

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 30, 2024
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 2/13/2024

Summary of Discussion

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

The meeting was called to order and ask Secretary Smith called the roll.

Roll call 2023-24

Present: Ammon Allred, Tomer Avidor-Reiss, Gabriella Baki, Sharon Barnes, John Bellizzi, Sheri Benton, Terry Bigioni, Timothy Brakel, Carmen Cioc, Daniel Compura, Deborah Coulter-Harris, Vicki Dagostino-Kalniz, Maria Diakonova, Holly Eichner, Hossein Elgafy, Elyce Ervin, Collin Gilstrap, Karen Green, Sally Harmych, Samir Hefzy, Cindy Herrera, Mitchell Howard, Gary Insch, Dinkar Kaw, Lauren Koch, Revathy Kumar, Linda Lewin, Kimberly McBride, Daniel McInnis, Thomas McLoughlin, Kimberly Nigem, Mahasin Osman, Elaine Reeves, Jennifer Reynolds, Linda Rouillard, Eric Sahloff, Paul Schaefer, Barry Scheurmann, Gaby Semaan, Kathy Shan, Chunhua Sheng, Stan Stepkowski, Steven Suchek, Weiqing Sun, Jami Taylor, William Taylor, Kasey Tucker-Gail, Jerry Van Hoy, Randall Vesely, Don Wedding.

Excused Absence: Ritu Charavarti, Rene Heberle, Jason Huntley, Ahalapitiya Jayatissa, Catherine Johnson, Mohamed Osman, Lee Strang, Aela Vely

Unexcused Absence: Elissar Andari, Bruce Bamber, Mohamed Moussa, Puneet Sindhwani, James Van Hook

Senator Smith: Called roll.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Smith. The first order of business today is to adopt the agenda. Quinetta is going to pull that up for us. This is the agenda for today. You'll notice that I have flipped the 'items from the floor' up to number six, 'other business' to number seven because we will have some visitors who very briefly are going to talk about a networking program. They will likely be here only after 5:30 pm, but I think they won't take longer than 10 minutes. If our items from the floor aren't finished, we can continue for a bit. So, I would ask a motion to adopt the agenda.

Senator Semaan: So moved.

President Rouillard: Second?

Senator Brakel: Second.

President Rouillard: All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please indicate in the Chat box 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain.' Oh, I'm sorry, the people who have weathered the snow, please indicate with a voice vote, 'aye,' 'nay,' or any 'abstains.' You all were very brave; it is getting nasty out there. ***Agenda Passed.***

The next item is approval of the Minutes. Quinetta distributed those. These are the Minutes for January 16th. All those in favor of approving the Minutes, please signify in the room 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain,' or in the Chat box, please.

Group of Senators: Yes.

President Rouillard: Any nays? Abstain? Hearing none. Thank you. We will wait for the Chat Box vote. The Minutes were circulated. Do we have any other votes there for the Minutes? The Minutes are approved, [with] one abstention. ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

All right, that brings us to the Executive Committee report. The first thing is to show a screenshot. The Provost Office has sent the following list of suspended programs—meaning, suspending admission—to the Faculty Senate Exec. Quinetta will share that with you in a moment on the screen. Does everybody see the list on the screen? And those in the room, I expect you are going to need a ‘telescope’ to see the small print. Please also note, at the bottom of this list. I would like to speak regarding program suspensions proposed by the provost office, who seem to have only consulted with the deans so far.

The reasoning for the proposed cuts provided by the provost office was, quote “by reducing low-demand degree programs and their associated courses at UToledo, we can apply the time and talents of more of our faculty to develop and deliver new, innovative, and high-demand programs.” end quote. These program cuts are also said to quote “generate some immediate cost savings” and “growth in student enrollment, retention and graduation rates by making UToledo more competitive”.

Essentially, administrators propose that by eliminating low-enrolled courses and programs, getting rid of part timers and replacing them with faculty to teach those large sections, we can cut down the costs AND attract more students.

Let me explain why this is unlikely to happen, aside from limited cost savings from laying off part-timers and savings from hoarding students into large sections.

What do prospective students look for in a university?

A study on Institutional Strategy and Positioning produced by consultants of the A&S Group for UToledo last semester suggests that students want to go to a school that is an appealing and safe location (well, Toledo is probably not the first choice), a school with a vibrant and fun campus social life (we have a lot of that), with a strong sense of community (we beat Ohio State in this regard), and where they can find internships and jobs and then settle down (and recent developments with solar industry, Intel moving in and being close to global manufacturing hubs definitely helps us).

Affordability and cost is of secondary concern to students according to the study.

The study also says that academically, prospective students want to go to a school that provides the experience of a large, well-resourced university which provides an opportunity to pursue their academic and professional aspirations at a high level. End quote. How do we give this to students? Well, by providing them with a wide menu of programs, degrees, concentrations, certificates and classes to choose from.

Closing and eliminating existing established programs and classes, without new programs and classes already in place, only limits those choices for prospective students and makes UToledo less attractive to them. Closing programs or suspending admission to programs will only diminish the diversity of choices that prospective students expect from us.

Prioritizing programs and classes almost exclusively based on the recent enrollment numbers with a little bit of wiggle room for things like a required course for a degree, makes us a very inflexible institution that is poor in adapting to future needs of students and the economy. We live in the age of rapid changes where it is hard to predict what the economy will look like 5 years from now. If you have 500 statistics or computer science majors it doesn’t mean they will not be replaced by AI in the next 5 years. Looking at current workforce needs is certainly important, but so is the need for flexibility and options for students. Trends, booms and busts –they come and go but the need for critical thinkers with solid communication and research skills will always be there.

How do you hedge against future uncertainty? You diversify; you spread the risk across different options. Reducing the number of programs and classes will eliminate these options and will expose us to greater risks. And for what? The pennies that we save by laying off part-time instructors who do the bulk of our teaching. Larger classes also mean less personalized attention to students and less time for faculty to do research due to more grading and talking to more students. This is not positioning UToledo for growth; this is positioning us for a failure.

Our primary mission is to develop in our students a creative and innovative mindset. Students come to us, often undecided, to explore different options and opportunities, to pursue their passions and aspirations, worrying less about the current job market and more about transferable skills that they can use in any job of the future. That is why we are not a 2-year technical college but a 4-year University. Our goal is not so much to prepare for specific jobs of today, as to develop creative and innovative thinkers of tomorrow.

Bottom line: cutting low-enrolled courses and programs will diminish our attractiveness as a university, expose us to more risk and will hurt our enrollment.

And as for the process of the proposed program cuts:

- poor rationale for why we need it in the first place,
- arbitrary cut offs for what is a low demand course,
- very rushed timeline,
- opaque process with close to no input from faculty and students so far,
- details of the process are not worked out,

This is a recipe for disaster. If anything, it has to be done differently.

I'd say, keep student options open and leave it up to the departments what programs and courses they think are important or not. We are educators, we are experts in our fields, and we know better than any benevolent administrator what needs to be taught and how. Central planning works in a top-down business organizations, doesn't work well in academia. Shared governance is there for a reason.

Finally, I hope more faculty can speak up and have their voice recorded. If you think your program is currently well enrolled and therefore important and safe, with this kind of decision-making process – your program could be next.

Senator Brakel: President Rouillard, this is Tim Brakel.

President Rouillard: Okay, and then Senator Barnes [is next].

Senator Brakel: First off, I had forwarded you a message from the Attorney General, a letter that was sent out universities. It was regarding hiring practices. It was essentially stating that any hires cannot consider or have any references in the application process regarding diversity statements etc. So, we can get that letter distributed to everybody a bit later.

President Rouillard: I'll ask Quinetta to distribute that tomorrow along with the results of the Faculty Senate survey.

Senator Brakel: Right.

President Rouillard: Senator Barnes

Senator Brakel: And---

President Rouillard: Oh, sorry, go ahead.

Senator Brakel: And another thing. We've been closely following a draft of a bill that it seems to be related to what the Attorney General said, but also it is related to what Senator Cirino has within Senate Bill 83. It relates to diversity issues and freedom of speech types of issues. At this point in time it is just a draft. It has not been assigned either a Senate bill number or a House bill number, but there is a concern that because of the capital projects bill and because of what we stated already two weeks ago, Senator Cirino is asking for university presidents, when they present their capital projects proposals, to give information about diversity statements and other issues. This bill may be an attempt to supplant the Senate Bill 83. So, keep watching that closely as it moves forward or whatever happens to it. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you, Senator Brakel. That is good information.

Senator Barnes: I just wanted to say that I think the language that you shared from the Faculty Senate Constitution about our rights and responsibilities with regard to curricular and program closure, etc. is also language in our AAUP contract. I think that it's very similar and it also requires consultation and considerations, so [I] just wanted to mention that.

President Rouillard: Okay. Thank you. And of course, review and response is significantly more than notification. Any other comments? Well, in that case, I will -- oh, sorry.

Senator Brakel: Is this comment from the floor?

President Rouillard: Yes.

Senator Brakel: So this is Tim Brakel again. I'm going to go on record here that the Music Degree that's listed on this list, frankly, we were not consulted about it until today.

President Rouillard: Okay, that is important to know. Thank you, Senator Brakel. We have a faculty member, Aliaksandr Amialchuck from the Economics Department. You had a comment you wanted to make?

Professor Amialchuk: Yes. So, hello, my name is Aliaksandr Amialchuck. I'm a Professor in the Department of Economics. It is my duty per the Collective Bargaining Agreement to review and make recommendations about the curriculum, and so I would like to speak regarding program suspensions proposed by the Provost Office, who seem to only consult with the deans so far.

The reasoning for the proposed cuts provided by the Provost Office was, quote "by reducing low-demand degree programs and their associated courses at UToledo, we can apply the time and talents of more of our faculty to develop and deliver new, innovative, and high-demand programs" end quote. These program cuts are also said to quote "generate some immediate cost savings" and "growth in student enrollment, retention and graduation rates by making UToledo more competitive".

Essentially, administrators propose that by eliminating low-enrolled courses and programs, getting rid of part timers and replacing them with faculty to teach those large sections, we can cut down the costs and attract more students.

Let me explain why this is unlikely to happen, aside from limited cost savings from laying off part-timers and savings from hoarding students into large sections.

What do prospective students look for in a University?

A study on Institutional Strategy and Positioning produced by consultants of the A&S Group for UToledo last semester suggests that students want to go to a school that is an appealing and safe location (well, Toledo is probably not the first choice), a school with a vibrant and fun campus social life (we have a lot of that), with a strong sense of community (we beat Ohio State in this regard), and where they can find internships and jobs and then settle down (and recent developments with solar industry, Intel moving in and being close to global manufacturing hubs definitely helps us).

Affordability and cost is of secondary concern to students, according to the study.

The study also says that academically, prospective students want to go to a school that provides the experience of a large, well-resourced university which provides an opportunity to pursue their academic and professional aspirations at a high level. How do we give this to students? Well, by providing them with a wide menu of programs, degrees, concentrations, certificates, and classes to choose from.

Closing and eliminating existing established programs and classes, without new programs and classes already in place, only limits those choices for prospective students and makes UToledo less attractive to them. Closing programs or suspending admission to programs will only diminish the diversity of choices that prospective students expect from us.

Prioritizing programs and classes almost exclusively based on the recent enrollment numbers with a little bit of wiggle room for things like a required course for a degree, makes us a very inflexible institution that is poor in adapting to future needs of students and the economy. We live in the age of rapid changes where it is hard to predict what the economy will look five years from now. If you have 500 statistics or computer science majors, it doesn't mean they will not be replaced by AI in the next five years. Looking at current workforce needs is certainly important, but so is the need for flexibility and options for students. Trends, booms and busts – they come and go but the need for critical thinkers with solid communication and research skills will always be there.

How do you hedge against future uncertainty? You diversify, you spread the risk across different options. Reducing the number of programs and classes will eliminate these options and will expose us to greater risks. And for what? The pennies that we save by laying off part-time instructors who do the bulk of our teaching? Larger classes also mean less personalized attention to students and less time for faculty to do research due to more grading and talking to more students. This is not positioning UToledo for growth; this is positioning us for a failure.

Our primary mission is to develop in our students a creative and innovative mindset. Students come to us, often undecided, to explore different options and opportunities, to pursue their passions and aspirations, worrying less about the current job market and more about transferable skills that they can use in any job of the future. That is why we are not a 2-year technical college but a 4-year University. Our goal is not so much to prepare for specific jobs of today, as to develop creative and innovative thinkers of tomorrow.

Bottom line: cutting low-enrolled courses and programs will diminish our attractiveness as a University, expose us to more risk and will hurt our enrollment.

And as for the process of the proposed program cuts:

- poor rationale for why we need it in the first place,

- arbitrary cut offs for what is a low demand course,
- very rushed timeline,
- opaque process with close to no input from faculty and students so far,
- details of the process are not worked out.

This is a recipe for disaster. If anything, it has to be done differently.

I'd say, keep student options open and leave it up to the departments what programs and courses they think are important or not. We are educators, we are experts in our fields and we know better than any benevolent administrator what needs to be taught and how. Central planning works in a top-down business organizations, doesn't work well in academia. Shared governance is there for a reason.

Finally, I hope more faculty could speak up and have their voice recorded. If you think your program is currently well enrolled and therefore important and safe, with this kind of decision making process – your program could be next. Thank you!

President Rouillard: Thank you, Professor Amialchuk. Any other comments on this topic? We can also return to it later on in the meeting if you prefer. Thank you.

Senator Smith: President Rouillard, have you seen the question in the Chat?

President Rouillard: Oh, thank you. From Senator Lewin. "Other courses have received cuts that fall under the responsibility of Grad Studies. Are there similar dynamics in the decision making process?" I believe there is an identical process that is unfolding at Graduate Council with the same timeline as far as I know. Any other questions? All right, in that case, I will cede the floor to the Provost for his report.

Provost Molitor: In the interest of the Minutes, I'm going to stick to my script and then I'm going to go off script to address a few of the things that I've just heard here. So, if you're wondering why I'm kind of hopping back and forth, that would be the reason.

So, thank you. And so, first off, I want to start with a few quick updates. The final finalists for the Provost position completed their campus visits last week, and Dr. Postel has reviewed the feedback on these candidates and will begin the process of negotiating with the preferred candidate later this week. Similarly, the semifinalists for the Arts and Letters dean candidates completed their campus visits last week, and I will be meeting with the search committee tomorrow morning to discuss their recommendations on finalists to bring back to campus in a few weeks. An internal call for an Honors Program director was released last week with the goal of finalizing this search before the end of March. Apologies again for the delay in getting this out, and please encourage any interested colleagues to apply.

Dr. Postel has begun meeting with faculty and staff from the various colleges to provide updates on major university-wide initiatives related to the 5-year strategic plan. He met with Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences yesterday, and he met with Health and Human Services earlier this afternoon. He will meet with Law on Thursday and Engineering on Friday. He will meet with the remaining colleges between Friday February 9th and Friday February 16th. These meetings are in person but should allow for remote attendance and recording capability for those that cannot attend in person or have scheduling conflicts. Please encourage your colleagues to attend or to review the recording afterwards.

Yesterday I sent the list of programs to the individual colleges that will suspend their admissions for fall 2024. This was followed by an email to Drs. Rouillard and Mc Bride to provide the list of undergraduate programs to Faculty Senate, and an email to Drs. Patrick Lawrence and Barbara Saltzman to provide the list of graduate programs to Graduate Council. I apologize for the delay in getting this out, but we wanted to ensure that we identified the correct set of programs and to ensure everyone has the same information regarding this process. To this end, I sent an email to all faculty to provide an update on this process, along with a link to a website created to update our progress on this initiative.

Over the next two weeks, department and college curriculum committees will receive notifications in the CIM system from individual programs in their departments and colleges suspending admissions. During this time, the Faculty Senate Academic Programs Committee will receive CIM notifications for suspended undergraduate programs, and the Graduate Council Curriculum

The committee will receive CIM notifications for suspended graduate programs. There were several programs on the list, mostly at the graduate level, already showing as inactive on CIM, or missing CIM pages altogether. I included these programs in my correspondence with Faculty Senate and Graduate Council leadership in case CIM notifications were not disseminated for these programs.

I would also like to take this opportunity to answer some questions about program prioritization I received from Faculty Senate leadership. The first question was regarding projected revenue loss and savings resulting from program prioritization. In terms of projected savings, we are working with the colleges to identify courses that no longer need to be taught. This information may show some limited savings through a reduction in part-time instruction. In terms of revenue, it is possible that we lose some students next fall because their program of interest has suspended admissions. Given the recent enrollment within the affected programs, and given the availability of alternative programs, I suspect this loss will be minimal.

Again, I want to be clear on the expected outcome of this process in terms of expenses and revenues, which also address the second question I received regarding the anticipated impact on recruiting and retention. Our goal is to reallocate faculty time and workload to improve existing programs or to develop new programs. Reallocating faculty time can allow us to improve existing programs and their associated student outcomes, which could increase retention and graduation rates, which would result in increased enrollment and associated tuition revenue. Reallocating faculty time can also allow us to develop and deliver new, innovative, and high demand programs. If successful, this process will improve our ability to both recruit and retain students, increasing enrollment and thereby increasing revenue.

The next question is regarding the number of students who will be affected by suspending program admissions. Again, I want to be clear on this point: no currently enrolled students will be adversely affected. All students currently enrolled in affected programs will have the opportunity to complete these programs. In terms of any students already admitted for fall 2024, but not yet enrolled, we will work with the colleges and Enrollment Management to communicate with these students and to determine whether alternative programs would be suitable to achieve their academic goals. Again, given the recent enrollment within the affected programs, and given the availability of alternative programs, I suspect we

will be able to accommodate most, if not all, students that have been admitted already to affected programs for fall 2024.

The next set of questions were directed toward the impact of the program prioritization process on the faculty. Again, we are working with the colleges to identify courses that no longer need to be taught, and this information may show some reduction in part-time instruction.

Any impact on full-time faculty in affected programs should be addressed during the 2024 – 2025 workload assignment process. I anticipate that faculty in affected programs will still have appropriate teaching loads given the necessity to teach out current students, or the delivery of programs in alternative formats such as concentrations, certificates, or minors. I do not necessarily think we will require overloads to teach out affected programs as presumably these courses are already part of full-time faculty workloads.

Once courses in affected programs are removed from the course schedule and from faculty workloads, I do believe we will be entertaining proposals to provide workload release to allow faculty time to improve existing courses, develop new courses, or to teach subjects in related disciplines that they have not previously taught. I will be working with the Deans to ensure the colleges have provisions in their workload guidelines related to course release for improving existing courses, developing new courses, or teaching courses for the first time.

Finally, I was asked about providing data on metrics utilized in the prioritization process, including workforce demand. We will be providing this information as soon as possible. Given the nature of higher education today, I believe that the prioritization process does not end here, and we will be working with the Deans and with faculty governance to develop and to implement an ongoing process for the review of our programs. Are there programs that we do not offer but should consider offering? Are there opportunities to offer our degree programs in a different format? Do we have offerings that are no longer sustainable in terms of enrollment or workforce demand?

To this end, we would need to provide information through a live dashboard that is continuously updated vs. relying of a static set of information that was utilized for the current process. We will be working with Institutional Research to explore the feasibility of creating a live dashboard for this purpose. I would welcome any suggestions regarding the metrics we should incorporate into such a tool.

So, that is the end of my script. Now, I am going to go off script to address the things I heard here, and I'm sure there will be additional follow-up questions if I didn't miss anything or if further questions are generated.

So, first of all, on the College of Business degree associate programs, it turns out that the College of Business actually have six associate degree programs, all in the area of computer support, computer network, and business software management. So, they have consolidated those associate degree programs into, I believe, they are maintaining a computer network specialist and business management software and they decided to suspend admissions on those other ones that you saw before. In terms of losing students for fall 2024, it turns out, the bulk of the students that have been admitted into affected undergraduate

programs are either in the Exercise Science, which is being supplanted by the new health science major, or in the media communication, which is going to be absorbed as a concentration in the BA in communication. So, other than that, I believe we were in the single digits on students that were admitted to programs outside of those two. And even those, we believe there will probably be alternatives that those students may want to consider. So, at this point, given where we are in the admissions process, and given yield expectations and everything, at most, we're probably talking about losing two or three students based on the projected information I received. My concerns actually in this regard, and I'm collecting information from Graduate Admissions, is potential losses for the graduate programs that may be on the list. Again, the programs that we have targeted, at least at the Graduate level are almost all exclusively very low enrolled programs. So, I don't anticipate that would be a significant impact. However, at the graduate level, I will concede it's probably a lot less likely that we would find alternatives that those students would find suitable.

I also wanted to address the issues about the delays - why some programs? It turns out that there was a total of eight and I believe we added a ninth program to the list of why programs were allowed to extend into fall 2024. Those actually came from conversations regarding donor requirements or external funding of the students in those programs. So, that is why we decided to put a hold on those to address those issues before we move forward. And I should also point out here that regarding the input process—and I will concede this was rushed, I'm not going to deny that, but it doesn't mean you don't have time to provide input. Remember, we are only suspending admissions. We are not using the term 'closing programs.' Closing programs, actually, after you notify that you're suspending admissions, you have up to five-years to reactivate programs. So, at this point given the numbers of admits we've seen and given the process that can move forward, there is still plenty of time to consider and provide input. And again, I would like to—not on a rush basis, but on a more thoughtful and systematic process—implement a process that we can continuously engage in these conversations, review programs, and decide whether new programs are needed, whether we can modify existing programs, offer them in a different format or if we can no longer sustain the offerings of those programs. But, we did have the time crunch in place in terms of getting these changes incorporated in time for fall 2024. We needed to get moving on this. We have a budget process. We have a five-year financial forecast. And to be honest, every time we delay this cycle, it adds another year before we can actually start implementing changes. So, yes, the process was rushed a lot faster than I would have liked; however, it needed to get moving. And so I believe moving forward, we can still continue to have dialogue and conversations about the program that are on those lists and other programs that are going to be coming forward. We expect that, again, in addition to the ones that would be on the lists for next fall. There are at least 25 other programs that have been identified as further 'exploration is required,' so we could see additional programs moving forward here.

I would like to address the point about resource allocation. It is correct that we don't anticipate much of a change in enrollment or faculty costs. You know, there may be limited savings in terms of part-time instruction, but in terms of the fall 2024 budget process, there probably won't be a significant impact there. But again, we have to move forward and get these processes initiated so that moving forward, we can start looking at questions, like, okay, we have faculty attrition; should we replace faculty in these areas, or should we consider hires in other areas? What can we do to start improving programs to get those changes out there and marketed, to get those changes publicized so we can start attracting further students? And really, to me, most importantly, where we're going to have the biggest impact at least—I'm

not saying in the short term because we're talking fall 2024—in the medium term, the biggest impact I am anticipating from this process is in the retention of our current students. Okay, so if you think about increasing graduation rates by 1%, you'll probably talking about, I don't know, maybe I need help from IR here. But let's say 1%, you're talking about from an incoming class of a couple thousand students. So, let's say that would be, you know, 50 students. Think about the tuition revenue associated with those 50 students. That's already a couple hundred thousand dollars right there, right off the bat just with a 1% increase in retention. So then you couple that with potential to increase enrollment in higher demand areas, adding potentially new programs - and we've already launched new programs that we see are growing pretty fast and we need to resource those programs effectively. So, if we couple that increased enrollment in those areas along with improved retention, that has a multiplier effect where now you start seeing tuition revenue in a couple of million-dollar range. So, this is really where I think we have the most chance to impact our financial situation. And again, it is not going to happen tomorrow, but it can happen, again, if we allocate our resources and our faculty time correctly. So, I think that was the things I kind of scribbled down, and I assume there's going to be some other questions as well. Do we have another microphone?

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator McInnis: Hi, Provost Molitor. I'm sorry, super quick question just to clarify because I think I missed it. Did you say the 25 other programs that you mentioned, are those new programs you were talking about or are those programs---

Provost Molitor: No, these are existing programs that we're exploring to determine if they are still sustainable, if they can be modified, and other considerations there. And so, I believe that was part of the timeline that Linda showed. They were like, explore those throughout the spring semester.

Senator McInnis: Thank you.

President Rouillard: Any comments?

Professor Amialchuk: Scott, I respectfully disagree that suspending programs and letting existing students get taught out in the program 'is not going to hurt them.' I can imagine if I teach a student like that and I know my class is not going to run in the future, I'm going to allocate less resources. Then there's going to be no incoming cohort of new students that existing students might matter. There are so many other ways the students could be hurt.

Provost Molitor: I know, and that is a valid point. But again, in terms of our ability, we are required to make sure we teach out those programs. And I think that's a great point, and it may require some creative thinking as to how to support those students. So, I appreciate that, that's very valid.

President Rouillard: One of the things that may very well be affected by these program suspensions is that students come to us without often knowing what their major is going to be, and they go through two or three majors. Some students also discover that they can fit a double major. And in fact, one of your engineering students has just discovered that after coming back from a summer of study-abroad. We

talked about how she could be a combination, French major and Engineering major -- and we've had students do this before, French and Pharmacy, for instance. They don't necessarily come in thinking they can do that, but once they are here, they discover it. We have to have that option there for them. That is a big, big advantage or it advantages retention, let's put it that way.

Provost Molitor: When I share the static data set with you--I just want to finalize it and make sure we had all the correct lists of programs because we were going back and forth--you will see I included second majors and second completions, and we accounted for that in the enrollment. Now, in the example you provide, yes, it's great to provide the ability for a student to do a second major. But really, if a student is already earning a bachelor's degree, what is the difference between two bachelor's degrees, or a bachelor's degree with two majors, or a bachelor's degree and a minor, or a bachelor's degree and a certificate? So, we have alternative ways to deliver those programs that still allow students to get those additional credentials and to graduate with a bachelor's degree.

President Rouillard: But if a student is planning an international career in a professional field, I think that a major in a language is going to stand that person in better stead than a minor, not to say we should disregard the minor. And I appreciate the fact that many of the major programs that you targeted, the minors are remaining intact. But, once you're teaching the minor, you know, it is not a big leap from 18 hours to 30 hours. We're only talking about teaching another 12 hours over a span of several semesters.

Provost Molitor: But, you know, and again, delivering that, especially when you have low enrolled programs, I mean, it is hard to offer the full class experience if you are just teaching it to two or three students. Right? So we have to consider that. Is that degree really giving that student that much more of a beneficial experience compared to the minor?

President Rouillard: Conversely, we could also say that the students we pack into sections of 300 students are not perhaps getting the best class experience either.

Provost Molitor: I would agree with that, but again, I don't think we are necessarily envisioning packing students into larger and larger classes. Presumably, we are going to be eliminating classes that have two or three students, but that's not going to result in classes of 300. And again, if you give faculty time in their workload to figure out ways to deliver courses to larger sections and to give those students a good experience in those courses, then I think we can also have some, you know, good outcomes there.

President Rouillard: Well, I am not suggesting that the suspensions are going to lead to packing students into [classes of] 300. We already have sections of several---

Provost Molitor: There are courses like that, yes.

President Rouillard: Okay. Are there other comments?

Senator Barnes: Provost Molitor, would you say more about how eliminating choices will help retention?

Provost Molitor: Again, the idea is, rather than having faculty spread thin, if we can allow faculty to concentrate on fewer things, they can do those things better and they can improve outcomes for students.

Senator Barnes: So, I'm listening to the radio and I'm hearing Owens say, 'over this many programs even now available.' I wonder about is there some good research around that, like, reducing choices? I mean, I hear the theory, which I don't really understand in the sense that, especially if you're going to keep us all on as minors, we're all going to be here without the reward of students. And I mean, literally, we have some double majors who said, I want the reward of the bachelor's degree, I am investing in this because I want this degree, and I'm putting the work in, and I want the degree. So, I think this doesn't make sense to me.

Provost Molitor: So number one, the numbers don't necessarily bear that out. Again, a lot of these programs we are talking about very, very small numbers of students who are actually going on and receiving the degree credential. I will also point out, along with this process and part of the reason it was so rushed is we are working with the colleges to identify courses that no longer need to be taught. Those courses are taught, presumably many of them at the higher levels, by full-time faculty. So, remove that from the faculty workload, you're not necessarily going to replace that with another course – [or] you may, depending on the needs for the faculty. But you can say, all right, you're teaching a course in a minor that maybe is part of the core curriculum that a lot more students take. Can we focus our energies on that course, do things a little better, improve retention, and improve outcomes? That's the theory.

Senator Barnes: What do you think the effect on the faculty is going to be? I mean, I just see this as -- you know, we just recruited a new faculty member a number of years ago; she is about to get tenured. She's the future of the institution, and this is true all over the institution. When you have people who are ready to, I mean, I am going to be here, I'm not going anywhere. But when you have people who have opportunities to go elsewhere, I recognize this as an attempt to eliminate faculty. But you're going to eliminate the wrong faculty. And no offense to 'old timers' like myself, but I feel like the people who are going to choose to leave are not the people you really want to leave, and you're imperiling a lot more over the long term than we're gaining in the short term, particularly in programs where they can fix the cost issue and still provide the degree that they want. I just don't understand why you attack the degree when we can attack the cost issue and allow faculty to develop things that they want to do, rather than maybe something they don't want to do.

Provost Molitor: Well, again, by "attacking" the degree, and I'm not sure I would phrase it that way, but--

Senator Barnes: I mean, eliminating.

Provost Molitor: But by focusing on degree programs in this case. Again, the whole point of this exercise is to reduce course offerings and to kind of reduce the overall workload of courses that need to be taught.

Unknown Speaker: faculty workload.

Provost Molitor: Right. And so, we have to find the workload for those faculty. And again, the idea is, okay, instead of teaching a 4:4, can you teach a 3:3, and do something to redesign one of the courses you're teaching to improve outcomes?

Professor Ally Day: Hi. This is Ally Day, is it my turn?

Provost Molitor: Yes.

Professor Day: Professor Barnes actually sort of pivoted to my concern, which is the faculty retention concern. I love that we are tracking student retention and we have this theory about how this is going to help student retention, but I don't think we are going to retain students very well if they see their faculty fleeing. So, I'm wondering if there is a system already setup in place to track the faculty retention throughout this process? And I also just wanted to just say, the idea of having an ongoing 'meter,' like 'dooms day meter' on the Provost website about which programs are going and which aren't, seems like a nightmare in terms of setting up a system where it's like, 'oh, it's an ongoing process of program prioritization so let's make sure,' or like, 'oh, we need update the clock on all of these different programs.' I can just see it becoming really contributing to a doomsday atmosphere at the University about like who is next, who is next to go, have you checked the meter this month, which program is going to get cut? I just think it is an awful idea.

Provost Molitor: Regarding the faculty retention issue, we do have a process setup to conduct exit interviews with faculty that are separating for other reasons besides retirement. And so, that is incumbent upon, you know, we can't make faculty do that, but we do request them to participate in those interviews and we generally do get a fair number of them. So that would address, I think, at least our ability to track the faculty retention issue. And yes, it is possible we can lose faculty through this process. It is a risk. We don't know. But, unfortunately, again, we only have a limited number of resources, and we have to direct those resources on things we think are our best opportunities to make sure we are ultimately a financially solvent institution. And we have to make sure we have availability of resources to direct to identified growth areas.

President Rouillard: Senator Semaan had a question.

Senator Semaan: In fact, I have a couple of them. Provost Molitor mentioned about finalists for the provost position. We are here and somebody will be picked. So, to what extent they are involved in this process? I'm not sure you are at liberty to say, [but] are you being pushed to get this done before the new provost, for whatever reason, comes?

And the second question, I'll go back to what Senator Barnes, and I think Ally as well mentioned, retention and all of this...programming. I'm still not able to grasp it. Maybe I'm naive in understanding, but we already have heard from some students, I just heard today that some students are thinking about leaving UT because they are hearing what is happening right now. Which might be, possibly because of that opaque not so transparent, not communicating with people which allows room for rumors to happen, they might be hearing things that are not accurate. So, why we are losing some of that transparency with everybody who is a stakeholder, including students? You mentioned lists were sent to individual colleges.

Why are we not aware of what's happening at a university-level? Because at the end of the day, we are one institution. What affects one organism is going to affect the other as well. And if students are already, who are here thinking of leaving, thinking of leaving just by hearing some of this, how would retention be?

And finally, should faculty feel a little offended [by administration] saying, we are going to relocate you in a way that it's going to increase retention of students because right now you are a problem in retention?

Provost Molitor: Okay. Three questions there. Number one, on the provost involvement, right now we don't know who the next provost will be. But, as soon as we do know, that individual will be involved in conversations moving forward about what we've done at this point. And I know both finalists are aware through the interview process. They've been asking about it. So, they are aware what we've done at this point. And then they will certainly be aware and involved in decisions moving forward. For example, how to create an ongoing process? In terms of your second question regarding communication, that was one of the reasons for the delay in getting this out. I wanted to get this out right at the beginning of the spring semester. We wanted to make sure that we had a coordinated communication. So, Dr. Day mentioned the website that was out there- there was a UT News communication. So, we wanted to make sure everybody had the same information regarding affected programs and the idea that current students will be allowed to complete their degrees and there won't be any interference with that. Third, about this idea [about] blaming faculty for retention, it is not the intention. We are blaming your workload, right? You guys are spread too thin and you're doing too much. I see workloads for lecturers and for tenure and tenured track faculty that make me wonder how you can be as successful as you already are in what you're doing. And so, I think that's where we really need to look at and say, can we focus our efforts having you do fewer things and giving you more time to do those things?

President Rouillard: Thank you. I'll also like to call attention to Professor Thompson-Casado's comment in the Chat box: "Current language students are impacted by announcing the suspension of the French and German programs. All of our language students believe that languages are not valued at UT. And they doubt that resources will be directed to the field, hence causing many students to question majoring or minoring in those languages."

I can also say that we don't always get a great deal of collaboration from advisors. I have heard from some of the faculty in our department that some of our students have been actively advised not to double major in a language, which is very discouraging that we have that kind of attitude towards an academic pursuit.

There's another comment in the Chat box: "Was wondering when faculty might know what the next 25 programs under consideration for possible suspension would be. [It would be] great for those programs to have additional lead time to restructure."

Provost Molitor: Yes, I got it.

President Rouillard: Is there another hand up from the online participants? Is there anybody else with a question?

Senator Smith: There's a hand-up and another comment in the Chat.

Provost Molitor: I want to comment on this. So, the comment or question here is: "In my experience, every time a faculty member leaves, either for another position or retirement, the line is lost, and this has negative impacts on our programs. This is bad for departments and students and negatively affects retention." I (Provost Molitor) could not agree more. In fact, I'm in a position right now where every time I keep getting requests from deans saying, we need to replace this faculty line. My hands are tied because of budgetary constraints. This is why we need to get to a point where our expenses and our revenues are more in line so that we can make strategic decisions regarding, 'okay, we have this faculty member that is departing. Is this something that's very essential and important or is it something that perhaps we can reallocate to another field?' We can't even make those strategic decisions right now given our current budgetary situation. And so we need to get to that point where we are able to do that. Yes, sir?

Tirrell Frost, UT News Journalist: Hello, my name is Tirrell Frost, I am a student. I am a philosophy major and a beat writer for the Collegian. I'm here to cover the Faculty Senate. My question was, is there a cap for how many programs are going to be cut?

Provost Molitor: In other words, a fixed number?

Mr. Frost: Yes.

Provost Molitor: No, there is not a fixed number. Again, this is an ongoing process and we're not looking at this in terms of some absolute number or target. We're looking at this as overall sustainability of the institution.

President Rouillard: And Senator Heberle.

Senator Heberle: I wanted to follow-up on the 25 programs that you mentioned and see when we will know. There was a question in the Chat I think got scrolled over about the 25 programs you mentioned for the fall. And also, I think what would really help is if the administration generally, and maybe this is about the CFO and that operation, give some more coherent representations in advance and going along with all of these announcements about how this saves money. Because I'm just not persuaded, I don't think any of us are persuaded and that has to be part of this discussion. And we're not part of that discussion because when Matt Schroeder comes here, he throws a bunch of charts up online that nobody here can read. He doesn't speak to us as colleagues. He speaks to us as a financial officer who is telling us a bunch of stuff he is doing, but not really engaging with us about what all this means. So, that is one thing that I really request as we move forward here, is if we can just get a better sense of how actually fixing the budget problem. Because I'm not—I'm sure it is—but I am not persuaded. And so, and clearly from the questions here, people are not persuaded. So, the administration, if they want more participation, they want more -- then one, talk to us more in more coherent fashion across the various CFO, President and Provost Office and everything else. And two, let us know more about how this is actually working and what the research is that shows it's going to work. I just feel baffled most of the time when I hear about all of the messaging coming from above.

Provost Molitor: Okay, well, Matt can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I'm going to quote him here, and that is, 'we can't cut our way out of this.' He knows, just like the rest of us, that our only hope is somehow growing. Okay, and again, I believe given the process we put in place, the programs that we've identified, and this idea of reallocating resources and faculty time to potentially improve retention, and to develop programs alternatives that could generate new enrollment or grow enrollment in those programs that have capacity. That is our hope for growing revenue. And that is what's going to help Matt solve his problems.

Mr. Frost: [Indecipherable]...students?

Provost Molitor: That program was not identified as by any means, a low enrolled program. That program was identified as there was significant overlap already with the BA in Communication. And so, we are now starting to get to more of a philosophical conversation about what is a (and you are a philosophy major) degree program vs. a concentration in a degree program. Given the overlap in the curriculum, it probably didn't make sense to call one a BA in Communication and one a BA in Media Communication. It probably made more sense to call them all a BA in Communication with concentration in Media Communication - and there may be other existing concentrations in the BA in Communication. And so, that's in particular why that decision was made. And we have a number of examples. If you refer to the website, you'll see there's a number of examples of that where we're more along the lines of consolidating programs that are related vs. actually suspending a discipline.

President Rouillard: There was also a comment.

Senator Huntley: So, Scott, I think there was some suggestion that some programs were blindsided by this. Could you go back to the actual process? When did these discussions start? This didn't magically occur in December, correct?

Provost Molitor: Well, so we've been having conversations with the colleges for over a year-and-a-half regarding the transition to the IBB and then a Huron academic portfolio review process. Now, some deans obviously had communication with their faculty. So, for example, HHS has been actively engaging this process. Education has been reviewing their portfolio for about two years now. I know the College of Medicine and Life Sciences has been having these conversations. Other colleges may not have been as active and mea culpa, I should have gotten on the Deans right away about that. So, for those colleges where those discussions may not have been occurring, yes, those initial decisions probably came out in December and did take people by surprise.

Senator Huntley: But there were communications from your office to the Deans well before this, December and January, right?

Provost Molitor: The deans knew this process---

Senator Huntley: So, it sounds like there were issues of communication between the Deans and various departments' programs.

Provost Molitor: That is a possibility. And again, maybe I wasn't more explicit when I started in September. Maybe I could have been more explicit with things going on.

Senator Huntley: Thanks, Scott.

President Rouillard: Senator Tucker-Gail is next. While I get over there, there is a comment [in the Chat] about faculty members leaving and the load redistributed to other faculty who are told to be team players. Lauren Jin, who is I believe is the Vice President of Student Government, has a comment about "Lack of student enrollment in these programs, is that the sole reason? Or are there more factors for making this list?" Lauren is the Faculty Senate Representative from UT Student Government

Provost Molitor: If you could scroll up, I'd like to address [comments in the Chat box] before we get to Kasey. So again, Dr. Kumar's comment is very-well taken. And again, this idea that we're trying to deliver all these programs, and that yes, when somebody leaves, all a sudden now we have this extra course to cover that is now uncovered if we can't afford to rehire the faculty member. So again, having the reduction in programs and reducing the number of courses we offer is a way to prevent that from happening. So, if a faculty member leaves, but that program is no longer being delivered then there is nothing to redistribute to the workloads. So, again, having these kinds of conversations, and having the ability financially to replace the faculty members when they do leave, when we do have programs that we want to maintain and continue is as important.

Then the next question about student enrollment. The sole factor for suspending them, well, we are not going to suspend the programs that have a lot of enrollment. So, enrollment is certainly a big issue. But I will say, there were a number of low enrolled programs that we did not suspend admissions for, for a variety of reasons.

And I should also point out, like the example with Media Communication, we did have better enrolled programs where they identified opportunities to consolidate while they were still offering the discipline and more fairly representing essentially what the degree name is for these four-year degree programs.

President Rouillard: Okay, one final question or comment from Senator Tucker-Gail.

Senator Tucker-Gail: I do want to confirm that HHS has been working on this for a year, so it was well communicated for us. But I also wanted to highlight what Senator Heberle said, communication is important. I asked the President about that today when he met with our college. I think that having the CFO do a town hall tour like the President is, or having hearings where the budget can be discussed and shown. I mean, there's only so much money. This is the real world. He's got to make that balance, however that is. But having it explained and answer questions, and things like that used to be something we did here, and it hasn't been something we've done here for a very long time. It would be really great if we could do that again. Not just be at Faculty Senate for five minutes and then he's got to go kind of thing, but where it is a designated amount of time for faculty to ask real questions after he shows us the budget.

President Rouillard: Okay, thank you. Lauren Jin

Provost Molitor: I thought I addressed that.

President Rouillard: Okay. Thank you, Provost Molitor for your time and efforts to address these questions. Okay, that brings us to our next item, which is curriculum. I put the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee first because there is at least one course that will be implicated in the Academic Programs items. We have about 28 items, although many of them are in a block, so it won't be as bad as you might think. What we are also committed to doing is moving the queue of items forward much as possible so that we don't have backlog. There are probably right now another 20 items in the queue after today's. We'll keep bringing that to you. The deadline for submitting curricular matters to Faculty Senate is February 28. That's the guarantee that you'll get into the fall 24 catalog. For my part on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, we will continue to review things after that date, but there's no guarantee that it will make it into the catalog after that point. Okay, you had all the materials distributed by Quinetta.

[Experiencing Technical Difficulties with Uploading Docs.]

President Rouillard cont'd: All right, well, I'm going to have to just go through it verbally then. And if you need to see something, we have the syllabus and we have the actual course modification or new course proposal. So, the first one on the list is **SOCW 2010, Survey of the Social Work Profession**. The difference here is simply a change to the catalog description, which involves adding a sentence as follows: "Students will need to provide their own transportation to the off-site field experience as a requirement for this course." And the reason for this is the elimination of on-campus internship.

RCRT 4340, Leisure, Recreation, and Aging in Recreational Therapy Practice. The only modification is adding prereqs. "The new prereqs will be Recreational Therapy 1300, 1310, 3310, 4720 and a grade of C." Most of these are really kind of perfunctory changes.

Then there is a block of **Respiratory Care**, the respiratory care program courses. All of these are simply updating the prereqs to a C, instead of a D-. This goes for RCBS 3110, 3120, 3130, 3210, 3220, 4160, 4140, 4150, 4240 and 4800. All of these courses are simply updating the prereqs to a C, instead of a D-. One added thing to 4140 Integrated Clinical Practice. That course will now be repeatable up to 12 hours. Instead of 8.

We then have a block of five courses from the Medical Technology program. Some of these are simply changes in credit hours. All of them are changing from grade no-credit, n/c, to a letter grade. Some of them are changing SLOs to align with a creditor language and some of them are adding fees. More specifically, **MEDT 4020, Clinical Hematology I**, will go from 5 credit hours to 4, along with the change to standard letter, new fees, and revision of the SLOs. The Med Tech program is also changing some of their credit hours to reduce the total number of program hours, which will come in a separate committee report. **MEDT 3040, Urine Analysis and Body Fluids**, changing credit hours from 3 hours to 2 hours, standard letter grade, new fees, extensive revision of the SLOs. **MEDT 4050, Clinical Microbiology I**, is going from 5 hours to 4 hours, new fees, SLOs revised. **MEDT 4080, Clinical Immunohematology**, is going from 5 hours to 4. This one does have a catalog description change, which will now read: "Introduces the student to the basic genetics of red cell antigens. Students will also study the significance of the blood cell antigens and antibodies, uses of specific blood components for transfusion, component processing, donor requirements and various transfusion associated disease states. Laboratory instruction emphasizes ABO and Rh typing, antibody detection and identification, and

cross matching procedures.” Then **MEDT 4952, Clinical Externship: Chemistry**, is going from 4 credit hours to 2. Then **MEDT 4953, Clinical Externship: Hematology**, is changing its prereqs from 4020 to 4025. And that's it for the Med Tech course modifications.

There is one course modification to **Information Science, INFS, 3160**. This is a title change: Business Process Automation and Integration, and a catalog change, which will now read: “This course aims to give students a broad understanding of technical and business issues in automating processes. Students will gain understanding of the techniques and issues surrounding digital transformation, task automation, workflow automation, system integration, and citizen development.” There's a change in prereqs from Information Science 3150 to 3770 with a C and updated SLOs. The rationale for this is “Our recruiters are searching for students with skills in both process automation and no code/low code development.”

There are just a few more course modifications if you can bear with me. **Civil Engineering 4610, Hydrology and Water Resources**. A change in prereq from Civil 3610 and MIME 4400 to the new prereqs: Civil Engineering 1170, Chemical Engineering 2110, or the equivalent Fluid Mechanic course, still with a D- minimum grade. The reason for this is the administrative change, modified and clarified prerequisites to make it easier for qualified students and environmental engineering students who are required to take this course.

The last block of three courses is from Social Work. **Social Work 3060, Social Work Ethics**, updated SLOs to align with accreditation requirements for generalist practice. And I won't read all of these SLOs. You could have seen them in the materials sent out. Some of these revised SLOs to accord with accreditation language have resulted in 30 and 40, and I think on 1 occasion, even 50 SLOs. So, I will spare you that. Then **Social Work 3090, Social Work Perspectives on Culture and Depression**. Again, revised SLOs to align with accreditation requirements. And the final course, **Social Work 3230, Human Behavior in the Social Environment**. This has been removed as a WAC course and has updated SLOs.

President Rouillard cont'd: Are there any questions, comments, concerns? I'm sorry there was no summary report. But if you access your email, you can see the materials. All right, I will ask for a vote on these items on a consent agenda. Please indicate in the Chat box, 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain' for approval of these courses. And in the room, all those in favor please signify by saying, 'aye.' Any nays? Abstain? Thank you. We will wait a minute. And, while we are waiting, we could pull up [from here] the new course proposals because those would be more important to see. ***Motion Passed.***

So, among the new courses right now, there are four, and then we will move to the Academic Programs Committee. We are doing ok for time.

[Experiencing Technical Difficulties with Uploading Docs.]

All right, **MEDT 4025, Clinical Hematology II**. This is a 2-hour lecture:1 hour lab. Here is the catalog description. Introduction to Theory Practical Application: “Technical performance and evaluation of neoplastic hematologic disorders, morphologic analysis of body fluids, hemostasis and advanced hematology procedures, including bone marrow and flow symmetry, chromosome analysis and quality assessment. Correlation of clinical laboratory data with a diagnosis and treatment of blood cells diseases.”

The prereq is **MEDT 4020**, with a minimum grade of C. There is an indication that this new course is part of a major revision of the new MLS program that will bring the required credit hours and time to degree, dropping from 143 credit hours to 121 and improving alignment of course offerings, and successful completion of the ASCP BOC certification exam. Any questions or comments?

There is also another MEDT course new course proposal, **4120, Clinical Microbiology II**. The catalog description reads: “Discussion of specific concentrations of clinical microbiology. That includes intracellular bacteria, mycology, parasitology, virology. Clinical manifestations and organism identification will be discussed. In addition, review of laboratory techniques used to culture and identify microorganisms isolated from common body sites.” This is a 3 hour lecture: 2 hour lab, prereq MEDT 4050 with a grade of C with the same rationale. Questions?

The other course is called **Communication 3380, Media Producing and Performance**. The catalog description. “The class is designed to give students experience being in front of a camera through a variety of performance assignments that will give them practice that interview skills and reading off a teleprompter. In addition to performance, students will produce content by writing and creating material for different media platforms. Students will gain experience in both producing and performing for the media, the reason Communication 2180 has evolved over time. These changes weren’t an upper-level course designation.” If this course is approved, the current COMM 2180 would be deactivated, and this new course would become a core requirement for Media Communication.

And the last new course is **MATH 3020, College Algebra Co-Requisite Laboratory**. The catalog description: “This course can only be taken along with MATH 3020. It would have the same impact on other programs as the MATH 2320 course. The credit hours are zero. The course has no effect on credit hour allocations and other programs.” So, this is a co-requisite course that is like an extra lab course. No credit hours for the student, but I assume this counts for our workload credit for the faculty member. It is hoped this lab course will get the students to earn a C grade or better in the 1320 course, 4 credits. Any questions or comments? I’m sorry to do it this way. I don’t understand why my files are being disdained by this computer. So, if there are no questions, I’ll call for a vote: ‘yes,’ ‘no,’ or ‘abstain’ on these four new courses comprised of MEDT 4025 and 4120; COMM 3380; and MATH 3020, a co-requisite lab. All those in favor, please put your vote in the Chat box, and in the room please give me a voice vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstain? And we will wait for that vote. ***Motion Passed.*** Senator Compota, are you there?

Senator Compota: I’m here.

President Rouillard: Okay. Do you have some materials that Quinetta can pull up or can you share from your desktop?

Senator Compota: Let’s see. Did that come up?

President Rouillard: It did indeed.

Senator Compota: Okay, good.

President Rouillard: Now I feel slighted, why did your files come up and mine don't?

Senator Compore: They like me - I don't know <laughter>. We only have one program to approve today, and it was awaiting a course modification, but we voted on this a while ago. I do know that the proposer of this course, Steve Wallace, is at the meeting today, virtually. I'm sure he can answer questions. But pretty much, just a couple changes to update required courses of relatively minor changes, except they overhauled one course, and those modifications need to be approved before I can bring the program modification to the Senate. So, if there are any questions, I have the expert here to answer them. I don't see any in the Chat. Is it okay to move to a vote?

President Rouillard: Can we just quickly go over them?

Senator Compore: Oh, sure. It looks like they just list MATH 1320 or higher required. The acceptable replacements include MATH 1260 or 1270 or 1340 or 1730 or 1750 or 1760 or 1850 or 1860 or 2450 or 2460. And now Information Systems course, INFS 3160, will be a required course or an elective depending on the students chosen track.

President Rouillard: Any questions? Okay, is that the only one we have?

Senator Compore: That is the only one we have. I was going to mention the recently inactivated programs, but I think that has been well covered by both you and Provost Molitor.

President Rouillard: All right, very good. So, if you want to go ahead and call for a vote.

Senator Compore: Okay. All those in favor, please signify by voting 'yes,' those opposed by voting 'no,' and those without an invested interest or lack of understanding can 'abstain.'

President Rouillard: And can we have a voice vote in the room, please.

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Rouillard: Any nays? Any abstentions? So, it certainly passed in the room, and Quinetta will watch the Chat box. *Motion Approved.* So, that brings us to -- is Melissa Oddo here?

Provost Molitor: She was on.

Melissa Oddo, Program Manager for Student Success: Yes, I'm here.

President Rouillard: Well, welcome, Melissa. Melissa is the Program Manager for Student Success, and she is here to do a quick presentation on women's mentoring network. Take it away, Melissa.

Melissa Oddo: Well, first, thank you for having me. Can you all see this okay?

President Rouillard: Yes, we can see it.

Melissa Oddo: So, I won't take too much of your time because I know you've had a long day. I just want to say, thank you for having me. I had asked for this information to be shared with Faculty Senate, but then I was invited by Dr. Rouillard to come present this to you. So, here I am. As she said, my name is Melissa Oddo. I am a program manager for student success. I have recently taken on that leadership role with the Women's Network with my co-chair Danielle Lutman, who is the Associate Director for the Eberly Center for Women. She cannot be here today, so I am here on behalf of both of us. We took over fall of 23, and our initial goal when we became co-chairs was to reevaluate the mission of the Women's Mentoring Network. We wanted to redefine what the words mentor and mentorship look like. And so we worked with the Women's Network Committee, which was comprised of faculty and staff from both Main Campus and Health Science Campus to get to where we are today. So, we defined the network as a space where opportunities for organic, and authentic, and genuine connections could be made between women, identified faculty and staff at the University of Toledo. We will provide women, identified faculty and staff the opportunity to create the same relationships that meet a varying level of need for mentorship and personal and professional support growth and development. What we really wanted to do was to move away from the traditional hierarchal model of mentorship. You know, for example, the idea is that, you know, you must have a higher position of leadership to be a mentor or vice versa. And then we wanted to move more towards the idea that mentorship can be like, more inclusive to any woman identified member on our campus who is just seeking connection, and that we believe mentorship can stem from and also be sustained through a mutual goal to support one another at most personal and professional levels. So quickly for us, this is just how we define mentorship. Again, it's an authentic and genuine relationship between individuals who have a mutual goal to support one another. Mentorship is provided by an individual sharing their personal experiences and knowledge to engage with others for the purpose of providing insight, guidance, and or problem solving. We really see this as like a reciprocal relationship where those engaged utilize this personal connection to provide, or have their varying levels of need for again, personal or professional growth and development. We promote the notion that anyone can be a mentor, or anyone can be a mentee. Through our program and events, we really hope to just cultivate a sense of belonging and sense of community for all members and provide an opportunity for faculty and staff to come together.

And then briefly, I'll just go over some of the upcoming programs and events that we have offered. You can scan the QR code, or I can send this little presentation thing via email, and you can access the website. But this just gives an overview of what we are planning to offer this semester, and that we are planning to offer this semester and we are extending the invitation for women, identified faculty to join our group. The first one is what we're calling the WMN BYO Lunch. We did have it scheduled last week, but we had an issue with the room. So, we're going to have a new date very soon so hopefully, you can engage in that. But these events, we'll have members bring your own lunch, whether you pack a lunch, grab takeout, or you don't have to eat at all, but it's an open house format. We'll provide beverages and cookies, but the goal is to get people together to just initiate these connections with one another and to engage in conversation in a casual environment.

Then we have the Circle Connects. Those are a little more structured, but we're designing them to create intentional opportunities for individuals with shared experiences to come to engage in a variety of areas. You know, the circles will consist of guidance conversation and storytelling. It'll be a safe place to ask

questions, share concerns, seek feedback, guidance, etc. with others. And then another opportunity is the monthly series of the Lunch and Learn from the Eberly Center.

How to join? If you are interested, you can go to Women's Mentoring Network and sign up for an event. Or you can email Danielle or myself; we will have that shared for you.

And just so you know, after joining the network you would be added to something new that we created. We're calling the Women's Mentoring Network, Social Network. It will be on Teams and that is when you will receive reminders and updates, and you will be able to chat and connect with other members virtually. So, if you have any other questions, I'd be happy to take them; otherwise, I can just put my contact information up here for you. Again, thank you for your time this evening.

President Rouillard: Are there any questions? Okay, I don't see any in the Chat. Thank you very much, Melissa. Thanks for inviting us to your events and telling us a little bit about your group. So, we will see you somewhere on campus at some point.

Melissa Oddo: Thank you.

President Rouillard: Okay, that brings us to 5:45, there's a little bit of time if we want to return to items from the floor or make announcements. Anybody online who has comments and questions? Anybody in the room?

Senator Sindhwani: I want to congratulate Melissa on her initiative. Wonderful initiative. I have a question. Is there something in the wings on similar lines?

President Rouillard: Melissa is putting it in the Chat box that they are trying to alternate between campuses for their events.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Smith
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary