

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 14, 2017**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>**

Approved @ FS on 4/11/2017

---

**Summary of Senate Business**

Faculty 180 Demonstration – Associate Vice President Brenda Grant  
Proposal for Institutional Student Learning Outcomes – Dr. Connie Shriner  
Duplicate/Low-enrolled Programs Report- President Mary Humphrys

---

**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 Humphrys:** I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the thirteenth Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2016-2017. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

**I. Roll Call: 2016-2017 Senators:**

**Present:** Ariss, Atwood, Bjorkman, Bouillon, Cappelletty, Compora, Crist, Devabhaktuni, Duhon, Edwards, Gilchrist, Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Hall, Harmych, Haughton, Hoy, Humphrys, Jaume, Jorgensen, Keith, Kippenhan, Kistner (substitute for S. Barnes), Kovach, Krantz, Lecka-Czernik, Lundquist, McLoughlin, Modyanov, Mohamed, Monsos, Nathan, Niamat, Nigem Oberlander, Prior, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Said, Sheldon, A. Thompson, Thompson-Casado, Tian, Tucker, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, White, Williams Wittmer

**Excused absences:** Brickman, Burnett, Dowd, Duggan

**Unexcused absences:** Emonds, Lanham, Malhotra, Martin (substitute for G. Thompson), Schaefer, Srinivasan, Willey

**II. Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of the February 14, 2017, meeting of the Faculty Senate.

**President Humphrys:** Welcome to the fourteenth Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year.

The candidates for the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs are on campus this week and next. Please see the email I sent earlier this week for the schedule for each candidate's open forum. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is also interviewing each candidate.

As a follow-up to our previous discussions about the 15-week semester, the dates for Fall Break for 2017 have been determined. Fall Break will be Monday and Tuesday, October 16 and 17.

On this Friday, members of your Executive Committee will be meeting with representatives from Barnes & Noble. It will be an opportunity for us to discuss any issues that you and your college colleagues may have had regarding textbooks. I would like to encourage you to get the word out that if there have been problems with ordering and/or the timely availability and number of textbooks to please email me a description of the issue by this Thursday.

We will have busy weeks ahead including the Senate elections, which we will hear more about later in this meeting, and dean evaluations. Also, I would like to remind everyone that it is imperative to have course and program modifications and proposals through the curriculum tracking process and to the Faculty Senate committees very soon. Please let your colleagues know about this.

There are a few pieces of information related to the State government that I would like to pass along. First, there is a bill that is being formulated in the State legislature that would end tenure in Ohio. In an email that was originated by State Representative Kristina Roegner, whose district includes suburban Akron and parts of Cuyahoga Falls, and sent in an effort to secure co-sponsors for this legislation, Representative Roegner states, “I will soon introduce legislation that will prohibit the establishment or continuation of permanent tenure systems at all state institutions of higher education for newly hired faculty members. This legislation will only apply to public institutions and any faculty member employed on or after the effective date of the legislation. Those already tenured shall be grandfathered in, allowing them to retain their tenure. Faculty members hired before the effective date of this legislation that are currently on the tenure-track will retain their tenure-track program status.” Obviously, this is a very significant development and as always, Senator Linda Rouillard, UT’s representative on the Ohio Faculty Council will keep us informed of activity related to this legislation.

The other government-related topic I wanted to share is that Representative Rick Perales, chair of the Ohio House Finance Education Subcommittee, was on campus on March 3—as part of his listening tour regarding Governor Kasich’s proposed budget. Diane Miller, UT’s Associate Vice President for Government Relations, shared with me a memo summarizing the discussions with Representative Perales. During the meeting, Provost Hsu and Chief-of-Staff Matt Schroeder expressed the University’s concerns regarding the unfunded textbook mandate and the modest incremental increase in the State Share of Instruction. Representative Perales indicated that the current language in the budget pertaining to providing textbooks for all full-time undergraduate students would likely change. He suggested that the Inter University Council provide a proposal that could substitute for the budget’s current language. Senator Rouillard will also keep us posted on the issues related to the budget.

This Friday at noon is an important day for many UT students—it’s Match Day for graduating medical students. The day they find out where they will do their residency in their chosen specialty. The Faculty Senate wishes the best of luck to all of these graduates on this momentous day.

I’d like to end today’s Executive Committee Report with a few announcements.

I’ve been asked by Norm Rapino, Executive Director of Rocket Innovations, to remind faculty of the upcoming Introduction to Customer Discovery program, which is delivered as part of our NSF Innovation Corps Site grant. Participation is part of the qualification process needed to submit grant applications to the University of Toledo Rocket Fuel Fund and to the NSF I-Corps program that allows for travel and connection with those outside of UT. For dates, times, and further information about the Introduction to Customer Discovery program, please contact Norm Rapino.

Bittersweet Farms, UT’s Student Disability Services and Disability Studies Program, and the Carlson Library are partnering to offer a lecture series to raise awareness about adults with autism. This series kicks-off this Thursday, March 16, from 5 to 9 p.m., in the Canaday Center with an exhibit of Bittersweet artwork and artifacts and a brief lecture starting at 7 p.m. Also, Bittersweet products will be for sale in the concourse outside of Carlson Library during the event. That ends today’s Executive Committee Report. I would like to ask any members of the Executive Committee to comment on anything. Okay. Are there any comments and questions from senators?

**Dr. Wedding:** What is the third bullet under “Other Business,” Duplicate/Low-enrolled Programs Preliminary Response?” This is a very, very important topic. We seem to have a habit of frequently putting some of the most important topics at the very end to the agenda so that by the time we get to it, it is ten minutes to 6 o’clock. Is it possible that that can be moved up in the agenda today?

**President Humphrys:** I would certainly entertain that thought. I guess there are two reasons why I did that; one is because we do have two guests prior to that and I don't know what their schedules are. What are the Senators' feelings on that? Would you like to see it moved up?

**Group of Senators:** Yes.

**President Humphrys:** Okay, we will move it up. Thank you, Dr. Wedding. What I would like to do prior to that though, if we can, just go through the reports and then move it up in "other business." Does that sound good, Dr. Wedding?

**Dr. Wedding:** Yes.

**President Humphrys:** We are going to go ahead with the first of our reports today, which is from Provost Andrew Hsu.

**Provost Hsu:** Thank you, President Humphrys. There are three things that I would like to report to the Senate: The first one is a proposal for institutional student learning outcomes. Two or three months ago we had established an ad hoc committee in response to a concern from HLC midterm review and also as part of our strategic planning process. HLC's criticism was that our program review assessment does not link to our strategic plan and that we do not have an institution-wide student learning outcome, and so those are the reasons why we started this effort. The committee that looked at this includes members from the Faculty Senate, Graduate Council and the Assessment Committee.

A related issue is that we kicked-off a university academic program review committee; the first meeting was this morning. This committee has six faculty members, two from the Faculty Senate, two representatives from the Graduate Council and two faculty representatives from the University Assessment Committee. The committee's charge is to develop and implement a process following external program review that will summarize the external program report as well as develop an action plan with priorities for the directors and deans.

Lastly, I want to share information about the State Duplicate Program Report. Responding to a request from ODHE on duplicate programs, The University of Toledo is developing a list of Duplicate Programs Not Considered for Action and a list of Duplicate Programs Considered for Action. Based on a program list provided by ODHE, the initial lists were developed by the relevant colleges and modified by the Provost Office, and presented to Senate President Mary Humphrys last week, who will make a report later at this meeting. Here I want to emphasize that the programs on the list of Programs Considered for Action are ones that we will consult broadly with faculty and programs on before any decisions are made. We have until the end of this calendar year to finalize our plan, and the possible outcomes for each of these programs are (1) no action, (2) collaboration, or (3) elimination. This report will be up for approval by the BOT at its next meeting and submitted to ODHE in April. Are there any questions I can answer? If not now, I know that there will probably be a lot of questions about the list and---

**Senator Rouillard:** Actually, Provost Hsu, since you've mentioned that you forwarded the list to the deans with the instructions that the deans should consult with their chairs, I need to tell you that our dean did not do that with my chair. We haven't seen that. We have two programs that are on the list that are targeted for some sort of action, and I will have to tell you that that's pretty "stunning" to not even get a heads-up from our dean.

**Provost Hsu:** I will talk to all the deans tomorrow and I will bring that up. The deans didn't have much time either, but they should have had enough time to consult with their chairs.

**Senator Rouillard:** Do you know who provided the rationales for "no action" on the first list because each of those programs has at least a bullet list of rationales for not taking any action. Who compiled those rationalizations?

**Provost Hsu:** The dean provided that to the Provost Office and we assumed that the chairs developed the rationales.

**Senator Rouillard:** Well, we had one program that was on the list that was targeted for “no action” that has a rationale and I don’t think our chair was contacted about that either.

**Provost Hsu:** Okay.

**Dr. Hottell:** I am not a senator, may I speak?

**President Humphrys:** Certainly.

**Dr. Hottell:** Thank you. I am the Chair of Foreign Languages, my name is Ruth Hottell. I want to continue with what my colleague, Dr. Rouillard, was saying. For example, one of the arguments is whether or not faculty are “research active,” but, in those two programs that are on the second list for consideration, marked “for action,” the faculty are research active and that was not included in the rationale.

**Senator Rouillard:** Yes, there were no rationales for the two programs that are on the list that were targeted for action and yet the third program from our department that is targeted for “no action” has extensive lists of bullets as to why it needs to be maintained.

**Provost Hsu:** Okay, I guess I have no explanation for why that is. Looking at the final list, I must admit that I have not had a chance to talk to all the deans about their lists yet. But looking at the list, my guess is that they essentially based their decisions on the number of graduates, so I think those two programs you’ve mentioned, the state provided the number of graduates over the last three years and one had one graduate and one had three graduates over a three-year period of time.

**Senator Rouillard:** There are programs with many more graduates than that that are on this list.

**Provost Hsu:** Well, there is one program that I know has 40 graduates that is on that list, but that is because that program has the intention of closing that program and moving it to a graduate level; that [decision] was based on that prior intention, not based on the number of students they have graduated, but that’s the only one that is relatively high and that is---

**Senator McLoughlin:** Athletic Training.

**Provost Hsu:** Is that your program?

**Senator McLoughlin:** Yes.

**President Humphrys:** Since there several people here who haven’t seen the list, maybe we could hold the questions for our later discussion?

**Provost Hsu:** I am going to be here, so you will get all of my time if you have questions.

**Senator Rouillard:** Thank you.

**President Humphrys:** Well, we will take Senator Nigem’s question.

**Senator Nigem:** Since we are in this discussion, I would move that we go ahead with the presentation so the rest of Senate as a complete body has a full understanding as to what this involves and have full disclosure.

**President Humphrys:** Sure, let’s do that. The two lists that we’re referencing are the list of the programs that are not targeted for future action and the list of programs that are targeted for future action. Senator Rouillard was referencing the “not targeted” program list that contains an explanation as to why each

program does not need further review. I will send you that list because it will be a little easier to review it when you can see it on a computer screen rather than in a PowerPoint. So this is the first part of that: These are the programs that are not targeted for any future action. This is the second page of the programs that are not targeted for future action, so these won't be investigated any further.

#### **PROGRAMS NOT TARGETED FOR FUTURE ACTION**

<b>Women's Studies</b>	<b>Spanish Language and Literature</b>	<b>English Language and Literature</b>
<b>Liberal Arts and Sciences, Liberal Studies</b>	<b>Philosophy</b>	<b>Psychology</b>
<b>Economics</b>	<b>Geography</b>	<b>Political Science and Government</b>
<b>Sociology</b>	<b>Drama and Dramatics, Theatre Arts</b>	<b>Film, Cinema, Video Studies</b>
<b>Art and Art Studies</b>	<b>Music</b>	<b>History</b>

<b>Business Administration and Management</b>	<b>Logistics, Materials, and Supply Chain Management</b>	<b>Accounting</b>
<b>Accounting Technology</b>	<b>Finance</b>	<b>International Business, Trade, Commerce</b>
<b>Marketing and Marketing Management</b>	<b>Register Nursing</b>	<b>Biology, Biological Sciences</b>
<b>Computer Engineering</b>	<b>Electromechanical Technology, Electromechanical Engineering Technology</b>	<b>Mechanical Engineering, Mechanical Technology, Technician</b>

<b>Construction Engineering Technology</b>	<b>Information Science</b>	<b>Parks, Recreation and Leisure Studies</b>
<b>Criminal Justice, Safety Studies</b>	<b>Social Work</b>	<b>Respiratory Care Therapy</b>
<b>Special Education and Teaching</b>	<b>Teacher Education, Multiple Levels</b>	<b>Kindergarten, Preschool Education and Teaching</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>Chemistry</b>	<b>Physics</b>

**Dr. Wedding:** Question. Were they originally considered for targeting?

**President Humphrys:** Yes. The State provided a list based on duplication and low enrolled programs and so that's where this came from. The university is being asked to address every program that was on the State's list.

**Provost Hsu:** President Humphrys, can I make a comment?

**President Humphrys:** Sure, anytime.

**Provost Hsu:** The State provided the list based on CIP code of all the programs that are duplicative. Many of these are high enrollment and some of these, for example, nursing is our program and not their program, but they have the same CIP code, and so there are many instances like that in here, and many of these are high enrollment.

**President Humphrys:** The duplication was specifically with Bowling Green, right?

**Provost Hsu:** Right, just Bowling Green.

**Senator Nigem:** So are they looking at graduation rates, particularly programs? What are we looking at, overall enrollment or what?

**Provost Hsu:** So the State provided the spreadsheet and it has programs, CIP codes and the program name, and then the cost to graduate, and then the total number of degrees conferred during a three-year period, and that is what they provided to us.

**Senator Nigem:** Is that what the decisions are then based on, coupled with whatever other descriptive information that is provided by the dean's office?

**Provost Hsu:** Right. Presumably, that's the information that we use if we need to justify that we're not taking any action. The State also provided a list of things that you can use to justify, for example an important mission of the university, or the strengths of the program, which includes the number of graduates. There is a long list of things that the State suggested to use to justify, to not collaborate or not eliminate.

**Assistant Dean Pollauf:** President Humphrys, what's the definition of a low-enrollment program?

**President Humphrys:** I never saw a definition of a low-enrolled program; was there one, Provost Hsu?

**Provost Hsu:** Well, there is no "definition." But again, they have provided us with the total number of graduates over a three-year period of time. So, you can assume if you only graduated one student over a three-year period of time, that's probably low-enrollment and if you graduate 100 students over a three-year period of time, that's probably not low-enrollment and then there's anything in between which is really a judgment call, there's no "definition."

**Dr. Wedding:** I would think that low-enrollment would be determined on the basis of cost which wasn't easy to do, determining the cost when students are in there. But the real issue for me is at the Finance and Strategy meeting; we've been talking about low-enrollment courses which I took to mean some kind of cost model, but now instead of talking about enrollment, we're talking about graduation rates and I don't think there's a connection per se between graduation rates. There are programs that have high-enrollment, but may not be contributing per se to graduation, except in other programs, so, I think the two are completely separate, but they can be related.

**Senator Rouillard:** And I would still like to come back to the issue that already at this point judgments have been made, and they have been made without faculty input and that's serious.

**Dr. Wedding:** That's true.

**Senator Rouillard:** Well, at least in the case of my college, I can't speak for the other colleges. But in the case of my college, there have been judgments made and there was no faculty input, it's important for you to know that. I believe you when you say, you set out to do this with faculty input, but, you need to know that has not been how it was practiced across the board.

**Dr. Hottell:** I, for one, look forward to more faculty input later, because some of the programs that are targeted for action, such as Asian Studies have a huge impact on other programs. Our Japanese program is the second in the state, right behind OSU and ahead of Cincinnati and it is definitely very closely linked with the Asian Studies Program. By the same token, concerning German Studies: we have six vibrant groups in this city of German associations who give a great deal of money for scholarships-I think they would not be happy to see that money being given to students on their way only to Bowling Green if we're closing the German program (at UT). So those are the kinds of conversations that I wish would have happened and I hope they will happen in the future with faculty input.

**President Humphrys:** This is the last slide of the programs that are not targeted for future action and here's the slide of programs that are targeted for future action. As Senator Rouillard was pointing out, unlike the not targeted group list which has bullets explaining why the programs did not require further review, the targeted group information is limited to enrollment and graduates- it's the number of graduates from 2012-2014. So these are the programs that will be talked about further. If I am not mistaken, there are three things that can be done with each of the programs on the targeted list: first, the program can be put into the "not targeted" category; second, the program can be targeted for collaboration with BGSU; or third, the program can be eliminated. Does that sound correct, Provost Hsu?

#### **PROGRAMS TARGETED FOR FUTURE ACTION**

<b>American/United States Studies/Civilization</b>	<b>Asian Studies/Civilization</b>	<b>German Language and Literature</b>
<b>French Language and Literature</b>	<b>Digital Arts</b>	<b>Art History, Criticism and Conversation</b>
<b>International Relations and Affairs</b>	<b>Business/Commerce</b>	<b>Athletic Training/Trainer</b>
<b>Geology/Earth Science</b>	<b>Clinical Laboratory Science/Medical Technology/Technologist</b>	

**Senator Hoy:** Are these only undergraduate programs?

**President Humphrys:** Yes.

**Senator Rouillard:** But it could conceivably affect our graduate programs. For instance, Bowling Green no longer accepts students in the Master's program for French, are they accepting for German?

**Dr. Hottell:** I don't know about German; I believe they're not accepting for French.

**Senator Rouillard:** We have a Master's in French and so if we close this program down, that conceivably can affect our graduate program. Our Carnegie rankings depend on the number of Master's programs that we have. That is one program, what about these other programs? Are we going to affect those graduate programs if we eliminate one of these programs?

**President-Elect Thompson:** Can I just ask maybe an obvious question?

**President Humphrys:** Yes.

**President-Elect Thompson:** Let's say we eliminate all these programs, we're not going to get rid of the faculty, so isn't that the cost? I guess I do not understand, I mean, does that make sense?

**Provost Hsu:** Yes. I think from the university's point of view, it is certainly true, but from a politician's point of view, they feel that there are inefficiencies because we're duplicating the efforts. So from the university's point of view I think there is probably no financial benefit in the short term, maybe ten years or fifteen years when the faculty from those areas retire and we don't rehire, then there might be, 15 years down the road. But let me just say that I don't think we're aiming to close anything out, at least from the Provost Office. In fact, in here I can easily name four of those that we are going to eliminate and nobody's going to say a "word" because the college wanted to eliminate them: (1.) Athletic Trainers program is one- they are an accrediting body and they have to move towards a graduate program and so they can't keep that undergraduate program, so that's an easy one. (2.) Business & Commerce and International Relations & Affairs- those are two College of Business programs that they do not even admit that they own those programs. They said, "that is not our program" and we asked around and nobody knows who that program belongs to, and right now it is listed under Business. (3.) Clinical Laboratory Science- again, it was listed under Science and Math, but Science and Math says, "we don't have that program." And so there are already four of those that we can easily eliminate and our hope is that by eliminating the four programs from that list, it is going to be sufficient. Then the question is the rest of these we could take a careful look to see if it does make sense to keep them or if we want to collaborate with Bowling Green. So, I don't think that we need to be overly concerned about this process. I think we need to watch and look at these very carefully, but I don't see the need to eliminate all eleven programs.

**Senator Thompson-Casado:** I just want to add to the conversation, that I hope when this moves forward that we take a look at the number of full-time professors graduating those students and the programs targeted. There is only one full-time professor in each of those sections, so if we look at the return on investment compared to some other departments – a pretty big return on investment.

**Senator Rouillard:** I would also like to ask, when you all go to the IUC, does somebody explain to the Ohio Department of Higher Education the financial consequences of this, that it is negligible? I mean, I appreciate hearing from you that you acknowledge that this isn't going to save us anything, but when do the legislators get educated on this? We have a Government Relations Office, is it not part of their job description to help us in these efforts?

**Provost Hsu:** I'm sure our Government Relations people and the IUC are trying to educate, but the Department of Higher Education people are really just trying to carry out some legislation that requires the university to look at these programs.

**Senator Rouillard:** Usually when they pass legislation, there's time for testimony. Are the university presidents not testifying?

**Provost Hsu:** These were legislations I think were passed two or three years ago. I'm sure at the time I wasn't---

**Senator Rouillard:** No, you weren't here and I understand.

**Provost Hsu:** I wasn't at Wright State either at the time, so I'm not sure what effort there was at that time.

**Senator Jorgensen:** Two clarifying questions to make sure I understand. Are all undergraduate programs on one of these lists or are there some that are not even considered in either category?

**Provost Hsu:** These are only the ones that both Bowling Green and UT have. They don't include any other programs other than the duplication.

**Senator Jorgensen:** Thank you. The second question is, the ones that were not targeted, is there a potential that the arguments that were presented by the university will be rejected? Are you making a value judgment on those?

**Provost Hsu:** At our monthly IUC Provost Meeting we asked those questions and what they are saying is that each university should take a careful look to see if anything can be done to improve the efficiency. They are not going to be the "judge" to tell us what must be done. According to Stephanie Davidson, no one is going to tell us what to do or not to do. They just want us to do a careful review so that they can report back to legislators that we did this. But on the other hand, we asked a question: if every university came up with the two lists, one, "no action considered" and the other, "action considered" and this is a "full list" and this is the "no list," so will that be acceptable? The answer was that's probably not acceptable.

**Senator Rouillard:** I guess my reaction is that you have a group of programs that people want to close for a variety of reasons and it seems to me that that makes sense. But in my case, I have a dean [now] who has signaled to me what some of our academic disciplines are worth and in her estimation, it is not much.

**President Humphrys:** Would it be possible, since we know at least in one case that the dean did not consult with the department chair or the faculty about their program being placed on the targeted list, is there a chance where a program could be removed from the "targeted" list before the list goes to the Board of Trustees?

**Provost Hsu:** I'm having a meeting with all the deans and my request to them is that they go back right away if they have not talked with their department chair or faculty and talk to them. But just based on looking at how many of these programs have graduated over a three-year period of time, I would think that it is a reasonable list to keep. If that discussion turns out to be otherwise for one or two then---

**President Humphrys:** They will be pulled off from this. Okay, so maybe we will do that.

**Dr. Hottell:** Another issue that I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of this body is studies of global perspectives. I'm struck by how many of these very important issues pertain to global studies. I think it's important to bring to the attention again of this body that Asian Studies has no faculty whatsoever; the faculty members are all brought from other departments, so it has a small budget that the director is given to spend for courses, and books, etc., but it has no faculty and no staff at all. The other important thing is that Bowling Green State University does not have a Confucius Institute, unless they have started one over the last two or three years. That fact that we have one here is very important and affects Asian Studies, so I would expect these kinds of programs (i.e., Asian Studies) to be on Bowling Green's agenda, not on ours. I would expect us to be the leader in many of the areas of global studies and world languages.

**Provost Hsu:** When we talk about collaborations, it's not going to be, one university is going to be the leader or one university will close theirs and the other keep theirs. It's simply to work together for example, some of these language programs, a number of majors are small and the number of students in classes are small, so then if we could co-offer some courses, that would be sufficient, right? So, if we offer an Arabic class and then video stream to their campus and they offer an Italian class and video stream to our campus, that's the type of collaboration we could do. If we both have French programs, it doesn't have to be "they follow us" or "we follow them;" it's more like an airline co-chair and if they agree to do that, that's enough collaboration to show the politicians that we are making good efforts to improve our...

**Senator Monsos:** I'm wondering because my college does a lot of service courses; the Language courses of course, and Art History has a huge service component, not only to Gen Ed, but to the Art Department, which is not targeted for future action, but their accreditation requires that they have a certain amount of art history. So even if we do away with the program, we still have to teach all those classes to meet just the Art Department's need as well as provide for Gen Ed., so there's not really a point. It's almost a bonus that a couple of people graduate with a degree every year because all of it will still be there, as they would need to be there to support the other programs anyway. Given that the Art History program exists in a building that attaches to the Toledo Museum of Art and uses the museum as a second campus, it seems odd to cut that particular one. I also have a question about Digital Arts; I am not sure what it means by that because we don't have a program in Digital Arts, but we do have a Digital Arts Concentration, so, is it the Concentration that's being looked at?

**Provost Hsu:** So there are a lot of coding issues there. I agree with you, there's also this Art History-if you eliminate the program, you can't eliminate the courses. These are all things that we can look at. Again, we're not looking at cutting programs here. The other thing is that, I don't think that we need to look at every program and then start arguing what should be kept and what should be considered for collaboration, because we still have at least seven or eight months to look into this. What I would like to do is have a faculty committee to look at every program carefully, including not only the number of students that graduated, but also the courses they offer, whether it's Gen Ed. courses or whether it's service courses, or the number of enrollment in those courses and take a closer look at the programs and then report back to the Senate. At that point we can start elaborating on what does make sense.

**Senator Hall:** So that I'm getting this right, what the law actually requires is that the universities take a look at their courses in terms of efficiency and overlap; it doesn't require that they do anything, right? But, the way the State's Department of [Higher] Education and the legislators would look at it is if we don't give that a true and honest attempt, then that may require further action to accomplish the same goals.

**Provost Hsu:** That is my interpretation.

**Senator Hall:** Well, in that case then an important part of the response (regardless of our decision) is going to be sending back a strong rationale for all of us.

**Provost Hsu:** Exactly. Sending back a detailed analysis on what action we're taking and why we're taking those actions and all the rationale behind it.

**Unknown Speaker:** Then in that case, this sort of faculty input that you've just mentioned is very critical in terms of providing that sort of input.

**Senator Atwood:** Just to clarify, the Ohio Revised Code says there is actually a definition for low-enrollment courses and that is defined by the Chancellor. In a correspondence in November of 2015 he acknowledges there is some subjectivity in how low-enrollment courses are defined, but basically says that, to comply with the legislation, the Chancellor is defining low-enrollment courses as course sections that fall below 20% above the institutionally-defined threshold for that course section over two or more semesters.

**Dr. Wedding:** Does that say courses or programs?

**Senator Atwood:** It says course sections.

**Dr. Wedding:** The point I'm trying to make is that we talk about two things that we have not discussed at the Finance and Strategy meeting, which is that we're talking about programs and they've been talking about courses, and they've been talking about graduation and we've been talking about enrollment. It seems to me, to at least initially address this is to have some sort of cost model that looks at courses and

enrollment. I mean, that is where you [should] start and then from there you could build and get your rationale. But programs, I don't know what programs means- Digital Arts, they don't know what it means and they think we don't have a program that is called Digital Arts. In the College of Business we don't even know what International Business Affairs is or Business Commerce, but yet we have 32 graduates from it. So we better be looking at courses and not programs, and we better be looking at cost, that's the real question here, is cost.

**President Humphrys:** Okay, one last thing here as Provost Hsu alluded to in his report; here are the dates that are coming up or the dates related to this process. I guess if anybody would actually want to look at the resolution and what it said, I'll send out this PowerPoint so we will have this. Are there any other questions? So there's a hope or possibility that we will be interacting with the faculty whose programs were not consulted before being placed on the targeted list.

The timeline on the Governor's efficiency report is as follows. Initial Report to Chancellor from BOT due: April 30; Progress Report due: Sept. 30; Final Report due: Dec. 31.

The next thing on our agenda is to have a report from Senator Cappelletty, chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, to talk about the course modifications and new courses.

**Senator Cappelletty:** So again, the committee was very active these last few weeks. There were 29 new course proposals and 25 course modifications that were reviewed by the committee. There were four that were paper submissions and one of those paper submissions, based on comments from the committee members, went back in discussion with their college curriculum committee and the suggestion of the curriculum committee members was to move that particular course from a variable credit hour course to a 4 credit hour course. So that particular course was AL4940, which is moving then from a variable 1-8 to a fixed core. The Kinesiology course, this was a single submission that is changing a number of courses and so they are changing the alpha code, so the KINE alpha code is going to go away and then they're going to move it over to Exercise Physiology, ESSC would be the alpha code and there were no other issues with that particular proposal.

Speech Language Pathology, we're changing a grading system so that it would fit the type of experiential course. Again, part of these are either course number changes or changes in the credit hours. Then finally, there was one missed out of the COIL from the amnesty document and in order to move that over to the IUC designation they're also going to do a course number change with that up to 1140. So all of these were unanimously approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Are there any questions on these proposals? Hearing none. All in favor of approving these course modifications, say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Thank you.

My college was highly contributing to the new course proposals in here. Business and Administration had created an information technology course. The only question the committee had was related to the grading scheme, and the syllabus was submitted and has been posted with the curricular tracking system. We had no issues with that new course coming on board. Then there is a series of courses, MBC, PHM, PHPR that are new courses for the PharmD curriculum, so the PharmD curriculum is undergoing a major revision to its professional program in order to comply with accreditation that's required of us. All of these courses were again recommended for approval by the Curriculum Committee. HealthCare Administration, we're changing the electronic medical records and the work flow formatting within the course and increasing the content within there. By accident, the second course was brought forward that was not intended to move forward, so we are not approving this at this time. Again, under course modifications, there were a significant number of those as well. Undergraduate Research, several of the HCAR HIM courses -some were just changing content to some degree in order to better produce content for the programs that the students are studying and some were grade changes, which we always applaud when people raise the minimum to a "C." There were a few prerequisite changes and a couple of course title changes. Under Geology, they had a credit hour change from a 5-6 to a variable 4, changing the

catalog description. Then Math, a title change and a catalog description change associated with those as well. Are there any questions of these

**Senator Jorgensen:** The changes in the PharmD program, are some other courses going to be deleted [then] because they'll no longer be needed?

**Senator Cappelletty:** As we phase out the old curriculum, yes, there will be other courses retired out of that. It's a three-year transition to bring new curriculum on board. All right, all in favor of approving these new courses and course modifications say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Motion Passed.** Thank you.

**President Humphrys:** Thank you so much. It's to be noted that Senator Cappelletty and her Undergraduate Curriculum Committee are completely caught up on the curriculum tracking system, so we really appreciate that.

[Applause]

**President Humphrys cont'd:** Speaking of people who have been working really hard, our Election Committee and the committee members have been working extremely hard. I would like to have both co-chairs, Senator Weck-Schwarz and Senator Compora come up and give us an update on this year's election that we will be starting soon.

**Senator Weck-Schwarz:** So elections are scheduled to start tomorrow. We've been working pretty hard to verify data and President Humphrys helped tremendously with that. Tomorrow, March 15<sup>th</sup> Quinetta has already agreed to send out the announcement in an email which contains the three links to the sites for Faculty Senate, UCAP and Sabbatical Committee elections. The timeframe for nominations is March 15<sup>th</sup> to March 28<sup>th</sup>, so it is approximately two weeks. Then we expect to spend a week or a little longer than that on finding the necessary people to place on the final ballots. Around about the 5<sup>th</sup> of April or maybe before that, we will have another two week period for the final elections. The email contains also some additional information. We decided this time to send out only one email, as opposed to last year's elections. It caused some confusion the last time when everything came with the same subject line and people started discarding things. So this email will go to essentially all faculty which means that some people will get email that doesn't apply to them. If somebody tries to log on, they need to first be eligible to vote in that election and their college needs to have elections. Not all colleges have elections this year. Faculty Senate, all but two colleges will have elections for representatives and the two colleges are: The College of Business, which lost one seat in the apportionment of seats while the newly merged College of Health and Human Services gained one from 3+2 to 6, so that changed a little bit. So Business is not going to be in this year's Faculty Senate elections. The other college not participating in this year's Faculty Senate elections is University College, which has one seat that is continuing. The other elections, UCAP and the Sabbatical Committee, only three colleges are participating in each. All are listed at the end of the email. If anybody logs on and finds that they cannot get in, they should first look there to see if their college is actually doing elections. I think that is about what I wanted to say.

**Senator Compora:** I would like to say that Senator Dowd went through a tremendous amount of work to get us the most accurate faculty data that we could possibly get. Both Senator Weck-Schwarz and I re-verified and verified again and now we sent it out for re-verification to the committee members. So if something happens and you're left off, please let us know and we will definitely try to have it fixed for next year because once these [ballots] go, I don't think there's any way to call them back. They have gone through at least four or five levels of verification.

**Senator Weck-Schwarz:** We can change the electorate, but not the ballots. So if somebody is left off by mistake who is eligible to vote, we can change that, but we cannot change the ballot once we start elections.

**President Humphrys:** Are there any questions?

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** One of the things I would like to bring up is that a senator can serve two consecutive terms, which is  $2 \times 3$ , which is a six-year period. I think there's a "sit out" period and you take a break and then you are eligible to be on the ballot, right? When I reviewed the list a few months ago, I did see that there are several senators that are actually past their six-year period. So what have you done at the committee level to make sure that this aspect is addressed because otherwise, we are maybe violating our own constitution?

**Senator Compora:** So since we've had so many reorganizations and establishments of "new colleges" – whenever there is a new college, the rule doesn't apply; it's considered a "new college," so the representation is reset to zero. I was not involved in that decision-making process – that was made back in 2008. So since my college, The College of Arts and Letters is a new college, nobody is term-limited. Maybe President Humphrys has the history on that decision, but that's why we're seeing some people being eligible when theoretically, a college structure had not changed, they wouldn't be eligible this year.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** Was that discussed at the committee level?

**President Humphrys:** The thing is, we are really doing it from a precedent point-of-view. We did a lot of research on how this type of thing was handled in the past, and to be fair we just handled it the same way. Senator Compora, Senator Weck-Schwarz and I met about this several times and then I confirmed with Past-President Keith and some of the previous Senate presidents as to what happened when colleges were combined to form a "new college." There is nothing that addresses this in the constitution.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** I think that's my problem. Sometimes I sit here and I get troubled with traditions---

**President Humphrys:** Sure.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** Traditions really trouble me sometimes and I think on one hand we have discussion and give a lot of feedback to the provost how faculty should be consulted and how they are not being consulted- make sure deans talk to chairs and chairs talk to faculty etc., But here is an issue that is important like that, it was not discussed at the committee level, it was kind of handled at the president's level with just the "chairs" talking about it and I think that that type of process is unacceptable to me.

**Senator Rouillard:** No, we did talk about it at the committee level.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** Pardon me?

**Senator Rouillard:** We did talk about it at a committee level.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** At the Election Committee level?

**Senator Rouillard:** The Election and Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

**President Humphrys:** I know I spoke about it with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

**Past-President Keith:** You did.

**President Humphrys:** Yes, we did talk about that. It was a real concern. There have been times since the merger and our new constitution, where the Senate may have allowed faculty to serve more than two consecutive terms, but I can assure you that anybody that is not in a "new college" is not being allowed to serve beyond two consecutive terms.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** Basically I have a problem with that because in the first place there must be a reason why a two-term rule is in place to be followed. Is there any reason why we established a rule that after six years some people sit out for one year before they are reelected? I know what it is, but I just want to really reiterate that there's a rationale for having that rule in place. We have no control over how many times college names keep changing, so theoretically it is possible that people serve lifetime memberships on Senate and to me, you can't have it both ways, right?

**Past-President Keith:** Can I just say though, if they are serving lifetime memberships on Faculty Senate, it's because their college and their respectful colleagues are voting them in.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** Oh, I agree with you; so we should get rid of the two-term rule so that everybody has the same right that you just talked about, to be elected by their faculty colleagues.

**Unknown Speaker:** True.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** If my colleagues elect me for a lifetime, then my colleagues have the right to elect me and I have the right to serve consecutively for my lifetime, so why would there be a different rule for [certain] people? So the fact the College of Engineering does not change its name now-and-again is a disadvantage for me, right?

**Past-President Keith:** I think the people who have been through multiple breakups and mergers over the last few years would disagree that it is not a disadvantage to be in a stable college over a period of time.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** I know that, but I feel this policy is not applicable in a uniform way and I think that this type of behavior shouldn't---

**President Humphrys:** I think one of the things that should be done is to change the Constitution so it accounts for the creation or dismantling of colleges. Unfortunately, the Constitution does not address all these special circumstances, and so I will take responsibility for going along with precedent.

**Senator Compora:** That is a Constitution and Rules issue and Senator Weck-Schwarz and I and President Humphrys put it right to the Executive Committee, what are we supposed to do in this case because our job is not to rewrite the rule, our job is to interpret. When we can't come to a general understanding, then we get a ruling from the Executive Committee which is exactly what we did. I agree, it is a constitution and rules issue, but that is out of our committee's charge to change that.

**Senator Jorgensen:** A couple of points: One, I've been on Senate on and off, but only two years at the present time, so, I do voluntarily jump on and off. I wasn't aware of this "interpretation" and maybe it went to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate, but it didn't go to the Faculty Senate, not even as an information item, at least as far as I know. I think one reason why it was in there, of course – I was actually the chair of Senate when the merger occurred- it has been suggested by administration over the years that the Faculty Senate is this "small" group of people who are there all the time that don't have anything better to do, they don't represent the faculty- totally not valid of course. But there are some issues that if you have a broader representation of faculty, you might come up with better ideas. Truly, six years is a very long time, sit out a year and then come back for another two terms. So I think the term limits are a valuable thing and I've noticed that apparently we haven't been enforcing that; some people voluntarily do it, but we haven't been enforcing it and I don't think that's a good thing. We have approximately 800 faculty around the university and to pick 60 of them to serve, that doesn't seem too hard to do.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** I have a question actually. So there is a term limit with people serving on Faculty Senate, right? Is there a term limit for people serving on Faculty Senate Executive Committee?

**President Humphrys:** I guess there will be an implied term limit from the point of view of---

**Senator Sheldon:** This was addressed in the last two prior years with Constitution and Rules, the committee that I served on as well. Having one senator from Honors is still a violation of the constitution, but it is the only “band-aid” that we could come up with, and the committee did not discuss the term limits. I am beginning to feel like a lifetime member because I have been on Senate for 12 consecutive years, but I’ve been in three different colleges in those 12 years. So, Constitution and Rules has to reconvene within the next year to finally resolve this “small” college representative issue that Honors and University College has folded into. It is something the committee may take up, but it wasn’t addressed previously; previously it was admitted that we weren’t exactly following the rules, but we were doing the best we could with what we had.

**President Humphrys:** Again, I will reassure everybody that anyone who is not in these “new” colleges, and there are several of us, including me, who are term-limited for this coming year. Because I will be the past-president, it is in the Constitution that I am required to serve. But, as Senator Weck-Schwarz mentioned, the College of Business has had a decrease of one Senate seat, so it works that one of COBI’s Senators is being term-limited.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** Listening to what Senator Jorgensen just said about the diversity of people sitting on Senate, general faculty are not thinking that this little set of people called senators have nothing to do with the rest of the university. I think that those members that have actually completed six years, I think the committee should send them an email saying “you have served for six consecutive years and the reason you’re eligible is because your college name has changed, but if you decide to voluntarily respect the actual rule then that’s up to you.” I think that’s how the communication should go. If they really want to run then that’s fine, there’s a “loophole” here, but I think that this has to be conveyed at least.

**President Humphrys:** Sure.

**Senator Compura:** A number of people have asked us to be removed from the ballot because they did not want to run again. We cannot selectively remove somebody from the ballot because if we do that everybody will be making that request.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** No, I’m not asking them to be removed from the ballot.

**Senator Compura:** No, I’m saying a couple of people who have served two terms kindly asked us not to include them on the ballot and we had a discussion with President Humphrys over break and said, we cannot be taking special requests. I agree with you, they have a choice to reject that assignment when we call them. Anybody can refuse to be on Senate and having been on Elections before, I can tell you, a lot of people refuse to be on Senate despite the fact they are nominated. So, that has come up and there are people--- I don’t want anybody to get the impression that there are people who are just “chomping at the bit” to get on Senate, sometimes it is pretty hard to get somebody to agree.

**President Humphrys:** We’ll take just one more comment.

**Senator Lundquist:** I just want to correct this notion that all that changes when a new college is created is the name. It is a different thing to represent Arts and Letters at Faculty Senate than it was to represent LLSS. The senator has to learn a new college, and represent more colleagues. The nature of the representation has changed. So I think there is wisdom in welcoming people to another term when they are now representing a new college.

**President Humphrys:** Okay, is there anything else? Tomorrow the elections will start and not everybody is going to be voting for all three of these categories and so you want to make sure that you read the explanation in case you think you are being held out of voting.

**Senator Wittmer:** President Humphrys, will you be notifying people in the College of Business that they won’t be voting?

**President Humphrys:** I will. That's a good idea. I just want to say that Senators Weck-Schwarz and Compura worked all through the break and they worked night and day; this is a major undertaking because it's not just getting the ballots together, but it's getting the ballot in a format that is going to be able to be accessible by UTAD. It is just tremendous work and they've done a great job.

[Applause]

**President Humphrys cont'd:** Up next is Assistant Vice President, Brenda Grant. She is going to be talking about Faculty180. I talked to Brenda, if you recall at our last meeting the provost mentioned about how this is going to be used for tenure, promotion and eventually all of us will be uploading information onto this software. So, Brenda is going to give us an overview and all of you will have the opportunity to get further training through various training sessions that Brenda will be conducting for your particular college. I will hand it over to Brenda Grant; thank you, Brenda.

**Brenda Grant:** Hello everyone. So to get started, this is pretty simple for everyone now: You are going to go to your UTAD login. As faculty members you have a tab up here that is a "faculty resource" tab and you also have an "employee" tab and so it's either one of these tabs. You will scroll down to the "academic resource" section- we have put the link there for Faculty180 and so that is where you'll get to the Faculty180 launch site. We are working with IT for a single sign-on. Once you log in to the MyUT portal and you click on "this" link, you will automatically come into your Faculty180 dashboard. So if any of you noticed, at the login site there is a link, you can click there and so if you're interested how to get your login password and ID, just click that link and it will send an email to the administrator and that will then get your login credentials set up for Faculty180. You will then receive an email with those login credentials or you can wait until a group makes its way around to your college and when you are invited to a session for training. So at any rate, this is the initial dashboard for Faculty180 and you will have a tab here that says "Faculty"- this is your dashboard, this page right here. There is a profile that is basically your name, your title, the stuff that's in Banner – that is your basic information. "Activities" is basically where you will spend most of your time entering information or have a GA help you enter, so there are ways to get help with assistance for getting stuff in. So from this "activities" list, this list mirrors this list right here. You can just click on, say if you are on some institutional committees, there will be a list there that might say college committees- you'll click on that and it will expand that. Since I've logged in as myself, I entered some fake information to kind of play with the system and show people how the system works. Since I have a couple of committees listed here, if I want to edit my start or end date when I'm on this committee, I can put this pencil and you can see this little "pop-up" there that says "Edit." There's a delete button if you want to delete that all together and/or if I want to clone it because I'm going to be on that committee again and I just want to change the start and the end date. Let's click on "add" and I will show you real quick how you add. Yes, Senator Ariss?

**Senator Ariss:** Now that you are talking about dates, for some reason it does not go back beyond 1987, are you aware of that?

**Brenda Grant:** It hasn't caught my eye.

**Senator Ariss:** I happen to be an "old timer"<laughter>.

**Brenda Grant:** Okay, so we are going to put something in from 1987. Senator Ariss has been ongoing since Fall of 1987, however it's going to end in 2020 (I'm sorry), just kidding. This is the university right here, but if you're actually working in your college, the university committee will need this at the university level. So you can pick the "university committee" or you can click "change" and you will pick your college that you're in. Let me stop here for a second. You will only see your information; you won't see everyone else's information. You will only see your college; you're not going to see everyone's college. It is a secure site and the information is secure for you and the faculty member. There will be a handful of administrators in your college that will be able to see everyone in the college; for example the

department chair can see the faculty in the department and the associate deans can see everyone in the college and so this is a limited access system. When we are initiating the workloads for the online tenure and promotion [process], it opens up at a certain period of time so the faculty can enter their stuff and when you hit “submit,” it will go to the department personnel committee. They will have a period of time and then it moves, and so as that moves through the system it gets locked back down and those committee members won’t be able to see your stuff outside of that process. Okay, let’s go back: we’re entering a committee that we’re on. I’m going to select the College of Business and then I’m going to select the committee that I’m on. The College of Business is kind of our pilot college and the reason for that is because the dean would like to use it for accreditation reporting and that’s the benefits of this tool, it will make accreditation a lot easier in terms of reporting and collecting information. So the college is going to provide us with a list of their committees and we will populate this with the committees (simple dropdown menu) and that way, when the college is doing an accreditation report, all of the committees will have standardization to it, instead of a bunch of different abbreviations. If there’s not a committee there, we do have an “other” and you can type in the committee- we’re going to make this “Senator Ariss’ special committee.” So then it’s going to ask for your responsibility: are you a member, are you a chair, or are you other? So Senator Ariss is the chair of the committee. Now, you can upload a file or you can point to a URL site. So if you are charged by someone as a committee member or you are in charge of a committee and there is formalization to the committee, you can upload that memo here so that it’s retained here connected with the committee. So then you hit “save” and it’s now saved in the system. So this is a cloud-based system, it’s not retained on university servers. Once you have a lot of information in here as a faculty member, if you’re going to leave the university, we can download all of this for you and send it with you. There are quite a lot of institutions across the country who are starting to use Faculty180. There are a lot of our Ohio sister institutions that use Faculty180, so we’re not out here on a planet by ourselves with this system.

**President-Elect Thompson:** Are there ways that, much like ResearchGate, for example, how it populates things for you. So probably for most of us, the area that will take the longest will be like our presentations and publications, and so is there a way that you can help us out with that?

**Brenda Grant:** We can if we do a prescribed spreadsheet with that information and send it as an upload file to Faculty180 and they’ll automatically upload it for us. If there are things that have to be attached, we have to send all of those; I mean, it’s doable to do a package upload. However, we just have to make sure everybody is standard in the method that we’re sending it as a package for it all to be uploaded. This information is attached in this “box,” everyone has to follow the same format.

**President-Elect Thompson:** So eventually will this be customized to our ARPAs as well then?

**Brenda Grant:** Yes, but I’m not exactly sure since I’m not working on the tenure/promotion piece of it specifically how it’s going to be designed. One method of the way the system works is once you’ve entered this information in, as an example the vitaes and the bio sketches, so the system can compile everything that you’ve entered into all of these spots and package it together for you and send it through a workload for tenure and promotion. I’m not quite sure how it’s being designed, like there will be a handful of things that you will have to upload for tenure and promotion if everything is in the system already. But if everything isn’t in the system, then the system can be set up in a separate way where you can upload files and then move all of that. So there’s a couple of different ways that it can be done, but I’m not working on that side of it.

**Senator Wittmer:** To also answer the question in terms of publications and presentations, it’s not going to apply to everyone and everything, but you can get imports from Google Scholar. So if your publications are in Google Scholar and as long as you noted which your publications are, they can upload directly to the system.

**Brenda Grant:** I can send it to President Humphrys and she can send it out. I didn't bring a bunch of copies today, but the people who are interested and would like to take a copy, they can. I have step-by-step directions on how to import from Google Scholar. If there is another site like Google Scholar that is not listed here, we can have those added in; anything that is missing that makes your life easier, send me a note and that way we can have that feature added. So anything that would make a better quick link or better terminology, we can customize this product for us.

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** Is there a hierarchical access login available to send to the department chair? The reason why I ask that is because there were instances where the chair might need to do something special; for instance, people who apply for tenure and promotion...and they have a higher level of...there, that's situation. The second thing is, periodically chairs come back and keep asking for publications from the last couple of years like the list of students etc., that type of data and then we try to work and send it to them and they compile it, but if they have some type of data that...acts to login to the department, I'm assuming, maybe they will be able to compile that data without having to ask us several times during an academic year, but I don't know how the software works.

**Brenda Grant:** I'm not quite sure I'm following your question. For example, if something is moving through the department personnel committee for tenure and promotion, that committee can upload their recommendations, they can add comments, they can upload external reviews, all of that can be entered and we can structure that at the end here at any level. Does that help?

**President-Elect Thompson:** I think what you're asking is, can it be used to generate reports? The answer is, yes. For example, in the area of research- one reason they are very interested in this is they want to be able to say, how many publications that UT faculty have this year, how many grants etc. They can generate that..., does that make sense?

**Senator Devabhaktuni:** That is what I actually meant, thank you.

**President Humphrys:** Thank you so much. This will give us a feel of what it looks like. Anybody in here can go on and access it as you are saying and experiment with it.

**Brenda Grant:** Yes.

**President Humphrys:** I guess our major concern is that people going up for tenure or promotion will be using this if I'm not mistaken.

**Senator Relue:** So the teaching button, does that directly import stuff in from Banner?

**Brenda Grant:** Yes, it does. The nice thing about the "teaching" piece is for the Higher Learning Commission and accreditation at the university accreditation level, this is where we will be asking---I don't have anything here because I don't teach. But if you click on this, the courses that you have taught historically are there and you can upload your generic syllabus there, not your term-based syllabus, so that we have that collection or depository so when HLC comes and they want to see the syllabi, it's an easy location to grab that.

**Senator Gilchrist:** This is kind of a question for President Humphrys. Has there been any thought given to the timeline implementation of this beyond tenure and promotion? I ask because that seems to raise additional scheduling issues and faculty obligation issues. I'm thinking about who dictates when faculty will update this information. Is it doing it on a weekly basis or semester basis? Is that a department decision or a college decision?

**President Humphrys:** I know the last time we talked about the fact that eventually all faculty will need to use Faculty 180, is that correct, Provost Hsu?

**Provost Hsu:** I guess what we envision is eventually all the colleges will be using this. [*Indecipherable*]

**Brenda Grant:** So this list of activities you can click through and see where you have your professional services, community services, and your scholarly contributions.

**President Humphrys:** Wonderful; thank you. If you would like to send that document you refer it to to me and I will make sure it goes out to all the members. Thank you, Brenda, so much.

The last item on our agenda is to talk about something that I sent to you. Welcome, Connie Shriner, Vice Provost for Assessment and Faculty Development, who is going to give us an overview as to how this document came into existence. I think we talked about how it might be a good idea for us to go through this and have another week or two weeks to look at this and then at the next meeting ask for support for this document.

**Dr. Connie Shriner:** It's going to be a short PowerPoint now.

**President Humphrys:** I'm sorry.

**Dr. Shriner:** No, it's fine. I really think we have enough time to kind of give you the "nuts and bolts" of what it is we're trying to accomplish and where we are. Over the last few months I've had the privilege of chairing a committee that was charged by the provost to develop a set of institutional learning outcomes. As Provost Hsu just mentioned briefly during his remarks, there are two factors that are feeding into this. First of all, when the Higher Learning Commission was here a couple of years ago, they recommended that we have a set of institutional learning outcomes so we can talk about our educational program from this higher level. Everyone is assessing at the level of the program, but they encourage us to look at institutional assessment as a way to identify areas where the Provost's Office might be able to allocate resources or come up with initiatives that would support multiple programs if we found some area in need. The other timing issue is the fact that we're starting our strategic planning and to be able to integrate these institutional learning outcomes into our strategic plan, the timing is just right. So we convened the committee and I will give you a real quick overview of the process and focus more on what our recommendation is. I know all of you are familiar with learning outcomes. These are statements of general knowledge and skills that students will acquire by the time they graduate from your programs. Same idea, but now we are looking at a very general set of learning outcomes that all of our graduates will demonstrate regardless of their specific programs of study. So these are very general university outcomes, something that defines the academic experience for students here at The University of Toledo.

Our committee included members from Faculty Senate: Amy Thompson, Glenn Sheldon and Diane Cappelletty. We had members from Grad Council, the University Assessment Committee and some of us from the Provost Office. We looked at what other schools were doing; all the other universities tend to be going in this direction probably because their accredited agencies are suggesting that they do the same thing. We found a great deal of overlap in learning outcomes across universities. One model particularly caught our attention, the Degree Qualifications Profile, so the committee decided to adopt this; it has been adopted by 26 other universities in the state of Ohio, including Miami, Kent and Bowling Green. So we came up with a draft and we sent it out in a survey form in December. It was basically saying, what do you think? We are thinking about these areas for learning outcomes, do you agree that these are appropriate for undergraduate and graduate students? We received almost 2,000 responses and they were overwhelmingly supportive. For each of the learning areas, we had at least 85% and in some cases that number exceeded 90%, supporting that these are appropriate areas for institutional outcomes. We also received a lot of written comments and for any of you that provided them, I thank you. We integrated all of that feedback and came up with a model that I want to present to you today. This model is illustrated as a web and we loved this because it was a single diagram that allowed you to capture different degree programs, but it's also going to be flexible to allow you to capture different areas of focus, as you look at academic programs in one college or another. It was nested to account for different levels of post-secondary education- we of course, focused only on our bachelors and graduate programs. So while it is presented as a regular pentagon, a spider web, you can see the five major areas around it. It is really very

flexible and depending on the program of study and where you're focused and where your emphasis will be, the shape of this can change, but what will remain the same is some exposure in each of those five areas (that's just another variation of it).

These are the items that the committee is proposing to you for your consideration as institutional student learning outcomes: Broad and Integrated Knowledge: UT graduates will demonstrate proficiency in using broad and integrative knowledge so they are able to draw from various areas of study. Along with that, in the area of knowledge is Specialized Knowledge: our students will demonstrate a depth of knowledge in a field, a field that they choose wherever their program is and are able to produce applications drawing on their field of study and other fields. So that connects with the other broad integrated knowledge.

Intellectual Skills: [students will] demonstrate proficiency using and integrating intellectual skills, including communication. This includes critical thinking, analysis, application and evaluation, so all of the problem-solving activities that they do integrating knowledge from the first two categories. The fourth one, Civic and Global Learning: takes them outside of the classroom into the broader world and they demonstrate responsible citizenship, drawing on their formal education and community-based learning. Then the fifth one is, Applied and Collaborative Learning: the ability to integrate and apply learning in complex situations. Like I said, these are extremely general.

The expectation is that our students are already being exposed to these in their different courses and in their different programs. We believe that your learning outcomes for your academic programs are going to map very nicely to these five areas. We looked at a couple programs just to see what that looks like. There were seven student learning outcomes in the Bachelor's of Environmental Science: six of them were consistent with intellectual skills, six of them touched on specialized knowledge, three broad, and two civil and global, and two of the learning outcomes were applied. We did this with several just to get a sense of how the categories will work. General education, our core curriculum, it maps nicely to four of the five, but it is not specified; that makes sense to me because general education, the core curriculum is designed to be general and not specific. Our History- here again, they had five objectives and that's how we mapped. Am I concerned about this that they don't touch at all? No, not really, because the students also are required to take the core curriculum. We have Philosophy and Public Health (this is Senator Thompson's). I noticed how they have a larger number of learning outcomes, but that's fine. So, how do we assess them? Well, that's not going to be your job. We anticipate two approaches to assessment. We are going to infer that since we are mapping to your program learning outcomes that they are already being assessed at the level of the program and the second level will be through the university assessment committee. We are going to try to identify strategies that will allow us to look at a sample of graduates across colleges and assess these skills and knowledge. So, here they are for your consideration and as President Humphrys said, they are in the handout that she sent and will resend. We are hoping to get an endorsement, to get support from you and then I will also be sharing this document with Grad Council. I am hoping that we will include a reference to these institutional learning outcomes to the strategic plan and then after that, the Assessment Committee will get busy with the program directors to look at the mapping and to look at assessment strategies. Thank you.

**President Humphrys:** I think what we'll do is I'll re-send that document and if everybody can look at it, we will be prepared for next time to take a vote on an endorsement. We are not really so much looking at changing the wording, but if you have some content issues, please send them to me. Thank you, Dr. Shriner.

One last thing, again, congratulations to the Women's Basketball team for making it to the NCAA tournament.

**President-Elect Thompson:** One last thing. Just another reminder about the tenure and promotion workshops that are going to be next week, Wednesday and Thursday, so please encourage faculty to register, I think it's going to be very valuable.

**President Humphrys:** How about a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:  
Lucy Duhon  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary.