad overview of alternative or argumentative modes of communication for children who are unable to meet their daily communication needs through natural modes such as speech, gestures or handwriting. It will provide a broad overview of AAC and its application, along with the history and terminology. We will discuss the types of AAC and symbols used, as well as assistive technology devices in general. Assessment, vocabulary selection, and the role of literacy in AAC/AT will be reviewed. Service delivery for children will be covered in addition to funding and resource options. The field of AAC/AT is constantly changing, with new devices and technology; therefore, class is only able to present an overview. Videos also will be presented to demonstrate how different children communicate at their own levels, given vocabulary that is appropriate for them.” It came to my attention a few months ago that there are some typos in the rationale for a few of these courses where they refer to a different course, I think 40/50 210. We will get that cleaned up before it moves on in the cycle.

Are there any questions on these 10 course proposals coming to you today? If there are no questions, then all in favor of accepting these course proposals say, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

Senator Keith: I have a question about the foreign language. Did we just approve those?

President Rouillard: No, those will be corrected as.

Senator Edgington: I will make sure those are corrected. I will find out and then come back in front of you after I talk with Cathy Zimmer.

Moving on to course modifications. We have three from the College of Arts and Letters. The first one is DS2020, Introduction to Disability Studies. They wish to “add a General Education Social Science designation to this course.” My committee reviewed it and then it will go to Core Curriculum. Basically, we are bringing this to you today to pass so Core Curriculum can review and make their decision. Secondly, there’re PSC3790, Model United Nations. The “modification is to the course title. They would like a new course title (Model United Nations/Model European Union”) and to course description.” And

then there's WGST2010, Introduction to Gender. This is similar to our first one. They also "wish to add General Education Social Science designation to the course." Again, this will move forward to go to Core Curriculum for that decision.

The rest are all from Health and Human Services. CRIM3210, Applied Psychology for Criminal Justice. "The modification here is to make the course Junior/Senior status only. The rationale for that is because "Sophomores are taking the class too early and affecting space for Juniors/Seniors."

We have SLP4910, Directed Research in Speech Language Pathology. The "modification is to change from letter grading to S/U."

Then we have SOCW3060, Social Work Ethics. The "modification is to course prerequisite (SOCW2010 for SOCW2210) and grade prerequisite from D- to C."

We have SOCW3070, Child Welfare I. The "modification is for a grade prerequisite from D- to C."

Then there is SOCW3110, Social Work Practice I. The "modification is to course prerequisite (SOCW2010 for SOCW2210) and change to the course description."

We also have SOCW4210, Field Work Practice III. They want to "add prerequisite language to the catalog" that is currently not there.

Finally, SOCW4220, Social Work Field Experience II. They are asking to "make course a required course in the fall." Our committee discussed this and I don't think that is part of our committee overview as far as the college level, but I guess we are sending it on forward so it can be done---

Senator Molitor: It is a program modification.

Senator Edgington: And so that should go to Senator Bigioni then, right?

President Rouillard: Right.

Senator Edgington: We weren't sure how that came to us. I will send it to Senator Bigioni. Lastly, we have SOCW4230, Social Work Field Experience III. The "modification is to grade prerequisite from D- to C. Adding SOCW4120 and SOCW4200 as prerequisites." Are there any questions about these modifications, taking out SOCW4220 which we won't vote on today?

Senator Molitor: Regarding the HHS course that wants to change the grading to S/U. According to grading policies, S/U grades are not available for undergraduate courses. It probably needs to be PS/NC.

Senator Edgington: Okay. My apologies, I made that modification error.

Senator Molitor: And for WGST 2010, the only modification is to add the core curriculum social science designation?

Senator Edgington: That is the only modification they had in the---

Senator Molitor: Are we just approving this course to go to the Core Curriculum Committee?

Senator Edgington: That is what we decided as a committee. It is really nothing else that we can do with it. It had to come to us first and then to Core Curriculum.

President Rouillard: Right, and Core Curriculum has already been notified to look for it.

Senator Edgington: Right. Are there any other questions about the course modifications?

Senator Steven: Did they give reasons for the request to go from D- to C, the prerequisites?

Senator Edgington: Let's look and see. The SLP4910, Directed Research in Speech Language Pathology states, "Given that SLP 4910 is a directed research course rather than a didactic course, we would like to propose a change from a letter grade to satisfactory/ unsatisfactory." It wasn't much rationale. This is what they gave us. Let's read down here: "depending on which faculty member supervises directed research, the option may artificially inflate a student's GPA making him or her more competitive in a undergraduate to graduate program, which seems unfair to other students who cannot fit this option into their schedules and register due to extracurricular activities." So that is the rest of the rationale.

Senator Longsdorf: I think it was the rationale for a D- to C on the other two courses.

Senator Edgington: The other two, those were the rationales there that moved from a D- to C for a prerequisite. The question was to the S/U grade, right?

Senator Steven: No, it was the D- to C.

Senator Edgington: I apologize, I thought you wanted the S/U grade. Was there a particular one? I have a few here asking for that, SOCW3060 and SOCW3070.

Senator Steven: We are making the same change, so I am just wondering what rationale they used.

Senator Edgington: I see. I can tell you I am pretty sure they don't have anything else in there beyond just the request for change, but I will check to make sure for you. Well, I can find out for you and send it to you.

Senator Steven: So I guess we don't have to sweat about the rationale then.

Senator Tucker-Gail: Criminal Justice is going to put the same amount of modifications forward for our program as well. We decided as a group of faculty that we needed to up-the standards on the bar for our students moving forward, and so for ours it would be a C. I think we are pushing our students successfully.

Senator Edgington: It in lines with what most programs require for an overall GPA to get into the program and/or the major. So this just meshes with that, which I think what most people are doing.

Senator Krantz: Also responding to Senator Steven's question. NSM Council for the last three years now has been encouraging all degree programs within the college to consider increase at that level.

Senator Molitor: I was just going to comment. I think the rationale would be that you want to improve student's success in the subsequent course that requires the prerequisite.

Senator Edgington: I would say from my committee's standpoint, if you were lowering we would have more questions than if you were raising it. Are there any other questions or comments on these course

modifications? Hearing none. All in favor of approving the course modifications, taking out SOCW4220, say, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Thank you very much.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Edgington and your committee for your hard work. Next, we have the Chair of Academic Programs Committee, Senator Terry Bigioni, who is going to present a list of programs under consideration. Since these programs were forwarded to you late yesterday, we are not going to ask for a vote today, but at least this way, you will have some information of what these programs are.

Senator Bigioni: So I have five items to review with you today. There are three program modifications and two new programs. The first two program modifications are relatively straightforward and the third is a little more complex. This is the first modification, a Bachelor of Science degree for Computer Science and Engineering. This is a relatively straightforward change that adds two new courses and eliminates two breadth electives. It also eliminates their requirement of a thermodynamics class or a statics class, and it replaces that with a free elective. The rationale is that the Accreditation Board for the Engineering Technology recently mandated that computer science programs must cover topics and data bases, plus computer security. So that is where these two new courses come in. The loss of the statics or the thermodynamics requirement is simply related to the professional engineering exam and that students going through this program don’t typically do the PE exam since it serves no purpose anymore, and so that was eliminated and replaced with the re-elective. So ultimately the credit hours for the program is unchanged. Are there any comments or discussion on these modifications?

**Program Modification
Bachelor of Science
Computer Science and Engineering**

Program Code: EN-CSE-BSU
College: Engineering
Department: Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Contact: Gursel Serpen

Summary: Two new courses have been added to the required core curriculum, EECS 4560 Database Management Systems and EECS 4760 Computer Security, and the requirement of either CIVE 1150 Statistics or MIME 3400 Thermodynamics was eliminated. An adjustment was made to electives to maintain the same credit hours.

Rationale: Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology recently mandated that the Computer Science programs must cover topics in “Database” and “Computer Security”. Further, the Statistics/Thermodynamics courses were originally instituted to help students with the Professional Engineer (PE) exams, however BSCSE students rarely take the exam.

A total of three (3) changes to course list were proposed:

Two breadth electives were eliminated.
Two new required courses were added:

EECS 4560 Database Management Systems
EECS 4760 Computer Security

The requirement of CIVE 1150 or MIME 3400 was eliminated.
A “Free Elective” was added (must be a 3-credit hour academic course).

Credit Hours: unchanged (128)

President Rouillard: Again, if you feel like you haven’t had enough time to look at this, we don’t have to vote on it today. If you feel that it is straightforward enough and you would like to vote on this program modification, typically, we don’t need a motion to do that, but because of the timing I think I would like to ask for a motion if anybody feels comfortable voting on this today.

Senator Molitor: I would move to approve it.

Senator Ferris: Second.

President Rouillard: All those in favor of approving this program modification, please signify by saying, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Thank you.

Senator Bigioni: So the second program modification is a Bachelor of Business Administration in Health and Human Resource Management. This modification reflect current professional practices and work requirements. Again, it is a relatively minor change. Two courses were merged to make room for a third. The two courses that were merged are this management course, Performance Management for Individuals and Teams. This training and evaluation course was merged into one. It has already gone through the approval process up to the Provost level. A new course was introduced to human resource information systems which has also been approved at the Provost level, and that is the extent of those changes. Again, the credit hours are unchanged for the program. Are there any comments or discussion on these modifications?

**Program Modification
Bachelor of Business Administration in Human Resource Management**

Program Code: BU-HRM-BB
College: Business and Innovation
Department: Management
Contact: Dr. Laurence Fink

Summary: This is a revision of the Human Resource Management major to reflect current professional practice and work requirements.

Rationale: Based on major business advisory board suggestions, we are merging two courses and making room for human resource information systems/analytics.

Old	New
HURM 3220	HURM 3220 Human Resource Management
BLAW 3550	BLAW 3550 Legal and Safety Compliance
MGMT 4250	Performance Management for Individuals and Teams
HURM 4640	HURM 4640 Benefits, Health and Wellness
HURM 4650	HURM 4650 Compensation
HURM 4660	HURM 4660 Planning, Selection & Recruitment
HURM 4710	HURM 4710 Training and Evaluation
	HURM 4800 Human Resource Information Systems

Credit Hours: unchanged (21)

President Rouillard: Do you feel comfortable voting on this or would you like to delay this vote?

Senator Molitor: I move to approve it.

Senator Edgington: Second.

President Rouillard: I will let you do the “honors.”

Senator Bigioni: All of those in favor of approving these modifications, please say, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

The third program modification is a little more extensive. I am sorry about the “Christmas colors” <laughter>. This is a program modification for an associate degree in Applied Business and the program is Information Services and Support. Again, this is a program modification that is driven by industry needs basically, consulting with the industry. Modification, the modification is ultimately changing the program from a little more computer science orientated to a little more IT oriented, i.e. more backroom to front room kind of orientation. That is reflected in the changes in the course. The red ones are on their way out and the green ones are on their way in. So the first change is just broadening an elective from natural science core courses to either natural science or social science electives. The next two are eliminating a couple of accounting courses for a little more IT oriented courses—one in PC operating systems and the other in help desk concepts. Again, eliminating a little more computer science course (visual basic) and replacing it with supervision. These two Microsoft database software and eliminating the PowerPoint and replacing it with Microsoft Word and Excel. And then finally eliminating technical

elective and replacing it with Microsoft Outlook. Again, the number of credit hours for this associate program is unchanged at 60. Are there any questions or comments?

Program Modification
Bachelor of Business Administration in Human Resource Management

Program Code: BU-ISS-AAB
College: Business and Innovation
Department: Applied Organizational Technology
Contact: Kathleen Fitzpatrick

Summary: Based upon industry data, other two-year school degree offerings, and the current job market, a degree titled Computer Support Specialist would be an excellent opportunity to pursue. This would require a program modification to the Information Service and Support program, including a program name change to Computer Support Specialist.

Rationale: These changes are being made to provide students with a skill set to enable them to be better prepared for the workplace and to meet the knowledge-based required by employers.

<p>Old</p> <p>ENGL 1110 ENGL 1130, 1140, 1150 or 2960 Social Science Core Natural Science Core</p> <p>Humanities Core MATH 1180, 1200, OR 1320 ACTG 1040 ACTG 1050</p> <p>BUAD 1000 BMGT 1500 BMGT 2700 OR 2750 CMPT 1020 CMPT 1100 CMPT 1120</p> <p>CMPT 1320 CMPT 1410 CMPT 1420 CMPT 1440</p> <p>CNET 2150 CNET 2200 Technical elective</p>	<p>New</p> <p>ENGL 1110 ENGL 1130, 1140, 1150, or 2960 Social Science Core</p> <p>Natural science or social science elective Humanities Core MATH 1180, 1200 OR 1320</p> <p>CMPT 1110 CMPT 2500 BUAD 1000 BMGT 1500 BMGT 2700 OR 2750 CMPT 1020 CMPT 1100</p> <p>BMGT 2030 CMPT 1320 CMPT 1410</p> <p>CMPT 1430 CMPT 2460</p> <p>CMPT 1450</p>	<p>Financial Accounting Management Accounting PC Operating Systems Help Desk Concepts (new course)</p> <p>Visual Basic Supervision</p> <p>Microsoft Access Microsoft PowerPoint Microsoft Word Advanced Microsoft Excel</p> <p>Microsoft Outlook</p>
--	---	--

Credit Hours: unchanged (60)

Senator Ferris: What is the rationale for requiring the natural sciences or social science?

Senator Bigioni: There wasn't any specifically given on that. In fact, the rationale for the modifications in the courses are not incredibly enlightening.

Senator Monsos: I was part of an email discussion about that. Because it is an associate of applied business, according to the state, this is in line with what an associate level would have to have. They don't have to have a natural science, it is optional.

President Rouillard: Has the new course, 2500 come through Faculty Senate?

Senator Bigioni: That is a good question. I don't know the answer for that.

President Rouillard: I don't believe that has come through Senate. Did we pass it, Senator Edgington?

Senator Edgington: Which one, I'm sorry?

President Rouillard: This new course, 2500.

Senator Edgington: I believe it is on our current roster right now.

President Rouillard: But it hasn't gone through yet?

Senator Edgington: No, it hasn't been approved yet, at least to my knowledge.

President Rouillard: So we can't approve this, but at least senators have the information of what's coming.

Senator Bigioni: Right. Is there any other discussion to be had on this modification? Hearing none. We will just move on to the next.

President Rouillard: So that is just a preview of coming attractions.

Senator Bigioni: We have two new programs that are also based upon courses that had not yet made it through Faculty Senate. We will just have a discussion of the programs and leave for the formal vote until after the courses are approved.

**New Program
Minor in Mechatronics**

Program Code: MECE
College: Engineering
Department: Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
Contact: Sorin Cioc

Summary: A new minor program in mechatronics was created to promote and support the MIME department's strategic decision to expand in this area.

Rationale: This minor was motivated by industrial feedback and need.

Courses for Minor

MIME 3300 Design and Analysis of Mechanical Systems	
MIME 3380 Modeling and Control of Engineering Systems	
MIME 4410 (4460) MATLAB for Engineers	(new)
MIME 4430 Automotive Control Systems	(new)
MIME 4440 Mechatronics	(new)

Minimum credit hours: 15

Comment: The MIME 4410 course number has a conflict with existing course; the new course number should have been 4460 – change request submitted. (NB: the three new courses have not yet been approved by FS).

**New Program
Minor in Surveying**

Program Code: SURV
College: Engineering
Department: Civil and Environmental Engineering
Contact: Michael Pniewski

Summary: Completion of this minor program will fulfill the educational requirements for professional surveyor licensure for civil engineering graduates. This minor program was submitted for approval to the Ohio Board of Professional Engineers and Surveying. The contents of this minor program were developed with guidance from members of the Board and Board staff.

Courses for Minor

CIVE 3720 – Boundary Surveying	(new)
--------------------------------	-------

CIVE 3730 – Geodetic and Control Surveying	(new)
CIVE 3760 – Route and Construction Surveying	(new)
CIVE 3770 – Cadastral Surveys and Ohio Land Systems	(new)
CIVE 4720 – Boundary Control and Legal Principals	(new)
CIVE 4770 – Legal; and Ethical Aspects of Surveying	(new)

Minimum Credit Hours: 18

The courses required for this minor are being submitted concurrently with this new minor program. (not yet approved by Faculty Senate).

Senator Heberle: I am not going to say my name, but I just want to know what mechatronics are.

Senator Bigioni: It sounds awesome<laughter>.

Senator Molitor: Mechatronics is the electrical and/or computer control of mechanical systems.

Senator Heberle: Okay, so what is that for?

Senator Molitor: Every motorized appliance or vehicle has electrical and computer control of motors and other moving parts.

Senator Heberle: Oh my God, we need a PhD for that!

Senator Molitor: We are working on it.

Senator Bigioni: Professor Sorin Cioc is here with us if you want to direct any questions to him. Anyway, this is a new minor program housed in mechanical and industrial engineering. Again, this is in response to industry needs. This minor is built with these five courses, three of them are new. As I've said earlier, these three have not yet made their way through Faculty Senate, but it is 15 credit hour minor course.

Senator Keith: So you said somebody is here to answer questions?

Senator Bigioni: Right.

Senator Keith: Who do you imagine will actually take this minor, I'm just curious?

Professor Cioc: Who?

Senator Keith: Yes, what students?

Professor Cioc: [*Indecipherable*]...This one is to kind put students on the path.

Senator Keith: What do you think the accompanying major would be that goes along with this minor? Can you do a major and a minor at the same time?

Professor Cioc: This is mechatronics which is different.

Senator Keith: Okay, I got it.

Senator Heberle: So the minor is in some sense independent of mechanical engineering, it just sits on its own?

Professor Cioc: Yes. It sits on its own in terms of it does have a component of mechanical, but it also have additional.

Senator Heberle: So anybody can take it in the College of Engineering?

Professor Cioc: Yes.

Senator Molitor: If you took the prerequisites for the MIME 3300 course then you could pursue this minor. We do anticipate there will be other majors besides mechanical engineering who would want it.

Senator Bigioni: Are there any other comments or questions?

Senator Giovannucci: Is this report background on lateral objects type programming? I mean, I don't know if they need prerequisites to take this, but do students have to have a background related in machinery?

Professor Cioc: One of the courses if you look in there is...systems and the other one is...and so that is the control part.

Senator Giovannucci: Thank you.

Senator Heberle: I'm sorry, but I am just confused about mechanical industrial engineering students. All five classes are in that department and so they couldn't really minor in this, could they? I'm just not sure how that would work. For instance, political science students can't minor in political science own courses.

Senator Bigioni: Are any of these core courses?

Professor Cioc: The top two are core courses and the other three are not.

Senator Hefzy: This is also pertaining to the engineer industry. This is different, this minor... *[Indecipherable]* ... So this is coming closer to... There are people in the industry taking this.

Senator Bigioni: Thank you.

Senator Molitor: I think the question is the overlap between the minor courses and the degree program requirements for mechanical engineering students. I don't know the answer to this, but if you took all of these courses, would they apply towards your mechanical engineering degree or would any courses be above the mechanical engineering degree requirements?

Professor Cioc: The way it works right now is the top two are required by mechanical, but the other three are electives. So the mechanicals could take them in the future.

Senator Molitor: So how many technical electives do mechanical engineers have to take?

Professor Cioc: Other than these three I think they have two more.

Senator Molitor: So all of these courses would satisfy mechanical engineering degree requirements?

Professor Cioc: Yes.

Senator Molitor: If there is a complete overlap between the minor and the major, we need a concentration in mechatronics for mechanical engineering students. This minor would then be for students who are not pursuing a mechanical engineering degree. I did not think about this when it was originally proposed, but that is probably what we should go back and do. So I will work with you to accomplish this.

Professor Cioc: Thank you.

Senator Relue: My question was what is the requirement for a minor to be a minor?

Senator Molitor: I think it is 12 credit hours above a degree.

President Rouillard: That may vary by college.

Senator Molitor: That is the state requirement.

President Rouillard: I am not sure, but I think the state might even require 18.

Senator Molitor: No, the state requires 12 hours.

Senator Monsos: Yes, it is 12.

Senator Molitor: It is above degree program requirement.

Senator Heberle: The mechanical engineer minoring in this model would not get the 12 credits. They will only have nine credits for the minor because the two are already applied to the course.

Senator Molitor: Actually, the last three courses apply to the degree because they count as technical electives.

President-Elect Brakel: I listened to Senator Hefzy's remarks. You've said people in the industry will be taking this?

Senator Hefzy: Included in this.

President-Elect Brakel: I wonder if it would be better to be a certificate instead of a minor.

Professor Cioc: We do have a certificate for them as well. They are the same courses, but the next level, Master's 5000, would be for a certificate like that, but not with the same courses because they are separate.

Senator Bigioni: Are there any other questions or comments? Okay, then let's take a look at our last new program. This is a minor in surveying that is housed in Civil and Environmental in Engineering. It is a little cleaner. It is made up of six brand new courses. So this is intended to give an opportunity for civil engineering students and graduates to get professional survey licensure. Again, all of these new courses have not yet made it through Faculty Senate and so we will not be voting on this today.

Senator Molitor: Just so I can preemptively answer this one, these courses would be above the civil engineering degree requirements. I believe none of these courses except for one would count towards the

civil engineering degree. So this would be a minor even if you were pursuing a civil engineering degree. We envision that multiple engineering majors could pursue this to obtain professional licensure in the field of surveying. This could be construction engineering technology, or any other engineering majors that want to pursue a surveying license.

Senator Bigioni: Thanks for the comment. Are there any other questions or comments?

Senator Krantz: Just to build on Senator Molitor's comments. It appears that this set of six courses would satisfy the graduate certification or whatever the equivalent is regardless of where else a student in engineering is coming from, as in other degree programs. So this is in fact a different organization, a different structure than the previous one we just looked at.

Senator Bigioni: Are there questions or comments? Hearing none. Okay, then that does it for all the items on this agenda. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Bigioni, you and your committee for your work on these issues. That brings us next to Academic Regulations, Senator Wedding.

Senator Wedding: I have extra copies here if anyone want a copy.

President Rouillard: Does anybody need a hardcopy?

Senator Wedding: The backrow might need one because it is harder to read from back there. I am going to repeat what I said the last time. They gave us over 30 policies to bring forward and we are bringing them back a few at a time or so. This is the next five. This is Repeating a Course and Recalculating GPA Policy, 3364-71-07. We found nothing that we objected to. If you want to take time to read it and ask questions, which I probably can't answer, you can.

President Rouillard: But our Vice Provost is here.

Senator Wedding: Yes, Dr. Ayres is here.

Senator Keith: You know, this was on the list of policies we were going to discuss at our meeting a month ago and Senator Wedding said, "no, no, no; the committee hadn't had a chance to look at it." I said that I really recommend that Academic Regulations look at this policy. After the meeting I sent him a list of things I would like the committee to consider and I wonder if the committee actually considered those things because I really think this is our opportunity to ask some questions about whether allowing students to delete 12 credit hours is the appropriate number. I don't know. I mean, we say we are data informed. It is easy to find out the mode, median, and the mean of how many credit hours our students are actually deleting. The problem with 12 is that it looks like it is four courses, unless we start thinking about science and math courses which can be 4 or 5 credit hours. That could result in students not getting to 12 hours and having excess hours that they cannot delete. I really think we should do some benchmarking. I think we should what other schools are doing. I did a quick audit of our Ohio peers and saw one school allows students to delete up to five courses and another school allows students to delete up to three. Maybe 12 hours is the right number or maybe 12 isn't the right number; maybe we should think in terms of the number of courses instead of credit hours. Another thing in this policy is that it allows students to retake a course that they got any old grade in including a B+ and an A-. Again, I just ask the question it is in our student's interest to have them repeating courses in which they initially earned a passing grade? Why are they doing it because the higher grade is not going to help them out with any kind of honorary award? Maybe there are valid reasons they are doing it for, but if they aren't, then they are taking courses that they have already taken and prolonging the time it takes them to graduate. I think this is a policy that

the committee can actually do something with. This is our opportunity to improve it. I am voting against moving this forward.

President Rouillard: Are there any other comments?

Senator Wedding: The one thing I did notice the college may adopt a more stringent requirement and so it does give an opening to colleges to do as they like. I have no opinion on this. If anyone else has an opinion, please.

Senator Steven: I just wonder if anybody knows what other schools are doing. It would be strange if we were the only ones to do this, but if everybody else is doing the same thing then maybe it's ok.

President Rouillard: Well, ultimately we have to make a decision for our own campus.

Senator Steven: Of course.

President Rouillard: This policy was forwarded to us for a reaffirmation of an existing policy. The Provost Office had nothing that they wanted to signal, which is not to say that we can't make any changes. But as Senator Wedding points out, colleges have the option of making things more stringent or less stringent.

Senator Keith: I don't believe they have the option of making it less stringent. I don't think they can allow more than 12 hours to be deleted.

President Rouillard: Well, they can certainly make it more stringent if they choose to.

Senator Wedding: Well, they can't make it less because it says, "*colleges may adopt a more.*" I don't believe they can go less.

President Rouillard: Right.

Senator Keith: My issue is with the 12 hours. It is not four courses necessarily they are deleting. They are trying to delete a couple of classes including math and science courses that are four and five credit hours. I think I am interrupting Senator Molitor.

Senator Molitor: That is okay. Senator Wedding hasn't called on me yet.

President Rouillard: Go ahead, Senator Molitor.

Senator Molitor: So I was just going to comment to Senator Keith's point. She is correct, it does not matter for academic honors. However, you need a 2.0 GPA to graduate. The recalculated GPA is the GPA that we use to decide if a student can graduate or not. It is also the GPA that appears on your transcript. So if an employer or graduate program wants to see your transcript, that is the grade point average they will see. So that is the purpose for this policy.

That being said, I agree with her, it is a good idea to review and benchmark this. In my experience, there is not much variation with the four-year institutions compared to community colleges. Some community colleges have unlimited GPA recalculation - you retake a course and they automatically recalculate your GPA. I would also recommend that if we are going to revise this policy, we should eliminate the statement regarding 16 quarter hours.

President Rouillard: We certainly can do that.

Senator Wedding: Well, I think it is a safeguard where if we do perhaps have any quarter hours on this campus, return or still here.

Senator Molitor: But I don't think it has anything to do with GPA recalculation from a current semester hour course to a previous quarter hour course because those quarter hour courses no longer exist.

Senator Wedding: What are you saying, mark it, don't do anything with it?

Senator Molitor: I would recommend that we review it.

Senator Wedding: And you want us to benchmark it by looking at other schools?

Senator Molitor: Four-year institutions in Ohio at this point.

President Rouillard: President-Elect Brakel also had a comment.

President-Elect Brakel: Two comments actually. With regard to the equivalent to 16 credit hours, once in a while we get a student within the music courses that will come back who were under the quarter system and now they want to complete a degree, and it seems to be no timeline to go back and recertify courses.

Senator Molitor: So in other words, they would come back and fill a GPA recalculation for courses they took many, many years ago?

President-Elect Brakel: Right.

Senator Molitor: Okay, I see. Thank you.

President-Elect Brakel: So that's been a problem. It does seem to me that to expand this from 12 to at least 15 hours with the idea that a student over a course of a year would take 30 credit hours, that is essentially one semester worth of work. If they are just totally bummed-out, this gives them a chance to recover.

President Rouillard: So why don't we do this? Is there a motion to send this back to the committee or do you want to vote on it? Is there a motion to send it back to the committee?

Senator Keith: I move to send it back to the committee.

Senator Monsos: Second.

President Rouillard: Alright. All those in favor of sending this back to the committee, the policy on Repeating a Course and Recalculating a GPA, please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? [3] Any abstentions? Alright, so [this policy will go] back to the committee. *Motion Passed to Send Policy Back.*

Senator Wedding: One clarification. What was this about the GPA? I thought you were just talking about the hours? Do you want us to look at the hours, whether they be 12 or 15?

Senator Molitor: We should also look at the course grades that you need to request recalculation. Right now, our policy says as long as you get a higher grade you can recalculate. We may want it to be a little more specific.

Senator Hall: Do you have to get a C- or lower?

Senator Molitor: No. That was the old version of this policy.

Senator Hall: Oh, that was the old version?

Senator Molitor: Yes. Now this policy says you just need to get a higher grade. A student can receive a B+ and they retake the course and get an A- or an A.

Senator Wedding: Well, it says, “*prior to fall 2006, students must have earned a C- or lower in the original course and a C (2.0) or higher in the repeated course.*”

Senator Heberle: Yes, but since 2006 that is not the case.

President Rouillard: The committee might work at eliminating that particular phrase and just say, a student need to have a C- or lower to repeat a course.

Senator Wedding: In some colleges they do allow students to get a higher grade. If they had an A- and they want to get an A, could they not use this?

Senator Molitor: This policy is for the university unless a college has a more stringent policy on this requirement.

Senator Wedding: So that would be more stringent.

President Rouillard: Okay, well, that’s been voted to send back. What is the next policy that you want to do?

Senator Wedding: Whatever one you have up there.

President Rouillard: I can’t find it on the computer. Quinetta, could you give me a hand? In the meantime, does anybody need a hardcopy, Dual Degree Policy?

Senator Wedding: The handout is one page. Well, the second page is the signature.

Senator Molitor: Which one is this?

President Rouillard: Dual Degree, 3364-71-09.

Senator Wedding: Again, this is an affirmation of an existing policy. It applies to all undergraduates. Again, the Academic Regulations Committee have no problem with this. If someone has a problem---

Professor Humphrys: We actually passed the Dual Degree Policy last year.

President Rouillard: Yes, that is right.

Senator Wedding: Well, it was on the list given to me.

Professor Humphrys: It is on the Faculty Senate website.

Senator Wedding: So this one has been passed?

President Rouillard: Yes. So let’s go to Priority Registration, 3364-71-12.

Senator Wedding: The language to be added here is in red, “*...military active duty and veteran students, members of Gold Star Families.*” As I understand, this is actually may be even required by federal policy and regulations so we are adding that. There also was a discussion about adding other things in there. I don’t know if I have them here with me.

President Rouillard: That was a previous version that the Provost Office had forwarded and we had some discussion and we boiled it down to this.

Senator Wedding: I am not taking a position on this, but they are advocating student athletes which is there. They were going to add cheerleaders, athletic team managers, marching band members, and also elected Student Government senators. Those are not in here now and we are not proposing them, unless

somebody has feeling on them otherwise. We are proposing the military active duty, veteran students, and members of Gold Star Families.

Senator Emonds: What are Gold Star Families?

Vice Provost Ayres: A Gold Star Family is any [immediate] family member who has lost somebody in combat in the U.S Armed Forces.

Senator Wedding: On the battlefield.

Senator Molitor: Maybe I'll direct this to Vice Provost Ayres. Do we know why we have to offer exchange students and undergraduates with degrees priority registration?

Vice Provost Ayres: My understanding, the offer to Salford students is a relatively small number, maybe a dozen students. It has to do with the timing of when they come over and when they need to deal with the register to get in. The courses they take are entirely college science and math.

Senator Molitor: And what about undergraduates with a degree?

Vice Provost Ayres: I can't speak to that; that has been in the policy for some time.

Senator Gibbons: Can I ask a friendly amendment? Why in the caption are we still referring to the "chancellor?"

President Rouillard: That is because this is a previous policy. This is not a new policy; this is a revision. This was last approved, the initial effective date is 2011. Oh, so that should be changed—you are right. Are there any other questions?

President-Elect Brakel: Senator Molitor, I know in Education I've seen where students would graduate with their degree, but without certification for teaching licensure, so it was just allowing them to get the class that they need to register and get certified.

Senator Molitor: But to that point, do we want students who already have a degree to have priority over students who are working towards a degree? It seems to me students that already have a degree are not a high priority. We are trying to improve retention and graduation rates. In that case, I would argue that undergraduates with degrees should not be our high priority for registration. That would just be my opinion, unless somebody has a specific example.

Senator Menezes: In my program they are faring to get into the Master's program. We want them to get in there.

Senator Keith: And that is my experience too, Senator Molitor.

Senator Wedding: Is it a relatively small number?

Senator Molitor: Yes, it is usually a small number.

Senator Wedding: Well, no one brought it up previously to us, and this is all we have.

Senator Molitor: That's fine.

Senator Wedding: Is there any more questions or comments on this? Okay, I move that we accept this---

Senator Heberle: Can I just say something?

Senator Wedding: Yes.

Senator Heberle: Cheerleaders were not included, but why aren't cheerleaders just student athletes since they are free athletic? Can we just ask the student cheerleaders?

Senator Wedding: We do have student athletes in there.

Senator Heberle: I know, but Senator Molitor just said scholarship student athletes are different. It should probably say scholarship student athletes.

Senator Wedding: Well, there are walk-ons and there are a lot of them.

Senator Weldy: Let me refer to an official team as opposed to a club sport. I don't think cheerleading is an official team.

Senator Molitor: And the same thing with club sports, they are not included in early registration.

Senator Wedding: And student athletes because of travel may also have to register.

Senator Molitor: You mean, is the term NCAA student?

Senator Wedding: Right.

Senator Krantz: On that point, what is the present status of the swimming and diving?

President Rouillard: They are included.

Senator Krantz: So they are affiliated?

Senator Wedding: Yes.

President Rouillard: Any other comments or questions?

Senator Wedding: All in favor of passing this policy say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

President Rouillard: Okay, here is another policy.

Senator Wedding: So this is the Missed Class Policy, 3364-71-14. I think there is a typo on page 2. that I noticed. It is at the top in that first full paragraph on the last line.

President Rouillard: This was again another state compliance issue, Vice Provost Ayres, is that correct?

Vice Provost Ayres: What you see underlined there in red was brought to us by the Office of Student Disability Services as recommendations to bring us in line with Title IX.

President Rouillard: The last revision was in February 2018. This is the update to be compliant with Title IX.

Senator Wedding: I have two versions. One is your version that was sent to you, but I couldn't find it online, then we got this one. Some don't have [all of] the numbers, they are numbered 1 through 7. And again, 7. and 8. is also in the summary. Are there any comments or questions on this?

Senator Tucker-Gail: I totally agree with number 7, but my problem is that not all of the students that my center covers or deals with or the Counseling Center deals with are covered under Title IX. We are not associated with Title IX necessarily. So my question is, is there something that is going to allow students who don't report an assault to Title IX or don't report something through an official channel for someone like one of my advocates to go and speak to an instructor and have accommodations met, because not every victim wants to report their crime, or their assault, or their victimizations.

Senator Wedding: How would you word that?

Senator Tucker-Gail: I don't know.

Senator Molitor: In regards to Senator Tucker-Gail's comment. If a student came to me with this issue, and asked to be excused from class, am I not obligated to report it at that point?

Senator Wedding: Yes.

Senator Tucker-Gail: You are if you are a faculty member, but if my advocate comes to you --- I guess there is a fine-line in there. What if it is a mental health issue or what if it is any of those other things that are covered under the Counseling Center? I don't know where that line falls and I don't know what that language is, but is it possible for us to shove this one aside and maybe come back to readdress it?

President Rouillard: Well, I think again there's this issue of Title IX compliance that we need to address.

Senator Hall: Perhaps there is something officially that should be added.

Senator Tucker-Gail: Right, because I ran into instances where I can't get instructors to accommodate.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Heberle: I was going to come up with language, but I think it is best to leave it to a few people to come up with language. It could be a separate bullet point that might reflect something like the first one, elements of medical emergency that has to do with counsel needs and personal. I don't know how to handle the question of faculty members to not be able to not report if they know something happened. If an advocate tells us something happened, does that mean we don't have to report it if we know a student experienced something?

Senator Tucker-Gail: Well, I am just saying one of my advocates can say there is a really valid reason for this person.

Senator Heberle: But then we will know that, so we don't have to report that.

Senator Tucker-Gail: Well, they can see a random person. I don't know how you would define who those would be, like an advocate or counselor. I just don't know where that line falls.

Senator Edgington: I thought at one point after the bullets there was a statement about instructor discretion if there was an absence and then it fell under the bullet points. I don't see that anymore. Is that taken out or am I just imagining something that maybe wasn't there?

Senator Wedding: I didn't see what you are talking about, neither that particular bullet nor number.

Senator Edgington: I thought at one point we had something in there that said instructors could give an excuse as to something that doesn't fall under the bullets, but, it is their decision at that point.

Senator Hall: Can't they always do that?

Senator Edgington: I thought it was in the policy. Maybe that is why it was taken out because this is just a common sense thing.

Senator Wedding: Well, you could modify 7. to try to get where you want to be. We got enough lawyers in this room that could draft it up too. It says, "*covered under Title IX,*" but you can say 'associated with Title IX,' would that help? It does broadens it.

Senator Tucker-Gail: I think there needs to be something like a designated university personnel or something like that so it just can't be somebody random coming in and saying something. For example, a

medical doctor would have to give an excuse, and/or an advocate can advocate on part of a student, and/or a faculty member---

President Rouillard: It could be a condition covered under Title IX or other federal legislation, or a situation recorded by an advocate and associated with Title IX and federal legislation.

Senator Tucker-Gail: I honestly don't know.

Senator Relue: I don't know about [only] counseling services because she is also saying if you have something associated with not necessarily a Title IX associated title.

Senator Emonds: We can make it an extra bullet, right?

Senator Relue: Yes, we can make it an extra bullet. It can state something along the lines of, an issue that is brought to the attention of a faculty member by a Counseling Center advocate.

Senator Tucker-Gail: It might not be somebody from my center. It may be somebody with a mental health issue out of the Counseling Center or another designated authority on campus.

Senator Wedding: You have disability related excused absences in number 8.

Senator Hall: Well, under number 1. it says, "*illness or medical emergency*," so I would say that applies to these circumstances as well. It says it requires "*doctor care*," so that should probably be extended to requires the care of a health professional.

Senator Heberle: And add associated with the university.

Senator Weldy: It sounds like we need to pass this in order to be in compliance and then return it for further work and then bring it back.

President Rouillard: That would be another possibility.

Senator Wedding: Say that again, Sir.

Senator Weldy: It sounds like we need to pass this now so we are in compliance with Title IX etc. and then refer it back for further work to include these comments and ideas.

Senator Keith: Well, I guess I wonder if it can't wait two weeks and if it can go back to the committee. Everybody who have these wonderful ideas about appropriate language can email them to Senator Wedding because often times trying to fix things on the fly at Faculty Senate doesn't work as well as you might imagine.

Senator Wedding: I think we can pass it and then we also go back to the administration and find out who should be drafting some paragraphs to satisfy that.

Senator Keith: Graduate Council just passed a policy for graduate students. I don't know if it was posted and I don't know if the 30-days are over. Maybe there is language in the policy they just passed that we can borrow.

Senator Wedding: Well, we can always go back to it.

Senator Van Hoy: I don't think the language in that policy is any different than what was inserted here.

Senator Keith: Okay. Then if we are not in compliance, they are not in compliance and so maybe there is a broader conversation that needs to be had.

Senator Van Hoy: Well, we are in compliance because the Title IX language is in.

Senator Keith: You are absolutely right.

Senator Van Hoy: What is missing is the extra language.

Senator Keith: Right.

Senator Woolford: For number 5. there, is there supposed to be something after the “and?”

Senator Wedding: What number did you say?

Senator Woolford: Number 5.

Senator Molitor: It used to be that number 6. was the last point.

Senator Keith: If we pass this today then we are still not going to be in compliance because it has to go to senior leadership and it gets posted for 30-days. I don't know if passing it today and then turning around in two weeks and passing it again is the best use of our time.

President Rouillard: Well, we will ask some advice from the Vice Provost since he is the one who brought it to the committee regarding compliance.

Vice Provost Ayres: I think the administration's position would be that we are not terribly concerned about the timing. Graduate Council has passed a very similar version with this language. I think some excellent additional ideas have been brought to the table here. If this is passed today, then it will go through the process and get posted, that is fine. If it is modified two weeks from today, a new version that includes this language that could also include some other language, is passed and then put through a 30-day period, that is also fine.

Senator Wedding: We won't get this back in two weeks.

Senator Molitor: To save our colleagues on this committee a little time, why don't we just recommend that this go forward to the comment period right now and then people can add their comments and add suggestions?

Senator Wedding: Do you mean let it post for comments?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

President Rouillard: That is another option.

Senator Wedding: That's good; I will go with that. Are there anymore comments? Hearing none. All those in favor of sending this forward for posting for comments----

Senator Hall: Can I just ask one really quick question? If you go down to number 8, what does that phrase mean, “*accommodations memo emailed to instructors?*”

Senator Wedding: Well, we get a memo from the Office of Student Disability Services.

Senator Hall: Like each semester?

Senator Wedding: Yes. It may vary a little bit depending on their law and regulations, but they send us a standard boiler plate letter when we have a student who has a disability in our classes. It is usually by email.

Senator Hall: I was just wondering was that clear to people what that meant because it wasn't clear to me.

Senator Wedding: I see it regularly in my class for students, and that is all I know about it which is what I read. All those in favor of sending this forward for posting, please say, "aye."

Group of Senators: "Aye."

Senator Tucker-Gail: Wait. Well, if we pass this forward for comment, what is the requirement for us to see it again? Is there a requirement for us to see it again or does it just go to the Provost Office and they decide how to apply?

President Rouillard: It is a 30-day window for comments and based on those comments, my understanding is that the policy will either go into effect or be pulled. That is correct, right?

Vice Provost Ayres: Yes.

Senator Tucker-Gail: So there is no guarantee that comments will be taken into consideration or applied to the policy before it is put in place?

President Rouillard: No, but I think that given today's discussion there is a good chance that those comments would be applied.

Senator Tucker-Gail: I'm just asking. I just want that on the record. I trust you.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Wedding: This is the last one, International Baccalaureate Diploma, 3364-71-20.

President Rouillard: This was a new policy in 2015, so really this is a reaffirmation.

Senator Relue: I have a question related to the IB. Do we have an AP policy?

Senator Heberle: Why is this a policy?

President Rouillard: Yes, we do because there is an option of getting an international baccalaureate degree in some high schools and that is a specific program in of itself.

Senator Molitor: I believe the state transfer laws already govern this issue. We have IB scores for which we give credit. It is just like AP credit - you take an AP test, you report your scores, and you get the corresponding course credit at the University of Toledo. You take an IB test, you report your scores, and you get appropriate credit at the University of Toledo.

Senator Wedding: We have been doing this in our college for years.

Senator Molitor: It is automatically done by the Registrar's Office.

Senator Wedding: This has been going on as far as I know for years and years.

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Wedding: Does anyone have comments? Please take some time to read it.

Senator Keith: Where did this policy come from? Did it come from the Provost Office?

President Rouillard: Yes. It was first approved---

Senator Wedding: By the Provost, Deans, Associate Deans, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Undergraduate Admissions, and the University Registrar in November 2015.

Senator Ferris: And this has not been changed from current policies, is that right?

Senator Wedding: We were not given any changes?

President Rouillard: The projected review date was November 2018 in this academic year.

Senator Molitor: Again, to save our colleagues work, I would request that the Provost take a look at this to see if we even need this policy. If we do need this policy, then do we need a corresponding AP policy? AP and IB follow the same process - you take a test, you get a score, you report your score and you receive some type of course credit.

Senator Wedding: We got this from the Provost Office.

President Rouillard: Right. It came to us from the Provost Office.

Senator Molitor: Maybe the Provost needs to review to see whether we really need this policy. It seems like they sent it to you because they saw this policy hasn't been looked at in so many years and we need to review it.

President Rouillard: Right. As you say and now that you've mentioned it, I think I also seen this in the handbook for academic review at the state that there are provisions regarding the international baccalaureate degree. That is probably why this policy was drafted in the first place. And as far as I can see, nobody has come up with any need for any changes to this policy.

Senator Molitor: Yes, but then do we need an AP policy if we have this policy?

President Rouillard: I thought we have an AP policy.

Senator Wedding: Yes, I thought we had one.

Senator Molitor: We do not.

President Rouillard: We don't?

Senator Molitor: Not under undergraduate academic policies.

Senator Ferris: I move that we reaffirm this policy and ask the Provost Office to develop an AP policy.

Senator Molitor: If needed.

Senator Ferris: Yes, if needed.

President Rouillard: Is there a second?

Senator Molitor: I will second that.

Senator Wedding: Is there any discussion?

Senator Hefzy: What is the motion?

Senator Wedding: I'm sorry?

Senator Hefzy: What is the motion?

Senator Molitor: The motion is reaffirm this policy, which is already in place and ask the Provost Office to develop an AP policy if needed.

Senator Wedding: We are going to go with an AP if it is needed.

Senator Molitor: Can I amend this motion to request the Provost pull this policy if it is not needed? There is no reason for us to review this again in three years if it is not needed.

Senator Wedding: Can we do a separate motion on that? Let's do a first motion and then you can do a second motion.

Senator Molitor: Okay.

Senator Wedding: Let's do it back-to-back. The first motion is to approve this and also ask the Provost Office if we need an AP policy, that is motion number 1. All those in favor say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Thank you.

Senator Wedding cont'd: Now, state the second motion, Senator Molitor.

Senator Molitor: My motion would be to pull the IB policy if it is not needed.

Senator Wedding: I second. Are there any comments on that? Hearing none. All in favor say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? [1]

Senator Hefzy: I abstain.

Senator Wedding: Do you abstain?

Senator Hefzy: Yes.

Senator Wedding: Okay. *Motion Passed.* Thank you. Well, that is all I have.

President Rouillard: Alright, thank you very much to you and your committee. So next on the agenda is Dr. Amy Thompson and Dr. Christine Fox, student course evaluations. The materials were forwarded to faculty.

Dr. Amy Thompson: Thank you everybody for having us today. Of course, Christine Fox is co-chairing this committee with us. I just want to give you a little bit of history. You should've received two documents that were sent to all senators. One is the PowerPoint that I will be presenting today and the second is actually a course evaluation ad hoc committee recommendation. So these were sent out I think several weeks ago. Just to kind of give you a little bit of background in terms of why this discussion started, there's been lots of publications in the Chronical of Higher Education and other higher education journals to talk about course evaluations. One particular article that was recently published looked at student success and linking course evaluations to student success. So, if you modify these questions, what does that look like in terms of improving student retention and success in the classroom? So we began to approach President Rouillard and ask for a partnership to actually form a committee. I will give a listing of the people who were actually participating. President Rouillard not only helped us populate the committee, but also chose a co-chair for this committee. We came up with a charge for this committee to basically look at a couple of things: making recommendations for a standardize data collection process and actually developing some type of universal assessment instrument that has a set of common core questions. So you can see that we typically had a representative for every single college. We also had some members in the Provost Office and UT online. We wanted to make sure we also involved students, so we had an undergraduate and graduate student that were also part of our committee.

So, just to kind of go back to why this is important. There is lots of research that talked about how course evaluations often are not really reflective of teaching. In fact, they can often not really glean good information on course design, the climate or even some of the actual student learning outcomes. We also see that when you have all kinds of student evaluations or course evaluations, it becomes impossible to benchmark across the university in terms of how we are doing with our teaching. We can tell you this, we've actually seen some questions that can potentially be bias at our own institution; it can impact the promotion and tenure process for faculty and of course, that is a huge concern. Also, when we look at this idea of best practices in teaching and best practices in student-centeredness, this is something we are even evaluating and measuring in our courses. We are also looking at course evaluation, dissemination and analysis process, and are those standardized. I bet many people in this room have been in situations where they've given out course evaluations in their class and they had to ask students to help them out. Maybe you are teaching late till 10 o'clock at night and you asked your graduate student, can you bring those back to the department to the support person in the morning. It creates lots of issues with students actually handling course evaluations too. So we don't really have a standardize set of procedures on how to handle those course evaluations when they are disseminated. So we began to look at methods used to develop a new propose course evaluation. We did a really comprehensive review of the literature, and if you are interested in this, we actually have a whole bibliography we can provide you in your spare time. We asked that each committee member get as many course evaluations from the departments as we could to begin to look at what they looked like, what were some commonalities between those questions. Then we looked at what our peer institutions are doing. I can tell you that Bowling Green for example just this year also implemented a common set of core course evaluation questions. So we began to then do a sematic analysis. We began to look at what constructs were commonly measured within these course evaluations and which ones were also deemed as best practice. Based on the sematic analysis, we were able to develop 12 core questions and these basically covered the constructs of student engagements, course design, course implementation, assessment practices, and course impact. So those are most of the evaluations we gleaned or gathered and actually measured in one way or another, these types of constructs.

So based on this discussion we took it a step further and we said, how do we develop a university-wide course evaluation that everybody would use across the institution. I want to be very clear about this that this is really a process of shared governance. We do not by any means want to remove the input of colleges and apartments. The goal of this is to have a set of 12 questions that everybody might use across the institution. However, if departments or colleges might still want to add their own questions, that is perfectly fine to do so. So with that in mind, we began to develop this new course evaluation instrument that was based on everything that we had collected and we wanted to go through the various shared governance bodies. So we had actually met with both the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and we got some great feedback from them. We also met with Graduate Council Executive Committee. This also went to the floor of Graduate Council and was unanimously passed in terms of an endorsement for a pilot project. So, we are here today to actually present this to you and ask for your endorsement of a pilot project to roll this out and test these questions to see what feedback we can get to actually roll this out potentially next fall. This would be a pilot test and we will go over a proposed timeline in just a second. So in terms of the course evaluation dissemination procedures, one of the things, again, I mention is the fact that people give it at different times. Some faculty will actually give it on a day of a final exam. There is lots of research that says that is probably not a great idea. So, one of the recommendations we are actually suggesting is that faculty give it within the last two weeks of the course and not actually during the final exam. But again, that is just to help the faculty with standardization of the data collection. Also, we also recommend that faculty give it out at the beginning of the class. The reason for this is because

you don't want to say, you have five minutes, hurry up and fill this out because you then cut down on the amount of feedback that the students can provide. To also improve the course data collection process, we recommend that all course evaluations be collected electronically. So for many of you that already teach online through Blackboard, we already do this and we already use this in many cases. This would be asking that all course evaluations become electronic and online and use a platform like Blackboard by emailing out the enterprise survey link. I can tell you that this is a very cumbersome process for those of you that use paper and pencil still. I know our support person at HHS when I was a faculty member there used to spend six-to-eight weeks compiling all those comments and typing those out—it is a ton of staff time. Another thing is it is not instant feedback for the instructor. Typically, when you do it online, after the course has ended and after the grades are in, within a week or so you are able to access that feedback and then change your course accordingly if you need to, and sometimes the response is delayed as a result of that. Also again, we talked about ethical issues on having students sometimes handle those course evaluations. Then one of the other suggestions we recommend is actually asking faculty to direct students in the class to take the course evaluations survey. One of the things that we get as we talk about this course evaluation document is what about response rates. Because we tend to put things online, you may see a dip in response rates. Well, by actually asking students, okay, next Tuesday, we are going to do the evaluation and it is online so bring your phone, bring your tablet, or bring your laptop because it is still online and you can do it in class. So it is just not using a paper and pencil mechanism to be able to do that. There is also a recommendation that there is a standard statement that is attached to all course evaluation basically recommending each course taught by faculty being evaluated with electronic course evaluation, down here, and this will be where the link would be sent out. There are 12 questions. Please answer all 12, including the last three question which they are asking for written comments. This is very important because there was some discussion on this. The completed evaluations go directly to the university and the instructor will not be allowed to see your anonymous responses until after the grades are completed. For those of you who have not done online surveys online before, this is anonymous and it is not linked in any way to the student. I want to reinforce that.

To give you an idea of what the timeline for this would look like: We've already passed this through the Provost Office, deans, Graduate Council and the Executive Committees. It is our intent to ask for your potential endorsement of this pilot project. If possible, we would like to take a few classes even at the end of this semester and begin to pilot that with them and also spend the summer in pilot testing. The reason why we would like to try to do this by the end of the semester is because sometimes courses in the summer might be different, so we would like to try to at least get some initial this semester. So moving forward what this would look like is doing our work over the summer, doing things like focus groups (and this is why it is important to have Dr. Fox working with us.) Dr. Fox's background is at research and measurement. She is an expert in survey design and analysis. So she is has the whole propose plan to test out the survey and making sure the psychometrics of the survey are good. Do you want to say anything about that?

Dr. Christine Fox: Yes. A more important piece is to get the feedback from the focus groups and formal faculty input on the wording of the questions and the wording of the scale. Because as you'll see, the 12 questions that are proposed to you, those are being asked to be approved as a draft because we look at literature, we look at all of the constructs. We got some great examples. We got wonderful input from the committee across the university, but that is still one set of eyes creating that first draft. Any good survey has to have multiple, multiple drafts and a lot of input from all the key stakeholders. So it is not a matter of looking at these 12 and saying, I don't like number 11. and maybe this should be worded this way and hey, I am taking comments and email me what you think. Part of our formal pilot that we have planned is to elicit feedback from the faculty on both campuses and students on both campuses so that we

incorporate that into the final wording as well as what Amy refers to as the psychometrics analyses and all of that sampling and design. We are going to design a whole pilot of how we are going to change those, score those, and present results.

Senator Heberle: I just have a quick question whether or not the summer courses and limiting pilot to summer courses is the best thing to do. Summer courses are so different.

Dr. Fox: Well, we want to do it in the spring too.

Senator Heberle: Oh, I am sorry.

Dr. Fox: Yes, at the end of this semester.

Dr. Thompson: We actually took that from Graduate Council because they suggested trying to do it at the end of the semester so classes would be off.

Senator Heberle: So it would be spring 2019 and summer 2019?

Dr. Fox: Yes, pretty much.

Dr. Thompson: Correct. And so then what we would do is compile our results and make changes to the instrument and come back and share those with Graduate Council and share those with Faculty Senate and then assuming we are all on the same page, having the Provost do a formal announcement. What would happen is, the 12 questions—it might be a different number. I mean, we don't have the answer to that—would be identified and then colleges and departments would be able to submit, let's say at the beginning of October their questions that they still want to use or not and then full deployment will be at the beginning of fall semester. So that would be our proposed timeline.

Dr. Fox: And before you get into that, we want to make sure it is very clear that nobody is mandated to use the results of these 12 questions or whatever they end up being in your dossier for tenure promotion evaluation of any sort. So again, this is not a requirement for you to be putting forth this evidence in your documentation. This is just university-wide collecting for benchmarking purposes. Some departments have one or two questions that they like because those are the ones that are key to them.

Dr. Thompson: So really this is just something that we want you to say we are all on the same page and we are able to benchmark this and to make sure that we are really looking at some of the best practices in our classrooms. So you can see some of the questions: The very first one is actually setting the pace for the course evaluation and putting some ownership on the student—“I put forth my best effort in the course.” This gets them to think about what was their contribution to the class. Also, “Learning outcomes and expectations for performance were clearly communicated throughout the semester.” We know that is best practice—“I felt encouraged and supported to do my best work.” Using various teaching approaches to meet the needs of all students. Number 5. was actually a result of some of the climate survey that came out that said some students don't feel comfortable voicing their opinions in class and being cognoscente of being inclusive in the classroom—looking at things like feedback on their work and time to adjust their performance in the class. Using feedback in a helpful way to improving my performance in the course. Looking at a course grading. Actually looking at what did you take away—did you learn a lot in this course. And then specifically as an instructor, don't you find it interesting what you think is most important is not what the student thinks is most important and a way of looking at how the course can improved? I want to draw your attention to what I think is the most important distinction of this course evaluation. If you look at the questions, it doesn't really say the instructor did this or the instructor did that, and that is very purposeful to move away from creating that bias against the faculty member. Again,

tons of research on discrimination against women, minority faculty members, or underrepresented minority groups and so we are really trying to create something that we think would be helpful and informative to our faculty.

Senator Bailey: Dr. Thompson, I have a question. I am always lost when it comes to student evaluations. And the reason it is, you kind of said it just now, we are working on this and developing these questions, but they are not going to matter in the dossiers. So kind of what is the point?

Dr. Thompson: So Senator Wedding can jump in on this, but the way the CVA is written, it actually states that course evaluations may be used to examine tenure and promotion. So it is not necessarily mandated, correct? So that is thus the language in response to you.

Dr. Fox: I don't need to put those in there. But the reason why I was excited to be on this committee because I wanted to work to develop questions that is going to be useful to help me with continuous improvement in my teaching because a lot of the responses from the questions that I get now tell me about who likes what, but it doesn't give me specific guidance to moving and in what specific areas. So that is why I like it because I think when we work this way it helps us and form our pedagogy and also that helps with retention and so forth and all those things that follow. Now, whether you like these questions or not and want to put them in your dossier is separate.

Senator Giovannucci: For the College of Medicine, particularly for the medical students, there is already a long history of addressing many of these in a very wide-ranging course evaluation that goes back many years. We also have sort of a different structure which we have multiple instructors for courses at multiple sites and the students have lots of evaluations already.

Dr. Thompson: Can I jump in?

Senator Giovannucci: Yes.

Dr. Thompson: Because we actually had a full discussion with David Kennedy and there were emails that were going around with that, the College of Medicine because of their accreditation scales that they require and because the fact in some cases you have 25 or 30 instructors for one course, that is the one exception that would be applied for this.

Senator Giovannucci: The Medical School people?

Dr. Thompson: Yes.

Senator Hall: Pharmacy has the same circumstance in terms of organization of classes and accreditation issues. So I think you should ask a little bit more widely if there should be some [additional] exemptions.

Dr. Thompson: We are willing to talk about that, sure.

Senator Menezes: I think I received the most positive response in from my faculty and I think it was a student-centered review that was really amazing. The first question about "I put forth my best effort" can actually be referred to number 10. We typically get evaluations filled up by students who do not do well, who are failing. But here you say, if you think your work is not good, what could [you] have done for you to benefit? So they should be able to pinpoint something such as an assignment in the classroom. You want to check whether this was the student who was participating in class and do they know their activities. I think this is amazing. Truthfully, if you want to run this on my group of students, you are welcome because we already use a well-developed evaluation on Blackboard. The question I wanted to

ask you is, if this survey would be supplemental with the other one we currently run or can we choose on that?

Dr. Thompson: I'm sorry, can you clarify?

Senator Menezes: We do have an evaluation already so if you want to test this, do you run both evaluations?

Dr. Fox: Yes.

Dr. Thompson: We will combine them, so it will be like the first 12 and then college or department question(s).

Senator Menezes: Do we automatically run it or do we have to go to you?

Dr. Thompson: We will have it all hooked up so it is just the same.

Senator Keith: If you are looking for volunteers, as long as my chair is willing I am willing to let you have my class to participate in the pilot. I think this is a wonderful idea among other things.

Dr. Thompson: Thank you.

Senator Gilchrist: I appreciate the change to the evaluation, the College of Law needs it. To the extent that these are mandatory for colleges, I have some concerns about how these would apply at the College of Law. I generally would suggest, although I feel intimidated by the length of the process that already gone through and I'm kind of late to the game here, but I think it ought to be a shorter list of questions if these are mandatory for all colleges. My understanding is colleges cannot opt out of particular questions. The College of Law, we are less student centered than I think the university as a whole by design. We are currently working on raising our attrition rates for accreditation and bar pass reasons, so some of the tone might not apply well. I am looking in particular at number 4, "A variety of teaching approaches used to meet the needs of all students," that is not necessarily our goal. In some courses we develop what we determine to be the best teaching method for the most students to optimize bar pass rates and success, and that would be the goal. A little differently I suppose, number 6 and 7—"Feedback," a standard College of Law model is that the feedback, and I know this is not pedagogically favored by most educators, but the standard feedback is the final exam at the end of the semester after all teaching is done. So there is no feedback, not really. And then finally, "Grading in the course is fair." We give a grade only at the end and so they really don't have a grade and in addition to that, we use a curve. I think there is an argument that grading on a curve is unfair in certain instances. So if this is meant to be uniform across the whole university, I worry that these questions could put a college like the College of Law in a negative light from the administration's perspective because of what we are intentionally doing.

Dr. Thompson: Thank you for your comments. We did have a representative, Rebecca who actually served on this committee and she seemed very supportive of these questions. I think my response to that would be that because we have created the "n/a" category if needed, that students could be directed to respond to that. But kind of a bigger conversation, Senator Gilchrist is in moving the direction of student centeredness, and I think you said it right away, you are moving towards practices to look at attrition. So these are really the chronological sound practices that we all should be collectively thinking about. So if that begins to start a conversation amongst the faculty like, oh, maybe these are some things we should be looking at. If you don't feel that question necessarily applies to your area, then instruct students to "n/a." But I think what is hard is when we start to piecemeal the questions, then it also takes away the capacity to benchmark processes. We might just say we know in the College of Law, just because of what you've

just said, we might expect it to be a lower score in questions 2 or 4, but we can account for that, right? The whole point of this is to try to be able to look at some of the common themes that we can improve on across the institution.

Senator Heberle: Could it be that these are just not appropriate for graduate education or professional education because they are faced with different issues than undergraduate education is? Maybe this is not appropriate for graduate programs like the College of Law.

Dr. Thompson: Well, my response to that is because this is a pilot we can certainly look at that to see if there's a different need, and I think that is the whole point of this which is to research this and look at it, right? When we went in front of Graduate Council they were very supportive of this.

Senator Van Hoy: But you are talking about professional programs in particular, right?

Senator Heberle: I am also thinking about the graduate seminar that I might teach, I probably might not use a variety of teaching approaches that I will use for the undergraduate class. I might make them read, write, and repeat and read, write, repeat and talk etc. So I don't know if it is appropriate for Graduate Education even in my area.

Senator Molitor: To that point, sometimes you can use that information to determine if a student is actually giving you a useful evaluation. If they respond, "I strongly agree that you did this", and you are thinking, "I didn't do any of this", then you know this student may not be providing a useful evaluation of your course.

Senator Heberle: Well, the problem is that we use these and the university does as well, and I think that is Senator Gilchrist's point is that the university is going to be looking at this and saying, well then the College of Law needs to work on this stuff. So that is sort of the intention here that I can use this no matter what I am doing, but the university as an institution is going to be data managing, not doing what you just talked about. So I am not just sure it works.

Senator Emonds: If a faculty member would like to use the students' evaluations for their tenure and promotion dossier, will there be a link to Faculty180? So that it is not automatically populated to Faculty180, but it can be linked.

Dr. Thompson: We've talked about that, not ever being mandated. But for example, as faculty are starting to compile these into an online warehouse, for them to be able to add them very easily might be an option, but that will never automatically be populated. I want to be clear about that.

Senator Emonds: Right, but the possibility is there so they don't have to spread it out and then go to the scanner and scan it back in like the current situation we have right now.

Dr. Thompson: Right. I think that would be a great idea for sure. So again, what we are asking today is just an endorsement to work on a pilot to look at this. This is not like final. This is just for us to study this to go over this summer. I saw a couple more hands.

President Rouillard: It is 6 o'clock and I am perfectly willing to continue the discussion, but I would like a motion to extend the meeting time by 10 minutes to complete this and vote on an endorsement. Is there a motion to extend the meeting?

Senator Molitor: I move to extend.

Senator Edgington: Second.

President Rouillard: Alright, all those in favor of extending the meeting say, “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Meeting Extended.*

Senator Gilchrist: Just to clarify, is it the administration’s position that a college could instruct all their students to any question to answer “n/a?”

Dr. Thompson: I’m sorry?

Senator Gilchrist: Just to clarify, is it the administration’s policy that a college could say to all of their students, answer number 4, “n/a” so that we can effectively eliminate because I was under the impression that we will have to propose all of these questions. We can put them out there, but can we instruct our students across the board to answer non-applicable to every one of them?

Dr. Thompson: For specific ones that we would have a discussion about. I mean, if those are things that you and your dean doesn’t feel comfortable including, we can talk about that and work that through. Again, we want to try to have the opportunity to not give five questions to this college and six questions to that college etc. because it makes it too difficult.

Dr. Gilchrist: What if you went to four questions for all colleges?

Dr. Thompson: My response to that would be because there are very specific constructs that we are trying to measure that are more common, right? So you have to have a certain number of items to at least be able to measure both constructs. I am not saying that we are a group that is opposed to that, absolutely, who wants more questions? But in fact to your point, we saw some departments with 35 questions on their course evaluations, so this is pretty short to some of the ones we’ve seen. What we are hoping is that some people will say, you know what, we are already asking a derivative of this and so we will just substitute on that and it will cut down on the amount of questions maybe they were going to ask.

Senator Menezes: You may have to run a trial run anyway to get feedback to whether it is usable.

Dr. Thompson: You are exactly right, yeah.

Senator Ohlinger: So obviously what I am told what is useful and applicable to each college, each course, that is not going to happen for every single students. But, based on some of the discussion what I am hearing is that we have this desire to design an instrument where every question is going to be possibly “strongly agree.” Well, no, that is not the case. That is not what we are trying to do here. If some of the responses are “disagree,” well, you can look at that and the disagreement may be there because we do it differently and it doesn’t really apply to us—that is appropriate. But maybe you will find some where your students are disagreeing and you are like, wow, that doesn’t make sense; we are meeting our student’s needs, and how can we make an adjustment? I think that is kind of a point of this. We are not trying to create an instrument where everybody agrees.

Senator Krantz: For those of you who are in the room that deals with psychology for this type of survey more often, is there any advantage to adding a potential answer neutral? You are creating a binomial decision between positive and a negative.

Dr. Fox: Well, neutral isn’t in there right now because when I teach survey design, neutral is shown both imperially and in the literature to not add a meaningful distinction in most situations. However, but psychologically depending upon where you are at, neutral might be. A lot of times it might be not as much and it might be something different. So that is part of where we might be getting at right at the beginning of the pilot study working with student focus groups, undergraduate and graduate across both

campuses to sit and work through these. So the exact response options are also completely up for editing and modifying based on some feedback on that.

Senator Bailey: So for example, the College of Business currently have an evaluation, is this going to be replacing that?

Dr. Thompson: No.

Senator Bailey: Is it an addition to that?

Dr. Thompson: What would happen is, you have these 12 questions and it goes back to your college. If you decide to add additional college level questions or your department, you might take your items and say, I feel like this is already being addressed, so we don't need to ask that, but we want to ask four more questions. You can add any additional questions that you want.

Senator Hefzy: For the record, teaching evaluations was used in five-year reviews by some chairs.

President Rouillard: They can't mandate it if it is not in the contract.

Senator Hefzy: Can they still use it?

President Rouillard: They can't mandate it. You came today looking for an endorsement for this pilot program. Is there somebody who would make a motion to endorse this pilot program?

Senators Lee and Ferris: So moved.

Senator Van Hoy: Second.

President Rouillard: All those in favor of endorsing this pilot program, please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions [1]

Senator Hall: I abstain.

President Rouillard: Is there a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:
Mark Templin
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative

