

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 16, 2018
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS meeting on 1/30/2018

Summary of Discussion

Steve LeBlanc, Interim Vice Provost of Student Success: Student Success

Dr. Shanda Gore, Associate Vice President and Director of the Eberly Center: Center Update

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 Thompson: President Thompson called the meeting to order; President-Elect Rouillard called the roll.

I. Roll Call: 2017-2018 Senators:

Present: Atwood, Bjorkman, Bonnell, Bouillon, Brakel, Bruce, Chattopadhyay, Duggan, Edgington, Emonds, Frank, Ferris, Giovannucci, Gilchrist, Gray, Gruden, Haughton, Hammersley, Hall, Hefzy, Humphrys, Jaume, Keith, Kippenhan, Kistner, Kovach, Krantz, Leady, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Lundquist, Maloney, Menezes, Modyanov, Monsos, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Ortiz, Randolph, Relue, Rouillard, Said, Schneider, Schroder, Sheldon, Steven, Van Weck-Schwarz, Wedding (substitute for S. Ariss), Weldy, Williams, Wittmer, Woolford, Xie

Excused absences: Bonnell, Compura, Dinnebeil, Hottell, Hoy, McLoughlin, Ohlinger, G. Thompson, White

Unexcused absences: G. Thompson, Willey

II. Approval of the Minutes: Minutes from both meetings held on December 5, 2017 and January 16, 2018.

President Thompson: We are going to go ahead and get going. We are going to call to the first meeting of Faculty Senate to order for the Spring semester. Senator Fred Williams is not with us today, so I would like to call up President-Elect Rouillard to call the roll.

On Thursday, all of you should have received the Faculty Senate Minutes from November 21st. Do I have a motion to approve? Are there any discussions, additions, or corrections on the Minutes that were sent out? That being so, all those in favor of approval of the November 21st Minutes please signify by saying, "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.***

Welcome to the 9th meeting of the academic year and the first meeting of the Spring semester for the Faculty Senate. It is great to see everyone back and hopefully you are rested, relaxed and ready to roll up our sleeves and get back to work.

Executive Committee Report: As previously reported, over the semester break, UT participated in a pilot intercession program. While the cap on this program was initially set at fifteen classes, there were four courses that actually were offered. We look forward to working together with the Provost's Office to examine the pilot data that will be provided to assess its success and to promote further discussion on this important issue.

Last semester, it was announced that Faculty Senate, in partnership with the Division of Student Affairs, will be offering several crisis training workshops for faculty and teaching graduate assistants. These workshops will cover how and where to refer students in crisis and issues related to substance abuse, mental health and threat assessment. We highly encourage you to attend a session and to help us promote them. Special thanks to Senator Lisa Kovach who is donating her expertise to these workshops. The following is a listing of the workshops:

Thursday February 1st (Main Campus) Health and Human Services Building 1711 A&B

9:00-10:00 a.m.

10:00-11:00 a.m.

12:00 -1:00 p.m.

Thursday February 15th Health Science Campus Collier Building 1200

10:00-11:00 a.m.

One other item of interest while we are discussing the Division of Student Affairs, is over the Holiday Break, Dr. Flapp Cockrell, was permanently named Vice President for the Division of Student Affairs. On behalf of Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we wish him the best of luck in his new position and look forward to seeing some exciting new initiatives under his leadership.

Recently, The Ohio Department of Higher Education has published a report that summarizes the results of the affordability and efficiency reports that each public institution submitted. It can be found at <https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/affordability-efficiency/2017-Efficiency-Advisory-Committee-Report.pdf>.

Based on this data, Ohio's institutions yielded a collective savings or cost avoidance of around \$298 million in FY2017 alone. There are several findings that highlighted the University of Toledo's cost savings efforts, but perhaps the most impressive is that The University of Toledo's strategies to reduce textbook costs for students saved nearly \$800,000 in textbook costs across courses where lower-priced options were negotiated with publishers by UT's bookstore vendor. In addition, savings were realized by

making changes in several of UT's courses, including: \$160,000 by switching from traditional textbooks to open-source materials; \$62,000 saved by adopting an inclusive access model; and \$18,000 saved by switching to an ebook-only model, negotiated with the publisher by their bookstore vendor.

In terms of our regular policy updates, there are some significant developments happening regarding higher education legislation that you should be aware of:

State of Ohio Legislation

SB 216

The Ohio Senate Education Committee is currently reviewing legislation that might benefit from our attention. SB 216 has at least two items that directly impact higher education: 1) teacher certification and 2) College Credit Plus/dual enrollment programs.

Teacher certification

- Permits a school district superintendent to employ a licensed teacher to teach a subject area or grade level for which the person is not licensed.

College Credit Plus

- Prohibits a student from enrolling in a course at a college campus or online if a comparable course is offered on the campus of the student's secondary school unless the course at the secondary school is full. Having students take College Credit Plus classes at high schools would certainly reduce costs (and reduce tuition revenue to universities) but could come at the expense of quality and the transferability of course credits.
- Requires the student and the student's secondary school to each pay for 50% of textbook costs. If the student is home schooled, the student is responsible for the entire cost.
- Requires the Department of Education to conduct a study on the results and effectiveness of the College Credit Plus Program.

At today's Faculty Senate Meeting, we have several special guests. Dr. Steve LeBlanc, Interim Associate Provost of Student Success will provide an update on enrollment and share some of the efforts out of this office to retain our students. Dr. Shanda Gore, Associate Vice President and Director for the Eberly Center will update us on some upcoming events. Presidential Fellow, Dr. Melissa Gregory, will update us on progress made on the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

Lastly, we hope some you were able to attend our University and Community sponsored Dr. Martin Luther King Celebration. This is always a wonderful program that brings our campus and members of the community together in unity to celebrate Dr. King's leadership, the importance of diversity and inclusion, and "advocacy for things that matter". I look forward to working together this semester to collectively advocate on important issues and policies that make our university a better place for all of us. Let's have a great semester!!! Are there any questions or comments on the Executive Committee report?

Senator Ohlinger: What is the rationale for the first proposal out of the Senate Education Committee?

President Thompson: Well, actually there have been some superintendents, and this is like a dream to them and their testimonies because of the fact that they feel that licensure is limiting the teachers that they have to teach various disciplines. I think it is a cost-saving mechanism. For example, in my area, you could have somebody that can be teaching health, physical education and math, right? So they are getting a lot more versatility out of their teachers as a result of that. They are also looking at the licensure in terms of K-6 and 6-12, and they want to also be able to have people teach in areas that they are not licensed in grade-wise as well. So both of those are equal concerns as we look at what are students will be, such as getting jobs in those situations. Good question. Are there other questions or comments on the Executive Committee report?

Next, I will like to call up Provost Andrew Hsu to give us an academic update.

Provost Hsu: Thank you, Dr. Thompson. Before I start my report I want to mention one thing and that is, we had a little “hiccup” on the final exam schedule for spring semester. I’m happy to report that we have corrected that. Some of you may not have heard because a message had not been sent out to all faculty. \\A new final exam schedule was posted last Friday and the email message was sent out to the schedulers in each department. So some of the schedulers have informed their faculty and others have not yet done so. So, if you haven’t heard anything, you no longer need to be worried because we have restored the schedule to the previous schedule – and the new schedule is no longer in place. I have to say that our staff really did a good job designing a new schedule because they had the best interest of our students in mind when they did this over the winter break. The reason they attempted to redesign the schedule was because many students complained that the new schedule, compared to what we had before, and due to the 15-week conversion, complained that there were too many exams scheduled back-to-back. So some students had to take several exams within one day, which is not conducive to student success. However, the new schedule didn’t have any faculty consultation. Staff used a very good computer software and optimized it, so it’s unfortunate that we weren’t able to use it. We have made the commitment that in the future we will make any changes earlier on - and we will do it with faculty consultation. I apologize to those faculty members who were surprised by the changes.

There are a few things that I want to bring before you today. We had a very successful fall Commencement. Many of you participated, and those of you who did, I want to thank you for your participation. This is certainly the first time since I’ve been here that after the Commencement there were no complaints from anyone. We had over 2,000 students receive their degrees. We also started a new PhD student hooding ceremony that was received well by the students and by many faculty members who participated, and so we are going to continue with that event. Now we have a very good idea as to how much time we’re going to need to read the students’ names – which is two seconds per name. We’re now working on the design of our spring 2018 Commencement, and I promise you, it will not be four hours long. We’re going to continue to discuss the details, and we probably will have to modify the format of our spring Commencement, so stay tuned.

Last fall at our December Board of Trustees meeting, the Board approved a University of Toledo tuition guarantee program—some of you may already be aware of this initiative. The tuition guarantee program guarantees the tuition rate for fall 2018 entering students for four years. This program helps our students plan their finances and it also encourages our students to graduate within four years. This is the only way the State will allow a public university to raise its tuition and so it is a kind of “win-win” situation. Also,

at the December 2017 Board meeting, I presented a progress report on the university's strategic plan implementation. For our progress report, we developed a web-based "report card" to show progress on each of the areas, goals and outcomes outlined in the university's strategic plan – and it is now available on the university's Strategic Plan website. You can visit the website and see the list of areas and goals and also the status of each goal and outcome, with icons that demonstrate "making good progress, needs attention, or hasn't started yet". If you hover the cursor on an icon, then you'll see the actual action steps that have been taken on that particular initiative, so there are all sorts of detailed reports. We plan to update the progress report a couple of times each semester. This semester we're going to update sometime in March and then in May. We are going to report our progress to the Board twice a year, once in December and once in June. All of the VP divisions of the university and all of the colleges are also developing their own implementation plans which are due in February.

I also want to give you an update on Winter Intersession—we brought this initiative to the Faculty Senate several times. We initially had 11 proposals and eventually only six of them were offered during Winter Intersession. I'm happy to report that we have not lost money on any of the courses and that they are all successfully completed. Right now we are waiting for faculty members to report on the assessment of the courses, and once we have data, we will bring the review back to the Senate for your feedback on whether we should continue with Winter Intersession course offerings. I should also note that of the six courses that were offered, three of them were graduate courses, three of them were undergraduate courses, and one of the courses was a study abroad program.

The next item I want to report on is that we have successfully conducted our search for the new dean of the Judith Herb College of Education. Those of you who are from the College of Education and served on the search committee, I want to thank you for your service. I am happy to report that Dr. Raymond Witte from Miami University has accepted our offer and will begin his appointment on July 1, 2018. Dr. Witte served as associate dean at Miami University and currently serves as chair of the Department of Educational Psychology. We are very excited that he's decided to join us. I also want to thank Dr. Jenny Keil. Dr. Keil has served as interim dean for three years now and has stabilized the college and led the college to make great progress, and I want to thank her for her leadership.

The last item I would like to report on is good news. The University of Toledo was recognized last week by U.S. News & World Report for the quality of our online programs. In fact, our overall undergraduate online education ranking went up from 142 to 125, which is up 17 spots. I want to thank our entire faculty who are involved in online education. In addition, the Judith Herb College of Education's online education program went up from 109 to 107, which is an increase by 2 spots.

This concludes my report. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Maloney: I was just curious, I was working ahead of something and I looked at the academic calendar 18-19 and it says it is still a "Draft." When will that typically get finalized? I just want to know when Spring 2019 is going to start because it appears to me that it was starting a week earlier than this year and I was sort of wondering how that was affecting the Intersession.

Provost Hsu: We should have our finalized formal calendar very soon. We have to count the number of hours in order to do the calendar, the number of hours so we know how many days we need and so forth.

If it starts earlier, it will end earlier, but we are trying to leave three weeks between the New Year and the beginning of classes so that we will still have the possibility of offering the Winter Intersession.

Substitute for Senator Emonds: I have a question regarding Winter intersession. You mentioned you don't have the faculty assessment data, but do you have data about student enrollment?

Provost Hsu: Enrollment is not great simply because we probably started late. I know two of the courses had about 10 to 12 students, two of the courses probably had 7 or 8 students, and two had 5 or 6 students. So they are all in the range from 6 to 11 or 12 students. However, the one graduate course from the College of Health and Human Services had a very good enrollment in the one study abroad course.

Senator Relue: I wanted to ask about the tuition guarantee program. If you could be a little bit more detailed about what that guarantee is and how does that affect students who are in programs that are scheduled out to be longer than four years.

Provost Hsu: The tuition guarantee program only applies to the incoming students in the fall of 2018. So, it is the new student or the new transfer student who will be covered. To your other question, students who are currently in a program will not be affected. For students who are entering in the fall of 2018 and do not finish within four years, they will leave that cohort and be moved to whatever the current tuition is on campus.

Senator Keith: Provost Hsu, may I help you out a little bit?

Provost Hsu: Yes. Go ahead.

Senator Keith: For students that are in programs that require more than four years due to either licensing or accreditation because of required co-ops or internships, they will be granted an automatic extension up to one-year.

Senator Hefzy: Does this apply for graduate and undergraduate students?

Provost Hsu: It is only for undergraduate students at this point, however, we have some graduate and professional programs that we are considering.

President Thompson: Are there any questions for the Provost? Thank you very much. We are going to actually have Dr. Shanda Gore, she has another engagement. She has a couple of brief announcements that she have for us.

Dr. Shanda Gore: Thank you so much for allowing me time to talk with you about the UT Eberly Center for Women. I don't know how many of you are aware of the center, but it is located on Main Campus, Tucker Hall for those who want to visit it. Concerning our UT students, I want to personally say thank you. You all are so very critical. You may have seen some of our fundraising efforts and actually, our recent "coat" raisings that included mittens and gloves for our students. I am going to make a plea to you to please make sure that if you witness your students needing assistance to please send them our way. I've provided you with some upcoming highlights on our calendar in hardcopy. Our physical calendar will be out soon, but there is a purple sheet that has a list of highlights for programming. I am going to ask you to please help with promotion to get our students to come out. On the back of the sheet there are our other services—The mention of our lactation room and Kate's Closet. If you are unaware of Kate's Closet, it is

a professional clothing closet on campus for women. For students, it assists them with their practicums, internships, and co-ops. Some of them are making choices between clothes and some of them are just not sure, so we guide them through that process. So it is one-on-one, and so it is private. We spend those minutes with them, that is also when we get a chance to find out some other needs they may have such as food, shelter, shortfalls in life financially. This guides us to what we do next which is to refer them in line with services. I want to make sure you know we are not a crisis center; however, we do have students that sometimes come to us in crisis. You are also going to see on that same sheet some upcoming programming like Basic car maintenance. I know this may sound silly to some of you, but you would be surprised when student's breakdown, they just don't know about the basics of their car—I know I personally have helped students in Lot 13. These suggestions actually come from discussion and survey from our Eberly Center participants. Self-defense for women, one of our most popular with the students are also part of our courses and we tell students to get enrolled quickly because these do fill-up. We actually have a retired police officer from UT that does this for us and she is fantastic. Please make sure students are aware of that—even if it's a simple announcement in classes. If you want further information, we welcome the opportunity to come to your classes and talk with your students. Please make special note of our “Lunch with a Purpose” series that highlights women staff like the one that has out a new book that encourages women and our wonderful women faculty and graduate students who are doing great research. This gives us a chance to feature them. We are asking you to encourage students to come out and actually listen and we want faculty and staff to come out to support fellow faculty members as well. These are just a few highlights—you'll see some programming in our booklet and if you see programming of interest, give us a call (419-530-8570). We do have our 10th Annual Celebrity Wait Night which is coming up Thursday, February 8th. If you did not know the significance of 2018 for us, 2018 is actually our 40th year for providing service to women on campus as well as in our greater community. We are one of the longest sustained women centers in the United States. We are recognizing scholarships recipients that night. Please come out and help support. (<http://www.utoledo.edu/centers/eberly/waitnight.html>) Because it is our 40th year, we do expect a couple of hundred people and right now we are probably at 400 people attending, so get your tickets because we are do expect to probably sell out. Do you have any questions?

Senator Hefzy: Is this for only women or for both men and women?

Dr. Gore: The Center is for women and men. There are only two classes that we have for women specifically. Our self-defense class is for women and our women success series. The rest is open to the general population. We do have men who regularly use our services.

Senator Hefzy: Is all of this on the website?

Dr. Gore: It has been updated and the calendar is due out in the next couple of days which will be up on the website as well. I can actually have a link sent to you.

(<http://www.utoledo.edu/centers/eberly/docs/Spring%202018%20Calendar.pdf>)

Senator Hefzy: If you can send it to me, I will send it to my students. Thank you.

Dr. Gore: I really want to thank you because when you invite me to come to speak with you, we get a spike with our students coming in. Last year, we had more than 2,000 touches with our students, faculty and staff and community members. Actually, I was looking at the numbers again yesterday; just in 2017 alone, we had more faculty, staff and students using our services than those in the community. Actually, it was 60%, which is the highest [it's been] from when I took over the center seven years ago. I just want to say thank you for those numbers, and please help us promote and get our services out there because our students need it.

President Thompson: Thank you, Dr. Gore. All right, next on the agenda is Senator Cappelletty with our curriculum. I hear we have many proposals.

Dr. Cappelletty: All right. Everyone is keeping us busy this year. Again, I want to thank the members of the committee because they've been doing a great job with keeping up with everything that's been coming in. This week for your consideration, we have two new course proposals, both communication courses: one health communication and the other is special event planning. We didn't have any issues with the syllabi or the course content, they all seemed appropriate. Are there any questions as it relates to the two new courses? Hearing none. All in favor of approval of the two new courses, say "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

Then we have, I believe it was 48 course modifications in this round. They were fairly straightforward with changes. They were very little that were content changes. They were title changes for many of them, prerequisite changes, co-requisite changes and the bulk of them came from the Chemistry Department where they were changing the minimum grade of a "D-" on their prerequisite to a minimum grade to a "C-" on most of their prerequisite courses. So, there are several communications courses appeared that were title in course description changes, probably the biggest one was the change from seminar to studio course for the television journalism. Then you get into really the bulk of everything down and the rest are chemistry courses and again, the vast majority changing from a minimum grade of "C" or a minimum grade of "C-" in order to meet the prerequisite for the courses. I don't think there was anything outside of the chemistry courses. Are there any questions or comments?

President-Elect Rouillard: I have one question about Communication 3260, when I went to the actual page for the course modification, that course is listed as a gen ed. course. I mean, I have a question about a 3000 level course being a gen ed. and particularly---

Senator Monsos: It is not on the gen ed. side.

President-Elect Rouillard: The form has it as gen ed., so, that was an error, right?

Senator Monsos: Yes.

President-Elect Rouillard: Okay, so, that should probably be corrected so there is not any confusion.

Dr. Cappelletty: We can correct that. Are there any questions or comments? All in favor of the course modifications please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? *Motion Passed.*

President Thompson: Thank you so much. Next, we have Senator Monsos with Core Curriculum.

Senator Monsos: President-Elect Rouillard, a little more detailed about that—sometimes people think it is not a major course, it's an elective course, so therefore, "it is general, and anybody can take it" and they click that button with that fault.

There are two courses you have already approved the course modifications, and now we're approving the same modification, but it also changes their classification for the core, and those are Honors 1010 and Honors 1020. These two classes have been taught as a sequence and were equivalent to Comp I and Comp II, but for Honor students. They have never passed the state approval to be Comp I and Comp II; they were in our core, but we could not get them into the OTM. Honors made the decision now to stop having them be comp. course and make them equivalent simply to humanities. We looked at the student learning outcomes and I have them for you if you would like to see them, but they very clearly match the humanities learning outcomes. We thought no issue with this change.

President-Elect Rouillard: You said you have those learning outcomes, if we could see those.

Senator Monsos: Yes. I have to find them here. So first, this is what humanity courses should be doing. This is what our course says about humanity courses. Let me know when you are ready: Honors 1010 course description and student learning outcomes.

Senator Hefzy: So correct me, those two courses can be considered as if they are...?

Senator Monsos: They have been, but they will no longer be.

Senator Hefzy: So they have been, but they will no longer be.

Senator Monsos: That is correct, and they will no longer a series; they will be standalone courses, and I forgot that part, sorry. Do you want to see Honors 1020?

President-Elect Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Hefzy: When you say, standalone, it means the student can take Honors 1020 without taking Honors 1010, correct?

Senator Monsos: Yes, one is not a prerequisite. Are you ready to vote? All those in favor please signify by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you very much. *Motion Passed.*

President Thompson: Thank you, Senator Monsos. Senator Keith is up next. She has some policies for us.

Senator Keith: We are not going to talk about dual degrees right this minute. Instead we will start with a policy. This is where we left off at our last meeting. We hadn't had a chance to talk about this new policy, which is college, school, department of reorganization, and name changes. This is a new policy. Its purpose is to provide a procedure to ensure broad consultation with an input from appropriate faculties for any reorganization of a college, school, or department, and for any name changes. Its scope is all University of Toledo colleges, departments, and schools. Its elements it establishes is any department, college or school reorganization including name changes requires input from Faculty Senate and approval from the provost, president, and the Board of Trustees. It also outlines the procedure the administration will follow for any department, college, or school reorganization including name changes. This came

from the provost to our committee. It is a pretty simple policy, it has a statement and it was sent out to you yesterday. A purpose, a scope and then I think something that we are trying to get away from to some extent which includes procedures within the policy. But my committee thought it was very important to actually include the procedure within this policy. We liked the fact that it was there and we want it to stay there. So the procedure is pretty straightforward. Anybody can really initiate a change—it can be a department, it can be a dean, it can be the provost, but the department has to notify the dean and the dean has to notify the provost. If the college dean is considering this reorganization, he/she has to notify the provost and if it is the provost then he has to inform the dean who will then inform the department or the school etc. It also includes school or department level consultation, college of a consultation, cross-unit consultation and then campus-level consultation. What is highlighted here, my committee actually put this in because this is required by the current Collective Bargaining Agreement. Then it goes back to the provost and eventually it needs to go to the Board of Trustees. Are there any questions about this new policy?

Senator Ferris: Would you or the provost talk a little about cross-unit consultation because I am not sure I understand that?

Senator Keith: Well, perhaps you can help me out Provost Hsu. Please explain when that would be appropriate.

Provost Hsu: For example, the College of Business wants to develop a computer or information technology program and that has to be most likely sent to Engineering and then say, is this duplicating what we're already doing or is this a program that is needed for business reasons? There was a situation where both Business and Engineering had a program in Information Technology and ABET actually said "that violates our rules and you can't have them." So it is that type of situation where you need to have cross-college/cross-unit consultation.

Senator Keith: Are there any other questions?

Senator Weldy: Is there any way this could affect courses between the Health Science Campus and the Main Campus?

Senator Keith: Well, I don't think so because I think it's talking about reorganization, and courses would fall under curriculum and it would go through the curriculum process. What were you thinking about?

Senator Weldy: I think the Health Science Campus is being encouraged to involve more undergraduate students, so will there be cross-campus communication prior to approval if that would affect both campuses?

Senator Keith: I think there already is with the curriculum committees that we have at Faculty Senate. If the College of Medicine were to develop more undergraduate courses, they would have to go through the curriculum committee. I believe there is some cross-college consultation there because that committee includes a member from every college that we have at UT. I'm not sure that this particular policy has an impact on curriculum because it's about reorganizations, name changes.

Senator Hefzy: I have a question about item 5; I am not sure, so will you please help me? What does the highlighted text mean? Is it an added text or a removed text?

Senator Keith: No. It is highlighted because the committee put this in here because this is required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and we [just then] cited the collective bargaining agreement. It will be taken out when it gets posted for review. But it is to remind us that this is something that is required currently by the Collective Bargaining Agreement, that the administration is to seek input from Faculty Senate for any kind of reorganization.

Senator Hefzy: What does it mean here, “...through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee?” Does it mean it needs to be approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or by the Faculty Senate as a whole?

Senator Keith: I’m not quite sure what you are referring to; this is basically saying input from Faculty Senate.

Senator Hefzy: I am referring to the sentence “...seek input of the Faculty Senate as is required through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.” So what does “...through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee” means?

President Thompson: I am sorry, can I jump in? I think what you’re asking is, when policies come to Faculty Senate, they are always given first to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and then they are brought forward to the Faculty Senate, so maybe that is what you’re thinking. So that is the process. So the provost might come to the Executive Committee with a policy, we will look at it first then we discuss it and bring it to Faculty Senate.

Senator Keith: We have established a precedent with any kind of reorganization that first the Faculty Senate Executive Committee looks at it and seeks out input from the affected colleges or department to make sure that this is a reorganization, in sense that it satisfied the other four items. Then we usually draft something that we bring to the entire Senate for their approval. So both things happen, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee takes the initiative to draft a resolution that we bring to the entire Faculty Senate for their vote.

Senator Hefzy: If this is clear then it is fine. But if it is not clear then maybe it needs rewording. Maybe it is clear to everyone, except me, but that is fine. I understand now there is a process.

Senator Schneider: Just a follow-up on this. This actually does seem clear to me, it might be the intent. It looks like bullet 2-5, none of them suggest approval; they all simply suggest consultation. The final bullet, I think bullet 6 is the only formal power approval comes from, which is the provost, president and the Board of Trustees.

Senator Keith: Right, input doesn’t necessarily mean we have to approve it, it just means that the administration is required to seek our input. Are there any other questions? Are we ready to vote? All in favor, say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you so much!

The next policy is a policy that has been substantially revised. The Faculty Senate Office sent you the old policy and the new policy. I don’t recall, was it a markup version or a clean one?

President-Elect Rouillard: I think it was a marked up one and a clean one

Senator Keith cont'd: Okay. This is Academic Standing. My understanding is that the provost charged a sub-committee of the associate deans to look at our current Academic Standing policy and revise it in a way that basically changes the scope and make it really clear from the viewpoint of students, what it meant to be in academic good standing and what it meant if you weren't. The original policy, its purpose was to define Academic Standing through establishment of a minimum grade point average each term and the numbers of attempted hours and part of the graduation requirement. Each college will establish its own conditions for students to return to academic good standing, that was the scope. So now the purpose is to define academic good standing and provide criteria by which students can be suspended due to poor academic performance. The scope is it applies to all undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Toledo. I did invite Dr. Scott Molitor and Dr. Mary Powers who were on that subcommittee here. Hopefully, they can answer questions about how we got the current draft because I wasn't involved in those conversations and I'm not sure about all the details that went into the new draft. What are in the revisions? So this is what I got out of the revisions. It indicates that the accumulative GPA is now the UT GPA and not the Higher Education GPA. The UT GPA is adjusted by grade deletions and/or academic forgiveness. It added language to indicate when students will remain on probation if the UT GPA is less than 2.0. When they are released from probation is when their UT GPA is 2.0 or greater. It added language to indicate that colleges have latitude in what they require of students placed on probation. The examples in the policy reflect what some colleges are already doing to assist in monitoring probationary students. It allows college credit plus students or those from other transient programs who are on probation to have their probationary status waived upon initial enrollment in a degree program because otherwise, some of these students will automatically be placed on probation and perhaps even on suspension, which means they couldn't enroll at all. So what this does is it gives them a full year to improve their UT GPA. It specifies that students can only be suspended if they are placed on probation first and they must be given a minimum of one semester on probation before being suspended. They cannot be suspended after their first semester at UT. It gives colleges the authority to establish the procedure students must follow, including enrollment restrictions and/or conditions for readmission and it details the suspension policy: the second suspension you are out for at least one year and the third suspension, you are out for three years. It emphasizes suspended students are not allowed to take courses while under suspension or if they [do]take courses elsewhere, they are no longer considered to be UT students and must apply for readmission. It allows colleges to dismiss students in academic good standing from their degree programs because of inadequate performance while still allowing students to continue their enrollment at UT and other programs. Program and eligible students are the ones who were released from their degree programs, are in academic good standing, and do not select another degree program, they will have a registration hold placed on their account and directed to contact an advisor in their current academic college. Is there anything else, Dr. Powers or Dr. Molitor?

Dr. Scott Molitor: You got it all.

Senator Keith: Do you want to see the policy or do you have questions? Where do we go from here?

President-Elect Rouillard: I have a question about the college credit plus statement. I don't see why a college credit plus student who matriculates to the university and if that student didn't get a 2.0GPA in those college credit plus courses, I don't see why that student can't come in on probation. If a student is on probation, it doesn't say how long they remain on probation as long as they continue to get a 2.0GPA or greater. I think that admitting a college credit plus student who is on probation who has earned less

than a 2.0GPA signals to the students, their families and the high schools that this has to be taken seriously; otherwise, we're setting students up for distorted expectations. I don't see that this hurts the student and in fact, it probably might help a student buckle down a little bit and understand that he/she has to study a little harder at the university.

Senator Keith: Can Dr. Molitor or Dr. Powers answer that question?

Senator Molitor: Well, our thinking on that was decisions on probations and suspensions are made on cumulative GPA. So somebody coming in below a 2.0 is already at risk to be on probation after the first semester, because now it is going to be harder for them to get their GPA over 2.0. What we didn't want happening was that the student, after one semester in their degree program, would be in a position where they would be suspended after one semester and so that is why we put that in there. Let's say a student comes in with a 1.0 GPA from College Credit Plus, it is probably a good chance they're going to end up on probation after their first semester just because it would be hard for them to get their cumulative UT GPA above 2.0 in one semester.

President-Elect Rouillard: But why not just leave them on probation until they do eventually get the 2.0GPA? You are not suspending them, but it is a signal to them that they may need to seek out some extra services from day one rather than going through yet another semester of a low grade average.

Dr. Molitor: Maybe then the answer to that is the clause about not suspending the students unless they've been on probation for one semester. We could revise it to indicate we are not suspending students unless they have been on probation for at least one semester in their degree program. What we don't want is a first year student being suspended in December after one semester of the student being at UT.

President-Elect Rouillard: Well, I don't see where it says that a student is going to be suspended after the first semester.

Dr. Molitor: We put the language in there to prevent that from happening. The student has to be on probation at least one semester to be suspended. In December, you can't suspend a new student, you will have to wait until May. If a student comes in with College Credit Plus and is on probation already then they could be suspended in December, and we will have to add some type of language to prevent this.

President-Elect Rouillard: My concern is if you bring in a weak student and you let that student compete, you're setting that student up for failure.

Dr. Molitor: I agree.

Unknown Speaker: Just to clarify, so a student is on probation for one semester and then they get suspended?

Dr. Molitor: Our current policy allows us to suspend the student after one semester if their GPA is low enough. We would like to prevent this from happening and give a student at least one semester on probation before they are subject to suspension. If they remain on probation, then they can be suspended after their second semester. We do not want students being suspended in the December, especially if they are new, first-time students. We do not think that is a reasonable approach.

Senator Hefzy: Are you proposing to add the statement, students must be given a minimum of one semester in their programs?

Dr. Molitor: Well, this language could affect a student that changes degree programs. What we're trying to address is suspending students that are new to college. If a student changes from another degree program at UT, they should not be subject to this one semester grace period. Then you may have a situation where students will start hopping between programs to prevent being suspended if anyone would take them.

Senator Keith: I think they can't transfer between colleges, unless they have a 2.0GPA.

Dr. Molitor: There will be potentially some programs that may allow this. It is not a set rule.

Senator Keith: Right.

Senator Hefzy: Are you we going to make changes or no changes?

Dr. Molitor: I am proposing, I think we can make a change to address President-Elect Rouillard's comments about college credit plus students being on probation when they come in, but maybe not suspending them after one semester.

President-Elect Rouillard: Thank you, Dr. Molitor.

Senator Krantz: In the summary at the very beginning of this, I'm aware of what a GPA recalculation is, but I have not heard the term "academic forgiveness."

Dr. Molitor: There is a policy on academic forgiveness.

Senator Krantz: What is that?

Dr. Molitor: If you are out of school for three years and you come back to UT, if you demonstrate good academic performance after [I think] 24 or 32 credit hours, you can have all of your grades below a C- from your previous time at UT removed from your GPA.

Senator Krantz: And that is at the request of the student, correct?

Dr. Molitor: Yes. It is something that advisors will tell students about.

Senator Keith: It doesn't affect Honors.

Dr. Molitor: Correct, it is just the UT GPA that is recalculated. These course grades still remain in what we call higher education GPA.

Senator Kippenhan: Just a general question because I haven't had to deal with this issue yet. How much support is there for a student who is in this category? Does somebody have a sit-down with them and say, we are going to get you into other courses so you can pull up your GPA? Is support available to them?

Dr. Molitor: Yes. There are a lot of different mechanisms for these students. Different colleges have different ways of dealing with students on probation. We also have the success coaches that have been proactive in helping students in academic probation.

Senator Kippenhan: So there is no possible way for a student on probation or in danger of probation to slip through the cracks?

Dr. Molitor: In terms of which “cracks?”

Senator Kippenhan: Of not having somebody have a sit-down with them and say, what’s going on.

Senator Molitor: We certainly offer assistance, but many students don’t take us up on it. We do get students that come to us and say, I have no idea why I’m on probation or even why I was suspended.

Senator Keith: So if we make the change that President-Elect Rouillard suggested to college credit plus, is this policy acceptable or are there other questions? Did somebody write down the change?

Dr. Molitor: Yes.

Senator Keith: Okay.

Dr. Molitor: Do you want me to send a proposed text out to you to then [you can] distribute?

Senator Keith: I will like to vote today if possible.

Dr. Molitor: And this would be submitted to the policy for review process, correct?

Senator Keith: Yes. Can someone tell me where it is because I have the markup copy and I don’t have on my computer glasses on?

Dr. Molitor: Do you want me to read it verbatim?

Senator Keith: Well, if you tell me where it is, I can type it in as you read it. So where is the section on college credit plus?

Dr. Molitor: It is right where the GPA is at.

Senator Keith: So how do you want me to change it?

Dr. Molitor: How about, “students placed on probation during enrollment in college credit plus or other transient student programs will be allowed at least one additional semester on probation upon entry into their degree program.”

Senator Keith: So, “students placed on probation during enrollment in college credit plus or other transient student programs will be allowed at least one additional semester on probation upon initial enrollment in a degree program,” correct?

Dr. Molitor: You want to add “before being subject to suspension.”

Senator Schneider: I think that is a good idea to have that in there.

Senator Keith: Right here after “probation?”

Senator Relue: Is there a reason that it is “at least one” and not just one additional?

Dr. Molitor: Thank you. I would agree with Senator Relue, “just one,” not “at least one.”

Senator Keith: Okay.

Senator Monsos: What are the other “transient student programs?”

Dr. Molitor: We also have students who have guest student status who are enrolled at other institutions while taking courses at UT.

Senator Monsos: But are we clear that it doesn’t mean transfer students?

Dr. Molitor: So, do you want to limit it to college credit plus?

Senator Krantz: But that is very specific by name; there can be other equivalent programs.

Dr. Molitor: How about, “other dual enrollment programs for high school students” - would that language work because that is what we’re really trying to address?

Senator Schneider: I am wondering about this because we have students who participate in some Summer programs at the university who earn credits during the Summer and it may only take eight credits and their GPA might be below 2.0. For that Summer session, they have special student status while they’re simultaneously enrolled as first year students. So, the transient category captures students in that position whereas other specific names wouldn’t fit. I like the language, “other transient programs.”

Senator Keith: I don’t think we actually regard transfer students as transient students, right?

Group of Senators: No.

Senator Ferris: Could we solve the problem by saying, “no student shall be suspended before they completed one academic year at the university.” Then we don’t have to specify the programs in which they might have earned credit and simplify how we’re framing it. If that’s our goal, let’s go there rather than using “transfer”.

Senator White: Where is “transfer students” at?

Dr. Molitor: Transfer students would still be subject to the rule that they get one semester on probation at UT because they’re not going to have an UT GPA before they transfer to the university. When you come to the university, you won’t have a UT GPA until you complete your first semester. So this proposal would apply to the transfer students, direct from high school students and any other students who are new to the university. Then you will get that second semester on probation and potentially be subject to suspension after this. I do agree with that wording, I actually think it makes more sense.

Senator Schneider: When you say, you agree with that wording, are you referring to Senator Ferris’ wording?

Senator Molitor: Yes.

Senator Schneider: Yes, I think that is smart.

Senator Keith: Okay, Senator Ferris, what was your wording?

Senator Ferris: I'm a performance guy. Once I say it, it's gone <laughter>.

Senator Kippenhan: "No students shall be suspended before completing an academic year at UT."

Senator Molitor: State "a full year, two semesters."

Past-President Humphrys: So, does that mean if I take three hours the first semester then---?

Senator Molitor: Then those rules down below with credit hours and GPA are going to apply. We have a graded system. For example, if you take less than 10 credit hours, then you can only be suspended if your GPA is below 1.0.

Past-President Humphrys: And then the other thing is, do those early college high school students—is there an issue by doing this of trying to define what entering the University of Toledo means? Do you see what I'm saying? So in other words, those students who are in the early college high school, are they UT students?

Dr. Molitor: But they are not in a degree program and that's the language we will need to work on.

Past-President Humphrys: They are not? Well, see, I wonder. Don't they put them in an associate degree "something or another?"

Group of Senators: No.

Senator Schneider: And I think they're coded in as TPS in our system.

Senator Molitor: They have a NDU code, non-degree seeking undergraduate.

Past-President Humphrys: So they are only taking courses, but not in a program?

Senator Molitor: Yes. That is the language that we need to add to Senator Ferris' comment about two semesters in any degree program at UT.

Senator Monsos: What about undecided students then or exploratory?

Senator Molitor: She's right about exploratory studies.

Senator Keith: Well, I would like to vote today, but we don't have to vote today. In fact, I wasn't expecting to vote today because this is a policy that everybody will have lots of opinions on. So perhaps we can think about this because we want to get it right and then if our president allows, we can bring it back at the next meeting.

President-Elect Rouillard: I think that's a good idea.

Senator Schneider: What would be helpful is if you can send out the amended language from today with the questions we came up against, so we are thinking productively.

Senator Keith: I think we can do that. So I guess I move that we *Table* the discussion if I'm allowed to do that as Chair.

Senator Kippenhan: May I ask a question?

Senator Keith: Sure.

Senator Kippenhan: What was the purpose of this? Is the purpose to clarify the rules for the students in the degree programs or to clarify the rules for all students?

Dr. Molitor: I think it is to clarify the rules for all undergraduate students. It is also to clarify the rules for degree programs in different colleges to make sure we are, at a minimum, not subjecting students to harsher rules that originally intended.

Senator Schneider: It is also to clarify which GPA we're using because when this conversation was initiated, some units were using higher ed. GPA and some were using the UT GPA, and that is terrible for everyone.

Senator Kippenhan: That helps. Thank you.

Senator Keith: I think we have time for one more. This is the Dual Degree policy that you sent back the last time. It went out late morning or early afternoon. I give Dr. Molitor credit because he sent me language in my committee agreed that it would work to satisfy the issue in Engineering, which was the original language we had would prevent some Engineering students who are currently earning dual degrees from doing so because of the word "independently." As it now reads to receive two degrees, students must satisfy all requirements for each degree program. Students may use general education and major elective requirements from the degree to fulfill general education and major elective credits for the second degree. The second degree, individual colleges may implement limitations on the amount of coursework that can be counted towards two degrees and or specify a minimum number of credit hours of coursework that cannot be common to the two degree program as specified by each colleges elaborations on this policy. The rest of this is just some editing for grammar and the other thing we did was we changed the scope to include students who are returning who have previously obtained a bachelor's degree and are seeking a another bachelor's degree because we thought that would solve the issue with Pharmacy where students can earn a BSPS and not get into the PharmD program and come back and get accepted into the PharmD program where they have to earn another BSPS. The way we had the language originally, they weren't actually covered if they were coming back as a returning student with a degree. We also added in Faculty Senate, Provost, and Executive who is also the Executive for Academic Affairs must approve any procedures established by college, school, or department. We added in Faculty Senate because that is part of the current procedure for these types of approval. So I don't know, does this satisfy the majority of the issues we had at the last meeting? What are your thoughts? Dr. Molitor is here to assure us that Engineering is now okay. Could we vote?

President-Elect Rouillard: Actually, I do have a question. So you have a section here that says "*individual colleges may implement limitation on the amount of coursework that can be counted for two*

degrees.” So if a college decides not to impose a limitation, what you essentially got its basically two majors potentially across two colleges with no differences. So, that sort of makes the question, what is the difference between dual degrees and dual majors if there is in fact no required limitations on what courses can double-dip or be double counted.

Senator Keith: Well, I will take a “stab” at that. There are separate degree requirements. You can’t get a dual degree in economics and sociology because there is not a bachelor of economics, there’s a bachelor of sociology. I think were we run into issues where there all are dual degrees where we might think they are dual majors is in Engineering where most of their fields have separate degrees that are covered by accreditation and licensing requirements.

President-Elect Rouillard: Is there not still a BA in one of the sciences?

Senator Bjorkman: So for example, there is a BA in astronomy and a BS in physics where that technically is a dual degree because one is a BA and one is a BS. There is potentially also a possibility of essentially getting the same degree which is BA physics and BS physics, and we don’t want to have that. But there is a college elaboration that says the dual degree has to be from two separate departments. So that is how that is handled.

President-Elect Rouillard: What if a student is trying to do a BA in astronomy and a BA in my college? Is that dual degree or dual major?

Senator Keith: It is a dual degree because they are two different colleges with two different set of college requirements. You can’t do a dual major across college.

President-Elect Rouillard: I got it. Thank you.

Senator Keith: I guess we have to trust that colleges won’t. We also have to trust that the Provost Office won’t letter them water down their degree requirements to the point where there is no distinction between the two degrees.

Dr. Molitor: Just as a clarification to President-Elect Rouillard’s’ question. The Registrar would tell us that a degree program is specified by three components - college, major, and degree.

Senator Keith: May we vote?

Group of Senators: Yes.

Senator Keith: All in favor of the Dual Degree Policy please say “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions?
Motion Passed. Thank you so much.

President Thompson: Next on the agenda we will move forward with a student success update from Dr. Steve LeBlanc.

Dr. Steve LeBlanc, Interim Vice Provost for Student Success: Thank you everybody for having me here today. I am serving as the Interim Vice Provost for Student Success this year. I wanted to make you all aware of some student activities that are going on all across campus, some within your colleges and some at the university level. I also want to ask you for a little bit of help. I’m coming to the help part at

the end. Two measures of students' success are retention and graduate rates. The Fall to Fall retention is something that we've watched carefully. The Fall 2017 retention rates from the previous Fall was 74.5%; and it was at 74.1% the previous year, so we went up about .5% from Fall 15-16 and 16-17. Spring 2018 retention was up a little bit—it was up almost 1% from last Spring retention, but it is not final until we get the actual information. This six-year graduation rate is something we want to watch carefully because that is one of the things the state use to provide SSI, and it is also a component that goes into the U.S. News and World Report rankings. The baseline for 2016 was 43% with a goal in the strategic plan with 50% by 2022. In Fall 2017, it dropped and that was the cohort that came in 2011 and graduated in 2017, six years later, it went down to 41.9%. For 2018 which is not that complete, these are the students that came in 2012, who would graduate sometime this academic year by the end of Summer. Anybody that graduates from that cohort by the end of Summer would count—we are currently at 45% which is good—it is up from 41.9% last year. We are currently at 45% before Fall graduations, and if everybody who applied for Fall graduation graduates, we will be at 47.3%. I did a quick guesstimate on who could possibly graduate from that cohort from Spring and Summer by looking and saying, who got 96 hours or greater at this point—if all those people graduate, that will take up to almost 50%, about 49.9%. I think we are going to end up somewhere between the 45% and 49% range for this year, which is a nice increase from the previous one, and it takes it away from our 50% goal by 2022. So that is just a measure of the student's success efforts. That is not due to one thing in particular, but is due to all of the things that you're doing in the colleges to make a difference, and we really appreciate that. So some other things that are going on university wide that you may not be aware of is, in accordance with the strategic plan, the Provost has established a university wide student success taskforce. It has a broad representation from colleges and university departments. The purpose of that taskforce is to review current UT practices and best practices at other universities and then make some recommendations to the Provost Office on things we should implement campus wide. So that committee started meeting in the Fall, and we will continue our work in the Spring and then make recommendations for the Provost's consideration in the Spring. There is also an ad hoc advising committee that's been established, and they've been hard at work looking at advising practices across campus with an eye for sharing best practices and streamlining any administrative processes and improving communication between advisors and students... recommendations. They are going to provide their recommendations to the student success taskforce who will review those and pass those along to the Provost Office. There is something else going on with an eye for student success, it is a FYE committee that was established back in April 2017, and Senator Monsos chaired that committee. I've attended a number of their meetings and I know they worked very hard. They were charged with creating a plan for the first year experience including a first year course. Their work is to be completed by the end of this Spring as well with recommendations to the students success taskforce who will give their recommendations to Provost Hsu for what we ought to do here as far a FYE courses. Co-remediation efforts, there's been some co-remediation in the Math Department, Math 1180 this past Fall and then some sections of English are going to be offered as a co-remediation section this Spring, which is another section that offers some additional time for students that need some additional help in the courses. I know that colleges have been looking at courses where high DFW rates trying to determine what we can do to help with student success rates in those courses. The Learning Enhancement Center exists in the lower level of Carlson Library, Tia Tucker is the new director of that center. This center will provide tutoring services such as online tutoring and workshops for studies. Please make those services known to your students. The student success coaches have been very active. Their efforts are to make a critical difference in student success. Several early term efforts that they are engaged in this semester are: the Institute a

special intervention program with students in University College for this semester. They were looking at students who were on probation this Spring and was trying to get them on a more successful track. This included biweekly meetings with the coaches to monitor their progress and to help address issues they might face. The coaches are also reaching out to all students with under a 2.5 GPA and they are trying to schedule coaching meetings and interventions with those students to help them. They planned a great sequence of workshops that they have organized for the Spring and they are...for students who might be struggling. They are going to be offered in a centralized location in the Student Union as well as resident halls, and you will see flyers and posters about those going up around campus. The office of Multicultural Student Success has a program going on this semester as well for underserved populations. These are just brief highlights of the things that are going on. If you get surveys in your email, please complete those. They are going to be some early alert surveys planned from January through March for Arts and Letters 1000 and 2000 level courses and some math classes as well as surveys for all student athletes in your courses. Because of the college credit plus, this also applies to high school student athletes who might be in your classes taking college credit plus classes. So in order for the students to remain eligible, you have to respond to the surveys for your students. Reporting progress, we are going to ask for your assistance in reporting midterm grades this semester. We did the unfortunate situation where some students get to the point in the semester where they're reaching the withdrawal date and they don't have any grading and work returns, so they don't know how they are doing in the course. This put them in a little bit of a dilemma, so for those courses please submit your midterm grade so you can get some feedback from students. Please ask your faculty to communicate with students such as being responsive to student emails and questions. We hear a number of times when students have trouble getting email responses, so please take some time to work on that. We ask you also to take some attendance early on in your classes and report students who have stopped attending, so we could schedule some interventions with the success coaches and find out what's going on. If you haven't gotten your syllabus prepared already, you can reference the success coaches in your syllabus. I know the University Teaching Center has a little word in their syllabus template. If your syllabus is not already made up, and if the success coaches are not mentioned in there, if you could please mention that the first day of classes. Those are efforts I would like to ask your help with this semester so we can get the students started off well and raised the retention rates next Fall. Thank you very much.

President Thompson: Are there any questions for Dr. LeBlanc? Thank you for your very good work, we appreciate it.

[Applause]

President Thompson cont'd: Okay, last, but not least, we have Dr. Melissa Gregory who is going to give us a final update on what's going on with the promotion and tenure guidelines.

Dr. Melissa Gregory: I put this in a PowerPoint to make the timeline easier. I just wanted to report on the university level tenure and promotion guidelines that I brought to Faculty Senate back in Fall 2017, last semester. Just to review very briefly, we have what's called "elaborations" at the department and college level related to tenure and promotion at the University of Toledo, but we don't have an overarching cross-college document that addresses tenure and promotion. This kind of document is actually the norm at other institutions, including ones with unionized faculty. When I became presidential fellow in the Spring of 2017, Dr. Hsu asked me if I would look into creating some of those guidelines

with the goal of trying to protect faculty by stabilizing our culture by making sure we understood our shared standards. So, just to give you a sense of the timeline, we proposed that these guidelines be created to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee way back in March 2017, and they agreed it was a good idea, so they formed an ad hoc committee to work on drafting the guidelines. That committee wrote, drafted and revised in the Summer of 2017. They finished the draft by August 2017 and started kind of pre-circulating it at the beginning of last Fall. The draft made its way to Faculty Senate around the first of November of last year, and we talked about it at the November 7th meeting and then also at the November 21st meeting. At that point, although initially, the goal was to try to get a vote of endorsement from Faculty Senate by the end of the Fall 2017 semester. At the November 21st meeting, it became clear there were some additional questions that needed to be discussed and some of those were coming primarily from the College of Law and the College of Medicine. So I just want to make sure how this document was working and if it applied to them effectively. So we put the pause on pushing for a vote. At the end of Fall semester on December 14th, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee hosted a meeting that was attended by provosts, representatives from the College of Law and also Medicine, and I was there. At that point of time, we determined a timeline to discuss and provide specific feedback on the issues that they had aired during the meeting and to get those down in writing and make sure they were understood. Everybody there agreed to a target deadline of February 27 for a Faculty Senate vote. This is our new target deadline in this process. So currently, the College of Law responded to the draft in detail, they sent me really good notes on January 12th. I responded to their edits by email this morning. We have a fairly short list of about four things that we need to have some more discussion on. Although, I am pretty optimistic that those issues will get resolved, but in short, that conversation is ongoing. The College of Medicine has reconstituted its Faculty Council Academic Affairs Committee to finalize revisions on the survey on the guidelines that they hope to administer to their faculty. The timeline as I see it going forward, my proposed endorsement process is that the next several weeks will be dedicated towards some additional discussion with those two colleges and making sure we implement any kind of revisions that need to be implemented. We hope that process will wrap up by February 6, which will allow me to pull the draft together and recirculate it to Faculty Senate for the next meeting on February 13, which would allow additional and final discussion. The document will hopefully come forth on February 27th for a vote. So, let me just remind all of you that you're welcome to contact me anytime with questions or feedback on this draft. My goal was to make the process transparent and ultimately, to come up with the draft that is really useful to everybody on UT's campus. So, that is where we are and I just wanted to know if you had questions.

Senator Maloney: There is a small number-of faculty who are Health Science Campus faculty that teach on the Main Campus who are in College of Health and Human Services. I have never heard the College of Medicine at all in regard of this; do you think that we're part of that umbrella?

Dr. Gregory: Well, you are certainly welcome to talk to me directly, and I can share the draft with you. Other than that, I would think David Kennedy at the College of Medicine would be the person to contact there. The faculty affairs committee that they reconstituted is being chaired by Joan Duggan.

Senator Maloney: I am part of that committee, and I've never been contacted.

Dr. Gregory: Maybe you and I can talk afterwards, and I will make sure you get the document that's been shared with the College of Medicine and try to bring you in that loop. We want to make sure you're not getting brought out of that discussion and that's important.

Senator Weldy: I don't see this on the agenda today, so the College of Medicine senator might have come if they have known this was on the agenda to look at this. Can you send out this timeline to all of us so we can have that information because some senators may not be on the College of Medicine Counsel?

Dr. Gregory: Oh, of course. This is a timeline that was discussed at the Executive Committee in December. The committee that's working on it should actually be up to speed on it. But yes, I will be happy to send it out again.

Senator Weldy: It is a pretty aggressive timeline for the College of Medicine.

Dr. Gregory: Like I said, that is what we have talked about, and we can certainly review it.

President Thompson: Are there any questions? Thank you very much on your work on this. So that brings us to the end of our meeting. Are there any items at all from the floor?

Senator McLoughlin: Yes, about the upcoming Fall schedule that we're working on right now. I think it was a date of February 6, where all changes need to be kind of put into the system and any further changes will come from the provost. There was some concern from faculty members in our area about that being kind of an aggressive date—you're coming back a week later about faculty being able to look at the changes for the upcoming Fall, give it to the appropriate personnel, and faculty being able to review the changes again before it goes on further and go live. I know for our program we have a lot of problems and errors that will wait till almost the last minute, going into Fall and now it is Spring. We need more time for faculty to review the changes for the upcoming Fall semester. Again, I think February 6, was the drop date for faculty to have changes into the system.

President Thompson: Provost Hsu, can you respond to that?

Provost Hsu: Are you talking about the catalog?

Senator McLoughlin: Yes, the catalog and the course schedule for Fall; February 6, was the date that given to us in an email today.

Provost Hsu: If it is the course schedule, we have to open it up in early March so that students could register in time. So changes will still have to be made before opening it up to the students.

Senator McLoughlin: I was informed that after February 6, it will require approval of the associate dean and the provost, and it becomes a big hassle. So any changes that didn't require upper administration approval will need to be done prior to February 6, and after February 6, changes will occur, but it is a bigger issue and a major deal after that.

Senator Wittmer: Are those just the courses or the faculty assigned core courses?

Senator McLoughlin: The courses schedule themselves, the time.

Senator Wittmer: I was just going to say a lot of faculty decisions will not be made by then.

Senator Schneider: Is the difficulty that we return a week later than we usually return because this is the time of the year when the schedule opens/close?

Senator McLoughlin: Yes, I think that was some of the issue.

Senator Schneider: So it is just the one week delay of faculty returning back, right?

Senator McLoughlin: Yes, it was the one week delay. We were experiencing problems in our area of any shortage of staff being able to be incorporate changes; it was very rushed for us and the faculty never got a chance to review prior to the students to be able to enroll in the Spring. It was when we came back from Fall break and all of a sudden, it was live. There were 19,000 problems and overlaps and we had to deal with scheduling—it was chaotic. So the idea was to kind of make sure that before it goes live that the faculty will at least have already had a chance to review prior to registration.

Provost Hsu: I will go back and check with Registrar. I want to know if we are actually requiring giving this earlier than before compared to the first day of class.

Senator McLoughlin: I really appreciate it. Thank you.

President Thompson: Thank you for bringing that up, Senator McLoughlin.

Dr. Molitor: I'll just add to Senator McLoughlin's comment. Hopefully it will be less chaos this time around because now we've done the switch to the shorter semesters and the time slots are rolling with the new schedule. The time slots didn't roll with Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 schedules but will roll again with the Fall 2018 schedule and beyond.

Senator McLoughlin: You're right. That's a good point, thanks.

Senator Relue: I will like to make an announcement about a seminar series that we're starting in the College of Engineering. The kickoff for that is going to be February 7th from 3-5:00 pm...Technology Takes the Wheel. Those will be coming down the pipe as they start to be on the road with us. The first session we're having a speaker from Delfi who is actually going to bring a...vehicle to the program. There is also going to be a speaker from AAA. We would like to have the rest of the university involved in this on subsequent sessions because we can see this will have an impact and not just from Engineering...elderly population...a lot of people getting transportation or have difficulty getting transportation or legal issues surrounding around how...So, anybody in the room that is interested in this area, I would appreciate if you see me. We would love to have you there.

President Thompson: That sounds great. Thank you. Are there any other announcements or good news before we adjourn? May I have a motion to adjourn? Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Williams

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary