

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 24, 2015
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS meeting on 2/02/2016

Summary of Senate Business

Ohio Faculty Council Report
Meet the Dean: Dr. Christopher Ingersoll, CHS
Results of the Review of Syllabi
Update on HLC Assurance Argument

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 Keith: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the seventh Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2015-2016. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2015-2016 Senators:

Present: Anderson-Huang, Atwood, Barnes, Black, Compora, Denyer, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Edwards, Federman, Franchetti, Giovannucci, Gray, Gruden, Gunning, Harmych, Hasaan-Elnaby, Jorgensen, Keith, Kennedy, Krantz, Lee, Lundquist, McAfee, Molitor, Monsos, Oberlander, Prior, Quinn, Rouillard, Schneider (substitute for M. Caruso), Sheldon, Slantcheva-Durst, Srinivasan, Thompson-Casado, Weck-Schwarz, White, Williams, Wittmer

Excused absences: Brickman, Burnett, Cappelletty, Farrell, Hoblet, Humphrys, Kistner, Malhotra McLoughlin, Nigem, Ohlinger, Randolph, Smas, A. Thompson, G. Thompson, Wedding

Unexcused absences: Devabhaktuni, Elmer, Kovach, Mohammed, Nathan, Schafer, Skeel, Tevald, Willey

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of October 15, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting are ready for approval.

Academic Year 2015-2016. I ask that Executive Secretary, Lucy Duhon come to the podium to call the roll.

President Keith: Senator Duhon is checking to see if we have a quorum. Senator Williams just walked in, so now we have a quorum, which I think the only thing we require a quorum for is approval of the Minutes, October 15, 2015. May I have a motion to approve the Minutes of October 15, 2015? Is there any discussion or comment? Hearing none. All in favor please say, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? **Minutes approved.** Thank you.

The Executive Committee report: Your Executive Committee has been busy since the last Senate meeting. Aside from our usual meetings, we met with the President and the Provost, and attended the Provost's staff meetings. As always, several EC members attended the Clinical Affairs, Finance and Audit and the full Board of Trustee meetings. We also met with representatives from Smith Group JJR, which is the company conducting the Multiple Campus Master Plan. Last we met with Dr. Jim Mager, Interim Vice President for Enrollment Management, as a follow-up to his October 27, 2015 presentation to Faculty Senate.

Your Executive Committee will be meeting with Dr. Mager on a regular basis so we can provide him with faculty perspectives on instructional and enrollment issues. At our next meeting we will discuss ideas designed to increase fall 2015 enrollment with a focus on those that can be implemented in a couple of months. Subsequent meetings will focus on more complex ideas that will take longer to implement. That said, I ask each Senator to consider the short-term and long-term issues associated with increasing enrollment. If you have thoughts, ideas, suggestions, etc., please send them to me and I will make sure they are brought to Dr. Mager's attention.

At our last meeting I told you we were meeting with the Provost and representatives from Graduate Council to discuss modifying the approval process for academic policies to include reviews by Faculty Senate and Graduate Council prior to the policies being posted for comment. The Provost supports modifying this process to allow this type of vetting by Faculty Senate and Graduate Council. However, he made it clear that our vetting must be done in a timely manner, for example, completed within four to six weeks. His office is working on draft language for this modification of the policy process. Once we receive the draft language, we'll send it on to the appropriate Senate committee for its comments and suggestions.

At our last Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting, we hosted faculty representatives from the Colleges of Education, Health Sciences, and Social Justice and Human Service to discuss the proposed reorganizations that would affect their colleges. We wanted to hear their perspectives on the efficacy of the proposed merger between the Colleges of Health Sciences and SJHS as well as SJHS's Higher Education Program's move to the Judith Herb College of Education (JHCOE). We were also interested in learning the extent to which faculty were involved in the process. The consensus was that while there was little faculty input into the decision that SJHS would not continue to exist as a separate college, once the decision was made, the faculty in SJHS were asked to explore where they thought their programs would fit best among the existing colleges. In the end, they decided that the departments and programs that once had been part of the College of Health Science and Human Services (HS) should merge with HS. At that point, faculty from both colleges were involved in the process of determining the structure of the new combined college.

Because the Higher Education program in SJHS's Department of School Psychology, Higher Education, and Counselor Education did not have the same fit with HS as did the other programs, the faculty of Higher Education considered what would be necessary for them to rejoin the JHCOE. We were told that the JHCOE Council and its faculty were willing to work to create and establish initiatives for the smooth transition of faculty from one college to another. In addition, the negotiations with the Interim Dean of JHCOE went well – the faculty in Higher Education received almost everything they wanted as pre-conditions for the move. It was stated, the faculty in the Higher Education program believe they will be welcomed back to JHCOE. It was also emphasized by the faculty from all three colleges – JHCOE, HS and SJHS – that the level of fatigue for reorganization among members of all the colleges is quite high.

Continuing with our policy of seeking input from the full Senate for all departmental and college reorganizations, at our next meeting, we will have two resolutions for you to consider.

I was asked to attend the UT Multicultural Student Organization's *An Evening with President Sharon Gaber*, and was introduced to the audience as being there as the Faculty's representative. The event was

well attended and President Gaber affirmed her commitment to increasing the diversity of students, faculty and staff at The University of Toledo.

Finally, I received an email from James Winkler about the history of the Medical College of Ohio's (MCO) seal. He had read the Faculty Senate minutes of September 29, 2015, in which I had described the gift the Faculty gave to President Gaber during the inauguration. If you recall I noted that we were unsuccessful in finding information on the meaning of the colors in the MCO and MUO seals.

Mr. Winkler referred me to a book, entitled *A Community of Scholars: Reflections of the Early Years of the Medical College of Ohio*, published by The University of Toledo Press (2011). This book contains information about the original seal. Mr. Winkler, who spent the majority of his professional career in a variety of community communication and public relations positions at MCO and then UT, is one of the book's editors. He quotes "...with regard to colors, dark green is the color of medicine in academic circles, red is for blood, and gold is for urine, the specimens studied since antiquity. At the top of the staff, the tree leaves symbolize education, research and community service, which were the MCO's three goals." The Interim Director of the Library and University Archivist, Barb Floyd, has agreed to include copy from the book that refers to history of the MCO seals in the archives, and I will ask Quinetta to keep a copy of his email in the Faculty Senate files as well. Finally, at my next meeting with President Gaber, I'll give her a quick update on the meaning of the colors contained in the MCO seal.

Those are some of the issues that FSEC has been involved with over the past two weeks. As for our meeting today, we have an Ohio Faculty Council report from Senator Rouillard. Senator Molitor and Weck-Schwarz, co-chairs of the Elections committee, will give a report on the feasibility of electronic ballots. Dr. Mark Templin, Co-Chair of Constitution and Rules, will also give a brief report on what changes to the Constitution are needed, and who needs to approve those changes for us to conduct our elections using electronic ballots. The report by Dr. Templin is not on the agenda due to some late correspondence in which he indicated he would be able to join us. Thus, I ask your indulgence in letting him speak.

We've invited Dr. Christopher Ingersoll, Dean of the College of Health Sciences, to introduce himself and to tell us about the things that are going on in his college. Obviously the big thing going on in his college is the proposed merger with SJHS. As such, he decided to give a presentation on the history of the process as well as the recommendations that will be given to President Gaber. Dr. Connie Shriner, Vice Provost for Assessment and Faculty Development, is here to discuss the findings from a survey of syllabi, and Dr. Thea Sawicki, Vice Provost for Health Science Affairs and University Accreditation, is here to give us an update on the HLC assurance argument that we are making prior to their onsite visit in April 2016.

So, I am done, unless there are comments or reminders from the EC. Hearing none. Are there any questions from the senators?

Senator Anderson: Is the Executive Committee considering anything about tenure promotion elaborations which are also going on in the colleges at this time?

President Keith: No, we have not; perhaps that is something we should be part of.

Senator Dowd: When we meet with Provost Barrett perhaps this issue can be put on the agenda for that meeting.

President Keith: That is an excellent idea; we meet with Provost Barrett on Thursday and it will be part of the agenda, given that somebody writes it down <laughter>. Anything else? If nothing else then I will introduce Senator Rouillard, as you all know and ask that she gives her report.

Senator Rouillard: Thank you, President Keith. I have a handout that was given to us at the last Ohio Faculty Council meeting on November 13th. I will talk about the first part of the meeting, but this handout was from the second part of the meeting and I give it to you today for your information. I attended the Nov. 13 Ohio Faculty Council meeting in Columbus. We met with Brett Visger, an associate Vice Chancellor, Institutional Collaboration and Completion at the Ohio Department of Higher Education. He spoke with us about a new draft of the Prior Learning Policy and invited comments. Though, I will have to admit, I went on the website today looking for that latest draft policy, I see a final policy, but I am not sure if that's the previous final policy; they haven't posted the draft on the new final policy, but I expect that if you do have comments you could certainly address them to the vice chancellor. He stressed that this policy is student-centered and faculty-driven, that ODOE goals for PLA include consistency, integrity and portability. He acknowledged that in all cases, faculty control the curriculum and the assessment. VC Visger said that ODOE is looking at the development of a rubric for portfolio assessment and that campuses can decide if PLA should be treated as transfer credit or as native credit. He reports that most institutions limit the number of PLA credits to no more than 25% of total credits. I noted that at UT we were concerned about the use of ACE designations or assessments, and that at UT, our faculty would determine these. VC Visger replied that the state has not mandated that ACE designations be accepted. There is, however, a state mandate that military experience be considered for PLA. Paula Compton is currently working on M-TAGs. ODOE is working on the creation of a website listing different university policies on PLA.

The rest of this meeting was devoted to STRS. Some faculty in Ohio who are in Alternative Retirement Programs have expressed concern about the mitigating rate paid out of employer contributions to retirement. We met with 3 representatives from STRS: Executive Director Michael Nehf (nehfm@strsoh.org, 614-227-4001), Deputy Executive Director Sandra Knoesel (knoesels@strsoh.org, 614-227-2880) and Director of Member Services Gary Russell (russellg@strsoh.org, 614-227-2889). They gave a presentation about the mitigating rate which is currently 4.5% of the employer contribution. For those in ARPs, 4.5% of the total 14% of the employer contribution goes to STRS to pay down current and future benefit obligations of STRS. For those in STRS Defined Contribution plans, 9.5% of the employer contributions are directed towards the employee's STRS account, and the remaining 4.5% is directed towards current and future benefit obligation. I have brought copies of STRS handout entitled "Misconceptions about STRS Ohio's Defined Benefit Plan and the Mitigating Rate." I will ask Quinetta to distribute an electronic copy of the STRS presentation. If you have any questions about this mitigating rate feel free to ask me, but I will also direct you to contact STRS. Are there any questions? Thank you very much.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Rouillard. Next, on the agenda are the two co-Chairs from the Faculty Senate Election Committee, Senator Molitor and Senator Weck-Schwarz.

Senator Weck-Schwarz: One of the charges that we received for the Election Committee this year was to explore an implementation of electronic balloting. Senator Molitor and I, co-chairs of the committee, met with Mark Templin and Senator Giovannucci, co-chairs of Constitution and Rules Committee, to discuss what revisions of the Constitution will be necessary to accommodate that. We have also met with Bobbi Vaughn and Jamie Carothers from the Center for Creative Instruction, CCI, here on the Health Science Campus, and worked with the Faculty Senate Office. Our goal at this point is to have a process in place that can be implemented in time for the spring elections, AY2016 for the usual UCAP, UCS and

Senate elections, provided that there is consensus with actually going forward with electronic balloting. In order to map out the process of electronic balloting, as I said, we met with people from CCI. They have previously worked with Faculty Senate on the deans' evaluations and have in the past disseminated links to the appropriate faculty where faculty could anonymously vote and then they collected and collated the results. What we envision here is a similar process for the Faculty Senate elections within the purview of the Elections Committee. The entire process would look something like this: We would provide a list of the faculty that are eligible to appear on the ballots and for faculty who are eligible to vote and then CCI would generate the nomination ballots. We, the Elections Committee would then review the ballots. Then CCI would disseminate the ballots via email in the form of links, as in the deans' evaluations. Again, as with the deans' evaluations, we envision that any authentication would be done by UTAD login credentials. And then when the voter logs in there is a random process where the person cannot be identified through their vote. When the nomination part of the election is closed we will contact CCI again and they will generate the final election ballots via the same process. What we think is a cautious approach is to somehow ensure that the process is actually working before we go into the elections.

We would actually like to have a trial run. We would provide CCI with a small sample of test persons who would actually do a run-through of voting. We would provide CCI with a list of fake names, something to come up with a fake ballot and then, mainly, people from the Elections Committee would go in to see if the correct colleges are identified for voting so they are actually voting for their respective colleges, and they are able to do so anonymously. As for the timeline, we would hope that the process would be in place by mid-February so it is complete before the actual elections occur in the beginning of March. As a precaution we would suggest to generate paper ballots just in case the electronic system turns out not to be working as we think it should. We would give Senate an update in early spring. Also, with respect to the timeline, I should say that CCI has informed us that they would need to start working on the process pretty soon; they said a good portion of their staff would be away for training in February. The other thing (and you addressed that already by having the co-chairs of the Constitution and Rules Committee present): Before we can do anything, before anything can be implemented, the Senate Constitution, or more precisely the Appendix needs to be revised to accommodate electronic balloting. One final thing, we are looking to get a sense of Senate to determine if there's a desire to implement electronic elections because we certainly want to respect the time of our colleagues at CCI; we don't want them to spend an inordinate amount of time and effort on a system that eventually is not going to be implemented because there are objections to electronic voting as such.

Senator Anderson-Huang: When do you want the sense of the Senate?

Senator Molitor: Well, we were hoping to do it today and actually, perhaps the best time to do it is to allow our colleagues from Constitution and Rules to discuss their findings and updates and then perhaps after their presentation if it is okay with everyone else, we can then raise the issue of "is this something that Senate wants to move forward with?"

President Keith: I would like get a sense of the Senate today.

Senator Dowd: I would like to clarify an issue. If there is a desire to change the rules in the Appendix, we should not have that happen today. We can talk about changing the rules today but the vote should occur at a subsequent meeting. That way Senators can take the issue back to their colleagues to discuss whether there is support for any proposed changes.

Senator Molitor: Depending on the results of the conversation today, we would go to CCI and tell them we think the Senate is in favor of this, but there are no guarantees. They would probably be willing to

move forward on the basis of that. But what we don't want to do is tell them to move forward if there seems to be substantial opposition to it.

President Keith: Thank you, Senator Molitor and Weck-Schwartz. Next, Dr. Mark Templin will discuss possible changes of the Constitution.

Dr. Templin: I think it was the 10th of November, the co-chairs of the Senate Constitution and Rules, which is David Giovannucci and myself, met with the co-chairs of the Elections Committee. We talked about the possibility of going to electronic ballot for the elections. Since that time I've been "getting to know the Constitution <laughter>" and David has as well. We have a meeting scheduled for the Constitution and Rules Committee on December 1st in the afternoon, so the committee will pick up the issue at that time. In terms of steps of how can we move this forward, from what I am seeing in here, the election process and the move to electronic ballot would be part of the Appendix and Faculty Senate can change its Appendix to amend it with a 2/3rd majority vote of the Senate. As I look at things and think about things, there's going to have to be some longer-term strategic changes to what we have, I think, because within *Robert's Rules* the Constitution should be the most parsimonious document that you can get because every time you have to change the Constitution you have to go back to the entire body, which is a very laborious process; you want to do that as infrequently as you can. So, there are things that are currently in the Constitution that I really think are bylaws issues which would be in the Appendix, and there are things in the Appendix which are really rules issues, so I think that maybe we are going to have to do some moving around long-term. The way I am thinking about this now, the procedures for the election are really a rules issue, so it is the rules of how we do that. We have it currently in the Appendix which is kind of reflective of the bylaws of Senate. The good news is, Senate is in control of that part of the document, so that's good. What I would recommend is try it and we will try to write Appendix rules and bylaws and what-not to capture that process. If we don't adequately capture it there is a failsafe in the Constitution which says, "...*interpretation is the purview of Senate,*" so you can interpret as, the bylaws were violated and we have to do it differently or yes, that is what we meant all along and so we are kind of covered in that sense from the interpretation clause. Are there any questions?

President Keith: Just being clear. So what you are saying is if we decide to go forward with electronic ballots, at a future Senate meeting we can ask the Senate to vote to change the bylaws to allow that to occur?

Dr. Templin: Yes. To change it, it must be a 2/3rd majority.

President Keith: All right.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Is there any reason to proceed by saying such an implementation would be a one year proposal and then look at it again and if we're happy, it stays and if we're not happy? I don't know how to word it.

Senator Dowd: I don't think we can have a clause in the rules of the Senate that expires after a set period of time.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Okay.

Senator Dowd: However, we could have language stating that after one year the Senate should again consider that issue. For me, the issue is that we can't impose changes on future Senates.

Senator Giovannucci: Didn't we discuss that if we make a change like that, that it is not from this point on and everything has to be done electronically? There's flexibility and if we want to do a written vote we can also do that, it is the will of the Senate.

Dr. Templin: Thank you. Yes, we discussed writing it as an option. So, there are times where you would want to conduct that business electronically and there are times when you would want to do it the old fashioned way. It would seem that preserving the maximum flexibility you could have both options.

Senator Don White: So, would that involve a default option or would we have to actively decide before every election which way we are going to go?

Dr. Templin: Well, that's where I am talking about the larger structural issues. So if it's in the category of different rules – so you have a set of rules for the procedures and a set of rules for other functions that Senate is doing, having it in the Appendix means that any kind of election that you might have would fall under those bylaws that are in that Appendix, so that would be something we can sort out in a longer sense. Now, I am not familiar enough with it at the moment, but I suppose we could set a default and just say, the preferences for electronic or whatever Senate wants. I am assuming the preference would be electronic, unless Senate voted otherwise, we could have that as an option. You could set a default, but I think there are some things you would know automatically it's going to work better this way, so you would set the default differently for a certain function, I would think.

Senator Lee: I would just mention, in the College of Nursing our governance committee is required, the numbers are voted. We switched several years ago from the paper approach to electronic, although it is not through the Center of Creative Instruction, it is internal through our college. It is way more efficient for the people who have to get all the results. It is very timely and I think it is appreciated by everyone.

Dr. Templin: Yes. One of the issues with electronic balloting was the vetting, do we know that the person voting is actually the person who should be voting and so on. But as technology improves, those issues are dealt with technologically and now is starting to be the time to move towards this.

Dr. Thea Sawicki: If I can speak to the quality of the CCI efforts. They did an electronic ballot for the Grad Council election for the College of Med. for the last couple of years, and they do a beautiful job. It's all kept anonymous. The data is provided to whoever is running that election. You provide them with the person's name and UTAD address and the wording you want and it goes out.

Senator Dowd: I would just like to echo what Thea just said. Last year when Senate conducted evaluations of deans, CCI administered the evaluations and they were terrific. They bent over backwards to ensure anonymous responses. The entire process ran very smoothly with problems for only one or two faculty members – out of approximately 1,100 faculty members – and those few exceptions were immediately resolved. It was a good, solid, secure process thanks to the hard work of CCI.

Senator Barnes: It seems to me that the bigger issue has been getting accurate lists of faculty members, it's consistently been a nightmare and I don't know if CCI is responsible for that.

Unknown Speaker: No, they wouldn't be.

Senator Barnes: I know that there's a new strategy in place.

Senator Dowd: I spent five months last year, working almost every night to construct a robust, secure list of eligible faculty members. Now that we have that list no one will be able to access that list other than Quinetta. Each year the Senate will simply ask colleges to update their list of faculty and the Senate office will revise the master list. That way the Senate itself will preserve the integrity of that faculty list.

Senator Barnes: Do you have a lot of confidence that that's going to work right?

Senator Dowd: Senate has always had to construct the list of eligible faculty members. Since the UT-MUO merger, it was exceptionally difficult to generate new lists each year because of the formation of new colleges and the elimination of others. The provost office and some colleges did not have accurate lists of their own faculty. Last year Senate established the process of constructing and maintaining that list. We all can be confident in that process but we also must rely on future Senates to maintain the integrity of the list.

Senator Barnes: Thank you.

President Keith: So, what are your thoughts on electronic ballots?

Senator Molitor: If I can just amend this? We also met with Quinetta and Lisa Barteck who runs elections for the University Committee on Sabbaticals and the University Committee on Academic Personnel. Lisa Barteck said she asks Brenda Grant from the Provost Office to provide her the list every year that she uses to determine who's eligible to be on the ballot and who's eligible to vote. She also has to amend it depending on who's been on sabbatical. So our sense was that we should not change that process, unless Senate thinks that there's a substantial need to change that process. We haven't particularly heard any complaints specifically about the University Committee on Sabbaticals and the University Committee on Academic Personnel elections and so our sense was that Lisa should continue to follow that process, unless someone wants her to do otherwise. Obviously these elections are governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement so we need to be careful of that as well.

President Keith: Again, I would like to have a discussion, but maybe there isn't a discussion to be had; maybe people are comfortable with the idea of having electronic ballots.

Senator Barnes: Are there any other issues besides immunity that might make people not want to take part in electronic balloting?

Senator Molitor: I think it is the issue of determining, "did the person who is supposed to be the eligible voter actually vote?" The way CCI has addressed it – at least with the deans' evaluations and perhaps with the College of Medicine ballots – is just through UTAD credentials - your ID and your password - so we are comfortable with that.

Senator Weck-Swartz: It is so much more complicated with the Faculty Senate elections because we have the whole...subdivided into the other colleges and everybody needs to actually receive that specific college ballot and all of that.

Dr. Templin: Excuse me. The other issue with electronic balloting, if you think about where we were 20 or 30 years ago, if we were to put electronic balloting in, you would've disenfranchised voters because some people had access to the technology and others didn't, so electronic ballots would have been problematic. But as technology has proceeded and because this is a faculty body, in theory there's lots of access to technology; we are not disenfranchising the body because the technology is available to everyone.

Senator Molitor: Yeah, if you have any colleagues that don't use computers let us know <laughter>.

Senator Anderson-Huang: There is a distinction in having access between on-campus and off-campus, right? We should be aware that people who are off-campus should have the access to do this.

Senator Dowd: Again, if you refer back to the deans' evaluations as an example, in that case you did not have to be in your office to complete the evaluation.

President Keith: I suppose for faculty who are reluctant to do electronic, we can always give them the option of a paper ballot, we've done that in our college. If there are no more comments, can I ask you to please take this issue back to your faculty in your college and have a discussion? If we are going to do this then I would like to move on it as quickly as possible so that it can occur in the spring, AY2016.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Do you want us to vote now by hands?

President Keith: In terms of electronic balloting, having a sense of the Senate would be great. So, can you please guide us how to do that Senator Dowd?

Senator Dowd: If you would, simply ask Senators if they have any strong objections to proceeding with the planning of electronic ballots.

President Keith: Okay. Is there any strong objection to proceeding with the planning of an electronic ballot? Hearing none. Well, the sense of the Senate is that there is no strong objection to proceeding with the planning of an electronic ballot.

Senator Edwards: Do it <laughter>!

President Keith: Thank you, Dr. Templin. I appreciate you coming today.

Senator Molitor: Just one final comment. Senator Weck-Schwarz and I will let Bobbi and her colleagues know that we would like to proceed.

President Keith: Okay. Then the next step from Constitution and Rules is to change the bylaws so that we actually are allowed to use electronic ballots, great.

Senator Don White: President Keith, I have a comment and a question that does not need to be answered now so it would take up only the 30 seconds you asked for comments and questions. In our department we are also in the midst of considering electronic student evaluations. We have a one-semester study so we do have some information on that, but I am curious to know [send me an email] if there's anybody out there who already does this and has some feedback on some of the key questions like security and privacy and also on participation.

Unknown Speaker: Talk to Senator Molitor.

Senator Don White: Okay. If anybody else has that please let me know and I can share my information with you if you like. Thank you.

President Keith: Thank you. Next on the agenda I would like to introduce Christopher Ingersoll. You probably already know him, but he is the Dean from Health Sciences and he is part of our "meet the dean series." We sent this document to you, so everybody should have received it from Quinetta.

Dean Ingersoll: Thank you for inviting me here. I appreciate the opportunity to come and chat with you a little bit. It was originally started as a "meet the dean" type of thing, so I want to take a couple of minutes and share some information about me so you will know me a little bit better.

Most recently, I came here from Central Michigan University where I had the opportunity to serve as the dean for the Herbert H. & Grace A. Dow College of Health Professions. Prior to that, I had a long stint at the University of Virginia and served as the Joe Gieck Professor of Sports Medicine and the Chair of the

Department of Human Services and yes, my endowed chair was called the “Gieck Chair” and I worked all my life to be the Gieck Chair <laughter>. I was at Indiana State University prior to that, and I started my academic career at University of Nevada Las Vegas. Prior to going to UNLV, I was a PhD student at The University of Toledo, so I am back after almost 30 years. Some of the buildings on this campus look the same as when I was a student. I had the opportunity to start my deanship here in January, in the middle of the academic year. In the first semester I thought it was important to learn about the programs that were in that college and even though I had some similar ones in the position I was in, you know, if you've seen one program, you've seen one program, but the idea was to try to get the new ones of all those. Also, in the context of that discussion, try to understand what was important to all those programs and roll them up into some strategic themes that folks thought were important, relevant to the college. So I spent a fair part of the spring semester last year in doing that. I met with all the programs, not the departments, but individual programs. They set the agenda, so they talked about what was important to them. They showed me the facilities that they used, and so on and so forth. They did a wonderful job of getting me acclimated as quickly as possible. At the end of that process we rolled up a few strategic themes that we felt were important that were sort of rallying opportunities for all the programs within the college, this is in the College of Health Sciences. Those three items were inter-professional education – you are hearing a lot about that on campus. That is where all the professions learn about, with, and from each other. I think a lot of places across the United States are putting a lot of faith into the fact that that is going to evolve into a team-based care approach in the future and it is really important for our students to be well prepared for that future, so that was one of the themes. Another one was community engagement – the programs in our college are about helping people in lots of ways and understanding where do people come from. What's happening in communities is really important for all our folks rather, some actually go and work in the community and some of them are physicians and people come to them. It is truly important to them collectively for all of our students to have an opportunity to have a community engagement experience so that they know where people are coming from so they can be more effective. The third one was related to rebuilding a research infrastructure – the research in the college seemed to have diminished in the previous years coming up, and there was the strongest desire to find ways to be able to engage in that and stimulate some additional research. So, we had conversations around those three themes and we are working out some strategic goals around those three things and finding ways for the programs to come together. So that was a lot of the nature of the discussion prior to the last part of the discussion that came up. There was a suggestion to look at opportunities for colleges to merge. A lot of it was around I was trying to look at the amount of administrative positions that were on campus.

And so a conversation started with the cabinets of the two respective colleges, what that request to explore those types of things meant and then there were some discussions in the units from the chairs about what that meant. So the thought that sort of came back through that process was thinking about that now, particularly in light of the fact that the College of Social Justice and Human Service was not going to be in position, so something was going to have to happen with that. As all of you know, the programs from those two respective colleges were together at one time in history. So the thought was to get the groups together and have a discussion about what that merger might look like. The nature of the information that I am providing you kind of tells you how we went through that process. We thought at the beginning, before we have a conversation on what a merger proposal might look like, it is important to have some guiding principles around that. You can see what those are, they are basically saying if we are going to do this, we need to make sure we can maintain the quality of our programs and that we keep our eye on delivering quality programs to support interdisciplinary, those general type of things. And so that provided us a guideline so when discussions happen, we can refer back to that framework to make sure we were staying on task for what we were trying to accomplish with that. So once we did that – and this

was a discussion among the cabinets of the two different colleges – we felt like if we were going to go forward with any process where we might look at what that merger would be, it would be important for broader input and involvement in developing that. So, we went to our respective college councils and we asked for two members from each of those to join that team, we called it the Merger Team. We asked if possible that the folks that they recommended came from disciplines that were different than were already represented on that, so we had as broad a perspective as possible for the purposes of putting that together. The list of folks is included there. So that group got together and put together some possible options for folks to look at. And the intent was not that you had to pick one of these, it was, here are some different organizations that could possibly be one. It gave the opportunity for discussion and around how some of those may go together. There were four of them. One was a three-unit and there were three that had four-units. At that point we thought it would be important that we would share that and give people an opportunity to think about it and have some processes for feedback. The feedback was not vote on one of these, it was, what do you like about some of these and why? And so we did a couple of things to gather that input. We did a couple of town hall meetings and those town hall meetings are on those days listed and anybody was invited, faculty, staff, and students. It was an open session for people to talk about what was important to them. My executive secretary took minutes at both of those town hall meetings to make sure that we captured that. Those minutes were shared with the members of the Planning Team so if they couldn't attend the town hall meetings they had information available to them. We also had an instrument through Survey Monkey where we collected anonymous feedback and that feedback was then collected, there was no name associated with it, but it had their suggestions to those four questions. They were largely open-ended questions so people had the opportunity to talk about what was concerning to them and what they liked; they just had the room to provide the input that they felt was important for teaching along the way. We also asked – and this happened sort of organically anyway – the members of the Planning Team to have conversations with their colleagues around those subjects and find out what was going on. We wanted to get direct and indirect feedback of what those options might be, so that we would have a structure in the end that would be durable. It was mentioned earlier that there's a lot of reorganization fatigue among the faculty in those respective colleges and that was definitely recognized. As a part of this process, we thought it was really important to try to look at a way to make this so that it was hard to cleave or combine with anything in the future so once we got on the other side of this we could focus on the programs. After we collected all that information, then the recommended structure was as follows.

We looked at the size, relative to multiple things: 1) the number of faculty 2) the number of undergraduate and graduate students. There was no real way to make that perfectly fit, but they are somewhat reasonably similar in size even though you can see some that have more programs in it than others, the enrollment in some varies. So that was the recommendation for the structure and then the recommended name for the new unit was the College of Health and Human Services. That might have been one of the previous names, has anyone heard of it? <laughter>. That was a term we felt everybody was familiar with and if we used that term, people had an idea of the kind of units that might fall under that. This proposal was submitted to the president and the provost. We did do our recommendation that we gave to them. The opportunity for input then would go to the provost that has our recommendation and would receive your input; that would be used for the final decision on that. As well as a follow-up to share a little forecasting type of thing, some obvious things came up if that's approved: chairs need to be identified for the various schools and then the groups need to go on to the constitution and bylaws operation and things of that nature. The first step after that is identification of chairs and there's a university policy for that, and we intend to follow that policy, where essentially our process would be to poll the folks from the individual units and ask them if they are interested, or if they want to nominate

someone and I will follow up with all of those, and then forward a recommendation and ask for the input from faculty in that particular unit. And then that recommendation would go to the provost and normal procedures. Some of the planning and things relative to the individual units will be important I think, to have the chairs in place, so there's some leadership in terms of moving forward. I will glad to answer any questions about that.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I was curious, so you will have department chairs and then school chairs? And the second question is, are the schools going to have a title or are they simply school 1, 2, 3, and 4?

Dean Ingersoll: The school model that is involved here, they wouldn't be departments. Part of the reasoning for that is the nature of our programs; most of those have specialty accreditation and we need to try to find a way to give the necessary autonomy to the individual programs so they can do what is needed relative to that, and then the chair would be the chair of the school. The name of the school, we didn't put that into the proposal because we felt that it was important to identify the chair and then have that person lead the process for which then the faculty in that area could decide the appropriate name for the school.

Senator Thompson-Casado: So how does that affect faculty with regard to the tenure process?

Dean Ingersoll: One of the guiding principles in there was to hold people harmless in terms of the transition over to whatever the new elaborations might be for those individual programs.

Senator Thomson-Casado: Okay.

Senator Don White: I had the same first question so let me just follow up. I guess I am really curious, with this kind of a major restructure within a college, how will you hold the people "harmless"? You mentioned the special needs of the accreditations, so what administrative structure do you anticipate seeing for each of those individual programs? What do you envision for each program?

Dean Ingersoll: Well, the programs through their accreditation process all require that a program director be identified for that particular program. And the different accreditations, many of them have specific responsibilities relative to the program in terms of budget management, scheduling of the courses, and assignment of faculty. They have certain guidelines relative to having that experience and qualifications to do certain things, so the idea is that they would work collectively with chairs to make those assignments within the programs within the schools. So what we are trying to do, rather than trying to make all programs act the same way, give them the autonomy to make it easy for them to apply with the accreditation standards for that particular program.

Senator Molitor: So functionally, do you see the chair of a school as having different responsibilities than the chair of a department and if so, how are those responsibilities different?

Dean Ingersoll: Very similar. It will actually kind of reflect what happens anyway. So, I will give you an example of scheduling: oftentimes the programs have to do the scheduling because they have certain things and then the program directors roll it up to the chair and they put it together. So we identified the responsibility as pulling all those together rather than having to do that particular process themselves. There is some distribution of the funds to the program over which they will have discretion, not necessarily all being tied up at the top. So if you went through and took the job descriptions, oftentimes where it says the chair does this, it turns into that they oversee that, so the program directors can do it.

Senator Anderson-Huang: A related question then, what about department personnel committees? Being in a cohesive department like Physics and Astronomy the workloads for each person are roughly

the same, and it could be analyzed and given merit on that basis, whereas here it sounds like different programs will have different workloads and it would be difficult to make a comparisons?

Dean Ingersoll: I think the workload will be defined similarly across, I don't know if it would be any different. In regards to the promotion and tenure committee kind of set-up, the schools will function like departments in that regard. So there would be a committee of a school that would be like a departmental committee where a department has to have representation up to the university committees; it would functionally serve in that same role. I think the idea of identifying it as a school rather than a department, I get exactly what you are saying, traditionally the departments evolved along disciplinary lines and we have multiple disciplines in each one and so the expectation that everybody has exactly the same sort of thing is harder to follow in that regard, but it does present a challenge in terms of when you write that stuff, making it so it works for all the groups within that.

Senator Rouillard: I don't know what kinds of college requirements you currently have for Health Sciences, but how does this organization affect college curriculum for students? Do you anticipate that each school is going to have its own particular requirements or would they be an overarching college curriculum?

Dean Ingersoll: Well, that is one of the unique things. All those different programs have different needs regarding the curriculum in order to meet the accreditation standards for those individual programs. There will be very ability within the schools in order for them to meet it. In terms of having a common core type of thing that you might see in your traditional department, that is difficult to do now. I mean even if we call it a department and put the various programs in it, they can't necessarily do that.

Senator Rouillard: Do you have currently in HS any set of courses that are required for all of your students like writing or certain math courses?

Dean Ingersoll: No, that varies across the departmental program. I can't answer relative to the current College of Social Justice & Human Service; I am not exactly sure about that.

Senator Lee: I was just curious to distinguish what's new or different or the same. Do those 17 groups currently all have program directors now?

Dean Ingersoll: All, but a couple of them do.

Senator Lee: So your mention of them having program directors would be changed for most of them?

Dean Ingersoll: No. A couple of them we would be then identifying. That is part of the model; we would be identifying some program directors relative to that so they can fit within that. I think all but two or three, something along those lines.

Senator Lee: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Black: I was wondering if you were saving any money in terms of administrative cost because I thought that was the goal of the president.

Dean Ingersoll: Well, we will have one dean instead of two.

Senator Black: It seems like you have a lot of directors.

Dean Ingersoll: We already have those directors. Well, actually there are five departments across the two colleges now so we will have four units instead of five, and then we will have one dean instead of two. We were sensitive to the savings, but we have to deliver these programs.

Senator Thompson-Casado: One last question in regards to advising. As an advisor of LLSS, each department has their requirements and then the college has core requirements, so all of our students within the college can have a double major and not have any trouble with requirements. Are you saying that perhaps the college itself will not have one set of core requirements and if they were in school 1, they may have to do different requirements for school 4?

Dean Ingersoll: Well, the requirements are down at the program level in terms of what they do.

Senator Thompson-Casado: Right, we all have program-level requirements and then we also have college-level requirements; at least in LLSS we have core college-level requirements.

Dean Ingersoll: I don't think we have. We have the gen ed. like any other student. Mike, do you know if any of the other---

Senator Prior: I think it is all individual. It seems like it's built individually, so the impression that we got is that it's trying to maintain as much individuality as possible. We had a concern for example about [before we merged] they had a minimum GPA to get into college and so that kind of crunched some of our students. We were certainly reassured that those kinds of issues were going to be managed on an individual basis so that we can maintain the current integrity and current structure of what we've got going on.

Senator Molitor: If I can just add to this, not all colleges have college-wide core requirements. In particular Engineering, I think our only college-wide requirement is an orientation course other than the gen ed requirements. I think when you see colleges with lots of accredited programs it becomes really difficult to have college-wide requirements in order to meet all the accreditation requirements and to fit everything within a reasonable amount of credit hours.

Dean Ingersoll: I think it is important to point out too that many of the programs you see there are graduate programs.

Senator Dowd: Just a follow-up on Senator Thompson-Casado's point. Are degrees granted by the departments in your college and not by your college?

President Keith: No, I don't think it is the implication.

Dean Ingersoll: Degrees always go through the colleges.

Senator Dowd: Of course, I know that. But it seems that no vetting is taking place and there is no college-wide set of umbrella requirements for a degree from this college.

President Keith: I think the college requirements might just be the gen ed. and an orientation course, so they are the same as the gen ed. course.

Dean Ingersoll: And then the expectations in an individual program are defined by the individual program.

Senator Prior: It feels like to me that a lot of the structure is already in place like there's been a combining of a couple and a switching around of a couple, but in terms of elaboration agreements and relationships between programs and the schools, I think this is what we have been generally doing all along, so when we go back and rewrite stuff, a lot of it's already going to be in place.

Senator Molitor: I just want to follow-up on an issue that Senator Dowd raised. Just because a college doesn't have a college-wide curricular requirement doesn't mean that there isn't college-level approval or college-level vetting.

Senator Dowd: It was a comment rather than a question.

Senator Molitor: Okay.

Senator Dowd: Okay, it was a rhetorical question.

Senator Edwards: This idea of schools seems very similar to departments, and I really don't get the reason for naming them schools, particularly in light of the new schools that we do have and the last administration only has interdisciplinary schools in different areas. How are these schools different from those schools?

Dean Ingersoll: If it came to the end and they say we can't call them schools, we have to call them departments, that can happen. I think the idea was that the autonomy would be that subtle difference. And frankly, I would argue that these schools are interdisciplinary, every single one of them. That is how the faculty in those areas would describe that as being, interdisciplinary collection.

Senator Edwards: But I think the other schools were colleges.

Dean Ingersoll: Yes. It is interesting, not to bore all of you, but we looked at a lot of terminology. The department is the easiest one in terms of commonality across institutions. All the other terms are schools within departments or departments within schools. If it is a "school" then it's a professional school etc. I think the institution needs to decide how to operationally define it.

Senator Molitor: Do you have faculty that would be in programs that go across schools and if so, how would you determine which school they have a home in?

Dean Ingersoll: The programs are pretty encapsulated; the folks that belong to that program are hired in. Now, one of the things that we hope to do with this is to have more collaboration across programs and that is part of your inter-professional education. I am oversimplifying this, but we have many, many programs that need to understand..., but we don't have individual ones, we can work across the units to accomplish some of those types of things. So we hope to encourage working across schools and programs.

Senator Thompson-Casado: One last question. Have you looked at the CBA to see how these terms will affect faculty because I think a lot of the processes in the CBA use set terms and I am kind of confused with how this will affect faculty? With regard to departmental personnel and with regard to evaluation, merit, and all of this, who will be on these committees?

Dean Ingersoll: In that regard it would meet the criteria of the department, the school would. That is the fundamental unit within that. That is a fair question.

Senator Thompson-Casado: I find it very confusing.

Dean Ingersoll: It is a fair question. Part of it is we had to define what we thought made sense for the college, and it needs to be vetted as we move through the processes to cover all of our points.

President Keith: Are there any other questions? Thank you so much, Dean Ingersoll. Next, on the agenda is Dr. Connie Shriner, Vice Provost for Assessment and Faculty Development.

Dr. Connie Shriner, Vice Provost for Assessment and Faculty Development: Thank you, President Keith. Good afternoon. I gave the same presentation to the Academic Leadership Team, so I see some familiar faces. This presentation is going to be the same, but I did add a little bit more. As part of our preparation for the higher learning commission site visit in the spring, we conducted a review of our syllabi across colleges. The reason we did that is that we had every reason to believe that when the team is here in April that they are going to do something that they did not when they were here in 2012. It is going to be a random sample of programs and the syllabi that are used in those programs to serve as evidence for how the institution is awarding credit hours. I think you probably heard before that the Higher Learning Commission has really changed their approach, everything is very much evidence-driven. It used to be that we could write these 300 or 400 pages of narrative telling them everything that we were doing and just saying this is the way we are and this is our story and we are sticking to it. But now since they are being held more accountable by the federal government for oversight of institutions that they accredit, they really are seeking more evidence. So they will come to campus and they are asking for syllabi to serve as evidence of how we award our credit hours to students. It is really part of the federal compliance portion of their review. I begin with an excerpt from the actual worksheet that the team will have to complete and submit to the HLC. Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution, at least a few programs at each degree level. Well, what does that mean and how do we know?

We looked at a school that has about the same size population as we do and the team focused on 12 different programs. They had three PhD programs, three Master's programs, and the other six were all undergraduate programs. We don't know if it will be that same number, it could be fewer and it actually could be more. The team is also advised to sample across various formats to test for consistency. I think if you are in a department where you offer a total 100% online program and a face-to-face version, your chances of being selected in their random sample is going to be a little bit greater. I also think if you offer programs at alternate sites those programs may come under more scrutiny -if you have a program offered at an alternate site than a version here on campus. They are going to look for alternately structured or courses with high credit hours completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction. So summer sessions, they may want to review a summer session of a section of a course and compare it to one that is offered in a full semester. I know some programs also have other condensed courses that they do in a very short period of time. I believe that courses like that probably have a little bit higher chance of being selected if that program is one that they are going to review. They, HLC, are not going to go randomly across syllabi like we did. The HLC is going to come in and they first are going to select programs at each degree level and then they are going to drill down and look at syllabi in those programs. So if your program is selected it would probably need to provide syllabi for multiple courses. So what we did – because this was new – we did this in an effort to communicate with all of you about the process and what is going to happen and so we did a random sample of syllabi just to get people talking about a syllabus, what's in a syllabus, what should be in a syllabus, and how do ours look. We started with all the courses that were offered in fall 2014 as well as the spring. Then we requested 151 syllabi; I am not sure how we came up with that number. Then we went back to our sample and we made sure that we had all departments represented because we really wanted all of you, all departments to know that this was on the horizon and that this would be happening. We also added a few courses to our sample so we would have a blended course face-to-face versus an online course so we could look at what was happening in those situations. We put together a review team and they were basically those of us who were on the Steering Committee for the Higher Learning Commission. We also had Dave Cutri and some of his staff from the Compliance Office. We developed a standard rubric for syllabi based on best practices. And then we got together and we went through the rubric and a few samples so we would have

some inter-rater reliability so we were looking for similar things when we reviewed the sets that we were assigned.

The key things that I want to share with you today, we have data on all kinds of syllabus elements. But, I really want to focus in on ones that I think are going to be critical when the team looks at syllabi from the perspective of the rigor of the course, student engagement activities, and the credit hours that are being awarded. These are instructions to the HLC reviewers: The team should review syllabi and the intended learning outcomes and they should identify contact hours and expectations for homework or work outside instructional time. The second bullet, this comes from another part of their instructions: How frequently courses meet and what scheduled activities are required. So they are trying to get a sense of the time that the students put into a course to align that with our policy on credit. These are the results from looking at evidence in the syllabi that we met those: First of all, for 146 courses of our total, we had a 97% response rate and for five of our courses we were actually told that they did not have syllabi for those courses. For measurable student learning outcomes, because that was one of the points noted here, they are going to look at the learning outcomes so they need to be communicated to the team somehow. We had 96 or 66% of the syllabi that had learning outcomes that were articulated in terms of student behavior. We did not give syllabi credit if they used global statements about the course. We were looking for evidence for what will students be able to do as a result of completing this course. Then we felt that in order to get a sense of what students are doing and how often the courses are meeting and the kinds of activities, we looked for evidence of some kind of course schedule and that's the third point here- a schedule of activities or information on contact hours, descriptions, or expectations for homework, readings, problems, anything that would give a sense of what students were doing for the course. We had 61% of our syllabi that contained this information and 39% did not. I think the message here is that it's going to be very hard for the HLC team to determine that we are in compliance if they don't have the information in the syllabus that they are looking at. We did this early on and I know that there's been a lot of movement and a lot of attention pertaining to the syllabi across the institution and I am very, very grateful for that. But I think if we were to sample it again I think we would probably find numbers that were stronger, but we are not going to do that, the sampling will be in April when the team, HLC, is here. A few other things that we noted and I thought you would find them of interest: In 26% of the cases that we looked at, the content of the syllabus did not match the content that was published in the course catalog and online. We had discrepancies between the course description and we had discrepancies between the prerequisites and the co-requisites. Sometimes they were in the catalog, but not on the syllabus and sometimes they were on the syllabus, but not in the catalog. That just seems to suggest that a little housekeeping would be warranted. I don't know if this is related to the HLC, but I just thought it was an interesting result to share. The second bullet is related to federal compliance: 64% of our syllabi did not include the non-discrimination policy or the ADA statement and it is my understanding that a number of years ago there was a case that was brought here against the university and as part of our action items we were really going to increase awareness in getting this information out to students, and so maybe again just another look at that. If you could take the message back to your faculty to just make sure that that information is in there. There were... paragraphs that are on the Office of Disability Services, you can just copy and drop them right in. It is communicating to the students that if they need any kind of additional assistance or accommodations that we are willing to provide. Then a third point here, 40% of the syllabi, some element within the syllabus was missing. Sometimes there was no instructor's name and these were not templates syllabi, these were ones that were submitted by the instructor- contact information, office hours, class time and location, required materials for the course- they were just missing what might be basic information for students enrolling. Again, that's not an issue for the HLC, but it was something that we noticed as we were going through.

Senator Edwards: Hi. I know the ADA is on the Office of Disabilities website, but where is the non-discrimination policy?

Dr. Shriner: I am pretty sure the link is out there (on the website). [see Office of Excellence and Multicultural Student Success webpage]

Dr. Thea Sawicki: Connie's office filled in a template for the syllabus as a guideline and the wording is right in there.

Senator Barnes: It is on the Provost Office website.

Dr. Shriner: It's there as well, yes. I have a document and I will show you and it does have that link in there if you want to go to that and copy it.

Senator Molitor: Did you state what percentage of syllabi did use your template?

Dr. Shriner: We did have some, but we did this so early on, Senator Molitor. It was about the same time we were rolling out the template; that is when we decided to do this random sampling to see what we could find.

Senator Molitor: And was there a section on that template about the activities outside of class, do you remember?

Dr. Shriner: It was in the course schedule.

Senator Molitor: There was a section in the course schedule and so one recommendation that I might suggest is to specifically request this information because that is something that I generally don't think about with my syllabus.

Dr. Shriner: If you are listing assignments I think that you are listing what kind of activities are going to be done on-site like reading etc.

Senator Molitor: Right.

Dr. Shriner: Next, we didn't have a very large sample here, but we wanted to look at some of our courses that were offered in two formats and so we had seven sets of syllabi where we had a face-to-face section and we were able to compare that to an online and we had one that was blended. The question, we were trying to pretend to be HLC reviewers, are these courses equivalent? If a student enrolls in one version versus the other, is the experience and expectation rigor the same? In here the results are really pretty inconclusive. We found a lot of reasons why we couldn't make that comparison. In case (1.) there was no syllabus submitted for DL. In case (2.) there were no student learning outcomes, but they appeared to have similar assignments and work activities. In case (3.) the course actually had different names even though they were coded the same, such as the same number, they were not called the same. In case (4.) I bolded because that one seemed pretty solid. They had the same SLOs. They had similar activities, but different. The uniqueness from each instructor came through, but there seems to be very much a comfortable amount of work in those two modalities. And so I really believe that courses that are offered in both forms I would be very surprised if the team does not deliberately go after some of those for comparison. Here is what I was saying about resources: At the same time when we were doing the study, we put together a recommended template and the way we approached that is we looked at everything that was on the website. Faculty Senate, you have materials out there for undergraduate courses, and Grad Council had materials that were available for graduate courses and so on. So we put all that information together into one master resource for how to develop a syllabus and those materials, including the ADA

statement and the link for the policy are available in two places, the Provost website and then on the University Teaching Center website. On our website, this is the University Teaching Center, and you will see it, this is a difficult syllabus, develop resources. At the top we have resources for your typical course syllabus and then down below we have these special cases where you may not have a full-blown syllabus for a student who is taking an independent study or doing dissertation or Master's thesis research. But we did follow up with the HLC, what about these courses, do we need some kind of syllabi? And they said you don't have a full syllabus, but keep in mind the question. Is the work that you're asking students to do consistent with the credit hours that they are earning? So you need some kind of documentation that would support that there's an alignment there. These are the guidelines for a full syllabus and then this is the actual template that's there, notice the words that are required. We put those in to help differentiate between the things that the HLC will look for, but these are also things that are documents posted by Grad Council and by Faculty Senate, so we noted those as required. The other things were considered best practice so don't be overwhelmed by the amount of stuff that's in this document, focus on the things that are in red, and this goes on and there's the academic accommodations. There's the link to the policy, that top bullet. There is also a sample where all of this is filled in and it is available as a Word document, so if your faculty in any of your departments would like to use that Word document they can do that as well.

Senator Edwards: Is there not a separate non-discrimination policy per se for anything other than disabilities?

Dr. Shriner: I think that is the only one. That is the only one I am aware of.

Senator Edwards: Well, you can't discriminate against race, gender, and sex.

Dr. Shriner: Well, I think as far as I know that's the only one out there.

Senator Edwards: Okay.

Senator Lundquist: Does that syllabus include a schedule?

Dr. Shriner: There is a sample schedule. I am sorry that I don't have all the links, but one of them does have a mock of a model of what a schedule could look like. Maybe I am not understanding the question.

Senator Lundquist: I am unsure what needs to go in the schedule; is it like a day-to-day: this day we are going to do this and this day we are going to do that or is it simply like, four papers are due and they are due on these dates?

Dr. Shriner: I don't think it needs to be as detailed as your first one, day-to-day, but the way I interpret what the Higher Learning Commission would look for, what are the students expected to do? So readings, assignments, if you are going to have in-class activities that they need to prepare for, some mention of what those are. I think to just say "four papers are required for the course" would not be enough. It's what's happening in that hour that you are spending three days a week, so somewhere in the middle. I think there's a sample out there. Anyone who has prepared a document for the state of Ohio to review for the transfer module, that is a full-fledged schedule of activity, what are students doing every day, what objectives are you addressing, and how are you going to measure it? I am not sure if HLC will look at that.

Senator Lundquist: But will they look to see one, two, or five SLOs being addressed on a particular day?

Dr. Shriner: I never reviewed for them. Senator Edwards, do you have a sense of that?

Senator Edwards: No, they won't look in that detail, but they will look through students' learning outcomes. Another thing with the course schedule, when I chair HLC teams, we looked at the course schedule, not individual syllabi. We were looking for when does this course become..., where are the off-campus locations, and what's in the course schedules, not individual syllabi.

Senator Anderson-Huang: Since now there are all these other requirements for Title IX and ALICE and all these things, how much of that should be in the syllabus?

Dr. Shriner: As I read what they are looking for, that doesn't seem to be relevant to those standards. I think those are given to us from other sources, but it is not a credit hour. I am thinking about your question about a full schedule. I think so much work that we have done with the state of Ohio where they are looking for that level of detail and it's probably why we went down that path.

Senator Denyer: I am not sure if this is a question for Connie or Thea or Faculty Senate. But, this morning the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee met and we were reviewing proposals. We had a set of new course proposals and one of the questions that we talked at length about was in terms of looking at these new course proposals and they weren't coming through in the form of the HLC format/template, so we started wondering, what's our responsibility here? Is this something that every new course proposal that we get, should we be saying it has to be in the midst of the format? Part of it was that noted there was variability across colleges in terms of how colleges were taking that on. Some colleges are requiring new course proposals and all of that and others aren't, and so our question was, what's our responsibility?

Dr. Shriner: I would think that the more avenues that we use to communicate with faculty and make the contents of the syllabus a priority, the better it will be because I've even found inconsistencies between what Grad Council wanted in the syllabus compared to what Faculty Senate was looking for in undergraduate. I think, in my opinion, I think some kind of consistency would be optimal and if it would align with things that external viewers are going to look for. I think that would be a very nice thing. Because then we are always thinking about it and we are not going back now and saying, oh, what are they going to find. Half of our syllabi didn't have student learning outcomes, so we are kind of being proactive and making sure it is on the front end.

Senator Molitor: On your survey when you look at the seven courses with online and face-to-face sections, were the different sections taught by different faculty?

Dr. Shriner: Yes, they were.

Senator Molitor: Did you look at courses that were taught as all face-to-face sections with different faculty teaching different sections and did you find a similar result? I am guessing that is the issue. I don't think it's the mode that courses are delivered in that changes the syllabi; I am guessing it is the variability across instructors.

Dr. Shriner: I am not sure that we looked at similar ones, but I am really aware of the time here. So, very quickly and then I want to address Scott's question. The template that is out there for independent study for thesis and dissertation, it is very short, such as, what are the students going to do in this quarter and what are your expectations for them? It kind of covers our bases that we thought about what they are doing, and it is some contract with them. The second thing we looked at, we had got a CV as well as the syllabus and this is another HLC criteria and then I am going back to Scott's, I promise. Our faculty appropriately credentials and here we did very, very well- 95% of CVs are reflecting the appropriate level of education for faculty and then all the other cases, it was clear that these faculty were in the process of completing a doctorate or Master's degree and we also have situations where the department can defend

Masters' level prepared faculty teaching a PhD level or a Bachelor's or Master's, depending on the specialty and their experience. So we thought we were in very good shape on the credentials of faculty. Regarding the DL thing, I think sometimes with distance learning courses the information is posted on Blackboard, but it is not in the syllabus. I think that is probably a very plausible reason why we had such incomplete sets of data. So what we are going to do on the steering committee when we get information from the team and we know what courses they are going to look for, we are going to include a little cover letter and the point will be, keep in mind what they are looking for. If you are teaching a DL course and you've got some material in the syllabus and some on the website, send it all. Give them the information that they are going to need to make their decisions. If you are teaching something that is a 4000 or 5000 level or 5000 and 7000, if there's supplemental material that students get that shows that there is a distinction between those two levels, please feel free to send that in with whatever documents the team will request, just so if we know what they are looking for, we can get them the evidence that they need to answer their questions.

Senator Don White: Related to that particular issue. I had understood the situation exactly wrong as I asked the same question of the HLC; for 4000 and 5000 level I knew that they had to be different but for 5000 and 7000, and for 6000 and 8000 I did not know they had to be different. Do the SLOs have to be different, or just some homework problem or something in between?

Dr. Shriner: Depending on the content area I think they can be similar for SLSOs, but I think the expectation, once students completed or what they did...I don't think that is going to be their major focus and I could be totally wrong, but I don't think so.

Dr. Thea Sawicki: Senator Edwards, what do you think?

Senator Edwards: Well, on the 5000 and 7000 and 6000 and 8000, the major difference there is, is what's required as a higher level of analytical and critical thinking at the doctorate level than you do at the Master's level, but there's very much overlapping in the syllabus. But again, the level of work expected is at an analytical level, a much deeper level, so the analysis is more theory-based than at the Master's level. That is how we normally handle that.

Dr. Shriner: It all comes down to the awarded credit hours. The funding is different and this is their way to assure that what students are getting with experiences is somehow qualitatively different.

Senator Edwards: I don't know about the training on Blackboard for courses, but you should have in there that they have a syllabus on the Blackboard site. I don't know if they do that or not, but they should.

Dr. Shriner: We will be sure to be present to be able to answer questions when it's actually time to produce those documents. I am always available if you or any faculty in your departments have questions.

President Keith: Thank you so much.

Vice Provost, Thea Sawicki: I won't keep you very long. Thank you very much for the opportunity to come and speak to you today about our status for the Higher Learning Commission assurance argument. What I wanted to tell you is we have five teams working on each of the criteria since April 2014. They turned in a number of drafts that were reviewed by the steering committee and the team leaders. Our working draft is going up today, so it is either going to be up tonight or tomorrow and that is why my timing to come and speak to you is appropriate today. These are definitely working drafts, so if you click on criterion 1.- it gives you the wording for each of the criteria. There are four components which are a, b, c, and d and subcomponents which are 1a and then 1, 2, 3, and 4. The team has been working to write and provide evidence to support the argument that we are meeting each of those subcomponents, the smallest

unit and that will allow us as being reviewed as having met the component and if we meet all the core components, then we have met the criteria. The team members are on the side, the right of each of these; please take a look, these are the members that have members working hard on our behalf for all of us. I want you to please encourage your colleagues to go in and take a look at the working draft. We are asking the faculty, staff, and students to give us any other information or evidence that is not in the drafts that you know about and think would be very good supporting evidence of how well we're meeting these various components. I appreciate your effort. The draft will be up for at least three weeks and then we will gather the comments and take a look about strengthening our drafts.

What will happen at that time is the wording; the actual text of each of these criteria will go on an online site of the Higher Learning Commission. The evidence in the draft now is indicated by blue font with an underline so you can see what it will be. In the drafts that are posted here, the links are not active, so you will see a word underlined or a phrase underlined in blue and that is telling you we have a piece of evidence, it could be a Faculty Senate set of Minutes that where you voted to approve the mission statement back in 2006. We will be putting the text into boxes on this online site and there's a separate site where we will upload PDF versions of every single piece of evidence and then Heather Huntley and Marcia King-Blandford will be linking and testing those links. We will be working on that in January and February. The lock down date on our assurance argument for the Higher Commission site is March 10th, so everything has to be perfect and ready to go by March 10th. The team comes one month later and they will be here April 11th and 12th. Notice that we have about six or seven people coming; it is a much smaller team than the dozen we had in 2012. They are not here for 2 to 2 ½ days, they are here for 1 to 1 ½ days. It is a very focused visit. This is called a mid-cycle, even though this is week four of 10. We are fully accredited till 2022, technically, which is 10 years from 2012. We are on a pathway; this is a new mechanism that all of the institutions, about 1100 under the Higher Learning Commission, they have entered pathways. So we are on a standard pathway, so that means they come back in year four, so we have another chance to show them how well we're doing and then they will come and return in year 10. What's nice about this, this is like having a quiz before your actual exam. I think with Mary Ellen's help and looking at our drafts, and David who is one of the co-chairs and is also one of the peer evaluators, we have really good help from the point of great advice and how to do an argument. Please help us, go in and read. Also, Happy Thanksgiving and thanks for being here on a holiday week. Are there any questions? Thank you.

President Keith: Before the meeting started, I was told that there was going to be one item from the floor.

Senator Krantz: A junior faculty in my department asked me to bring to the attention of the Faculty Senate, there is a proposed policy regarding financial aid. The important point is in the wording; if the faculty member on behalf of their child "accepts the tuition and fee waiver" they may only apply for merit scholarships from donor funded sources which implies outside of the institution. I did some background checking on this today and got some real figures, the tuition waiver, plus the fee is approximately \$4,600 and the total cost to the student is more than twice that. So depending upon how institutional fees or waivers are defined, there are a whole series of things, "\$1,000 here and \$850 there etc." The comment period goes till December 18th, we have another Faculty Senate meeting between now and then. So I am just warning you of this and hopefully, possibly bringing this up at our next meeting.

President Keith: The president has been talking about this for a while- the issue about stacking tuition and fee waivers for UT employees. She was particularly talking about that we used to basically attract students to price discriminate. Her idea was if you're getting the tuition and fee waiver or whatever that is, then they don't want to add on top of that other university scholarships. The money that is outside of

the university, money that comes out of donor money would be exempt. It is certainly worth discussing and if you would like to do that at the next meeting we certainly can do that.

Senator Molitor: Just a follow-up on that. The concern that we got from her that there were children of employees with the combination of the tuition waiver and merit-based scholarships from the university were actually getting reimbursed above---

Senator Krantz: I looked that up; I heard that argument as well and there is an existing policy which says this is the maximum that any student can receive. It is very clearly defined and basically from my point of view, this policy is segregating the children of employees as different from the entire rest of the student body.

President Keith: She has assured us that students who are currently here would be grandfathered in.

Senator Krantz: There is actually a clause in there about that- if they miss two semesters then they are un-grandfathered.

President Keith: Okay. I have not read the policy.

Senator Krantz: What savings would be gained from this policy? I am guessing it is in the order of \$100,000 to \$200,000.

President Keith: Is there any other comment? Are there any other items from the floor? May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 6: 05 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary