

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 3, 2015
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved at F.S. meeting on 3/03/2015

Summary of Senate Business

Dave Cutri, Director of Internal Audit- Cont'd Note Taking Discussion
Toni Howard, Interim Director of Disability Studies- Cont'd Note Taking Discussion
Kelly Moore, Vice Provost- Cont'd Note Taking Discussion

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 Hoblet: I call this meeting to order. Welcome to the eighth Faculty Senate meeting of AY 2014-2015. **Lucy Duhon**, Executive Secretary, called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2014-2015 Senators:

Present: Bailey, Barnes, Black, Brakel, Burnett, Cappelletty, Compora, Denyer (M Templin), Devabhaktuni, Dowd, Duggan, Duhon, Edinger, Edwards, Federman, Franchetti, Gohara, Gunning, Harmych, Hasaan-Elnaby, Hoblet, Humphrys, Keith, Kennedy, Krantz, Lee, Malhotra, Mc Affee, Molitor, Monsos, Nathan, Ohlinger, Plenefisch, Quinlan, Quinn, Relue, Rouillard, Slantcheva-Durst, Teclhaimanot, G. Thompson, Thompson-Casado Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Den White, Williams

Excused absences: Boardley, Brickman, Caruso, Elmer, Giovannucci, Gray, Kistner, Lundquist, Nigem, Porter, Sheldon, Springman, A. Thompson, Wedding, Don White

Unexcused absences: Crist, Farrell, Hammersley, Prior, Schafer, Skeel, Srinivasan

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes are not ready for approval.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Senator Duhon. One of the things that I was reminded about at the last Fall Faculty Senate meeting was to honor one of our senators who passed away during the semester from the College of Business and Innovation. I would like to hold a moment of silence for Udayan Nandkeolyar, and for all of those who are family and friends of ours that have passed away; we just need to reflect on their presence, what they did in our lives, and how they served. Please take a moment of silence at this time in honoring Udayan Nandkeolyar.

[Moment of Silence]

Thank you.

The Faculty Senate Executive Report: I want to welcome all senators and guests. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee continues to work hard attending a variety of University meetings to remain informed on issues that are relevant to our community.

We have attended all BOT committee meetings which include: Clinical Affairs, Finance and Audit, Trusteeship and Governance, and Academic and Student Affairs.

We have been active participants on Higher Learning Commission Criterion Teams, University Council, and the Presidential Search Committee.

We continue to strategize two times each month prior to Faculty Senate meetings to assure that the follow-up on issues that have been introduced are reported to the full Senate.

We continue to meet with Interim Provost Barrett to discuss issues that occur and he can also gain insight and obtain feedback on issues that he learns about through his office.

We have expressed a desire for Interim Provost Barrett to come at least once a month to Faculty Senate to share a progress report of sorts regarding items he has been working on.

The Faculty Senate committees are up and running. Sharon Barnes, Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum has a report she will present later today.

Mary Humphrys continues to attend the Ohio Faculty Council and will provide periodic reports from the state perspective.

Jason Toth, Assistant VP of Construction and Facilities provided a report that they will be sending out an RFP to engineering and architecture firms to conduct comprehensive facilities and parking assessment at UT. The make-up of this group is John Barrett, Dave Morlock, and other facilities and construction personnel. Feedback from the University Council was this that group did not represent the stakeholders of the university well.

We continue to have issues with faculty not using the curriculum tracking system (CTS) that has been in place at UT. We appreciate that this is an archaic system that needs to be replaced, but it is the process that is in place currently and must be used so curriculum can be tracked. I have asked Vice Provost Traband to send out an email to deans and associate deans in colleges reminding them to use the CTS and the actual process for accessing and utilizing the system. So we will continue to ask for reports on Parking issues, the implementation of the Hiring Plan, Honors College admissions standards, courses, and experiential learning for course credit, online education through Vice President Cruickshank's area, Bill McCreary and gamification, ongoing library issues, and other issues that arise. I will ask the chairperson of the Core Curriculum Committee and Vice Provost Traband to come to the next Faculty Senate meeting to provide an update on where UT is now at with General Education and the Ohio Transfer Module.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been invited to a half-day leadership meeting this Thursday in Libbey Hall. Outcomes will be reported at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

I am sure I am missing some of the work that FSEC has completed, but hopefully I will be able to cover it at the next meeting. Thank you very much.

Managing reports for the Faculty Senate meeting: We have the Secretary of the Graduate Student Association here, Alcy Barakat, and she is going to talk to us today about the 6th annual Midwest Graduate Research Symposium; I welcome Alcy to the podium.

Alcy Barakat: Hello everyone. My name is Alcy Barakat and I am a graduate student here at The University of Toledo pursuing my Masters' degree in Public Health. I am also the Health Science Secretary for the Graduate Student Association. I am here tonight to speak to you on their behalf; I want to tell you about our largest event that we host every year, the 6th annual Midwest Graduate Research Symposium. This year it will take place on March 21, 2015 on our Main Campus. This is our biggest event because we've invited over 70 universities to participate, and it is the largest of its kind because it is multi-disciplinary, so it takes a lot of work in preparing and putting on. I wanted to tell you a little bit

about it because I came with a two-part ask with it. We are hoping to spread the word to graduate students within your department that may be currently doing research, or in the process of or have completed it; it's a great chance for them to showcase their work. It is somewhat home-based, local and it is free to them. It is a day-long event of oral and poster presentations that will be judged and a lot of awards will be awarded that day. We have a keynote speaker, someone from UTMC, Dr. Reece, who will be giving a talk on what it means to be human, he's given it before and it was well received on campus. As a perk to the participants who spend the day with us, there are free meals and lots of great accommodations for the day. We want to encourage you if you have grad students within your department or in your classes that you encourage them to sign up. I'm leaving behind 4 page-size fliers that have the website which you can register. Registration is free and it is open for another month or so, so we want to encourage them to do so.

Senator Dowd: Do you want to speak on the need for judges?

Alcy Barakat: Yes, that is what I am getting to right now. In particular I am the coordinator for judges and we are looking university faculty or postdocs to judge the oral poster presentations. Your time commitment will be a couple of hours that day. If you visit the website that is on this flier you'll find the timeslots for which you can sign up and if you are not available to sign up we encourage you to pass the flier around to someone else in your department or postdoc that might be looking for this kind of experience. If you have any questions that I can field right now I would be happy to that, if not, I attached my email to the back of this flier so you can personally email me and I can answer your questions. Thank you for your time.

Senator Barnes: Alcy, are you looking for judges in specific disciplines?

Alcy Barakat: We are looking for judges in every discipline; we do have a heavy need for science-based, but we are also strapped every year for folks from the Social Sciences.

Senator Williams: More of a comment rather than a question. Since I've been involved with this practically since the beginning- to those of you who volunteer for judging in any capacity, we want to thank you and please show up. We have had issues with that in the past where people have just not shown up, particularly for early poster or oral presentations. It is very hard for them to then scramble around and find judges that can judge those particular presentations.

Alcy Barakat: It is not an ALL day commitment, you can just sign up for a small timeslot and like we said, your help is very greatly appreciated; we can't put on the day without faculty judges. Thank you.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Alcy. It is my pleasure to introduce David Cutri, Director of Internal Audit and Toni Howard, Director of Disability Services, and Kelly Moore who will be joining us when he is able. He's gotten tied up in a couple of meetings and let me know that he's going to be running late. Dave has sort of spearheaded the presentation on the follow-up about note-taking efforts and how we resolve those at The University of Toledo. Mr. Cutri and Mrs. Howard, welcome.

Mr. Cutri: Thank you, President Hoblet for the opportunity to present in front of you; this is my first time in front of this group. Again, my name is Dave Cutri; I know many of you, but not all of you. As President Hoblet mentioned, I am Director of Internal Audit, Chief Compliance Officer for the university. One of the areas under our responsibility is the Student Disability Services Office led by Toni Howard.

In case you don't know who she is, Toni, can you raise your hand? Okay, great. Again, I welcome this opportunity to update you on some important initiatives that are underway to improve the learning environment for a significant part of our student population, those students with various forms of disabilities. I wanted to make you aware of three initiatives where I have experienced a great level of collaboration between various people in the university in the form of an ADA taskforce, I think that is a title that's been cast upon us. But really, we are a working group of leaders that have been tasked to address some issues that have come about roughly at the same time and it is my goal to update you on the progress of those initiatives. Those being the development of the note-taking protocol for our students with disabilities, the revision of the student advocacy memo, and for those of you who don't know, anytime a student with a disability is registered in your class, a memo called SAM is generated, which indicates the Americans with Disability Act of Accommodations he/she is eligible for. Then we also incorporate feedback and guidance on technology accessibility. In other words, how do we make our software and how do we make our websites ADA accessible? The taskforce consist of primarily myself, President Hoblet, Vice Provost Moore and we called in other people as needed including Toni Howard and members of the faculty. There were very good exchanges and I think it resulted in some good end products. At the end I am going to talk very briefly about a standing group we have called the ADA Compliance Committee, and I'll show you all the members, which shows the breadth of how we tackle ADA at the university. It includes representation from the faculty and the student body. I will discuss that very briefly at the end. Feel free to chime in with questions during or at the end of my presentation.

I've summarized the series of steps that we want to take as a university to make sure that all students with disabilities that require note-taking assistance can get it. Invariably during the course of a semester we have a mismatch between students that have a need for note-takers and the availability of note-takers, and so we've streamlined our process a little bit. At the end of the presentation Toni is going to hand out, the detailed note-taking protocol-- but these are the finer points. We've found that typically it is good to have another person, whether it is a fellow student or a volunteer, be designated to provide note-taking services. Historically, the task of identifying and matching note-takers with students has fallen on Student Disability Services. Again, I believe they do a very good job and we want that to continue. But we've also implemented a structure that, as we call them "ADA liaisons," -- which is basically designees from each college -- that can help us in the recruitment and the deployment of note-takers; it can be in the form of graduate students or other students that have skills in this area that can help out. If you will, there is an extension of Student Disability Services that is housed in each college. And of course, faculty are always encouraged and welcomed to indicate in your classes that there is a need for students to volunteer as note-takers in their classes. That is a bit of a fallback position. It is our hope that between the work of Student Disability Services and the ADA liaisons we will be able to get 100% coverage. We've found that volunteer note-takers are the best way to go. But we also have technology that can help us out in a form of Smart Pens. Toni can better describe what a Smart Pen is, but I would characterize a Smart Pen as a visual tape-recorder. It basically can translate the written text into a format that is usable and readable by a student with a disability. They are really neat devices and they're fairly inexpensive. Many universities are using Smart Pens more frequently as part as their toolkit, so we hope to deploy them even more aggressively than what we are today. But there are options, and I would say out of the first four options, that would address about 95% of the note-taking need. But we can also go back to notes from the same course from prior terms and Student Disability Services houses that in the software that they maintain. There are also some drawbacks to that because every course is different even from the same faculty from

semester to semester, but we do have that capability if we do need to fall back to it. We can also, if we need to, pay note-takers to serve. We have had good experience from volunteers in the past, so paying note-takers would not be our first choice. We ...like to use work study students, we are trying to explore our options. Even to go so far as to engage a third party firm, if that happens to be in great demand for note-taking services. Engaging a third party firm that can transcribe notes and turn them around within 24 hours. We've identified firms that can do that at a fairly reasonable price, but given the resource constraints that are placed at universities, that is a bit down in the priority queue. If all the seven options would fail, which is highly unlikely, we will seek other efficient methods of accommodation and Toni's group would lead that. But frankly as I say, the first four options address 95% of the note-taking need that we have. So we've outlined a more detailed protocol and I think it covers three or four pages and Toni will leave a stack of note-taking protocol documents for you to look at at your leisure.

All right, I mentioned earlier on the ADA liaisons, these are representatives from each college and in most cases they are associate deans, not all of them are, but they are representatives that have been nominated by their respective dean to be on the frontlines in assisting students disability services and addressing college-wide ADA issues. If the issues are localized to a particular faculty member, of course Student Disability Services will always work with that faculty member individually, but if there are college-specific issues, they will work directly with these liaisons and they are all listed here. I won't take your valuable time calling them all out, but I do appreciate them much for their service. The other area that we are waiting on is an ADA liaison to be nominated through the College of Medicine. We reached out to Dr. Cooper and I fully understand that he's tied up with some other matter now, but we will get 100% representation here very soon. Thank you to the ADA liaisons that are here; I look forward to working with you and thank you for your service.

Moving on, the second item that the ADA taskforce worked on is the revision of our student advocacy memo. Again, this is the memo that goes out to all faculty members that have students with disabilities registered in their course. The student is interviewed by one of Toni Howard's staff and is determined and verified that they have a disability and what it would take to accommodate them. And that language/information is communicated through the advocacy memo. We had perceived some feedback recently that the memo wasn't structured properly and it did not set the proper tone. With collaboration from President Hoblet and her colleagues, Toni, and others, we re-worked the memo to demonstrate the level of collaboration and commitment we all have in the university to making the learning environment for all students better and it is in that spirit that the advocacy memo is being produced and communicated. There used to be some language that referred to a contract which probably sounds a little more intimidating than what it was intended to be, so we eliminated that language as well. I think everybody understands that we need to comply with the law and nobody is against that, I hope, but certainly this is meant to be more of a communication tool for how to deliver the best learning environment for the students. That memo was updated before the Spring term. I do appreciate President Hoblet's and Vice Provost Moore's very constructive feedback on how to make that memo better. The last piece of work---

Senator Cappelletty: With regard to that memo, I know we had some situations come up where we don't get a memo until halfway through the semester and/or we get a memo changing the terms halfway through the semester, can you talk about timeline with any of that?

Mr. Cutri: Mrs. Howard, you can probably answer that question better than I could in regard to timeline.

Mrs. Howard: I would be happy to. A student can be found eligible for accommodations at any point during a semester. Students continuously submit documentation to us from their healthcare provider and medical providers. In fact, I think we just reviewed 14 files last week, so they are still coming fast and furious. Once we receive documentation, we review it, meet with the student, determine if the student has an ADA-qualifying condition and if so, what accommodations; the student will receive. That can happen at any point so you may get an advocacy memo at any point during a semester.

President Hoblet: A follow-up question to what I think Senator Cappelletty was getting to is, what are the requirements of the faculty in compliance with ADA; is it from the time that they receive notification, right?

Mrs. Howard: Right.

President Hoblet: So, if we receive an accommodation notification at the beginning, we accommodate what is written, and if that changes mid-semester from that point on we comply with the accommodations listed then.

Mrs. Howard: Exactly.

President Hoblet: It is not required of faculty to retrospectively accommodate.

Mrs. Howard: Right. You may receive a revised memo for a student at any point in a semester. A student can have one disability and then submit documentation and come in with a second disability that might make them eligible for additional accommodation; however, we don't retrofit the accommodation and say "go back to the beginning of the semester." So this student will have separate accommodations for things that's already happened- the student's "new" accommodation does not go back to the beginning of the semester- that train left the station. Accommodations take effect from the point you get the memo forward.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Mrs. Howard.

Mr. Cutri: Just to add to that, the advocacy memos are actually software-driven. The disabilities are entered into the software and the memos are produced automatically. So as soon as we are aware of an accommodation, it gets entered into the system and then a memo is produced. So, if there are interim situations like Mrs. Howard described, it's because we are notified midterm of those terms.

Senator Humphrys: Keeping all of that in mind, is it correct in assuming that every class we teach really has to be prepared in advance for a possible student issue that would require special consideration?

Mr. Cutri: This came up when we developed a graph to our technology accessibility policy. Ideally, courses will be designed up front with any perceivable disabilities in mind, but that is not always realistic, we realize that. But certainly, if it's known or perceivable that a student with a disability will be enrolled in your class, any measures will be taken to make that course content accessible. It can be as simple as making Word files or pdf. files accessible and there's instructions and guidance on how to do that online and various resources. It can get more complex, for example, making videos accessible. But to what I think you're asking, what's more important is, if you know a student is in your class, that is obviously a priority there making those courses accessible. As a Chief Compliance Officer for the university I would never say, don't not be compliant, but there are some realities there. I taught my first course in many, many years last semester and I had students with disabilities in my class, so I had to make sure my course was accessible. Quite frankly, if I did not have students with disabilities, then that probably would not be my first priority. Hopefully, that answered your question.

Senator Barnes: I know there are good reasons that you can't disclose the nature of a student's disability, but I wondered if, since the memo is software-generated, there might be a way to cue us in to a general pedagogic methodology that would be good for the student? I think we are all interested in students' learning, but really you go by touch and by sense in terms of what happens in a room. I think sometimes if you can give us a little more information about, maybe not the nature of the student's disability as I understand it is privileged information, but resources that we can look at to help us understand how to communicate or work effectively with the student, it would be really useful.

Mr. Cutri: That is a good point. We can certainly do that. Mrs. Howard, you typically see the same students semester after semester and perhaps there are special situations that you are aware of that can help Senator Barnes² pedagogically so you can give those faculty members a "heads up."

Mrs. Howard: We are working on an upgraded faculty handbook that would have more of that kind of information in it. I know Dr. David Krantz has given us some great information on note-taking. If anybody has anything that they think would be important to be included in that, feel free to email me, we will be working on that over the Summer.

Senator Barnes: I have often wondered if someone needs time-and-a-half on a test, what are the ways that they are learning in the classroom, because it is not always about time necessarily, so what is it about so we can help them learn?

Mrs. Howard: And those are great questions. Information about working with students with various disabilities is something we would be happy to include in a faculty handbook.

Senator Barnes: The teaching CTL, maybe you can do some faculty development on it.

Mrs. Howard: And there are lots of great materials on Universal Design in education that would really be great for everybody, including students with disabilities, that we can talk about.

Senator Dowd: Mr. Cutri, if you can just clarify an issue that comes up every time we talk about this particular issue? Who is ultimately responsible for making course material compliant? Is it The University of Toledo or is it the individual faculty member?

Mr. Cutri: Well, I am not a lawyer, but I think if the university were to be called out I think there's a shared responsibility. If a student would complain to the Office of Civil Rights and the Department of Education, which has happened in the past, they would call out the university and the university would conduct its due diligence and determine where the breakdown may have occurred. There is shared responsibility on all fronts, but certainly, I would say if a faculty member had been asked to provide accommodation there is some responsibility there, but---

Senator Dowd: No, that is what I am getting at.

Mr. Cutri: Okay.

Senator Dowd: The faculty is being asked to provide accommodation and if it's time-and-a-half, I don't see a problem.

Mr. Cutri: Right.

Senator Dowd: But if it involves anything, for instance, you mentioned making videos compliant, how many faculty have the equipment to make a video compliant? If it is something reasonable that a faculty member could do that would not involve additional resources, then maybe that is the extent of any shared responsibility that you spoke of. My own opinion is, The University of Toledo is responsible to provide

the resources to the faculty to make the magic work, so beyond your taskforce, has this issue of resources been addressed with Mr. Dave Morlock, with the provost, so that faculty can be given the resources to make this happen?

Mr. Cutri: That is a good point. Thank you for clarifying that. The answer to that is that's an ongoing process, but I think we are working towards that. You mentioned making videos accessible, you are right, that's a very time-consuming undertaking. We've recently arranged for those videos that can't be made accessible either by the faculty or by our own internal resources. We purchased a block of time for those cases when we don't have the internal bandwidth to get that done. So we are working to direct resources, whether it's through third-party assistance or temp agencies to get that done. As a Chief Compliance Officer, we are striving to make sure money doesn't stand in the way of complying with the law and especially providing students with their accommodations. Now, there's always a cross benefit tradeoff, but I can tell you in the disabilities area, we are working (as I mentioned in the previous slide) to source third-party note-takers if we need them to provide resources for captioning videos, we've already done that. So I am sure there will be more areas of accommodation where we will secure third-party resources, even outside the student realm. We want to make sure that money doesn't stand in the way. One of the good things about having responsibility for compliance in general is, I have a direct reporting line with the CFO, so when I can justify the need and the legal exposure, I can go to my boss and request a budget amendment, and probably more easily than many others in the university.

Past-President Rouillard: Mr. Cutri, you mentioned third-party companies, plural, are there other companies besides Flashnotes that you have been contacting?

Mr. Cutri: Well actually, the firm that I was referring to for note-taking for captioning is 3Play Media. Is there another firm, Mrs. Howard? I know we talked to other firms but I think we specifically contracted with 3Play Media.

Mrs. Howard: Right. We contracted with 3Play and we talked to places like Evernote and some other places that do note-taking, where you would put a microphone in a classroom and they would remotely listen and take notes. We are hoping we don't have to go to that; we are hoping that the note-taking protocol we discussed today will address our current and future needs in this area.

Past-President Rouillard: Are you still involved with Flashnotes then?

Mr. Cutri: They have reached out to us, but we have no plans to expand the relationship with Flashnotes; basically, things will have to really "fall down" before we need to deploy Flashnotes' capabilities. Those eight options that I had up there will have to completely fail, which is basically slim to none. To answer your question, you never want to take options off the table, but it is certainly not my plan to reengage them.

Senator Molitor: I am really happy in hearing you come and say two things. Number one, it is the university's responsibility in addressing Senator Dowd's question. And also in the previous question regarding the retroactive nature of the responsibility because I come here to this body with cases regarding both of those situations. I have a colleague who had a student receive the memo literally after the course ended and the grade was posted and was forced to go back and essentially redeliver the assignments to that student in the Summer after the course had ended. That is what he was told was his responsibility. I recently had a colleague with students who were visually and hearing impaired and was told, no, it is your responsibility to modify your course materials to accommodate that student. And so going forward, my request to you, and again, I am very happy to hear you clarify this, you need to make sure in your memos to the faculty that they understand that these resources are available to them, and that moving forward into the non-retroactive nature of these things because that communication, at least in the past, has not been given to my colleagues.

Mr. Cutri: Senator Molitor, if I may ask, are these recent examples?

Senator Molitor: One was this past Fall and the other one I believe was about a-year-and-a-half ago.

Mrs. Howard: We don't send out memos after the semester so I don't know what happened in that situation. If you could have that faculty member call me I would be happy to work with them.

Senator Molitor: I believe he already has been in contact with you, but I will have him contact you if needed.

Mrs. Howard: Well, memos are sent to UTAD emails and we have occasionally had some issues where someone doesn't use their UTAD email, they use a Gmail account or something else. I would like to encourage everyone to check their UTAD account. Accommodations are not usually retroactive. There are maybe cases, and I can think of one where a student will file a case with the Office of Civil Rights and Legal will come and talk to us about what needs to happen, but that falls outside of my particular realm. When this happens, we work with Legal and faculty to resolve the situation.

Senator Molitor: Thank you.

Senator Dowd: You hit on an issue that affects a number of faculty members regarding sending the issue through UT email. Given how important these issues are, what other methods of communication could be employed? Email is easy, it is also cheap and it is free; but given the stakes involved here, why not another letter? Why not send a note to the department chair that these are the individuals within your alpha code that have compliant accommodations, some sort of a back-up?

Mrs. Howard: We do ask the students to print out their accommodation memo and give it to their faculty- I know they don't always do that.

Mr. Cutri: In addition, Mrs. Howard, that is one of the roles of the ADA liaisons so that they will become aware of all accommodations issues within their college.

Mrs. Howard: It is a good suggestion. Our system pulls information from Banner and so doesn't pull liaison information, but there might be some ways that we could look at revising that. We tried emailing chairs and that didn't work very well.

Mr. Cutri: We will certainly be in contact with the ADA liaisons, and we will look at a way to monitor if a faculty member is not monitoring their email for whatever reason, we can certainly take on some multiple methods of communication.

Senator Dowd: Thank you.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: I actually have two questions for you. One speaks to the technology accessibility policy. As I understand it, everything you put out on the web has to be scaled etc. So is CCI handling that centrally or is every college responsible for somehow figuring out how to do it on their own?

Mr. Cutri: Well, let me take a stab at answering that. All externally facing websites, in other words, anything that starts with www.utoledo.edu will be under the purview of CCI to make it accessible. Now, that said, if a college is developing the content and we can get a head start on that then I'm sure CCI would appreciate that. But any externally facing website is ultimately owned by CCI and any other internally facing website, again depending on the website, it is either the responsibility of the college if they have their own server or their own network structure, or the responsibility of the I.T. Department to

make them accessible; for example, Banner websites -- those would be the responsibility of the I.T. Department.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Like an internal website or if your department or something that doesn't use the UT web address.

Mr. Cutri: Right.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: My second question has to do with this note-taking protocol. At one time, and I believe it was Interim Provost Barrett, but I see he is not here now, he had mentioned starting something for accommodation notes so that all the schools in Ohio could have a common pool of shared notes. Is that something that is going forward or has that idea turned out to be non-practical?

Mr. Cutri: Well, let me take a stab at answering that and Mrs. Howard maybe you can jump in. We are looking at a network similar to what you are describing for accessible texts and accessible course material; and actually there is already something in place called Bookshare, but we are also looking to develop a network for all Ohio institutions as well. The thought is that, Ohio institutions may share common texts that schools in California for example, might not. We've already gone down that path, but we have not done that so far with notes, that's probably going to be a little less fruitful because of the variation of a text that any particular faculty member would use. We've also been in contact recently with an organization called HathiTrust which is affiliated with the University of Michigan; it is basically a library that has a specialty niche in accessible materials and we are looking to develop a partnership with them as well. So I think we are going down the path of the spirit that you are asking questions on. Thank you for the questions by the way, I appreciate it. I know we are short on time so I will be wrapping it up. Briefly about the technology accessibility policy which covers expectations on software and websites that need to be accessible, with a particular focus on those courses and those situations where we know you have students or employees with disabilities. We are not asking the faculty to make adjustments to their technology-based course curriculum if there are not students with disabilities registered in the class. That is the underlying thought behind the policy, but we certainly want to create the expectation when it is known or perceivable, that we make all content, whether it is student content or any content accessible whether it's made by employees, third parties, or whatever.

Okay, the last slide. This is the eye chart, but is the ADA Compliance Committee, which is the ongoing working group consisting of various constituency areas across the university, to address any possible ADA issue. We are currently searching for a permanent ADA compliance officer. Right now, Katrina Nottke, who is an auditor that works for me is serving in that role. You can see all the various individuals that represent HR, I.T., Learning Ventures, Purchasing, and the hospital. We meet regularly to discuss issues much like what we are talking about today. I will direct you to the bottom of the slide, our newest members to the committee, Dr. Dawn Sandt and Dr. Renee Martin; they will be joining our committee and providing us with a very valuable faculty perspective with President Hoblet's support and encouragement. So if there is any other faculty members who are interested, we would love to have them join us. And then, Ali will also be providing the committee with a student perspective as well. So I think one good end product out of this taskforce, this working group that's been developed, is a broader, more full representation of all ADA constituency groups across the university.

Senator Barnes: Since we are about to become the only university in the country with a Disabilities Studies Department, it seems that we might want to make sure we are including those folks if we can.

President Hoblet: We have on the taskforce, and invited them to sit on the committees, but they declined.

Mr. Cutri: I am proud of this broadly represented group. The group has been in place about one-year-and-a-half close to two years, and it has worked out very well in improving the profile and the elevation

of serving all our stakeholders with disabilities. We've covered a lot of ground and answered a lot of questions so far, thank you for your interest and participation. This is one of the areas where more input is better than less. I am in the book so always feel free to give me a call or email me. Nobody wants to email the auditor or call the auditor, but I am not threatened by it, I welcome you <laughter>. Thank you for your time and your participation.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Mr. Cutri and thank you, Mrs. Howard, it was very helpful. I think that the taskforce and the ADA committee has been very conscientious about coming up with options that meet the requirements for accommodation and address our compliance issues without stepping on academic freedom and intellectual property of faculty. I think they've done a nice job and they truly heard our concerns and so I am pleased. Thank you.

At this time I would like to invite Senator Barnes, our chairperson of the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum, to come up and present us with what she did.

Senator Barnes: First, I want to say, the committee members that have met to do this work really have been taking it very seriously and have come prepared. They read the proposals; they read the rationale; they read the syllabi, and it is NO small job. Katelyn Smith, the Student Government rep has had a little trouble making the meetings, but has been in communication. Robert Yonker, Paul Fritz, Jenny Denyer, Matthew Franchetti, Eric Longsdorf, Elaine Reeves, Sally Harmych, Susan Sochacki, and Celia Williamson all have done a fantastic job. We don't have a Pharmacy rep or a Law rep, but we don't need a Law rep because we are undergrad curriculum. Thank you for your hard work.

I made this up and I have no idea if it will be useful to you, but the idea is to try to tell you the rationale and the nature of the changes. I think that we don't need to review them all, unless you have questions about individual proposals. The spelling errors are all mine. But if you have questions about these individual approvals; these are modifications from our two meetings, December 30th and January 30th and I don't have any need to pull you through this list one item at a time unless you have questions about it. Are there any questions or comments?

Course Modifications Approved by Faculty Senate Undergraduate Committee, December 30, 2014 page 1.

College	Course Impacted	Change	Rationale
Business and Innovation	FINA 3890: Quantitative Applications in Finance	Change name to: "Financial Modeling with Excel" with accompanying course content shift.	Response to requests from students and employers to focus on financial applications using Excel.
Engineering	BIOE 4300: Analysis of Bioengineering Systems	Adding specific statistical methods & software for quality control applications.	Was a traditional Engineering probability & statistics course; shift in content in response to request from employers in the field
	BIOE 4320: Biomedical Quality Control	Shift in course content.	Response to modifications to 4300; content moved to 4300 will be replaced with more advanced content.
	CIVE 1170: Fluid Mechanics for Civil Engineers	Remove MATH prerequisite	Math in the prerequisite is not needed for the work in the course.
Health Sciences	KINE 3200: Advanced Human Anatomy	Shift from 2 to 3 credit hours	Originally developed as a 2c.h. cadaver lab; determined that they need additional dissection time to include some lecture.
Medicine	EMS 1310: Paramedic I* EMS 1320: Paramedic II* EMS 1330: Paramedic III*	Change from 6 to 4 credit hours.	State and national EMS regulatory agencies have modified requirements; change

		*Already approved by FS	requires more clock hours (fieldwork), but fewer credit hours, reflecting a shift to experiential learning and less lecture.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	CHEM 1090: Elementary Chemistry	Shift in prerequisites: ACT 19 to 20; College Algebra Test score from 8 to 10; add ALEKS score (46); remove h.s. gpa, add C or better in MATH 1200	Responds to shifts in MATH course content. MATH 1200 is the course that aligns with CHEM 1090; this change will allow students to begin studying chemistry in the 1 st year instead of delaying the sequence for a full year.
	CHEM 1210: Chemistry for the Life Sciences I	Adds same prereqs as above.	Students in nursing & other allied health professions need additional chemistry preparation
Engineering	BIOE 3400, BIOE 4120, BIOE 4640, BIOE 4660, BIOE 4670 CHEE 3400, CHEE 4510, CHEE 4820 CIVE 3120, CIVE 4300, CIVE 4650 EECS 3200, EECS 3210, EECS 3700, EECS 3710 MIME 3370, MIME 3400, MIME 4060, MIME 4080, MIME 4100, MIME 4300, MIME 4340, MIME 4640	Shift the prerequisite for all of these courses to "MATH 2860 or MATH 3820 or MATH 3860." All modifications in this section are consequent changes because these courses have a prerequisite of MATH 3860.	During the 2013-14 year, FS approved the renumbering of MATH 3860 Elementary Differential Equations to MATH 2860. Course content was not changed; the renumbering was requested to satisfy state transfer assurance guidelines regarding linear differential equations coursework. MATH 3820 (Honors Differential Equations) is now offered as an honors section of MATH 2860.

New Course Proposals Approved by Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, December 30, 2014 Page 2.

College	Course	Rationale
Communications and the Arts	COCA 2000: Mindful Creativity	Gen Ed humanities course designed to improve critical thinking, provide an overview of philosophical systems including Zen and modern creativity studies.
Engineering	MIME 4040: Modern Manufacturing Methods	Students are required to have 12 hrs. of technical electives and have responded positively when the course has been offered as a special topics course
	MIME 4170: Manufacturing Entrepreneurship	Emphasis on "technopreneurship" meets technical electives requirement and has been popular as a special topics course.
	MIME 4180: Legal Aspects of Engineering	Same as above.
	MIME 4740: Applications of Math for Engineers	Same as above.
	MIME 4820: Sustainability Analysis and Design	Same as above.
Health Science	KINE 1560: Fundamentals of Anatomy and Physiology	Differs from other kinesiology courses in that it is one semester & less detailed than the one offered for majors
	KINE 1460: Fundamentals of Anatomy and Physiology Lab	Lab for KINE 1560.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	EEES 1180: Marine Biology Coral Reef Lab	Online lab opportunity for students needing lab credit or who want to continue after Marine Biology
Business and Innovation	PLS 4500: International Sales and	Intended to explore implication of sales

	Negotiation	careers in international or cross cultural settings.
--	-------------	------------------------------------------------------

Course Modification Approved by Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, January 30, 2015

Page 3.

College	Course	Change	Rationale
Adult and Lifelong Learning	AL 1130: Information Literacy for College Research	Change from 2 to 3 c.h.	Additional time needed for students to learn and use computer and information technologies, allows more reinforcement.
Engineering	EECS 3500: Formal Languages & Automata	Change name to "Theory of Computation"	Better reflects course level and content.
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	BIOL 2150: Fundamentals of Life Science I: Diversity of Life, Evolution, and ...	Removing "I" from name, strongly advising taking BIOL 2170 first. No change in content.	Focusing title on content to eliminate student confusion about order of courses (doesn't matter which order)
	BIOL 2160: Fundamentals of Life Science Laboratory I	Same as above.	Same as above.
	BIOL 2170: Fundamentals of Life Science II: Cells, Inheritance, and Develop	Remove "II" from title. Change sub-title and prereq.	Same as above. Change in prereq reflects reality that one can take courses in any order.
	BIOL 2180: Fundamentals of Life Science Laboratory II	Same as above.	Same as above.
	MEDT 2010: Clinical Laboratory Techniques	Remove "instructor approval" from prerequisites.	Other prerequisites ensure adequate preparation. Instructor approval is not required for curricular or programmatic reasons, and is an unnecessary hurdle.
Education	CIEC 4460: Science Methods for Early Childhood	Remove corequisite.	Banner has incorrect corequisite, difficult for students to register
	CI 4050, CI 4060, CI 4070, CI 4080, CI 4150, CI 5160, CI 4170, CI 4180, CI 4190, CI 4210, CI 4220, CI 4230, CI 4240, CI 4250, CI 4260, CI 4270, CI 4280, CI 4290, CI 4390, CI 4680, CI 4720, CI 4740, CI 4760, CI 4790	Course names all changed.	Course names have all been changed, along with course content, to reflect complete overhaul of undergraduate middle grades and adolescent/young adult teacher education programs.
	CTE 3010, CTE 3910, CTE 3020, CTE 3030, CTE 3040, CTE 3100	All # changed from 3 to 4000 level.	Change is for licensure only, also reflects elimination of undergraduate major.

New Course Proposals by Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, January 30, 2015

Page 4.

College	Course	Rational
Business and Innovation	FINA 4200: Fixed Income Securities	Need for and importance of fixed income securities expertise, faculty expertise.
	FINA 4360: Derivatives Securities and Markets	Required for professional designation in the field, advice, of Finance Advisory Board
Engineering	EECS 4590: Alogorithms	Techniques for devising efficient computer algorithms.

	4730: Open Source Software	Presents history and description of open source movement.
Nursing	NUR 4130: Transition to BSN Practice	All changes in response to the CON's shift to a concept-based curriculum, recommended best practice in nursing & education literature, and in keeping with trends in nursing education.
	NUR 4260: Health Promotion & Wellness Across the Lifespan	
	NUR 4240: Theory and Collaborative Practice	
	NUR 4270: Applied Health Assessment Across the Lifespan	
	NUR 4290: Nursing Care of Older Adults	
	NUR 4310: Research Methods and Evidence Based Practice	
	NUR 4320: Pathopharmacology Across the Lifespan	
	NUR 4330: Nursing Leadership and Management	
	NUR 4340 Population Focused Care	

Past-President Rouillard: Senator Barnes, I have a question about a notation on page 4. for a group of courses under Education. Is the change in the alpha code?

Senator Barnes: The change is in the course number, I apologize that that wasn't marked clear. The number will be changed from a 3000-level to a 4000-level.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay. And then in the next box there's the comment, "...undergraduate...major," which undergraduate major that's being---

Senator Barnes: Is there anyone from the College of Education here?

Senator Templin (substitute for Senator Denyer): That is in CTE. There was a bachelor's degree in Career and Technical Education and there is no longer a bachelor's degree, but, we are still licensing teachers in Career and Technical Education.

Senator Barnes: Career and Technical Education is the answer.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Barnes: This little sheet is only as good as the rationale offered by the faculty member, and in some cases there were none, so I took some explanation in the course description and applied it here. But, it is really helpful if you offer us those explanations because that is a big part of how we assess the proposal.

Past-President Rouillard: Thank you. Senator Templin, why did you decide to eliminate the major, was that a faculty-driven decision?

Senator Templin (substitute for Senator Denyer): The decision to not offer the bachelor's degree actually occurred in 2008 and apparently it was a very "quiet" one because it just now has gone through the pipeline. But thinking of Education, our licensing programs were actually two programs, one is state licensure and the other one is the degree. We encourage technical education, but the degree has gone away, but the licensure program remains.

Past-President Rouillard: I guess my question is, did the degree go away because the faculty wanted it to go away?

Senator Templin (substitute for Senator Denyer): Yes. The current Technical Ed. is even a stretch for me and I am the department chair. But, basically what it is is virtually all the people in Career Technical Education come in with a degree, either that or their field doesn't require one. So if you are the welding teacher for example, there is no degree in welding. It just changes in the nature of the current Tech Ed.

Past-President Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Dowd: Just a point of clarification. I've been on Senate for a long time and no degree has been eliminated from your college, has it been just deactivated?

Senator Templin (substitute for Senator Denyer): I stand corrected; it probably has been just deactivated, that is correct.

Senator Dowd: It is still on the books and it is still an option, but it is simply deactivated. To eliminate a major it has to go through Faculty Senate.

Senator Molitor: Another quick follow-up on this. You said you're changing them from 3000 to 4000, is that still offered as a dual-level course if some undergraduates want to take it as an elective?

Senator Templin (substitute for Senator Denyer): Right. The old pattern was 3000 and 5000 and some years ago we went from 4000 to 5000.

Senator Molitor: Understood. Thank you.

President Hoblet: Are there any other questions? Senator Barnes, please proceed.

Senator Barnes: I think what I need to do is ask for a vote.

Senator Dowd: No, because it is coming from a committee, it doesn't need a vote.

Senator Barnes: So it doesn't need Senate to vote, okay.

President Hoblet: The motion on the floor is to approve.

Senator Barnes: All in favor please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? Hearing none. Thank you. *Motion Approved. The above courses were approved by Senate on February 3, 2015.*

Senator Molitor: I just want to say, thank you for all your hard work on this, and this is excellent.

President Hoblet: This is the first time I really understood every modification quickly.

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Past-President Rouillard: It was very helpful, Senator Barnes. Thank you.

Senator Barnes: All the praise in the world is not going to get you to get me to do it again <laughter>. You're welcome. Maybe if I can do it one meeting at a time then I might be able to do it, but this was two meetings' worth and it was a little crazy. I also did a little research project about the time from initial proposals to FSUCC approval and in some cases it was less than 48 hours from when it was initially put into the system to when it was approved by us. So, the ones that were there since 2013, I would suggest that it is a problem in the system and about who has access to the system, which is something we can really improve on. I know we were just looking at some of the informational boxes and said, "What the heck are they even there for?" and that is a great point, so truly we can improve that system, but it does work. This is what I would say: If you propose a course, watch it go through each level, and if it is stuck

at some level, please understand there is no way we can deal with it in our committee if somebody hasn't signed off their approval at earlier levels, and yours (College of Education) wasn't, but I found the paper copy down in the Senate Office with the signatures, so we proceeded. The paper copy just made things more convoluted. If that curriculum authority is not checking it off in the CTS, if it's your department chair or the college curriculum authority that hasn't checked the box, that is the person to lean on in order to move your proposal along.

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Who can tell you what box to check? Because this is the first time anything has gone through electronically for us and I got a system-generated notice saying go ahead and sign this...functional; I linked to the course mod every way I could in the system, but there was no place that I saw where I can sign.

Senator Barnes: There's---

Assistant Dean Pollauf: Besides Marcia, is there somebody else that can walk us through?

Senator Barnes: Marcia is the person that gives you access if you are a curriculum authority person so she is the person to talk to. This is why we asked her, and I would like Senate to ask her to do some kind of workshop for new curriculum authority people. Because I've been on this committee before and I still didn't know how it worked until I needed to use it, and then it was like a rabbit-maze to ask around to get to her and say, "I need you to get me authorization." I think if we all had more training we would trust the system more. And because this committee especially, bless Dr. Steven Peseckis' heart for doing it for so many years, but really a different person should chair this committee every year so that people know our curriculum as an university. I really think that the more of us who are exposed and trained, the better the system will function because we will be knowledgeable about it. So that is sort of my recommendation.

Senator Cappelletty: Senator Barnes, I actually like the online system, but my problem with it is if there was an error made generating the form. If you type something off and if you don't catch it before you hit that "submit" then there is no way you can modify it. Is that a conversation that is going on right now to allow at least some modification at some point for the college?

Senator Barnes: I am wondering the same thing because what if we say, "No" and send one back and say, "You really need to do this," how does the person do it and get approval back up through the cycle, which I think is really time consuming? I know that people have asked Marcia to "Take this off the system, there's a mistake in it and we don't want it like this," and she can do that. That is not maybe an efficient way to have it, so certainly that can be something to put on an agenda for future conversations.

Unknown Speaker: What I've seen is once the chairperson of the department signs off on it then the Curriculum Committee chair can edit.

Senator Cappelletty: No, you can't. I am the Curriculum Committee Chair and I can't edit.

Senator Molitor: Yes, you can, Senator Cappelletty because I can from my college.

Unknown Speaker: Marcia King-Blandford can give you authority.

Senator Cappelletty: So, Marcia King-Blandford can give you editing authority?

Group of Senators: Yes.

Senator Molitor: You should have it.

Senator Barnes: You see, it would be nice to know that information instead of following the maze to Marcia <laughter>.

Senator Teelehaimanot: Once the proposal is submitted, the curriculum tracking system does allow faculty to correct errors or to sign the document. However, errors can be corrected by contacting the Provost Office before the College Curriculum Authority approves the proposal.

Senator Humphrys: Just to have it in the Minutes again. What I always see as a problem is that someone down the line can make some major change to a proposal from what was originally proposed. So I can or the dean can say, "that's not the what the name of the course going to be or I don't think it should be 4 hrs., it should be 3 hours," or whatever, and they can make that change, and unless the person who initiated it is really on top of it and stays on top of it, they will never know. And then it will come to your committee and I know they attempted to put in a way where that can be checked, but it is really more dependent upon people really making that notation on their own. And so it can come on over to us and any one of these courses could be majorly changed from the originator and they might not know and we've just approved Nursing 4260 with a title that the originator didn't want.

Senator Barnes: I don't know what person would do that. We were looking at syllabi, so we look at the syllabus that was provided by the person who was proposing the course so I think in that sense, I would hope that I would've noticed that there was a name change on the form. So it is sort of like a security issue almost from your perspective?

Senator Humphrys: It is. And really, Senator Barnes, it has nothing to do with your committee or you.

Senator Barnes: Oh, I am not taking it personally.

Senator Humphrys: It is a real issue and you will never know- there can certainly be internal conflicts that exist within the department or college.

Senator Barnes: Does that get to my other point about silo-building?

Senator Humphrys: Yes.

Senator Barnes: Okay.

Senator Humphrys: I think so. And also I know that I think Scott and maybe some other people- we were part of some review and they were looking to replace that curriculum tracking system with something that is a lot more user-friendly.

Senator Molitor: And just to follow up on this. One of the features that we've seen in some of these other systems is documentation anytime a change is made.

Senator Humphrys: Right.

Senator Molitor: So it starts with the original. Then there's a feature like "track changes" and it notifies the people that submitted originally at a lower level.

President Hoblet: Senator Monsos, excuse the point of order, but can Senator Plenefisch go because it's integrated with this thought?

Senator Monsos: Sure.

Senator Plenefisch: Again, I was also on that group that was looking at these other systems and that was my question, if someone is here from the Provost Office that could answer, when might these other systems be coming online because they certainly have a lot more capabilities including those that have been discussed?

Vice Provost Moore: I am probably the only person in the Provost Office that is not working on this, so I won't hesitate to carry your question back and get the answer.

President Hoblet: Senator Molitor, I know they were working on it and I know you all reviewed and weighed in on these products. I know that personally I sent the message to Vice Provost Traband that our CTS is archaic and it is time-consuming; it works, but there are issues with it and we need to move forward with a new product. And so, we will bring that up with Interim Provost Barrett and we might have a chance with Vice Provost Traband. Please, Vice Provost Moore, you take it back as well.

Vice Provost Moore: I'm taking notes right now.

Senator Monsos: I just wanted to say the associate deans were told (and it has worked in our college) as long as it is open at the point when you receive email saying, "you have something" at your level of curricular signing authority, and until you sign off you can edit. So if the Curriculum Committee decides to change it, the Curriculum Chair can go in and edit before that person signs off. I would hope that we are all following the processes in our constitutions and bylaws about discussion between levels, but that is another issue. That is only true through the college level; once it leaves the college and goes to Faculty Senate it can only be edited by Marcia.

President Hoblet: Thank you.

Senator Edwards: Can I just ask, what happens after it goes through the current system? Is there someplace where the course syllabi are housed and filed and how do faculty get a copy of that?

Senator Barnes: My understanding is that the Provost Office archives the system, I think Marcia said monthly, to make sure that everything is correct. She actually said to me, for me to make sure that I had every course number listed on paper so it would be in the Senate Minutes because they had to reconcile against Senate Minutes as well.

Senator Edwards: So, there isn't any department copy?

Senator Barnes: My department keeps copies of what we do.

Senator Molitor: And I keep a copy for my college.

Senator Edwards: That doesn't exist in my college.

Senator Barnes: The Provost's Office would be a good place to look for it; Marcia particularly will probably know where they are.

Senator Plenefisch: We had to use actual Senate Minutes as a useful source to show accrediting agencies that these things actually happened.

Senator Molitor: Just a final "thank you" for this form. When you were talking about the curriculum tracking system I looked through this today and I realized the course that we submitted was not on here. It was held up in the system and not sent to somebody to get approval. I emailed Marcia and about five minutes later it was going through.

Senator Barnes: I'm glad it worked. All areas are somebody's responsibility. The committee really struggled in our first meeting about what exactly was our charge- some of the folks who were new and even some of the folks that have been there a while were not clear; what we were looking for and why. I talked to Dr. Peseckis and he's agreed to come talk to us about that. What we are looking for is overlap, and Marcia offered us some really useful information about academic integrity, seriousness of material, relationship to the core etc. So I think the work that the committee does is only as good as the homework

that we can do individually and within our colleges about the courses, but also the due diligence of the person proposing the course and that was my point about silo building. That entrepreneurship course in Engineering generated a pretty vigorous conversation about it also being College of Business territory, so why is this different? In fact, we talked about whether it should be named “Technical Entrepreneurship,” which I guess is the language of that discipline, but we didn’t want to have something go back through the entire process for that, but it made us recognize that people who propose new courses really should try to work across disciplines and with people around the university; that is actually a useful thing to do.

Senator Edwards: The iteration of this curriculum tracking is it does not have the requirement that people address that specific issue, is this course offering a near duplication in other colleges or departments? Why was that taken off the form and why can’t we get it put back in?

Senator Barnes: Yes, it should be there. I don’t know why it was taken off.

Senator Edwards: It caused endless problems in the Graduate Council and it leads to the silo-building and duplication of courses that we need to address. I think it is a very important one and we need to get that back in.

Senator Barnes: I think there are some things that are best practices in a syllabus. This was only two meetings in for us, but I would say that it was obvious which courses had actually been taught and which new courses had not. And the ones that had not been taught, their syllabi looked like they had never been taught. It was really hard to be a responsible committee member to say, “Yeah, let’s go ahead and pass this course” when we were looking at a syllabus that we think is inadequate for an actual teaching experience. So I think nobody is looking to say, “You are assessing in this way or your learning outcomes are this, this, and this,” but we are asking that people have put enough thought into this course to at least have them [assessment methodologies and learning outcomes] is I think what we were/are saying. And I don’t think anybody’s asking everybody to have the same ones, but to approve a course you have to approve it based on something. So I take your point, but I will also push back to say, if you are proposing a course, develop a syllabus for the course in a way that you can actually teach the class.

Senator Edwards: Okay. And again, I agree with you, every individual syllabus that you’re teaching should have all those things in it. But, a master syllabus that is going to be used as a model for all the other sections of that course should not have specific text materials in it or specific grading. We assume that faculty are professionals and will use the grading system and the materials they need to achieve those student learning outcomes.

Senator Barnes: Understood. I think that the point is not that the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is saying that all sections subsequent for the rest of eternity should use this syllabus. We are simply saying, is this syllabus high enough quality to be accountable to students, to be accountable to our vision of what a university educational experience is that we are comfortable passing it? You know, we are not inclined to not support something that somebody proposed that a department and a College Undergrad Curriculum Committee already passed, that a dean already passed; that is not our authority. I don’t think there is any reason for our body to say no, unless we have pretty strong reservations about the nature of the course. So that is why I am asking for those elements of the syllabus, not because I want it to be imposed upon other faculty.

Senator Molitor: Just to follow up on that “legal requirement.” There is no legal requirement, it is the material on your syllabi that OBOR wants in order for courses to be approved for the Ohio Transfer Module or for Transfer Assurance Guides.

Senator Barnes: You say OBOR wants it, does that mean that it is state law that they should have it?

Senator Molitor: No, it's just that they will reject the OTM or TAG application if the syllabi does not have this information.

Senator Barnes: So "legally required" is maybe stretching the boundaries---

Senator Molitor: Exactly, I would agree. I think that is certainly overstated.

Senator Barnes: You know what, I think it would really be useful if the Provost's Office was more clear on that form, because I looked at it again today and it said "required" on every single element, and a month ago I looked it and some of them were recommended and some were required, and I thought "Hmmm...the law changes fast."

Senator Molitor: Another follow-up to a point you made earlier. I thought you made an excellent point about having the previous chair come back and talk to your committee about your charge. I think it would be useful particularly for undergraduate curriculum, academic programs, and maybe core curriculum to have a mini handbook for our future committees. Not to say that you are obligated to operate this way, but it would be certainly nice to have a little bit of guidance if you are new to the committee.

Senator Barnes: Yes, I hear people say, what are we doing? What are we looking for? Why are we here?

Senator Molitor: That is a wonderful idea.

Senator Barnes: We are simply going to be rubberstamping, unless we get a better idea of what we are after. We are trying to do good work.

President Hoblet: We have the Ohio Board of Regents, but we also have the Higher Learning Commission accreditation requirements. So some of those components that they have are not for a master approve type of syllabus, but some of those are those items that the Higher Learning Commission likes to see on a syllabi as well. So we got the Ohio Board of Regents making recommendations, we've got Higher Learning Commission accreditation components and that is what the Provost Office used I think to compile those sort of guidance syllabi that they have those examples out there, so faculty that are walking forward will at least have some example of what should be included.

Senator Barnes: I know, but they know we are rogues so they shouldn't say, "legally required."

President Hoblet: No, they shouldn't because it is not legally required.

Senator Barnes: Right. And Senator Dowd, on the institutional memory point; I think the point is to share institutional memory, right?

President Hoblet: Yes.

Senator Barnes: The more people who understand how these systems work and who participate in it, the better. I heard someone once say, "Don't ever make yourself essential" and I think that applies here. Now, if you are the only person who can navigate and operate and do something; after you there is nobody to carry on. So my feeling is, these positions, especially this position [as chair of Faculty Senate Undergrad Curriculum Committee], when I saw how much time it took, it should absolutely be done by people in a really serious way, so that everybody who is a member of that committee at some point shares the load, and new people should come on regularly. It is really education. I think that it is. But I do want to say, people complaining about the time, if it takes a long time to get your course approved, then follow up and be a little vigilant because it seems to move incredibly fast in some cases. Thanks a lot for the dialogue, I appreciate it.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Senator Barnes. I very much appreciate Senator Barnes' presentation. As a new Faculty Senate President- I've been here now two semesters and I've served on a Faculty Senate committee every year. One of the things that struck me this year is so many of the committee members have the same request, what do we do, how do we operate, and what is our charge? And, one of the things that I'll be taking back to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee because maybe in charging these committees we can work on this to get our committees seated earlier this late Spring so that they can be up and running Fall 2015. Because many of them end up seated the beginning of the Fall semester and it is just too much work. So I applaud your commitment. Senator Barnes, thank you for doing this; I had other people turn me down that I had asked to chair this committee. With that, we have other business from the floor, Senator Plenefisch.

Senator Plenefisch: I was asked by the Office of Undergraduate Research to remind senators that undergraduate Summer fellowships, the applications for those due date is coming up on February 27th, these are the USRCAP and the FYSRE fellowships. Students can get about \$3,000 to stay here over the Summer and do research and these are any area of research. I put some fliers up there, if you are interested you might want to take one back to your department and share it with faculty.

President Hoblet: Thank you, Senator Plenefisch. A reminder that the Graduate Midwest 6th Annual Research Conference will be held here in March and there are announcements about that and undergraduate research opportunities. Do I have any other items from the floor?

Senator Rouillard: President Hoblet, did you talk about the Faculty Senate Exec's meeting with Mr. Zerbey last week?

President Hoblet: No, I didn't and I said there are things that we forgot. We called Mr. Zerbey and had him come in to discuss with us the specifics around the absence of President Naganathan's name as a finalist to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for final consideration. Mr. Zerbey worked on his schedule and came and met with us on Tuesday of last week in the afternoon. Mr. Zerbey shared some information- he felt comfortable with his position and the three candidates and shared a bit about the process and that 20-member committee and how those recommendations were put forward. I think that everyone left with a better understanding of the process. I think he shared some confidential committee information, pointblank his ethics, the ethical dimensions of that decision and his basic thoughts and feelings about the perception that the presidential search committee did its due diligence and made the recommendation taking their charge into consideration.

Past-President Rouillard: Well, I have confidence in the committee, but I have heard some things that suggest that the committee may not be aware of these things.

President Hoblet: Such as the Facebook page of Chris Howard or what?

Past-President Rouillard: Well, that is one thing. But I've been made aware that two members of the committee -- likely unknown to the rest of the committee -- visited one of the candidates prior to the interviews in Dearborn, and I have no doubt that the rest of the committee doesn't know if that happened or not. I would ask you to ask Mr. Zerbey if that happened.

President Hoblet: I would be happy to.

Past-President Rouillard: I would also ask if you would ask Mr. Zerbey who counted the votes.

President Hoblet: Those were counted right in front of us in the room and the Witt/Keiffer people counted them, not us, with an observer watching them count.

Past-President Rouillard: The number of people who have suggested that they voted for Nagi seems significantly greater than the number that was reported by the count.

President Hoblet: And I can't argue that. All I can say is I was there and witnessed it. I know what everyone said and I don't know what they are saying now, but I know what was said at the time and I feel very confident and very comfortable with that count that it was correct.

Past-President Rouillard: And I want you to know that this is not aimed at the search committee in general.

President Hoblet: And I am not taking it that way---

Past-President Rouillard: Because the committee doesn't have full control over this if trustees are making other kinds of decisions and actions.

Senator Dowd: Can I follow up on that on a related point? If a subset of a committee met with one candidate, could you ask -- did they also meet with the other candidates?

President Hoblet: Absolutely. And that is what I am going to ask. Whether a subset of that committee met with one candidate I hope that they would have met with all the candidates.

Past-President Rouillard: The other seven.

President Hoblet: Absolutely, not just the three that were forwarded. At that point if there was an issue I would hope that they would've met with all the candidates, so I would be happy to take that forward; I have no difficulty. I sent Mr. Zerbey the Facebook page today on Chris Howard, so I am very aware of that and will forward anything that members of Senate have questions about.

Senator Edwards: Can I also ask Faculty Exec to make sure that the three finalists that are being brought here are treated equally when they come? For example at the last provost search committee, the only woman candidate for that position was not told that she was to make a presentation during the open meeting with the faculty, whereas the other two candidates, who were men, were told that. It put that person at an extreme disadvantage in the interviewing process. I also heard and this is just "rumor stuff" that some of the Board members have met individually with one of the three finalists. I really want this to be a fair process for all the candidates that we are bringing on board here.

President Hoblet: Absolutely. And I have no problem "firing" off emails. I always send them out of respect to Joan Stasa and Joan forwards those and always "cc" me when she forwards those. Anybody sending me an email, I usually will send it directly to Joan Stasa to have an answer from Mr. Zerbey or Ms. Speyer and I usually "bc", blind copy the faculty member so they know there's some check and balance that I did observe their request. I feel very comfortable doing that and I have no hesitation, so I would be happy to do that, Past-President Rouillard, Senator Dowd, and Senator Edwards; thank you for your comment. Are there any other questions or concerns?

Senator Humphrys: Just related to that, and I apologize, I wasn't able to attend that meeting with Mr. Zerbey because I was out of town. To any of the people who were there, did you get a feel that Mr. Zerbey understood the concerns of the faculty about Nagi not being a finalist? I realize that it is a vote was taken or whatever, but it goes back to the issue that we talked about very early on when the committee was announced- the committee isn't over-populated with faculty members (I'll just put it that way) and also not just that, but representation from the Main Campus is pretty light. Did you get the feeling that they understand that faculty certainly feel like their voices aren't being heard as much as we hope it would be?

President Hoblet: Yes, and I am actually going to defer to the rest of the EC; I know how I perceived it.

Senator Dowd: I don't know what his perception was prior to that meeting, but I know what was expressed to him by the various Executive Committee members. It was not personal opinions- people would preface their statements by, "the people who I talked to," and then they would express those feelings to Mr. Zerbey. So I don't know what Mr. Zerbey's perception was prior, but those views of each of the Executive Committee members expressed the views we have heard from faculty to him. Now, I don't know what the takeaway was and I don't know if he listened, he may, and we don't know what is in his head, but the Senate Executive Committee did what I think we needed to do- we heard from faculty and we took it to the Board.

Senator Molitor: I completely agree with what Senator Dowd just said.

Senator Keith: I would just add that we also told him that we were a little concerned that the message might be that the Board might be considering this recent experiment that we had in shared governance to be a failure and could he let us know if that was in fact true or if they would choose the candidates for the position that shared governance was something that the Board was very interested in and they wanted to hear more faculty voice. And he asked me what I meant by "experiment" because he wanted to reassure us that the Board still thought shared governance was important and faculty voice was important. Again, we don't really know what's in his head, but that is what he said.

Senator Molitor: I just want to follow up on that and it also relates to what Senator Edwards was saying before. I think given the dissatisfaction that many of us, not only faculty, but we are hearing student voices as well and staff voices about Nagi not being included in this process. I think it is incredibly important that the remainder of this process with these three remaining candidates does appear to be very fair, equitable, and transparent. If there's any indication that some members of the search committee have a preordained favorite, I think you're just going to have more disillusionment with the whole process and this idea that shared governance is just an experiment that will be ended. I think it is very important that that message be delivered to Mr. Zerbey. We tried to deliver that message and he heard that message, whether he takes it to heart, again, we don't know.

Senator Edwards: Also, if any of the candidates have contact with the senior administrative team not on campus that all of those candidates be afforded the same contact with...

President Hoblet: Thank you, we will take that forward.

Senator Dowd: Is it true that such a meeting will be considered an open meeting?

President Hoblet: Excuse me, Senator Dowd, what did you say?

Senator Dowd: If any administrators or Board members met with candidates, that's considered an open meeting and if there are any notes taken about those meetings then perhaps they can share them with us.

President Hoblet: Interesting. Thank you.

Senator Lee: This is just a practical question. We did get an announcement that there will be forums for faculty and other members of the University Committee; does that come from the search committee, the announcement of when those meetings will be?

President Hoblet: No. The search committee won't be making those announcements and Mr. Zerbey and Larry Burns attended our, Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting and actually covered the draft ...for the three candidates who will be coming to the campus and the campus visits, and meeting with FSEC, and open forums, and those sorts of things. So hopefully, we will have an opportunity to see those.

Those dates I'm sure will be posted sooner rather than later because we got told it was the first two weeks of March in our meeting.

Senator Molitor: The dates already came out.

President Hoblet: The dates have already been changed because we gave them feedback that that second week of March is Spring break, like a lot of students and faculty won't be here to attend, so they already upped those to the last week of February (I think).

Senator Lee: Yes, those dates did come out. The reason I am asking is because I know everyone, faculty and otherwise, have many obligations and I know sometimes the notice that we receive, for meetings isn't necessarily favorable to our other obligations. I know for our college, when people have clinical supervision commitments, for example, they just can't attend those... Thank you.

Senator Keith: One of the other things that was brought out, Larry Burns said that on the presidential search website they're going to allow people to give comments and so we asked if the comments would be anonymous and he said, "no, we thought about it, but we think it would be better that people would at least have to give an email address." And then Senator Dowd pointed out that if they weren't willing to allow the comments to be anonymous that Faculty Senate can actually accept the comments and forward them to the Board of Trustees, or whoever is now making the final decision, as an anonymous comment. So, I am encouraging everybody who has anything they want to share, I think it can be anonymous if you choose to do it that way. Thank you.

President Hoblet: Basically, we told them and informed Mr. Zerby that that would be done. If Mr. Zerby chose not to have the presidential site open for anonymous comments and feedback, that Faculty Senate would make that available for faculty.

Senator Dowd: Any faculty member who is not comfortable sending in their comments about one of the presidential candidates please send it to me and I will put my name on it. The faculty has to be comfortable providing input in this process and if you have any questions at all about if it is anonymous or not, I will send it in. Past-President Rouillard and I have done this in the past---

Past-President Rouillard: Yes, we did for an HLC visit.

Senator Dowd: So, it's an option out there.

Senator Unknown: Did Larry Burns say that he would look into making it anonymous?

President Hoblet: Yes.

Senator Molitor: He will take it into consideration.

Senator Duhon: I recall Chair Zerby making the comment that there were a number of faculty represented on the search committee.

President Hoblet: There were really six faculty and two deans.

Senator Duhon: He seemed to make a big point of that.

President Hoblet: Yes, he did. Are there any other questions? Are there any other items from the floor? Do I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

V. Meeting adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lucy Duhon
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary