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

President Brakel: I have 4 o'clock, so I will call the March 16th Faculty Senate meeting to order and ask Secretary Nigem to call the roll.

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

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

****[Please note, these Minutes are not verbatim due to recording malfunction] ****

Senator Nigem: President Brakel, we have a quorum.

President Brakel: Thank you, Secretary Nigem. You received an updated agenda this afternoon that included a Core Curriculum Committee report. So I'll entertain a motion to adopt today's agenda.

Senator Molitor: So moved.

Senator Kistner: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor, put 'yes' in the chat box, or 'no,' or 'abstain.' Thank you. *Motion to Adopt Agenda Passed.*

You also received the Minutes from our last meeting, which was March 2nd. President-Elect Bigioni, can you get those on the screen? Are there any corrections to the Minutes? Hearing none. I'll entertain a motion to approve the Minutes of the March 2, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Day: So moved.

Senator Kistner: Second.

President Brakel cont'd: Thank you. All in favor say, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? So that appears to have passed. *Motion Passed.* So that brings us to the *Executive Committee report*: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on March 5 at which time I informed them what transpired regarding the press release stating that the Faculty Senate was consulted regarding the removal of the interim title from the President's title. Members of the Executive Committee had also fielded questions regarding the Senate's consultation after the announcement. On late Friday afternoon, February 26th, I was contacted

by the Board of Trustee's chair and was informed that the Board was planning to meet the following Wednesday in Executive Session to remove the interim title from President Postal's appointment and that people may start hearing about it early next week so he wanted me to give me a heads up. He proceeded to state the reasons why this was being done which included the upcoming Higher Learning Commission visit, the improvement of the hospital financial situation and the several searches underway that were being impacted by not knowing who the permanent president would be. I stated that I certainly understood and could agree with those reasons. I spoke also about the current key initiatives that Dr. Postal undertook. As I was attempting to turn the conversation toward the faculty expectation of a presidential search, I was aware that I was being informed of the board's intent but not really being consulted. Since the board was going into Executive Session, I stated that there would be a Faculty Senate meeting the following Tuesday and can I include this in the Executive Committee report. I was asked not to share this in our report.

After the announcement of the appointment on that Wednesday, March 3rd meeting, President Postal called me whereupon I congratulated him on his appointment and we both affirmed our goals of working together in shared governance.

The Executive Committee then discussed the need to draft a resolution regarding this action. We agree that that this action should not and does not reflect negatively on our view regarding President Postal but is in response to how the process of selecting the permanent president occurred. The Executive Committee then worked on a draft resolution that hopefully establishes the facts and right tone concerning the matter. That resolution is later on today's agenda.

I also attended the Finance and Strategy meeting on March 3rd. There continues to be major concerns about next fall's enrollment numbers but with the change in leadership in Enrollment Management, they were reluctant to provide any numbers at that time. We also heard from regarding the onboarding of new hires which included some benchmarking that was underway for new hires.

I also attended the Enterprise Risk Management meeting on March 12. We were informed that the search for a Chief Enterprise Risk Manager has been successful and that announcement was to be made yesterday in the UT News. Douglas Huffner, comes to us from Ohio State University and will be the associate vice president for risk management and chief risk officer starting April 19th.

I had several conversations last week with Diane Miller, administrative liason to the Board of Trustees regarding the proposed constitution. As you will recall from our last Executive Committee report, we had met with Will Lucas, Chair of the Board of Trustee's Governance Committee and that we were expecting a response by Monday or Tuesday March 8 or 9. After he had conferred with the other board members, they wanted to place the matter for discussion at their April 14th board meeting. I responded that would effectively kill this issue for this year if they did that as we only have one meeting after that and that is our split meeting with the outgoing and incoming Senates. I proposed an alternative to solicit their input which was rejected. Diane Miller also wrote a memo to the board supporting the need to move this forward and stated to me that I know you explained the process in several of your board reports to the trustees but the board still wanted to discuss this at their April meeting. I told her that we might move forward with the second reading today so that we can wrap this up this year. I then contacted Constitution Committee Chair and we discussed options concerning how to move forward. We will present and discuss these options later on today's agenda.

That concludes the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report. Does any Executive Committee have anything to add? Okay. Does any senator have anything to add?

Senator Barnes: President Brakel, I would like to comment on the resolution. Can I comment now or should I wait till the resolution?

President Brakel: Thank you, Senator Barnes for asking. Please wait.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

President Brakel: All right, the is not here, so we will not hear a report from the Provost Office today. Next is a report from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Chair Edgington.

Senator Edgington: Thank you, President Brakel. All right, I have a relatively short list today. We have four new course proposals and nine course modifications. We are going to start with the new course modifications. The first one is **ARTH 3080, The Power of Visual Persuasion.** "This course is designed for the non-specialist. The course is intended to increase understanding and appreciation of visual culture through readings, recorded lectures and documentary films, discussion, reflective and critical writing, and a visit to a local or regional museum. The development of cognitive and critical processes, as they relate to visual culture, is emphasized."

The next course is **ART 4370, Wearable Conditions.** "In this course, students will experiment with and combine media through technology and traditional construction methods to enhance their abilities to see form and to develop personal and group visual language. Students are encouraged to become more effective and original communicators through the experience of using materials in innovative ways and through the examination of the possibilities of these materials for creative expression."

Then we have **ART 4360, Installation Art.** "Study of altering a defined physical and psychological space as an art medium. Includes a study of the history of installations."

Then finally, **ART 4300, Bio-Design Challenge.** "Interdisciplinary teams research and prototype solutions to complex global challenges. Student teams may include but are not limited to: Biology, Art & Design, or Engineering. Students fabricate experimental design solutions in response to challenges that combine design, biotechnology and biomaterials with a focus on future applications. The course culminates in a locally juried competition, the winning team travels to the annual Biodesign Summit at which students present and compete for prizes in an international forum."

Senator Edgington cont'd: Next are the nine course modifications. The first course modification is **GEPL 2040, World Regional Geography**. "Course will not be repeatable for credit. Change to catalog description. Course being submitted for Core Curriculum consideration (accepted by Core Curriculum). NOTE: GEPL 2040 (World Regional Geography) is well suited as a core social science course because it includes key geographic concepts. In addition, it provides students with the opportunity to learn more about the geography of non-US regions."

Next is **HIST 1050, Word History to 1500.** "Course will not be repeatable for credit. Change to catalog description. Course being submitted for Core Curriculum consideration (accepted by Core Curriculum). NOTE: I noticed HIST 1070 was non-US diversity and thought this class should be as well."

ENGL 3010, Creative Writing. "Course will not be repeatable for credit. Course being submitted for WAC consideration (accepted by WAC committee)."

ENGL 4070, Writing Workshop in Poetry. "Course is repeatable for up to six credits. Course being submitted for WAC consideration (accepted by WAC committee)."

ENGL 4080, Writing Workshop in Fiction. "Course is repeatable for up to six credits. Course being submitted for WAC consideration (accepted by WAC committee)."

MIME 5690 (4690), Reliability. "Change to course number (5690 to 4690). Move to cross/listed course (4690/5690). Removal of doctoral level cross-listing. Course not repeatable for credit. NOTE: It's chosen as one (1) of six (6) elective courses for Certificate in Manufacturing Program."

MIME 5060 (4060), Manufacturing Engineering. "Change to semester offered (spring and fall, not summer). Change to course description. Course repeatable for up to six credits."

WGST 4890, Research and Methods in Women's and Gender Studies. "Looking to cross-list course (WGST 6890). Registration restriction: Sophomore status for undergrad course, WGST 4890. Change in course credits (4 to 3)."

WGST 2150, Proseminar in Women's and Gender Studies. "Change to long and short title. Change in credit hours (3 credits). Course not repeatable for credit. Change to catalog description. Registration restriction: Sophomore or Junior status."

Senator Edgington cont'd: Are there any questions or concerns regarding the nine modifications and four new course proposals? Hearing none.

President Brakel: Go ahead and call the question.

Senator Edgington: At this time, you are approving the four new course proposals and nine modifications as seen on the screen. Please put 'yes' in the chat if you approve, 'no' for no, or 'a' if you are abstaining.

President Brakel: Those have been approved. ***Motion Passed.***

Senator Edgington: Thank you.

President Brakel: Thank you, Senator Edgington. And now we have the Academic Programs Committee report, Senator Lawrence.

Senator Lawrence: We have a total of six (6) proposals that had been reviewed and approved by the Committee for Faculty Senate to review and vote on today. There are four program modifications and two new programs. I will go through each one of these. They're all pretty simple, pretty basic. I can entertain any questions after I've gone through them.

Let's start with the four program modifications. The first program modification is the **EMT Paramedic Certificate**. This certificate is "already in catalog and offered but was never formally approved by FS"

The second program modification is a **Sustainability Minor**. "Changes required course, EEES 2010 replaced by EEES2020."

The third program modification is **Electrical Engineering Technology, BS.** "Changes selection of required courses in robotics (FS approved this new concentration 3.16.21, this is program modification)."

Then finally we have **Psychology BA**. They are "removing pre-psychology requirement and designation, students admitted directly into degree."

Senator Lawrence cont'd: Next we have the two new programs. The first is a certificate titled **EMT Basic.** "New certificate, 7 hrs."

Then a new minor, **ENGT, which is Software Engineering**. "New minor, 18 hrs." That is our report. I'll entertain any questions. Hearing none.

President Brakel: Go ahead and call the question.

Senator Edgington: So the committee recommends approval so if you can please enter in the chat 'yes', 'no' or 'abstain' on these proposals.

President Brakel: And that has carried. *Motion Passed.* Thank you. Next is Senator Gregory. We have the self-study report to discuss.

Senator Gregory: Hello. Our Committee created a self-study report. The following is the full report.

<div align="center">

SELF STUDY: THE CORE

by the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee

</div>

F. Scott Hall (Pharmacy), Melissa Gregory (Chair, Arts and Letters), Patricia Hoover (Nursing), Jennifer Joe (Library), Lisa Kovach (Education), David Krantz (Natural Science and Mathematics), Alana Malik (University Director of Assessment, Provost's Appointee), Barbara Mann (Honors), Scott Molitor (Engineering)

<div align="center">

Table of Contents

</div>

I. Overview of the University of Toledo

Founded in 1872 and located within the city of Toledo in the upper-northwest corner of Ohio, the University of Toledo (UToledo) joined Ohio's public university system in 1967 to become one of 14 public universities. Today, UToledo is an R2 urban institution that enrolls approximately 14,000 undergraduates and employs over 1300 faculty, 3800 staff, and 800 graduate assistants. It offers more than 300 undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs and also has a medical school with its own campus.

Undergraduate students from all UToledo colleges must complete the University Core Curriculum described in Part II of this report. These students come largely from within the state, with 85.1% from Ohio. The racial and ethnic diversity of the UToledo undergraduate population looks similar to that of Ohio's flagship institution, Ohio State University. UToledo is approximately 68% White, with 22% of our students classified as Ethnic Minority, 5% as International, and the remaining 4.3% unknown. However, unlike OSU's undergraduate population, almost 27% of UToledo's undergraduate population consists of first-generation college students. Perhaps even more importantly, 39% of our undergraduates are Pell grant awarded, indicating high financial need. Overall, a significant percentage of UToledo's undergraduate population are economically disadvantaged.

In a time of much global upheaval, the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee hopes that this external review will help us to redouble our commitment to a strong general education experience for our undergraduate students, strengthening our most important foundational program.

(See Appendices A-C for additional facts related to the university overall as well as our student population.)

II. Introduction to the UToledo Core Curriculum

OVERVIEW

The UToledo Core consists of a basic liberal arts curriculum required of all UToledo undergraduates. It offers a range of general education courses distributed across the arts and sciences and functions as a foundation for all students regardless of major. As

the Higher Learning Commission states, general education should "impart broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess" (HLC Criterion 3.B.2). This basic principle has informed UToledo's General Education curriculum for decades and continues to shape decisions regarding the UToledo Core.

The current philosophy and SLOs of the UToledo Core have remained consistent since 2013, when the UToledo Faculty Senate defined the Core for greater clarity to include a focus on multicultural education. At that time, the Faculty Senate stated:

> The University of Toledo Core Curriculum consists of two components. **General education** courses are of broad interest and are distributed across categories including composition, fine arts, humanities, mathematics, natural sciences and social sciences. These courses must be taught at the 1000- or 2000-level, and any course within our OTM* must be included in our list of general education courses. **Multicultural courses** foster an understanding of and respect for different cultures and peoples, both within and outside the United States. Multicultural courses can be taught at any level and may or may not be part of the OTM.

> *For more details on the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM), see Part III of this document, "State Requirements."*

Since that time, all Core courses have been limited to the 1- and 2000-level except those that meet the Multicultural requirement, which includes courses from 1-4000 level.

The College of Arts and Letters (CAL) and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) deliver the majority of the University Core Curriculum. CAL teaches approximately 75% of the Core offerings in the UToledo course catalog, while the remaining percentage comes primarily from NSM. Over the past five years, CAL has generated all student credit hours (SCH) for Composition courses, 93.4% of SCH for humanities courses, 78% of SCH for multicultural courses, and 94.6% of SCH for social science courses. NSM has generated all SCH for math courses and 97.8% of SCH for science courses.

(For additional details of the current Core Curriculum, see Part III of this document, "Curricular Structure and Development.")

PHILOSOPHY OF THE CORE

The University of Toledo Core Curriculum consists of 36-42 credit hours of coursework that provide the educational foundation for all undergraduate degree programs. The UToledo Core exposes students to a range of disciplines that gives breadth to the learning experience, prepares students for advanced coursework in their degree programs, and develops students as lifelong learners who will thrive in and contribute significantly to a constantly changing global community.

As stated in the UToledo catalog, the Core Curriculum "gives students critical reasoning skills to explore complex questions, grasp the essence of social, scientific and ethical problems, and arrive at nuanced perspectives. It hones the ability of students to communicate artistically, orally and in writing. It allows students to recognize their place in history and culture, and to appreciate their connection to others in a multicultural world. It prepares students to be thoughtful, engaged citizens in a participatory democracy. It requires students to explore the whole range of the liberal arts, both for the intrinsic value of doing so and in preparation for study in their degree programs. It provides students with insight into the social and behavioral sciences; familiarity with the history, aesthetics, and criticism of all aspects of human culture, including the fine arts; and experience in the scientific, philosophical and mathematical processes required to examine theoretical and natural phenomena."

CORE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. **Communication:** UT students must demonstrate abilities to communicate meaningfully, persuasively and creatively with different audiences through written, oral, numeric, graphic and visual modes.
2. **Personal, Social, and Global Responsibility:** UT students must demonstrate understanding of and critical engagement in ethical, cultural and political discourse and capacity to work productively as a community member committed to the value of diversity, difference and the imperatives of justice.
3. **Critical Thinking and Integrative Learning:** UT students must be able to integrate reasoning, questioning and analysis across traditional boundaries of viewpoint, practice and discipline.
4. **Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning and Literacy:** UT students must demonstrate the capacity to apply mathematical reasoning and scientific inquiry to diverse problems.
5. **Information Literacy:** UT students must demonstrate the ability to find, organize, critically assess and effectively use information to engage in advanced work in a challenging field of study. Students should demonstrate responsible, legal, creative and ethical use of information.

INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Broad and Integrative Knowledge
2. Specialized Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills
4. Civic and Global Learning
5. Applied and Collaborative Learning

NB: These ISLOs were approved after the Core SLOs were already implemented. They are aligned to the Core SLOs on the Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Program Review's webpage, but this alignment has not been formally approved by Faculty Senate. The current Core committee intends to recommend these alignments to this year's Faculty Senate.

III. Curricular Structure and Development

STATE REQUIREMENTS (OTM)

State requirements impact the UToledo Core in important ways. The Ohio Department of Higher Education's (ODHE) maintains a highly specific articulation and transfer policy that ensures students can transfer effectively between Ohio's public post-secondary institutions of higher education.

This policy has resulted in the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM), a complete set of general education requirements at Ohio public colleges and universities. OTM courses are guaranteed to transfer to any of Ohio's public institutions of higher education as an area credit.

Courses for the Ohio Transfer Module should be 100- and 200-level general education courses commonly completed in the first two years of a student's course of study. Each public university and technical and community college is required to establish and maintain an approved OTM.

The OTM contains 36-40 semester of course credit in English composition (minimum of 3 semester hours); mathematics, statistics, and logic (minimum of 3 semester hours); arts and humanities (minimum of 6 semester hours); social and behavioral sciences (minimum of 6 semester hours); and natural sciences (minimum of 6 semester hours). Oral communication and interdisciplinary areas may be included as additional options. Additional elective hours from among these areas make up the total hours for a completed Ohio Transfer Module.

CORE DISTRIBUTION AND CREDIT REQUIREMENTS

36-42 TOTAL HOURS

Skill Areas (9 semester hours)

1. English composition courses (minimum 6 hours)
2. Mathematics courses (minimum 3 hours)

Distributive Areas (18 hours). Must include at least two courses totaling 6 hours in each of the following three areas. Students must choose two courses from different disciplines.

1. Arts and Humanities courses (minimum 6 hours).
2. Social Science courses (minimum 6 hours)
3. Natural Science courses (minimum 6 hours)

Electives (9 hours)

Students must take 9 additional hours of courses from *I. Skills, B. Math or II. Distributive* described above.

Multicultural Courses (6 hours). Students must take one course from each of the following categories:

1. **Diversity of U.S. Culture courses** (minimum 3 hours) examine the economic, political, philosophical, social or artistic life of distinct cultural communities within the United States. Communities may include, but are not limited to, communities based on race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, beliefs, and disability.
2. **Non-U.S. Culture courses** (minimum 3 hours) examine the economic, political, philosophical, social or artistic life of communities outside the United States.

    NB. "Double dipping," or the practice of allowing students to use one course to satisfy more than one requirement, is allowed, here. Students may satisfy both of the multicultural requirements with courses that simultaneously fulfill a second area of the core curriculum. One multicultural course may be a course that also meets one of the

requirements in *II. Distributive Area*, and the other may be a course that also meets one of the requirements in *III. Electives*, as stated above.

CURRICULAR PROCESSES

The UToledo Core curriculum is composed of courses that the faculty in departments and degree programs submit to the Core Curriculum committee for recommended approval for inclusion in the Core. Procedurally, designated faculty and staff in the advising office submit courses to the UToledo Curriculum Inventory Management System (CIM), an online software system that automatically tracks new course proposals and modifications and sends them on to the next designated approver in the workflow.

Courses that come to the Core Curriculum for approval arrive in CIM having already gone through multiple layers of approval, since all new course proposals or modifications must typically be approved by a department curriculum committee, chair or program director, College curriculum committee, College dean, and Faculty Senate. The Core Curriculum Committee, in other words, does not evaluate courses on their individual academic merits as a department would, only on whether or not these courses align with the mission and learning outcomes of the UToledo Core.

Once the Core curriculum committee votes on whether or not to recommend the courses submitted to it, the Chair formally makes the committee's recommendations to the full Faculty Senate. If Faculty Senate also approves, then the curriculum moves forward to the Provost for final approval.

The Core Curriculum Committee meet regularly during the academic year so that it can have live discussion and vote regarding new courses and modifications submitted to the Core. The committee reviews the curriculum with the Core Student Learning Outcomes in mind, particularly when new courses are proposed to the Core, but the committee does not have a standing rubric. Provided that they appear to align with the standards and SLOs of each distribution area, the Core committee usually winds up accepting new course proposals into the Core; rejections are rare. The committee does, however, sometimes "roll back" courses to the previous submitters with requests for alterations, usually asking the submitter to revise some aspect of the course—often the student learning outcomes—to align with the Core outcomes.

Recently, the committee has discussed the need for more governing documents that it might use to ensure a more consistent evaluation process. This is particularly true for courses that are submitted for the multicultural requirement. The SLOs for this requirement are relatively minimal. Given the importance of this requirement, the committee has begun to discuss how it might develop it more fully.

The Core Curriculum committee is also responsible for assessment of the Core. Historically, we have been supported by the Provost's office. A full overview of our assessment practices occurs in Section V of this document, but we will state here that the Core committee has conducted a review of its assessment practices in the 2019-2020 AY (Appendix G) which suggested that the faculty committee with regular turnover was struggling to provide the sustained, consistent support of assessment necessary to a healthy Core. The committee's report to Faculty Senate recommended the creation of a Core program director position occupied by a faculty member who could help manage assessment processes on an annual basis.

FACULTY REPRESENTATION IN THE CORE

Overview. There are several types of faculty at UToledo, all of whom teach within the Core. Full descriptions of each category, including their typical teaching loads, follow this table. Note that at UToledo, the designation of "Lecturer" refers to full-time teaching faculty, not contingent instructors. "Part-time Instructors" refers to instructors who are contracted per course only. Tenure-track/Tenured faculty and Lecturers are represented by the UToledo chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) through two separate collective bargaining agreements.

This table reflects the major faculty groups at UToledo and what percentage of instruction they provide to the Core curriculum:

Faculty Designation	What % Teach in the Core	Full-time vs Contingent
Tenured and Tenure-Track	17%	**46%** of faculty who teach in the UToledo Core are full-time
Lecturers	29%	
Visiting Assistant Professors	9%	**31%** of faculty who teach in the Core are contingent
Part-time Instructors	22%	
Graduate Assistants	12%	**23%** of the faculty who teach in the Core are a combination of graduate students, administrators (almost all
Other, including Chairs and Program directors, Associate Deans, Professional	11%	

Staff Association (PSA), Librarians, Post Docs, etc.		of whom are also tenured faculty), and full-time staff.

Analysis. The above statistics indicate that almost one-half of Core instruction at UToledo comes from full-time faculty, while one-quarter plus comes from contingent labor. The remaining one-quarter consists of a combination of graduate students (who make up half that quartile) and a variety of other kinds of instructors, including full-time faculty who also work as administrators and staff affiliated with the university. For example, the academic Advisors for the College of Arts and Letters and the College of Natural Science and Math teach the required 1-credit "First Year Experience" courses for both those Colleges; they fall under the "Other" category.

FACULTY DESIGNATIONS, INCLUDING TYPICAL TEACHING LOAD

- **Tenured or tenure-track faculty.** Tenured and tenure-track faculty at UToledo are full-time faculty hired to perform in three areas: teaching, research, and service. They are collectively represented by the AAUP. They have doctoral degrees or the highest level of terminal MA (for example, MFA or MM). Tenured faculty may be assigned a maximum of 12 credit hours per semester or a minimum of 6, which means they typically teach between a 2/2 and a 4/4 load depending on their other responsibilities and the needs of their department.

- **Lecturers.** Lecturers are full-time, non-tenure track faculty hired as teaching faculty only. Some Lecturers have PhDs; others have MAs only. Research activity is not included in their letter of assignment as an expectation. Like TT faculty, Lecturers are represented by the AAUP and have their own collective bargaining agreement with the university that governs their workload, compensation, health care benefits, and so forth. Lecturers are assigned more courses to teach per semester than TT faculty: a minimum of 24 credit hours and a maximum of 30 (equivalent to a 4/4 load or higher). Many Lecturers perform some institutional service, although that is negotiated on a case-by-case basis with their department chair in relation to their teaching load rather than required as part of their assignment.

- **Visiting Assistant or Associate Professors.** Visiting assistant or associate professors are sometimes hired to fill curricular needs when a department cannot offer required courses within the major. They are typically hired for one-year contracts that may be renewed for up to three years only according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

- **Part-time Instructor.** Part-time Instructors are contingent faculty (adjuncts) who are contracted per course as needs arise. They receive $3000 for a 3-credit hour course. They are hired most frequently to teach lower-level courses, many of which are in the Core.

- **Graduate Students.** Graduate students teach a variety of Core courses, including those designated as Lecture (a combination of lecture, directed discussion, demonstration, or the presentation of materials and techniques); Discussion (used most often in conjunction with a lab); and Recitation (breakout groups which meet in conjunction with a lecture to review exams, discuss issues, address questions, and extend the instruction that occurs in the larger lecture).

IV. Oversight

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Per the University of Toledo Board of Trustees (BOT) bylaws (UT policy 3364-1-01), the BOT retains the ultimate authority to approve and/or initiate the educational programs and academic requirements of the University. Curricular authority is delegated to the Provost by the BOT and President. The Collective Bargaining Agreement for Tenured/Tenure-track faculty and Lecturers stipulates that the administration must seek input from the Faculty Senate on undergraduate curriculum, including the addition or elimination of academic courses, certificates, programs and degrees; standards and requirements for undergraduate degrees; academic rules, regulations, policies and standards regarding undergraduate students; and the reorganization of Colleges and Departments.

FACULTY SENATE

Overview. In practice, most of the work related to the Core curriculum occurs within the UToledo Faculty Senate, particularly the Core curriculum committee. Before turning to the Core curriculum committee in particular, it is important to note some of the key features of Senate as a governing body.

Mission. The Faculty Senate is an elected body of faculty that describes its mission as "the responsibility to promote the mission, function and interests of the University of Toledo and its faculty" (Faculty Senate Constitution). The university Core is just one of Senate's many responsibilities.

Membership. Members of Faculty Senate are elected from continuing, full-time members of the university faculty (Constitution Article III). Senators are elected for 3-year terms and may be re-elected for another, subsequent 3-year term. If they are elected for two terms in a row (six years total), at which point they are ineligible for re-election for one full year, after which they may be elected again. Many of the current representatives have had long careers as Senators, serving for six years at a time with one year off in between.

Structure. The Faculty Senate has three main structural units:

1. **Executive Committee**, including the Senate President. Prepares the bi-monthly agendas and manages both the Senate's ad hoc committees and standing committees.

2. **Senators.** 64 Senators represent all of the institution's Colleges plus the Library. The College of Medicine and Life Sciences has the most representation with 14 Senators, while the College of Arts and Letters comes in a close second with 13 Senators. The College of Natural Sciences and Math has 8 Senators, and all other Colleges have between 1-6 Senators.

3. **Standing Committees**. There are 9 standing committees run by the UToledo Faculty Senate. Each committee consists of one representative from each College including the Library. The committees report through the Fac Senate Executive Committee directly to the Senate.

   NB. The Constitution does not have bylaws that dictate by what point in the year committee appointments must be made. Historically, the timing of assigning both Chairs and committee members has varied widely, with some committees getting populated early in the academic year and others considerably later.

CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Overview. Of Faculty Senate's nine standing committees, three are devoted to undergraduate curriculum: (1) (2) Academic Programs committee; (2) Undergraduate Curriculum committee, and (3) Core Curriculum committee. The Core Curriculum Committee addresses all matters related to the Core.

Membership. Any member of the faculty may be appointed to the Core committee. The Core committee membership is re-populated annually (by the Committee on Committees). Senators are often re-appointed to the same standing committees, but not always, so the membership of the Core committee rotates regularly. The Faculty Senate President is responsible for appointing the Core committee Chair, and the Provost's office is allowed to appoint one non-voting liaison.

Duties. The Faculty Senate Constitution assigns the Core Curriculum Committee duties that are numerous and broad in their scope (see Faculty Senate description https://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate/committees.html#core-curriculum). We have listed the constitutional duties here followed by the ways the Core committee typically operationalizes them:

1. **Review and recommend guidelines for implementing the Core.** The Core committee makes recommendations to Faculty Senate regarding implementing the Core. For example, the Core committee's 2019-2020 report on assessment practices made several recommendations regarding improving the process for managing the Core; these recommendations were included in a written report and also presented to the full Faculty Senate body. However, there is no established process by which these recommendations get reviewed, modified or rejected, and then implemented. The recommendations the committee made in 2020 have not been acted upon.

2. **Review and recommend courses for inclusion in the Core.** The Core committee typically prioritizes this responsibility, ensuring that it reviews and recommends courses for inclusion in the Core in a timely manner. All Core course modifications, new courses proposed for the Core, and existing courses submitted for inclusion in the Core must be evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee and then recommended (or not) to Faculty Senate.

3. **Collect data on Core course offerings.** With the assistance of the Provost's office and particularly the Office of Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review, the Core committee analyzes the data that come from the annual assessment of Core courses.

4. **Monitor syllabi to ensure that course objectives meet Core requirements.** The Core committee does not have a process in place for monitoring Core syllabuses.

5. **Review and make recommendations on all proposals within 30 days.** The Core committee makes every effort to review curriculum that has been submitted to it within 30 days. Some glitches in the new online curriculum tracking system in Spring and Fall 2020 created some delays when curriculum was not routed to the committee Chair, but those have since been resolved.

6. **Oversee the implementation of the University's Transfer Module.** In practice, the Core committee has never overseen the implementation of the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM). The Provost's office manages this process. (For more details on the OTM, see Part III of this document, "State Requirements.")

7. **Approve courses that are proposed for inclusion in the Transfer Module.** Again, in practice, the Core committee has never approved courses for the OTM; the Provost's office manages this process.

8. **Institute and implement ongoing assessment methods for evaluating the efficacy of the Core.** The Core committee oversees assessment for the UToledo Core with support from the Provost's office. The Senate maintains a distinct set of student learning outcomes for the Core curriculum as mentioned in **Section II** of this report, while the Provost's office makes the university's Assessment Director available to the committee and sometimes, as currently, assigns her to the committee as the Provost's faculty liaison. The relationship between the Senate the Provost's office in regard to assessment of the Core is not spelled out explicitly, however; for example, it is not always clear who is supposed to initiate processes. The lack of clarity sometimes stalls action, leading to delays in assessment.

9. **Institute and implement ongoing assessment methods for evaluating the efficacy of the Core.** The Provost's office, particularly the Office of Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review, offers significant support for this process. In 2019-2020, the Core committee formed a faculty sub-committee on Core assessment as well as a Core assessment task force to ensure the active assessment of the Core.

The Core committee does not have a body of governing documents or policies that dictate how it fulfills the above duties.

(See Part III, "Curricular Processes," for more information on Core committee practices.)

CORE RESOURCES

Like all of the Faculty Senate standing committees (with the exception of the Executive committee), the Core committee does not have any resources formally assigned to it.

The university provides Faculty Senate with a website that includes its membership, committee assignments, meeting schedule, and relevant documents such as the agenda, minutes, and constitution. That website does not function as an online archive for the records or work in progress of its various committees. Faculty Senate also does not maintain a shared drive with its committees. The current Core committee has archival records that date back to 2013-14 that were kept by a dedicated Core committee member, who then shared them on a flash drive with the current committee Chair. The current Chair has continued to maintain the records and will share them with the next committee Chair.

The Provost's office has supported the Core committee's efforts when it has made specific requests. For example, when the Core committee Chair requested compensation for the faculty who had been assigned to the special Core assessment committee and the Core task force in 2019-2020, the Provost's office provided stipends to those faculty members. (To clarify, these funds were not awarded to members of the Core committee, just requested by the Chair to encourage faculty participation in these other sub-committees.) Similarly, the Provost's office is underwriting the cost of this external review.

The Core committee does not have any dedicated secretarial support. The Provost's office sometimes assists when requested; for example, the Provost's office secretary helped the committee find available times and schedule its bi-monthly meetings in Spring 2021. Faculty Senate has a secretary assigned to it, but to date that position has consisted of work for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee plus the task of transcribing and archiving the minutes of the bi-monthly meetings.

V. Assessment

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Core Curriculum Catalog

As stated earlier, the Faculty Senate Core curriculum committee oversees assessment for the UToledo Core with support from the Provost's office. The Senate maintains a distinct set of student learning outcomes for the Core curriculum: communication; personal, social, and global responsibility; critical thinking and integrative learning; scientific and quantitative reasoning and literacy; and information literacy.

In 2017, the university collaboratively developed clearly stated institutional student learning outcomes to provide a framework for measuring student achievement in in five broad categories: Specified Knowledge, Broad and Integrative Knowledge, Intellectual Skills, Civic and Global Learning, and Applied Learning. ISLOs The current core curriculum assessment plan outlines the alignment between the core vs. institutional student learning outcomes.

COURSE REPORTS AND STUDENT ARTIFACT REVIEW

Overview. Departments contributing courses to the core curriculum complete an annual assessment report for each Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) course taught in the curriculum. The report documents the alignment of the course student learning outcome(s) with the core curriculum student learning outcomes, measures used to assess student learning relative to that outcome, and the percentage of students who either met, exceeded, or did not meet the intended outcome. The departments are also asked to describe the actions taken to improve the course based on their analysis of the results. Departments contributing courses to the core curriculum review assessment data at the course-level and use the information to improve student learning in their individual courses. The individual core curriculum course-level assessment reports are secured, maintained, and archived in the online assessment tracking tool. All faculty and staff members may review reports by using their UTAD credentials to access the system. (See Appendix E for sample assessment course reports.)

Analysis of Assessment Practices. In the 2019-2020 academic year, the Faculty Senate Committee on Core Curriculum conducted a longitudinal analysis of the core curriculum reports to review and address some of the challenges with the current process and presented their findings to the Faculty Senate. The Core Curriculum Committee also began to develop an internal system to review samples of student artifacts aligned with each core student learning outcome. The committee appointed a task force in the spring of 2019 to develop a rubric to review student artifacts from the courses aligned with the critical thinking and integrative learning student learning outcome. Although the COVID-19 pandemic delayed the collection of student artifacts, the rubric was developed, and the institution plans to conduct an internal review of the student work in 2020-2021. The same student artifacts will also be submitted to Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) Institute for their spring 2020-2021 review.

PROVOST OFFICE SUPPORT

The current comprehensive external program review of the core curriculum is fully supported by the Office of the Provost, which has provided significant assistance with the assessment process through the Office of Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review, and which is also providing support for this external review. However, neither Faculty Senate nor the Core committee have any governing documents that make explicit what processes related to Core duties the Core committee members should be responsible for initiating and implementing, and which should be run by the Provost's office. In other words, there is some ambiguity about the relationship between the Provost's office and the Core committee in terms of managing and assessing the Core that can sometimes paralyze forward momentum.

The Core curriculum committee noted in their 2019-2020 longitudinal analysis a need to address shortfalls in their assessment process and determined that to do so within the broader context of an evaluation of the program was warranted. At the request of the Chair of the Core curriculum committee, this project was prioritized and funded through the Office of the Provost.

The University Assessment Director serves as the liaison between the Office of the Provost and the core curriculum committee, assisting with the data collection of course reports, and the coordination of the internal student artifact review. The office also offers to help faculty and staff write effective learning outcome statements, and to improve the alignment between course-embedded assessment and student learning outcomes. The office also reviews and offers periodic feedback to departments on the required elements of their syllabi, including course student learning outcomes statements. In the fall of 2019, all course syllabi affiliated with the core curriculum were reviewed. (See Appendix F for Core Syllabus report.)

VI. Questions and Issues

The current Core committee has worked hard to create space in its bi-monthly meetings for a larger conversation about the Core's mission and values that extends beyond the local work of reviewing individual course submissions. Such questions include:

- Is the Core effectively fulfilling its broad mission?
- Are the current practices and processes used to maintain the Core effective? What could be done better?
- What mechanisms or policies are in place that help to ensure high quality Core courses?

- Does the percentage of Tenure-track/Tenured versus contingent faculty who teach in the Core impact its quality, positively or negatively?
- What is the role of the Core in supporting an education that values human diversity? More specifically, are the multicultural requirements effective?
- Is there an ideal size for the Core, or a limit to how many courses it should include?
- How does the Core contribute to the persistence and retention of students? (See Appendix N related to Core GPA and DFW rates.)
- How do we maintain a coherent assessment of the Core curriculum?
- Do Core courses cover all of the SLOs within the Core?

VII. Appendices

Appendix A. UToledo Institutional Data Report, 2019-20.

Appendix B. UToledo current Strategic Plan.

Appendix C. Fall 2020 Facts at a Glance.

Appendix D. 2018 Community Engagement Report.

Appendix E1, E2, E3. Sample Course Assessment Reports.

Appendix F. Core Syllabus Report.

Appendix G. Core Curriculum Committee report on assessment practices in the 2019-2020 AY.

Appendix H. Overview of the UToledo Core Curriculum from the course catalog. https://catalog.utoledo.edu/general-section/university-undergraduate-core-curriculum/

Appendix I. List of UToledo Core Curriculum courses from the course catalog. https://catalog.utoledo.edu/general-section/university-undergraduate-core-curriculum/courses/

Appendix J. Excel spreadsheet with detailed catalog and enrollment information for all courses in the UToledo Core Curriculum. Enrollment data are from the past five academic years (Summer 2015 – Spring 2020) and courses are sorted by enrollment in descending order.

Appendix K. PDF with table showing average GPA by course category from the past five academic years (Summer 2015 – Spring 2020). Courses are categorized by general education distributive requirement - Composition, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, Social Science or not general education. Courses are separately classified by multicultural category – non-Western, US diversity or not multicultural.

Average GPA calculated separately for the College of Arts and Letters (CAL) and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) because the majority of core courses are offered by these two colleges. A small number of core courses are offered by other colleges; the average GPA for these courses is reflected in a separate column in addition to overall averages. Values shown are mean ± SD with number of course grades used in each calculation.

Appendix L. PDF with table showing DFW rates by course category from the past five academic years (Summer 2015 – Spring 2020). As with average GPA, results are classified by general education distributive requirement and multicultural category; and DFW averages are calculated separately for CAL, NSM, other colleges and overall.

Appendix M. PDF with table numeric student course evaluation results by course category from Fall 2019 and Fall 2020, the two semesters in which a new online student course evaluation system was utilized. Again, results are classified by general education distributive requirement and multicultural category; and average scores are calculated separately for CAL, NSM, other colleges and overall.

Ten separate tables are shown – one table for average scores across all nine questions followed by individual tables for each of the nine questions. Numeric results are from a Likert scale where 0 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree to each of the questions asked. Values shown are mean ± SD with number of course evaluation scores used in each calculation.

Appendix N. Some Core data related to DFW rates and GPA.

Senator Gregory cont'd: Are there any questions? Thank you.

President Brakel: Thank you, Senator Gregory, and thanks to the Committee members. Next on the agenda is Resolution. This resolution was drafted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. President-Elect Bigioni, please put it up on the screen. It reads:

Resolution Regarding University Academic Administration Searches (Draft until final approval by Faculty Senate)

March 16, 2021

Whereas the resignation of then President Sharon Gaber created a vacancy in the University of Toledo's President position and

Whereas the current COVID-19 pandemic has created extraordinary conditions in university operations but does not excuse the lack of consultation and transparency by the Board of Trustees regarding the search for a university president,

Whereas the Faculty Senate Report to the Board of Trustees stated the readiness of Faculty Senate to participate in the search process for a university president in multiple reports to the Board of Trustees and,

Whereas the Faculty Senate recognizes that the Board of Trustees has the responsibility of the hiring of the University President and,

Whereas the University Administration and Faculty Senate on different occasions have affirmed their belief in shared governance and,

Whereas the Board of Trustees appointed a president of the University of Toledo with no consultation with Faculty Senate and other stakeholder groups on campus,

Be it resolved that

1) The Faculty Senate goes on record as holding the Board of Trustees responsible for violating norms and procedures of shared governance in appointing a new president without prior consultation with Faculty Senate or other University stakeholder groups and be it further

2) Resolved that the Faculty Senate calls for open and transparent search processes for future presidential searches and other administration academic appointments (Provosts, Deans, etc.) which includes open campus visits where members of the university community have opportunities to meet and ask questions of candidates in a public forum, and be it further

3) Resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the efforts of the Ohio Faculty Council to review and strengthen relationships between the public universities of Ohio and their respective Boards of Trustees, and be it further

4) Resolved that the Faculty Senate will actively pursue avenues to strengthen practices of shared governance with the UT Board of Trustees and the incoming administration.

President Brakel: Next, I want to discuss the Faculty Senate Constitution and where Senate is currently at with it...That discussion that Mark and I had on Friday, we discussed about three different options. One was that we proceed with the second reading, and then we run the risk of, if the Board of Trustees come back with some changes, even at that late date then we would have to come back and actually work on those changes. That gets us kind of in an awkward position because we've had the second reading. Then the other option is that this gets postponed till next year, which we've been working on this for four years, and I really don't want that as a viable option. The option that we would like to do is, if Senate feels comfortable enough where the Constitution is currently at in terms of our first reading aspect that you give us permission to proceed with town hall meetings to begin to get the faculty informed there about this constitution changes and we will continue working to try to push the Board of Trustees before their April 16th meeting to give us some feedback. As they are looking at this April 16th meeting right now, once we get that feedback, [we'll] hold then perhaps a special meeting the Friday following the Board of Trustees April meeting. If I am not mistaken, it is April 14th and so that Friday would be the 16th, calling a special meeting that afternoon to work through any changes that needed to come forth there, and then we can get it out to the faculty for a vote yet this semester, get it approved by the Board of Trustees, and move forward. So that is what we've talked about. Senator Templin, would you like to add anything?

Senator Templin: No, other than the town halls, as I envision them would be Webex town halls. So, we would just send the Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules materials out to all faculty and have a little bit of background about where we are at with the process. I think the key would be to have, I'm envisioning three of them, like a Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. Maybe one of those in the morning, one somewhere around midday, and one in the later afternoon because some faculty are free in the morning and some have a Monday/Wednesday schedule or Tuesday/Thursday schedule, you know, we can try and hit the maximum amount of convenience for the faculty. That way the faculty as a whole would be familiar with the Constitution if we could get a second reading in mid-April, then we would still have time to do a faculty ratification vote before the end of the year.

President Brakel: Any discussion?

Senator Heberle: If we don't get this voted on this year, do we have to somehow start over with all the readings and stuff with the new senate?

President Brakel: Unfortunately, that is correct.

Senator Heberle: I just wanted to clarify that for everybody.

President Brakel: And what would happen is, if they do come back with some changes then the Constitution Committee could quickly get those changes correct into the new constitution aspect. But, it would be next year senate that could hopefully then quickly put this to rest in the fall semester.

Senator Molitor: This is Scott Molitor from Engineering, and I am also chairing the Elections Committee. I do want to point out that the current Constitution does not have a provision for an electronic ballet for amending the Constitution. Article 11 says that the Constitution may be amended by 2/3rds majority of the returned mail votes of the University faculty. The mail vote will be conducted and tallied by the Senate Committee on Elections and verified by the Executive Committee. I guess the reason I am saying that is that might add to the timeline it takes to actually implement this.

Senator Templin: Well, Senator Molitor, how long does it usually take to do a mail in vote?

Senator Molitor: I've only been Elections Committee Chair with electronic. I've never had to do mail.

Senator Steven: Does mail include email?

President Brakel: Well, the one thing about email is that you lose confidentiality.

Senator Heberle: Can we claim COVID emergency and do what the States did? There's no opposition party that is going to try to take us down for it.

Senator Molitor: I would say as Chair of Elections Committee that the electronic systems we have in place, seem to be working very well. I don't know if anybody would object, but I'm just kind of wondering if in the future somebody would object to the amendment process because we did not follow the procedures in the current Constitution.

President Brakel: I think given the fact that there's a large number of faculty that are not on campus under the COVID situation, that, yes, the vote should be conducted electronically. But, I understand your point.

Senator Heberle: I think especially if the old constitution was written in a time when electronic voting was not common and not commonly when the assumption was that it would be mail in. I am pretty certain that wasn't on principle. It was just what was available. I don't know, but I think maybe if we can vote on

principle and what President Brakel said, or sort of agree on principle and the timeline that President Brakel put out, and the plan that he and Mark put out, then we can figure out these details otherwise.

Senator Anderson: I would agree to reference the COVID virus for conducting this vote electronically, because I am one of the faculty members that is teaching remotely.

President Brakel: And that would be my concern. Senator Van Hoy said that can the ballot be emailed and returned by mail? Again, there's a number of faculty that are not on campus. So I think we can go ahead and declare that electronic ballot there because of the COVID circumstances there, but having a vote of the Senate to confirm that would be helpful. So I would need a motion perhaps for that. Senator Templin as parliamentarian, in that regard, what do you think?

Senator Templin: Well, I think because of COVID it is an extenuating circumstance, and that we are now, correct me if I am wrong, we are now electing senators themselves electronically, so we're electing people. So, there is precedent for electronic votes in other areas.

President Brakel: And the other issue is that we have there is that we wouldn't necessarily have to vote on that today, about the voting of the Constitution, because in the town halls we can say that this is what it says here, but because of the circumstances that we were in, we will conduct this electronically and then that can do that.

Senator Templin: Yes, I think giving people a fair warning. You may want it as the main vote is electronic and if people absolutely want to mail in their vote, we could have a secondary process for that. You know, just give them a date, tell us by such-and-such a date and we'll give you a paper ballot. I mean, I don't see---

Senator Molitor: As Elections Committee Chair, I do not believe we can mix modalities. There would be no way to track to figure out if somebody voted twice, mail in and electronic.

Senator Templin: Right.

Senator Heberle: I completely agree. We still have to wait for all those mail in ballots to come in, so it doesn't serve the purpose. We would be interesting in using electronic.

Senator Molitor: And I agree completely with Senator Steven's comments that we should update the constitutional section on amending, or update the section on amending the Constitution to include other means to vote.

President Brakel: All right, so how would you like for us to proceed here? I think we all want to put this to bed this year, if we possibly can. We've worked on this a long time. So, are you okay with us moving forward with these town halls? Any further discussion? I need then a motion that indicates the Senate's **pleasure of moving forward.**

Senator Barnes: I'm happy to move that. Please move it forward. And please don't make us listen to the whole thing again.

Senator Kistner: Second.

Senator Heberle: Thank you, Senator Barnes. I can hear your 'tears' through the call.

Senator Barnes: No offense to the brilliant authors.

President Brakel: All right, so we have a motion on the floor that we can move this forward to the town halls. So, any further discussion on this motion? Please vote yes, no, or abstain in the chat. That motion appears to have passed. *Motion Passed.* So thank you everyone. We will begin to schedule some town hall meetings to inform the faculty with regard to the Constitution changes moving forward. Okay. So that brings us then to Items from the Floor. Are there any items for the good of the cause?

Senator Molitor: I just wanted to remind everyone that the Faculty Senate elections are going to be starting. In fact, tomorrow everyone should be receiving a link to an electronic ballot, which is in our Bylaws, we are able to vote electronically.

President Brakel: Any other items for the good of the cause?

Senator Barnes: Two quick items. We have our featuring feminist faculty presentation coming up, and I unfortunately can't pull the flyer out fast enough. I also just wanted to say to those of you who are recently here that most of us who've been around a while experienced a pretty devastating presidency, and I think that some of our reactions, if they seem exasperated and exaggerated, that might be why. Because I think there is still some healing that has not happened for a lot of us who suffered through those years. So, I just wanted to mention that. Our showcase is March 25th.

President Brakel: Thank you. Are there any other items? Hearing nothing, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Senator El-Zawahry: Motion to adjourn

Senator Kistner: Second.

President Brakel: All in favor, put yes in the chat. Thank you everyone, we stand adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Kimberly Nigem   Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard   Faculty Senate Executive Secretary