

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 12, 2024
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 4/09/2024

Summary of Discussion

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

President Rouillard: Good afternoon. It's 4 o'clock. I'd like to call this meeting to order and ask Dr. Suzanne Smith to call the roll, please.

Senator Smith: Good afternoon, everyone.

Present: Ammon Allred, Rafael Garcia-Mata (proxy for T. Avidor-Reiss), Gabriela Baki, Sharon Barnes, John Bellizzi, Sheri Benton, David Black (proxy for R. Padillo), Timothy Brakel, Ritu Chakravarti, Daniel Compota, Vicki Dagostino-Kalnik, Maria Diakonova, Holly Eichner, Hossein Elgafy, Elyce Ervin, Diana Frantz (proxy for K. Green), Cyrus Hagigat (proxy for A. Jayatissa), Sally Harmych, Rene Heberle, Samir Hefzy, Mitchell Howard, Jason Huntley, Gary Insch, Dinkar Kaw, Lauren Koch, Linda Lewin, Kimberly McBride, Daniel McInnis, Kimberly Nigem, Elaine Reeves, Jennifer Reynolds, Linda Rouillard, Eric Sahloff, Barry Scheuermann, Gaby Semaan, Kathy Shan, Chunhua Sheng, Puneet Sindhvani, Suzanne Smith, Weiqing Sun, Jami Taylor, William Taylor, James Van Hook, Jerry Van Hoy, Aela Vely, Randall Vesely, Donald Wedding

Excused Absences: Catherine Johnson, Paul Schaefer

Unexcused Absences: Elissar Andari, Bruce Bamber, Collin Gilstrap, Cindy Herrera, Revathy Kumar, Mohamed Moussa, Katherine O'Connell, Mahasin Osman, Steven Sucheck, Kasey Tucker-Gail

Senator Smith cont'd: We have a quorum, President Rouillard.

Senator Lewin: Senator Smith, I don't think you picked up my name.

Senator Smith: Who is it?

Senator Lewin: Linda Lewin.

Senator Smith: All right. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Do we have a quorum?

Senator Smith: We have a quorum.

President Rouillard: All right, thank you. Thank you, Senator Smith. Our first order of business is to adopt the agenda. Quinetta is putting that up for you now. We have a revised agenda. Our final speaker today is going to be Mr. Greg McDonald. Mali eka Bell will be at our March 26th meeting. Can everybody see the agenda on your screen?

Senator Harmych: Yes, we can see it.

President Rouillard: All right, thank you. And Quinetta, can you scroll down so everybody can see the full agenda? Is there a move to adopt the agenda, please?

Senator Semaan: So moved.

President Rouillard: And a second?

Senator Barnes: Second.

President Rouillard: All of those in favor for approving the agenda, please signify by saying ‘aye’ or typing ‘yes’ in the [Chat] box.

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Rouillard: Any nays in the room? Hearing none. And if you can indicate ‘yes,’ ‘no,’ or ‘abstain’ in the Chat box. Has everyone voted? It looks like a majority. ***Adoption of Agenda Passed.***

Our next order of business is to approve the Minutes from the February 27th meeting. All those in favor of approval please by saying, ‘aye’ in the room or typing ‘yes’ in the Chat box, ‘no’ or ‘abstain.’ In the room?

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Rouillard: Any nays? Hearing none. Any abstentions? Hearing none. Please vote in the Chat box. And while that vote is continuing, I’ll start with the Executive report so that we can try to stay on schedule as much as possible. I hope you all had a chance to recharge during Spring break and are ready for the second half of our semester. Here are a few updates from the Faculty Senate Exec. Committee.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee report: We met with the Neuroscientist faculty about a proposed merger with Psychiatry. You will hear more about that shortly during this meeting. Our committee also discussed the recent CAL statement of support for all of our colleges programming. Quinetta has re-sent that statement to all of you. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee asks that you consider endorsing similar statements in your colleges and propose a similar statement for your college councils.

The Committee met with Interim Provost Molitor on Friday, March 1st. Our discussion involved the implementation of the Arts and Sciences Group recommendation that we promote creativity and innovation in our program offerings as a way to recruit more students. The A&S Group also recommended a capstone course in the Gen Ed. program.

President-Elect Kim McBride and I met with President Postel on March 1st as well. He updated us on the recently approved master plan to go to 3 to 400 Million in renovation and new construction. He also pointed out that this money is coming from a low interest loan from the state, which will be extended over five to ten years if I remember correctly. Is that right, Scott?

Provost Molitor: The master plan will be implemented within ten years, but the loan itself will extend far beyond that.

President Rouillard: Thank you. ***Executive report cont’d:*** You will also hear a report from the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee. I’ve asked them to consider the requirement that any course applying to the gen ed. submit their course for approval in the OT 36 core. While I am not opposed to our gen ed. courses applying to the OT 36 for approval, I am concerned that this requirement was imposed by administration without first coming to Faculty Senate. The Core Curriculum Committee will summarize their opinions on this matter, and I will ask the Faculty Senate to vote on the issue at our March 26th meeting.

That concludes the Executive report. Are there members from the committee that would like to add anything? Hearing none. Senator Brakel, do you have any updates on Senate Bill 83?

Senator Brakel: Not at this time. If I'm not mistaken the legislature is out until April right now for the primary stuff.

President Rouillard: Okay, thank you. *Minutes Passed.* All yeses, except 1 abstain. All right, so we will turn it over to Provost Molitor.

Provost Molitor: Thank you, Dr. Rouillard. I'll try to keep this quick, looking at the agenda. I hope everyone has a safe and enjoyable Spring Break. A few quick announcements to start. First, a link to a wellness survey was sent this past Friday via the Faculty Announcements email. Please take a few moments to complete this survey to ensure University Wellness Services has faculty input before making decisions on programming for the next year. Second, I have completed negotiations with the preferred candidate for the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, and I anticipate an announcement will be made within the next few days. Third, Institutional Research is working to finalize a program data dashboard for our ongoing program prioritization discussions. I hope to have a beta version available for demonstration soon.

We are finalizing plans for the April 8th eclipse which will include activities on Centennial Mall and in the Glass Bowl. As a reminder, classes will be in session, and we are expecting heavy traffic in our region and on campus for this historic event. Given this expectation, please do not penalize students for missing class or give any in class exams or high stakes assignments that day. If possible, please provide options for students to join class remotely or view a recording of the session. I would also like to remind everyone that the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics is hosting Fred Espenak, NASA's leading expert on eclipses, for the 2024 Doermann Lecture tonight at 7 pm in Doermann Theatre.

At the February Academic Leadership Team (or ALT) meeting, we had a discussion regarding the use of diversity and inclusion statements on applications for faculty positions. As you may recall, the State Attorney General recently submitted a request to review our application processes to ensure we are not using race as a factor in hiring, which has resulted in some confusion regarding what we can or cannot do in our hiring processes. I am convening a committee that will be chaired by Dr. Dilip Das to investigate this issue and to provide recommendations on how to move forward. I will circulate the names of individuals I asked to serve on this committee to Faculty Senate leadership and will solicit their input on other potential members.

At the March ALT meeting, we had a presentation from the Art & Science group regarding factors that prospective students consider when making decision to attend the University of Toledo or other institutions. This was followed by a meeting with the Art & Science group and the Faculty Senate Recruiting and Retention Committee (or RRC), in which we had an excellent discussion on the best ways to implement the findings of the Art & Science group, and how this aligns with similar recommendations that RRC has already put forward. The consensus was that we could implement these recommendations through a revision of our University core curriculum. I will work with Faculty Senate leadership and the RRC to create a framework for a revised core curriculum based on this discussion, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to work with Faculty Senate on moving these recommendations forward over the next year.

Note that recordings of both February and March ALT meetings were distributed to all faculty in an email from my office yesterday for anyone interested in the discussions regarding faculty hiring and the Art & Science group report.

Thanks again for the opportunity to speak with you today, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Heberle: Thank you for going quickly, but I need you to go back to that revising core curriculum---

Provost Molitor: Yes.

Senator Heberle: I had another question that's unrelated. And that is, we've heard a lot about the restructuring of advising, and I just had a question about whether or not—and I'm not advocating for new consultants or anything, as we have people on campus that can do it perfectly well—if there was a survey of students about advising issues, because I just wonder if that is really driving this or if it's being driven by the need to restructure employment opportunities, or what it is really being driven by in terms of feedback...?

Provost Molitor: That is a great question. We do have a few ongoing consulting engagements. One of which is surveying students and several parties across campus, whether they be advising staff, administrators, or faculty. They are compiling their recommendations based on their analysis of the survey results, as well as an analysis on quantitative data, such as the retention and graduation rates of specific populations. And one of the goals of this centralized advising structure is to ensure that students have an opportunity to provide feedback about the advising experiences they received. It would be nice if we have a system much like they have in consumer marketplaces, such as, how was your shopping experience, etc.? Ideally, if we could get feedback from students, on an ongoing basis, we can make sure we continuously improve our processes.

Senator Heberle: And about the revised core curriculum?

Provost Molitor: There was a conversation with the idea of how we could best ensure that we promote university-wide the creativity and innovation we already have in our curriculum and course work. We could then brand ourselves as a place you can come and study and get the experiences that involve creativity and innovation. And we thought of a way to revise the core curriculum to incorporate courses. The idea would be a framework in which we keep our gen ed. and our multicultural requirements, and on top of that, we build in disciplines or specific courses that are identified similar to the writing-across-the-curriculum so we could have a creativity-across-the-curriculum set of courses that would be in Arts and Letters, Pharmacy, Engineering, Nursing, wherever you have undergraduate degree programs. They would have to meet a certain framework, a set of learning outcomes or skills that would then be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate. Then each discipline would have a capstone course, an ultimate experience for students to unleash their creativity and innovation. That would also be considered part of our core curriculum. Those courses would have to apply and demonstrate that they met learning outcomes that would be determined by the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee. The framework that I'm going to propose is a summary of the conversation RRC had with the Arts and Science group and me. Then I'm hoping it will start the ball rolling in terms of evaluating this idea and providing feedback, and whatever else you may want to do.

Senator Heberle: And will the Senate Core Committee be involved at the very start?

Provost Molitor: I will make sure that they receive this framework as well as everybody else.

Senator Heberle: No, I meant actually involved in the construction of these new core requirements, involved in the process.

Provost Molitor: I assume they would be taking the lead on it, yes, absolutely.

Senator Hefzy: Provost Molitor, I have a question.

Provost Molitor: Sure.

Senator Hefzy: I apologize, but I lost track. What is the purpose of the committee that was created and chaired by Dr. Das?

The purpose of that committee is to look at our faculty application process, in particular the diversity, equity and inclusion statement that we require faculty candidates to submit. The goal is to determine whether we need to modify that process, and if we need to provide training and support for committees on how to evaluate those statements. We want to ensure that search committee members are comfortable with how they conduct searches, because right now, we have search committees who are not reviewing the DEI statement because they fear that they are going to run afoul of the state attorney general. We want to make sure everybody is comfortable with whatever process we have implemented for faculty searches.

Senator Hefzy: So that the purpose would be to develop a training for the faculty before they become members of the search committee. Am I understating [this] right?

Provost Molitor: I don't want to get rid of that training. If anything, we may need to enhance that training. I don't want to predetermine what that committee is going to find. I want to make sure they can provide the best recommendations they see to move us forward in this regard.

Senator Hefzy: Thank you.

Provost Molitor: You're welcome.

Senator Barnes: I would just like to comment on the phrase 'revision of core curriculum.'

Provost Molitor: Yes?

Senator Barnes: [A] way to raise blood pressure for no reason.

Provost Molitor: I understand.

Senator Barnes: I think we can really work on enhancing core, adding to change. I mean, I think 'revision' implies something that sounds much more significant than what you're talking about.

Provost Molitor: I would accept that as a friendly amendment to my remarks.

Senator Barnes: Thank you. And then, a quick question about the email that came out during [spring] break, about not assigning work over the break.

Provost Molitor: Yes?

Senator Barnes: What was the purpose of sending that during the break?

Provost Molitor: We got received complaints from some students saying, hey, a faculty member says I have to turn in this assignment during spring break.

Senator Barnes: So, the email suggested that we shouldn't have any assignment that was due when they got back. Well, that is how I read it.

Provost Molitor: Oh, no, that was not my intent.

Senator Heberle: No.

Senator Barnes: And to me, it's like, that's been a practice that I've been doing since forever and I was like, what?

Provost Molitor: No, and I apologize if that is what you read---

Senator Barnes: I probably misread it. But I was like, why would you send this now? The syllabus has been -- I just thought, oh my god, if I cancel that assignment now that's due---

Provost Molitor: No.

Senator Barnes: Okay, I got it.

Provost Molitor: No. If you have assignments due the day they get back and that was in your syllabus, that's fine. It was having assignments due during spring break.

Senator Barnes: Thank you. I misread it. Thank you.

Provost Molitor: Okay. And I apologize if that was misstated.

Senator Barnes: I'm sure it was me.

Provost Molitor: Dr. Mc Loughlin, you're next.

Senator McLoughlin: Thank you so much. We received an email today from the Dean of the College of Health and Human Services, weekly updates about scheduling of courses moving forward and program directors and faculty members having to justify their courses at specific times and provide input to you. Is it going to be core scheduling by the University? What is the issue?

Provost Molitor: I don't know if you had a chance to see the Campus Master Plan, but we're going to be taking some classroom buildings offline. In fact, we're already working to remove all general-purpose classrooms from Rocket Hall. We want to make sure that we can fit all classes in the classrooms and in the spaces that we have remaining. Because of this, we're going to have to take a little more control over the course caps. Traditionally, people just let course caps roll from one year to the next, and we find the course enrollment and predictions on enrollment change in those courses. Therefore, I've asked the Registrar to take a little more active role in setting course caps to make sure that we have enough appropriately sized classrooms. This may require us to look at some courses and ask if there are alternative meeting if we can't find a room for that course during its scheduled time. That's the whole purpose of that email; we just want to make sure we're able to schedule all our classes in the rooms we have available.

Senator McLoughlin: Okay, so faculty would still have some input when classes would be---?

Provost Molitor: Oh, yes.

Senator McLoughlin: It sounds like they were more shipping towards a centralized system.

Provost Molitor: There would be more feedback from us in cases where we can't find a room for a particular class.

Senator McLoughlin: Okay. Thank you, thank you.

President Rouillard: So, Provost Molitor, does that mean the Registrar can't automatically up the caps on courses?

Provost Molitor: We are thinking the other way, reducing the caps to fit into smaller rooms that are more likely to be available.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Provost Molitor: The problem is that many of our course caps haven't changed from the days when enrollment was higher, but we have fewer large classrooms available.

President Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Huntley: I don't want to steal 'thunder' from what Senator Barnes is going to talk about, but a few years ago there was an external review of the core curriculum.

Provost Molitor: Correct.

Senator Huntley: So, this discussion about core curriculum, are those guidances by those external experts being considered or is that report being not acknowledged at all?

Provost Molitor: That is a great question. I would have to go back to that report and take another look. I appreciate you reminding me of that.

Senator Huntley: Yes, because my recollection of the report was that our core curriculum was a core. We had three hundred-some courses, [and] that is not a core. I thought one of the recommendations also regarding having Faculty Senate involved was not sustainable. Like, there have to be other mechanisms.

Provost Molitor: No, Faculty Senate has to be involved.

Senator Huntley: Right, but as the driving force.

Provost Molitor: Correct. I think the issue was having continuity, if I remember correctly. The Faculty Senate Core Curriculum membership changes and most faculty are on a nine-month contract. So, I'm glad you reminded me of that. I'll make sure I circulate that report along with the proposed framework that we're talking about. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Any other questions? Any questions online?

Senator Taylor: Yes, I have one.

President Rouillard: Who is speaking, please?

Senator Taylor: Jami Taylor.

President Rouillard: Alright, thank you.

Senator Taylor: Yeah, Provost Molitor, I just want to make sure I heard that right. Did you say that parts of the core would be shipped off to sort of disciplines, specific things within the colleges?

Provost Molitor: We're not talking about shifting things like in our gen ed. What we're envisioning is adding credit hours to the core so you would still have the gen ed. requirements, the multicultural requirements, but then on top of that, we would have discipline specific courses. So, instead of 36 to 42 credit hour core, it may end up being more like a 48 to 51 credit hour core.

Senator Taylor: So this sounds more like college requirements.

Senator Molitor: Correct, but we want to make sure that all colleges would have a similar set of courses that fit within that framework. It would vary from discipline to discipline in terms of the content in the application, but they would still involve the same set of skills, creativity, and innovation.

Senator Taylor: Okay, good. All right, that makes a little bit more sense to me. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Anything else?

Senator Heberle: Just one other thing. I just want to put on the floor about that, and that is the question of how regimented our degree requirements are---

Provost Molitor: Correct.

Senator Heberle: And I think that becomes a serious problem, weighing and balancing how regimented we are with our students, and how much we make them do, and how much they can explore.

Provost Molitor: Absolutely. We cannot implement something that adds credit hours to student of degrees. That's a given.

Senator Heberle: No, I mean within 120 even regimenting like all of that into these things that student has to do. I don't want the whole 120 to be given to students that are advanced. We've got to have some flexibility to explore and stuff.

Provost Molitor: Well, I mean---

Senator Heberle: It is just something to keep in mind as we add on requirements.

Provost Molitor: What I'm thinking about is, disciplines like nursing and pharmacy where the curriculum is already tightly scripted. There is not much room to add additional coursework. The idea would be to tweak or modify select discipline-specific courses that you already require so these courses could meet the specific outcomes that relate to the creativity and innovation. Then those courses would be classified in this type of core course category, analogous to writing across the curriculum.

President Rouillard: I would just like to respond to Senator Huntley's remark that having Faculty Senate involved in core curriculum is not sustainable. I think that is a very dangerous attitude to take towards curriculum. If curriculum is not driven by faculty, we are in trouble. And whether the Core Curriculum Committee changes membership on a regular basis or not, the fact of the matter is that faculty are responsible for the curriculum; administration weighs in and approves or disapproves, but it has to start with faculty. And to even think of bypassing faculty on curriculum, I think it is a very unwise strategy.

Senator Heberle: Here, here.

Senator Huntley: I'll just point out, that report came out two years ago. What changes have been made? I think that's the point.

President Rouillard: I think that the core curriculum does change, in fact [they've] pulled out already a bunch of courses from the Art department that would be removed from the core.

Senator Heberle: Of course, the core curriculum has changed in the last two years.

President Rouillard: All right, if there is nothing else, thank you very much Provost Molitor. We appreciate your time, and we appreciate your willingness to get into a very tight schedule.

Okay, the next thing is the Undergraduate Curriculum report, and this should be fairly short. We only have three items today, and that is to revisit MATH 1320, 1330, and 1340, simply because there were some questions about the new score cutoffs for the prereqs. Chair Geoff Martin is here to answer questions and maybe to just give us an overview of that. Do you want to come down and speak into the microphone and I'll help Quinetta get the revised prereqs here? So, here are the old prereqs. for 1320, and here are the new prereqs. [MATH] 1320 has the longest list of changes, but essentially there's an underline reason for all of this, so if you would like to explain that.

Professor Geoffrey Martin: Thank you, Dr. Rouillard. So, in general, for a very long time, our math department has included our placement guidelines in the prerequisites of our placed courses. The ones that you just saw were the old placement guidelines that I believe came into effect probably five or six years ago. Since then we have been sort of studying our data and trying to find ways in which we can allow students to avoid extra coursework that could delay their programs, because the placement is not adequate and not accurate. Recently, I guess, for the last two years, we have been using abandoned method, using high school GPA as one of the placement criteria. So, what this means is that if you look at students with above certain high school GPA levels, what you find is that placement cutoffs with the test scores change. Right? So, a higher high school GPA is going to allow students with lower test scores to be placed into the class. Right? We actually implemented these high schools GPA dependent placement guidelines in 2022. And so, we have had a year to study the data and see what the impact of this scheme was. Actually, the scheme was actually an old one. I used it before when I was chair probably, maybe 12 - 15 years ago. But in any case, it applied to all our placed classes. So right now, what we are considering is only three of them. Placement typically includes, you know, all the first semester calculus courses and intro...classes also.

So, what we discovered was that in the last year, which was the first year we had data on this, we actually doubled the number of students that were in these placement levels in the upper-level classes. So probably, if you take for example MATH 1320, you can reduce the courseload to at least 60 students. We looked at the results, right? And in fact, the statistics poured out what we [had] suspected-- there's no lack of success with students that we allowed to go on with lower test scores, but higher GPAs. We think it is a good strategy. We want to continue doing it because it helps students. This fall, I guess in part, the discussions that Provost Molitor and I may have had with Julie Quinonez, Julie Quinonez put the high school GPAs in Banner...called SOATEST, which is the Banner table that Banner looks at to determine whether students satisfied correctly with all their test scores etc. So, this...idea uses the fact that we now have high school GPAs that we can use as prerequisites. So, if we implemented this, this would allow students to maybe self-serve themselves into courses that they are able to take and allow them to avoid courses that they don't need to take. So, now, in the 1320 case, which is this one we're looking at here, there's actually one more wrinkle, and that is that 1320 is one of the only classes that we have currently that operates with our corequisite laboratory. The corequisite laboratory also allows students to take 1320 before they are ready by their standardized test results. This year we are actually splitting off 1320, which have been run with just a few extra hours in certain sections. We are splitting off 1320 into its own class, which would be a corequisite course for 1320 and 1310. And so, another thing that is in this logic here, I don't know, I can't see it from here.

Provost Molitor: Scroll up.

Professor Martin: No, wait a minute. It should be sitting right in front of me. If you count down one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine lines.

Provost Molitor: Oh, there it goes.

Professor Martin: There's a concurrence enrollment in 1310. So once a student enrolls in 1310, then they would fall under those other test scores guidelines, which are even lower than the ones for students...

Provost Molitor: You have three levels of test scores. One is they have a certain high school GPA. One is they can currently enroll in 1320. And the other one is, they don't have either.

President Rouillard: And if you want to see 1330, the list is shorter here and 1340.

Professor Martin: They only have two levels, either they have a high school GPA, or they don't. But then 1320, we have...GPAs...

President Rouillard: All right, are there any questions? Any questions online? If not, we'll proceed to a vote on---

Professor David Krantz: Wait a minute. Dr. Rouillard, may I comment?

President Rouillard: Sure. Who has a question?

Professor Krantz: This is David Krantz. I'm Chair of the Curriculum Committee for NSM Council.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Professor Krantz: I support everything that Geoff just said. We have several members of council who actually teach these courses and have been directly involved with developing this as an approach. Within council, we took apart the logical statement and we think that this is a completely appropriate and efficient way of going about it.

President Rouillard: Okay, that's good. Any other comments before we vote? In that case, I would ask for your approval of the course modifications for MATH 1320, 1330, and 1340. If you approve, please say 'aye' in the room or type 'yes' in the Chat box. Do I hear 'ayes' or 'nays' in the room?

Group of Senators in the Room: Aye.

President Rouillard: It passes in the room. Please vote in the Chat box. Are there any nays in the room? Hearing none. Any abstentions? One abstention. Likewise in the Chat box. Any nos or abstention? I'll let Quinetta watch the Chat box. ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you, Geoff. Oh, he's already left. Okay, that brings us to the Academic Programs report by Senator Dan Compura. Senator Compura, are you there?

Senator Compura: Yes.

Provost Molitor: Dr. Rouillard, can I make one request?

President Rouillard: Sure.

Provost Molitor: I don't know who, do you have the authority for approving the course mods?

President Rouillard: Yes.

Provost Molitor: Could you approve those as soon as possible so we can get those on the schedule?

President Rouillard: Absolutely.

Provost Molitor: I appreciate it.

President Rouillard: I will do that. Okay, Senator Compura. Senator Compura, are you there? Can you share?

Senator Compura: Can you hear me now?

President Rouillard: Yes, we can hear you.

Senator Compura: Okay, good. Is my screen showing the committee report?

President Rouillard: Yes, it is.

Senator Compura: Okay, good. We have a lot to approve today, but really, there was only one that is problematic; a lot of them are very similar, so I will go as quickly as possible. We have 23 program modifications. These three in Education, two of them, the Multi-Age Education for Musical Instrumental Concentration. The Choral Concentration exchanged out a course as requested by Arts and Letters faculty. I checked it out and it seemed that that was indeed the case. Special Education Intervention Specialist did a replacement of two courses in their program. These are all of these programs here. It appears to just update their accreditation requirements with the current GPA. I don't think we have a question about any of these; every single one of them had the exact same change. I believe there are 10 of them there.

President Rouillard: Senator Compura, these courses are programs that are currently already concentrations, correct?

Senator Compura: Yes, these are just modifications.

President Rouillard: Thank you.

Senator Compura: I have a couple of concentrations as new programs coming later. Arts and Letters, these really just updated these foreign communications. I just had an updated electives list; it was really nothing troubling. The Film bachelors was reducing the total number of hours needed from 124 to 120. There is a problem with that plan of study. The plan of study online still shows 124 hours. I reached out to the proposer to see if we can get that corrected. I have not heard from her yet, but I was hoping we could approve this pending the change to the plan of study. Everything else was in order, it's just they didn't correct the plan of study. I'll ask your guidance on that. President Rouillard, should I pull that from the list, or should we just approve conditional on the correction?

President Rouillard: I think we can approve conditionally.

Senator Compura: Sure. Thank you. I thought so too. It's very minor. I think they just have to pull one course off. The Psychology BA, the modification revised something in the footnotes, does not require the courses listed there, but it will retain them as elective options. I think this is my last one. The Natural Science and Mathematics, they had a revision on the concentration. They just made a change in the pipeline program to replace the MA program with an MS program with concentration in pure mathematics. This again is a program modification. Then in Pharmacy, the Cosmetic Science and Formulation Design added some electives and made some minor modifications. The Drug Discovery and Design program, let's see, this one is a little bit longer. I don't think we got a question on this one either...as far as the committee could see. And then finally, the Toxicology. This one was a little more involved, but again, really didn't have a concern, except that this program is going to be suspended. This is adding the career planning strategies in the fall or in the junior year. Internship in Pharmacology and Toxicology has a change in credit hours from 6 to 12. But this program is slated for suspension. We have approved program modifications previously, even if the program is going to go into a suspension. So, we did not feel that this was a reason to hold this one up.

President Rouillard: What is the reason given for this program suspension?

Senator Compore: I'm not sure. I assume it was just part of the program prioritization.

Provost Molitor: It is going to be part of the Drug Design and Development major if it's the Pharmacy program.

Senator Compore: Okay, that is correct. Thank you for the clarification. Our representative I believe clarified that for the committee as well, the Pharmacy rep.

President Rouillard: Any questions on any of these program modifications? Any online? All right, in that case, Senator Compore, do you want to call for a vote?

Senator Compore: Okay. I still have some new programs, but I would prefer to vote on all these modifications because there are so many.

President Rouillard: Okay. So, you want to do the modifications separate from the new course/new program?

Senator Compore: Yes, I appreciate it. Yes, let's call for a vote on these. All those in favor please signify with 'yes' and those opposed say 'no,' and those wish to abstain please do so.

President Rouillard: So, in the room?

Group of Senators: Yes.

President Rouillard: Nay? And any abstentions? One abstention. And online, please type 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain' on these program modifications. While Quinetta is counting the vote, Senator Compore, do you want to proceed with the new programs?

Senator Compore: Sure. We have six. The first one was supposed to be approved last time, but I forgot to put it on there and it had already been voted on. This is a Mechanical Engineering, Aerospace Engineering and Concentration. The rationale here is they have students in the Mechanical Engineering program that are interested in earning a credential that documents their focus area in aerospace work. It was approved by their faculty. We have an undergraduate certificate from Education that will give students a program to complete at the University so they will be eligible for financial aid. It looked like a pretty simple program. I think it was all with existing courses. There are so many from Education at this time that it is hard to remember. Arts and Letters, we had two proposals from there. There is a concentration in Media Communications. They're adding this to expand opportunities for students while at the same time, giving all communications majors a consistent foundation of education. Then Geography Urban Studies with a concentration. With the elimination of the Bachelor of Urban Studies major in CAL, this new concentration replaces that major. Patrick is here if we have any questions. The committee was okay with this, but we do acknowledge that this is a new concentration. And Natural Science and Mathematics, Materials Chemistry, these are very similar, but one is a concentration, and one is a certificate program. The Chemistry BS, Materials Chemistry provides students with more material centric training and adds more hours and materials in related areas. The certificate is similar, but it is also composed of courses with modest prerequisites so it would be available to non-majors in other tech fields. Now, those are the six new programs, or certificates, or concentrations that have been proposed.

President Rouillard: Any questions? Kim Nigem, please.

Senator Nigem: Could you go back to the Education one, and just briefly describe for me the certificate that allows students financial aid?

Senator Compura: Let me look. Let me bring that up.

Provost Molitor: If I'm not mistaken, this is a program where the College of Education trains professionals who can then become teachers, such as training machinists to teach high school courses related to machining or computer aided design. The career and technical education certificate is giving those kinds of skilled professionals the ability to become licensed teachers. This program currently exists as a set of courses that qualify professionals to obtain a teaching license but did not result in any formal UToledo credential. They want to formalize it as a certificate so that they can apply for financial aid eligibility.

President Rouillard: Are there enough credit hours in the certificate to get licensed?

Provost Molitor: I believe that is correct as they have it setup, yes. They are working with the State on this.

Senator Compura: Yes, that is what we looked at. Sorry, I'm just looking for the rationale. That was all existing courses.

Provost Molitor: Yes, 24 credit hours I believe.

Senator Compura: Yes. I mean, from our point of view, everything was in order. I was not aware, Provost Molitor, that we even had anything like this before. But it looks to fill ...that apparently we had at one time. Provost Molitor, do you remember when that program went away? Do you have any idea?

Provost Molitor: I don't know if it ever went away. I just don't think it was formalized as a certificate. It was just a set of courses that they would advise professionals to take to obtain a teaching license.

Senator Compura: Got you. And this just formalized the process?

Provost Molitor: Yes.

Senator Compura: Got you. Well, thank you. Thank you for that clarification. Senator Nigem, does that answer your question?

Senator Nigem: I'm fine.

Provost Molitor: Can I just make an editorial comment?

President Rouillard: Sure.

Provost Molitor: When we add concentrations to existing degree programs, we don't call those new programs. We just say those are program modifications.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Provost Molitor: And the reason for that is, we don't then have to go through the full approval process with the Board of Trustees and the State of Ohio.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Compura: Got you.

Senator Heberle: This might be probably a stupid question. So, certificates are different from concentrations because certificates allow the students to take this set of classes without being enrolled in a bachelor's degree?

Provost Molitor: Correct.

Senator Heberle: They come in and they take 24 hours and then they have the credential that allows them to go teach, right?

Provost Molitor: Correct.

President Rouillard: Anything else? Anything online? Any questions from online?

Senator Wedding: I have a question.

President Rouillard: Yes?

Senator Wedding: Why can't we vote on some of these, break it down? Why do we have to always vote as a collection? Can we just break it down to maybe three groups or something?

President Rouillard: You want to break it down?

Senator Wedding: Like, Engineering and Education and then go on from there.

President Rouillard: We can do that. I think in the past we've been doing that to sort of expedite matters. But if you would like to do that, is there anybody else who would like to -- if that is a motion on the table, is there a second?

Senator Wedding: It's a request.

President Rouillard: A request. Is there anybody else interested in breaking down the vote? Online? Hearing none. In that case, Senator Compura, do you want to call a vote for these new programs with the understanding that if it's a new concentration, it's not exactly a new program?

Senator Compura: All those in favor of the six proposals, please signify by saying, 'yes,' Those opposed say, 'no.' And those wish to abstain, please do so in the Chat box.

Senator Wedding: Are we voting on all of them?

President Rouillard: Yes, on the new programs. So, in this room, all of those who approve of these six programs please signify by saying, 'aye.' Any nays? Any abstentions? One abstention. People are voting online. I'll let you watch that while we move to the next report. Thank you, Senator Compura and your committee. I know much work is involved in reviewing all these items.

Senator Compura: Thank you.

President Rouillard: Our next report is from the Chair of Faculty Senate Elections, Dr. David Black.

Senator Lewin: Other people in this room may have an answer to this question. How is it that suspended courses have not come to Faculty Senate?

President Rouillard: Good question. They aren't doing suspended courses yet. They have been working on new programs.

Provost Molitor: Any courses will come to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and to the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee.

Senator Lewin: Eventually. It just we haven't seen them yet?

Provost Molitor: They have not come through yet, that is correct.

President Rouillard: Programs I'm assuming will also come to Faculty Senate.

Provost Molitor: They still are, yes.

President Rouillard: Okay. Good question. So, I'll turn it over to Dr. David Black to give us an update on elections and apportionment. He also has a chart, which we will circulate to you through email tomorrow, but he'll talk to you now a little bit about apportionment. Do you want to come on up? It'll probably be better off to speak in the microphone over there.

Senator Black: Hi all. Can you hear me?

President Rouillard: We can hear you.

Senator Black: Can you hear me loud, the people at home?

Group of Senators on WebEx: Yes.

Senator Black: All right. So, I'll tell you, this is my first-time doing elections, so I didn't know at all what I was doing<laughter>. I've got a list of everybody hired for all the colleges from the Provost Office. That included all the faculty that are eligible to vote as well as all the other employees that aren't able to vote. So my committee and I had to weed out the ones that are eligible to vote. We did that. I sent out that. I truncated the list by colleges and sent those truncated colleges to the different members on the committee, and they went and eliminated all the associate deans and deans who are not eligible to vote as well as the visiting assistant professors and research professors, which might be graduate students and whatever. So, over the spring break, I put together a tentative list of all those eligible to vote. That list on Monday included 823 names, and I sent that back to the committee members to verify the work that I did over spring break, and I am getting emails. I got an email today from one committee members saying that I need to eliminate four more from his college, and I'm still getting more. So, we're doublechecking. The doublechecking, though, has to be completed relatively soon because we need to have elections within the next two weeks. I'm hoping for two weeks from today the ballots will be out. We're working at verifying the eligibility list, and right now that eligibility list is 818, just by January. So there's 818 eligible voters from all the different colleges. So, we got to determine apportionment. There are 64 senators. So, what I did is, I took each college, for example CAL has 173 eligible members to vote. I take that number and divide it by the total number in the college, and that gives me the percentage of .21 or 21% of the voting electorates from CAL. I did that for each of the colleges. Other examples would be Engineering has 8.6% of the eligible voting members. So, it took that percentage, multiply it by 64, and that gives you representation for that college. That's how I did it. Of course, the numbers aren't perfect, but for CAL, I get 13.5---

Senator Heberle: I want to be the .5 <laughter>.

Senator Black: Then you only have to be at half the meetings.

Senator Heberle: I know.

Senator Black: Well, the College of Medical and Life Sciences, their percentages is 15.6, but according to the bylaws, a college can have at most 14 members. So, they are truncated down to 14. Another example would be Business. They got 4.2% of the electoral. Since it's less than 4.5, I would truncate that down to four members. Pharmacy has 2.6% of the electorate. Well, they had 4% of the electorate, which amounts to 2.6 representation. I rounded that to the nearest whole number, and that gives them three representatives. If I did that across all the colleges, I'll get 64. Because of restriction and apportionment changes every year, I got CAL rounded up to 14 members; Engineering, six members; Health and Human Services, six members; Law, they were on the board from rounding up or rounding down, so I rounded up to two; Natural Sciences and Mathematics, they are at nine; Nursing, again, they are on the borderline. But because of the numbers, they were the college that I had to eliminate four members from. So, I originally had them going up to three, but because of the loss of faculty, they are now down to two; Pharmacy is at three; Education is three; Business is four, and Library is one. It gives me a total of 64. As President Rouillard said, she will email this table to all the members of Faculty Senate. Please let me know if you get any comments relatively soon because we have to have elections two weeks from today.

President Rouillard: Any questions?

Senator Heberle: Is there a formal approval process for what Chairman Black has done, or we just say that sounds like great work. Thank you.

President Rouillard: According to the Constitution, we do have to present the latest apportionment. Quite frankly, I don't remember if we voted on it or not.

Provost Molitor: I think it's just informational.

President Rouillard: I'll have to check. If we do have to vote, then we'll bring it back to you. But I agree with Senator Heberle, it is a huge task, and we are very appreciative of the efforts.

Senator McInnis: Can I get those last three one more time?

Senator Black: In terms of apportionment?

Senator McInnis: Yes.

Senator Black: Education, three; Business, four; and Library is one.

President Rouillard: Anything else? And again, thank you and thank you to your committee for all of that hard work. We appreciate it. Okay, next on the agenda we have a report from the Core Curriculum Committee, Dr. Sharon Barnes.

Senator Barnes: Hi everyone. We had a small stack of courses to look at. We were also asked to address a couple of other issues. One was first brought to us by Alana Malik from the Provost's Office, and she is requesting that we assess the core multicultural courses. When we had our last accreditation visit, this was identified as a hole in our assessment plan. So, she has requested that we take up the assessment of those courses, which led to a conversation about a lack of shared learning outcomes in those courses. So we thought that prior to trying to assess the courses, we want might want to see if we could develop some shared learning outcomes across those courses. We think it's a pretty big lift and [it] involves a lot of faculty who teach in a variety of contexts. And it's our request that the Senate as a whole or maybe college councils, whatever is the best way to do it, that we get volunteers of faculty teaching those courses to help write the learning outcomes. We think we currently have a lot of diversity in those courses and how we structure those learning outcomes to prepare to have an assessment is going to be kind of a heavy lift and maybe something we would want a lot of input on. We already have broad representation on our

committee, but I think working with course approvals is a big job for our committee, so we were hoping that we can develop a subcommittee or an ad hoc committee, or something to work on assessment for the multicultural core. Not quite sure what the procedure is on that.

Senator Heberle: Do other requirements in the core, like, distribution across natural science and bio science, and all that. Does those have problems with student learning things that are assessed as such?

Senator Barnes: I don't know about that.

Senator Heberle: Why do multicultural classes have common assessment if other distributed courses in...?

Senator Barnes: They were learning outcomes. They were shared learning outcomes.

Senator Heberle: That was my question.

President Rouillard: I think it happens through the approved in OT36 or in TAGS.

Senator Heberle: Okay.

President Rouillard: So, it is not really in house. It's more, when these courses go out to be approved and included in one of these categories. That, I think, is when they get to shared learning outcomes.

Senator Heberle: So, biology and chemistry would have shared learning outcomes even with two different---?

President Rouillard: If they apply to be in OT36 or upper-level courses in TAGS.

Senator Heberle: Okay, thank you.

Senator Barnes: I think it is true for the social science core as well. I have a class that has my learning outcomes for the class and also core learning outcomes.

President Rouillard: The institutional---

Senator Barnes: Yes.

President Rouillard: You had very general high levels student learning outcomes.

Senator Barnes: Yes. So, we are asking that you solicit through your communication back to your colleges folks who teach these courses who might be interested in helping work on assessment and learning outcomes for these courses. One of the motivations from Alana's perspective is that there is sort of a midway check-in with the assessment part with the Higher Learning Commission. This is something that they would like to demonstrate that we're moving forward on. And I think, to Senator Huntley's point about committee turnover, this has been something that we haven't made progress on, and we would very much like to. Because I think this year in particular, since I was asked to chair the committee late, my hope is, if we can, why don't we try to roll over chairs or elect chairs from the previous year so that the chair is already in place because then we can move agendas forward faster? So, I would like to suggest that we make sure we do that, or at least the subcommittee, so this work can get done starting right away in fall.

Related to that, Alana wants to develop a guide related to the workflow in CIM. I think our committee was just generally like, God bless you, please do that. Good luck and let us know. I think just an

instruction guide to help people who have to work in CIM at least know who to call. Sometimes you may need help. We are in support of that.

President Rouillard: Is she talking about a workflow in generally CIM or workflow specific for core curriculum?

Senator Barnes: In general. That was my understanding. I can ask her if you want. Alana, if you have a better recollection, let me know. But to me, we were just like, anything that would help people navigate the system, yes.

President Rouillard: We can do that with the Core Curriculum and Academic Programs Committees too.

Senator Barnes: Okay. So---

President Rouillard: That would be a joint effort.

Senator Barnes: We should make sure, though, whether it is core or whether it's just more general.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Barnes: As Dr. Rouillard mentioned, we were also asked to discuss the requirement that new course proposals be submitted to the OT36 transfer module. The concern as Dr. Rouillard made clear is that first perception, that this is in fact sort of infringing on faculty governance over curriculum. I think the conversation that we had with Alana was really helpful for the committee in seeing how incredibly valuable it is to submit your courses to the OT36, how beneficial it is to students, which, of course is highly motivating to us. But I think it doesn't get at the concern about faculty having a voice in whether our courses are submitted to the OT36 or not. With the committee's permission, I approached the Provost about the possibility of just, rather than getting into the debate about where the boundary between faculty control and management rights are, would they consider just softening the language to say "highly recommend, suggest, or encourage." Provost Molitor, if I don't represent you well, please chime in.

Provost Molitor: No, it's fine.

Senator Barnes: But the response was that, from the Provost's perspective, this is really no different than requiring us to submit a course through CIM or to submit a syllabus. I'm just representing that from the Provost's perspective---

Provost Molitor: That is accurate.

Senator Barnes: I didn't know the template was actually a requirement. I thought it was just a suggestion - the syllabus template we use. From the Provost's perspective, it is certainly part of management rights to ask us to utilize the systems and there is no difference. I think our committee, and again, not trying to kick everything down the road, but we felt like the committee alone should not answer this. The committee would rather that the Senate, as a whole, weigh in on it rather than just us. I think I would underscore and I think the committee would agree, it's a good idea to submit your courses to the OT36, from the perspective of the benefit to students. That doesn't mean we don't think it could still also be an overstep of management rights. But---

Provost Molitor: And just to add, we're not requiring approval in the OT36. We are only requiring a submission.

Senator Barnes: That is right. They are not requiring approval so your course could get rejected and it could still be accepted by the University. I think, again, that may be true, but it doesn't address whether

this an overstep or not. I'm not sure whether we should vote to approve a statement on this. We can take this issue up again. I don't think we should take it up today, but I think it is a question of how hard we want to argue with the administration over something that we all generally agree on. That is what I was hoping to avoid by asking the Provost to just change the language. But I wasn't able to convince our Provost that I was right on that issue. So, if you want to take that up, we can. And certainly, the committee would do that.

And finally, by way of the Provost's Office from Eric Buetikofer, who is the Director of Military and Veterans Affairs here at UT. He has requested that an overseas deployment satisfy [or allow the student to waive] the non-US multicultural component of the core. The committee brought up substantive, interesting, thoughtful, broad ranging conversation, including some folks who had been in the military who serve on the committee, so they had experiential knowledge. There were a lot of other implications to this request that include things like: an equity concern about how would this position international students. Who would be included in this requirement? The broad diversity and differences in terms of the kinds of experiences that military people have overseas. There was one more issue that was discussed. I've lost it; I can't remember. It will come back to me.

So what we decided was that we wanted to take this request seriously and certainly to support the veterans. But one of the things we thought might be a better approach, at least until we can think more deeply about it, would be to have them make a proposal the way anyone applying for transfer credit who gets credit from another institution does. So if you've ever gone through that process, you would get a request with a syllabus and it says, 'we think this course would match your course; can you approve of this transfer?' And so, we were thinking that if folks did have military experience that they think would satisfy requirements for a course, they could approach a department with a course that might work with their experience. Because it could happen that a person with overseas military experience, you know, they could never leave the base and it doesn't really fit with, I think, the intention of this non-US diversity requirement. I now remember the one thing that I forgot earlier, which is that when you sent the email, Provost Molitor, you said the "non-US multicultural" requirement. If you look at our university website, it says "non-Western." There's a really big difference between "non-US" and "non-Western." And there's some tension there we should resolve.

Provost Molitor: I may have been using the old nomenclature.

Senator Barnes: Yeah. And when you think about equity issues, the distinction between "non-US" and "non-Western" changes things in terms of not just military, but what courses might count in a non-Western diversity requirement. That's how it is articulated in my department. So, we thought the best solution to really give the veterans the opportunity would be to say they could apply. We recognize that that may privilege some veterans over others or some people generally over others, but it seemed like the best solution we could come up with right now.

Provost Molitor: And I apologize. I started on the Core Curriculum Committee probably 2009 or 2010, so I probably called it non-US.

Senator Barnes: Right.

Provost Molitor: I would suggest a friendly amendment because I don't think we can use transfer credit, unless it is a course from an accredited institution. What we can do is what we call prior learning assessment, meaning you can submit work experience as being equivalent to the content of a course. The question then is, what course or courses in our non-Western catalog would those experiences equate to? And I don't have an answer to that.

Senator Barnes: It is going to be hard.

Provost Molitor: Yes.

Senator Barnes: It's going to privilege some folks. [Where we can give credit will be] where we have faculty expertise, where we have curriculum and relevant courses. And so maybe there's another kind of curricular solution that we can work on, but I don't have any problems with that suggestion. I wasn't anticipating that we would actually need to vote on it.

Senator Heberle: So, an overseas deployment, is it carved up like study abroad in terms of credits towards graduation?

Senator Barnes: No. I don't think so.

Senator Heberle: Okay, so it is just deployment by and large, wherever they go, they can use that. I think broader learning experience---

Senator Barnes: I think so too. But I do think it does---

Senator Heberle: It would have to be.

Senator Barnes: The committee's concern was, are we forcing students from non-Western cultures who come to UT to take a non-Western diversity requirement? And we didn't know the answer to that. It seems sort of relevant if we are going to waive it for military veterans---

Senator Heberle: Okay. Very good question.

Senator Barnes: So we can follow-up on that. I don't think that needs a vote. We were just brainstorming ways to be responsive so that there was some way for them to move forward. Thank you for the feedback. So the rest of our time was devoted to these courses. I did stop Geoff (Prof. Martin) on his way out the door to see if [the rationale for the math courses we looked at] were the same rationales that he described for the courses that we talked about earlier. He took a look and he said, yes, he thought so. So, these are not new courses. These are courses in the core and so the changes are really, except for the bottom one, basically to update their prerequisite requirements.

Provost Molitor: Yes, because they have core courses, and they were already approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. They come to you next.

Senator Barnes: Yes, that is what I thought. But 2640, actually, was not in the core, but it is the same as 2600. It is just specific for EEES students, and it adds some statistics to their coursework. So, 2600 is in the core, but 2640 wasn't, so they were asking for 2640 to be in so their EEES students can get credit. Similarly, the DST course was already in the core and they are just updating the catalog description. There was one course from political science that was in the core and they were updating the course description that caused lot of questions about the description being quite a bit different and folks were just concerned and curious about it. They asked me to not send that course forward for now, but to talk to political science about what happened, and I have done that, so we will be bringing that forward next time.

President Rouillard: So, all of these math courses are applying to be in the core?

Provost Molitor: They already are.

Senator Barnes: They are already in the core. I'm sorry, I should've said that. Yes, they are not new courses, and they are already in the core. All we are doing is updating their -- is that wrong?

Provost Molitor: They are existing courses in the core curriculum. When you modify a core curriculum course, it comes to the Core Curriculum Committee.

Senator Barnes: That was my understanding.

Senator Molitor: Right.

Senator Barnes: Really, virtually, all of these except for 2640 are already in the core.

President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator Barnes: That's all we are doing. So that brings me to, can I ask for a vote? Folks in the room-- unless there's discussion. Any more questions? Folks in the room, signify by saying yes. Folks online---

Senator Wedding: What are we voting on?

Senator Barnes: Approving these---

Senator Heberle: Number four.

Senator Wedding: What? Number four?

Senator Heberle: Number four.

Senator Wedding: What about number three? Have we passed that this time?

Senator Barnes: I didn't think we need to vote on that.

Senator Heberle: It is nothing to vote on.

Senator Wedding: You are putting a bunch of stuff on the board, and you are asking them for a vote. I think the Senate has a responsibility to know what it is voting on. That is all I am saying.

Senator Barnes: Absolutely.

Senator Wedding: Pardon me for being stupid.

Senator Barnes: You're not stupid. That's a great point. I didn't think we needed to vote on number three. That was my perception, but I'm happy to ask for one if folks feel like it.

Senator Heberle: It is nothing to vote on.

Senator Wedding: I don't think it's something to vote on. It's not even clear yet.

Senator Heberle: I thought it was pretty clear that we moved on to number four to discuss how to vote on number four.

Senator Barnes: Yes. And what I am asking for is a vote on the math courses and the DST course.

Unknown Senator: We are voting on number four.

Senator Barnes: If you approve, please say, 'aye' or post it in the Chat. Any opposed say, 'nay' or post it in the Chat. Any abstentions, say abstain or post it in the Chat? [1 abstain]. Thank you very much.

Professor David Krantz: Sharon, before you step down, may I ask a question?

Senator Barnes: Yes.

Professor Krantz: Once again, this is David Krantz from NSM. The number three proposal was specifically for military veterans, is my understanding correct?

Senator Barnes: It really wasn't a proposal; but yes, it was a request for us to consider that.

Professor Krantz: Okay. Was there any discussion of expanding that to other units of the federal government that have international interactions? I was thinking various agencies within the State Department. I mean, you can go on and on.

Senator Barnes: No, they didn't ask us to consider that, but in our broad ranging conversation, a lot of other issues came up. Now, I'm not sure that one did, but it should've.

Professor Krantz: Now, what's a little different for military service is largely they are coming back to college after their deployment as opposed to if you're an employee at the State Department, you probably have finished your college degree first and then join the agency. That is not true for everyone, obviously. It's not true for everyone.

Senator Barnes: Well, I think if we want to proceed and then maybe I'll work with Eric directly by way of the committee to sort of resolve it, but it seems like there are lots of angles that we might want to consider before we say yes.

Provost Molitor: I just received an email from a colleague who's listening and says they are called military TAGS, which is part of the Ohio Transfer Articulation Network; [this is] maybe an avenue to provide course credit for military experience.

Senator Barnes: Okay.

Provost Molitor: That may be an avenue by which we can accommodate this request.

Professor Krantz: Provost Molitor, I agree with that interpretation.

Senator Barnes: I do think it still raises other issues because if [we are waiving the requirement for veterans, even if only for those who serve in non-Western cultures], then I think we should also consider waiving it for international students coming from non-Western cultures; it does seem a little unnecessary. For equity reasons, we should consider that too. Thanks.

President Rouillard: All right, thank you very much.

Professor Krantz: Linda, before we move on away from curriculum matters, may I ask a question to Provost Molitor?

President Rouillard: Very quickly if you could because we do need to move on to a couple more items. But go ahead.

Professor Krantz: Go ahead and take care of business. I can do it in items from the floor. That's fine.

President Rouillard: Thanks, David. So, the next item on the agenda is discussion of a department merger in COMLS between Neuroscience and Psychiatry. Dr Arun Anantharam and David Giovannucci are here. If you'd like to come down and briefly present the issues. You were also sent copies of memos that came to me from the Provost Office summarizing some of this discussion and issues.

Dr. Arun Anantharam: Okay, thank you very much Dr. Rouillard for letting me speak here at the Faculty Senate and share concerns that I'd like to emphasize are really unanimous amongst the faculty in the Neuroscience Department. So, my name is Arun Anantharam; I am an associate professor in the

Department of Neuroscience. I've been at Toledo for about two years. Those two years have been great. I've been lucky to have the support of my chair, Dr. Smith, who's here in the audience and who's the proposed chair of the new merged program. I was given a very generous sort of package by Dean Cooper. I've got a great lab. So, I really want to frame this. My opposition to the merger and all the faculty's opposition to the merger [is] solely in what we feel is going to be a long-term interest of the University of Toledo's Department of Neuroscience, how it is going to affect teaching quality, faculty retention and improvement.

So, what are some of the reasons why do we feel that we are not in favor of this merger going through? And so, the arguments that have been put forward for the merger include, that it streamlines operations, enhances collaboration between clinical and basic faculty, and optimizes resources for strategic growth. I can't really speak for streamlining operations and how that's going to save money; I think that people with much more experience in those matters are going to have to answer that stuff. But I do take issue with the fact that it is going to enhance growth in particularly basic research area. I think that if the merger does go through, it's going to be more difficult to recruit top quality, basic research-oriented faculty to the University of Toledo. I also don't think that you can manufacture collaboration where it is pushing two departments together, if there isn't a natural sort of collaboration that already exists. I mean, I think collaborations have to happen organically. I don't think that, again, just sort of putting people in different departments together and saying, 'well, now you are going to collaborate,' I just don't think that's going to happen successfully. Also, the Psychiatry and Clinical Department have a fundamentally different mission than Neuroscience. It's unclear to me and other members of faculty how those two different missions are going to be reconciled. I think what we fear, and again, this is [not] speaking for all the faculty, we fear that Neuroscience will be completely consumed in the end by Psychology and the research mission is going to be prioritized. So, if not now, [and] not by Dr. Smith necessarily, who again is a very supporter of all of us in the department. But down the road, it is really difficult to predict what is going to happen. We have a clinical chair supervising a very basic departmental faculty. I also think that it is unclear to us why we want to reduce the footprint of neuroscience at a time when the University has started a new undergraduate program in neuroscience that's been started in conjunction with biology. In fact, initially, when I came here, I was appointed director elect for that new program. It sort of reflected my interest in sort of being very involved in undergraduate teaching in addition to sort of doing research at a high level. This is a program that President Postel has championed as being important to increasing undergraduate enrollment, making us a more appealing destination for high school students interested in the brand. And I do think that that it is going to affect that by merging us into the Psychology Department, where we may not have the kind of faculty that we need to be able to teach these courses. You know, I'm sure that our psychiatry colleagues are excellent teachers in their own right, but I believe that the basic sorts of classes that undergraduates are going to be exposed to, that should be exposed to more, taking undergraduate neuroscience should be taught by basic science researchers in neurophysiology and neurodevelopment etc. etc. So, these are sort of our objections to the merger. You know, ultimately, it is going to depend on other people also. But I also felt it was important for me to come here to sort of articulate why we felt that this is not something we were in favor of.

Senator Wedding: What kind of support do you have for your position from the faculty in each department? Are there 'struggles' or anything at all? What is the attitude of the position of the faculty?

Dr. Anantharam: Again, I don't think I would be exaggerating if I said that it was a unanimous opposition to the merger. So, every single person who---

Senator Heberle: Across both departments?

Dr. Anantharam: I can't speak for Psychology. Just in terms of Neuroscience.

Senator Black: I have two questions. Since Psychology isn't represented here, would you assume that they are in favor of the merger?

Dr. Anantharam: Well, the chair of Psychology is here.

President Rouillard: Would you like to speak on either side of this issue?

Dr. Robert Smith: When Arun is done.

Dr. Anantharam: I think I'm finished.

President Rouillard: Okay, come on down.

Provost Molitor: And I should note that I believe a summary of various meetings was handed out.

President Rouillard: Were sent out in the memo to you today. You have a description of the merger proposal, and you have a summary of the meetings.

Dr. Robert Smith: Hello, everybody. I'm Dr. Robert Smith. I'm the basic scientist or translational scientist. I won't say I'm too basic because that might have been the real basic scientist in the room. I'm also a practicing psychiatrist. I am presently the Chair of the Neuroscience Department and the Psychology Department. I came here in about 2018 as the Chair of the Neuroscience Department. I was charged with rebuilding the research footprint of the department and growing faculty, amongst other things. During that time, we had a long and nice healthy process bringing online and undergraduate neuroscience majors, which people in the room were critical for that, to UT. I think it's a key win over those years that I was involved in that. Dr. Anantharam kind of referred to that. I think the question really for me is, what is the vision then going forward? All of the country top programs in the college of medicine, most of the top neuroscience research is not done in the neurology departments. It is not done in basic science departments within the college of medicine. A lot of it's done in the graduate departments. Many of them have cohorts, a PhD scientist. So, I don't disagree with Arun's position that it is concerning. I just want to point out that it is done well, and very well in a lot of places, and it is possible to do it well. I think the exciting opportunity is that this really aligns with NIH's recent mission statements, and I believe that is in the memo. There's a real interest in connecting the bench to the bedside and the bedside to the bench. And Arun is absolutely right, we can't just magically make that happen by pushing people together. It takes really hard work. And, you know, that's a path I've traveled at other institutions, bringing together translational basic science with clinicians, and that's why I'm excited about the opportunity. I would say that it is not quite 'unanimous' in Neurosciences – I'm voting for the merger.

The last thing I'll say is that I think that the footprint that would be created stands educational levels from high school where we have summer camp for high school kids and high school kids coming into the laboratories learning automatics remotely, undergraduates, of course, in both departments doing research and be taught by faculty. We, of course, have PhD and master's graduate students, particularly in the Neuroscience Department, but also the Graduate Department. We've got undergraduate medical education. We have post graduate medical education. We have clinical fellows. So, we would end up with an entity that spans the entire educational spectrum focused on the... So, that is what gets me excited about it. That is why I am enthusiastic for those reasons. And I'm not here to disagree with Arun, but just to throw out that enthusiasm and just answer any questions that anybody has.

Senator Wedding: You say the faculty are not in favor of it? You say the faculty in both departments are not in favor of it?

Dr. Smith: Arun said the faculty in Neuroscience is not in favor of it. The faculty in Psychology, again, I wasn't in the meeting with Dr. Molitor. I stood out.

Provost Molitor: I would characterize it as the faculty in Psychiatry were supportive. The faculty in Neuroscience were not.

Senator Lewin: In psychiatry there's also the whole behavioral aspect. If you do not engage a patient successfully in pharmacological intervention, you've lost the patient to their mental illness. So, I don't know where the behavioral aspects and the engagement in the treatment relationship is. Would that be less than if the two departments are combined?

Dr. Smith: Behavioral manifestations in patients have endophenotypes that are measurable and studiable in rodent models. For instance, Dr. James Burkett was in the Neuroscience Department and studies empathy-like behaviors in rodents and uses these models to try to understand the underpinnings of autism. His work is directly translatable to what we see in the clinic with people who are methodical, neurotypical and have autism-like traits. So, those are the types of opportunities that are present with...endeavor.

Senator Lewin: If you cannot create a therapeutic alignment with the patient, the patient will not come in for the medication management. We know that. Most folks with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder if they are off their medication management, they are kind of lost in the therapeutic benefit. Like you have to have an engagement behavior that utilizes various forms of treatment modalities and therapies in order to keep them engaged. So, my concern would be, would that be diluted, the educational aspects of psychiatry that support that? Would that be diluted?

Dr. Smith: No, that would not be diluted. In fact, it would enhance the clinical treatment to have more exposure to research. So, for example, we held a joint neuroscience and psychiatry research day back in January. We had over 35 posters and four talks, and massive attendance. The clinicians read one of the docs. in the basic science things. And some of the basic scientists read about some of the clinical things. So, it is a first step in the long term.

Senator Heberle: Why merge to get these benefits, especially if you have people 'kicking and screaming?' Why merge? Why not just collaborate between departments? Why not just do the work that you're doing? What is the value added of merging administratively? Because to me, merging is an administrative move and then it places people under different types of hierarchies, different hierarchy evaluation and it's all about administration. I don't understand why all the stuff that you're talking about in terms of the quality of the collaborations can't be done without merging. So, what's the value added to what your goals are for collaboration of merging the department?

President Rouillard: And that question is also showing up in the Chat box.

Dr. Smith: I think that's delineated in the documents that were sent out. I think that it's an opportunity to align with the NIH student admissions, to have bench to bedside and bedside to bench under one roof, and a leadership to promote that.

Senator Heberle: But you're under one roof already.

Dr. Smith: Well, actually not. We're actually in two separate buildings. But I take your point well.

Senator Wedding: How many faculty are involved in each department, about?

Dr. Smith: I would say seven or eight in Neurosciences and about 20 in Psychiatry.

Senator Wedding: So, the smaller department would be absorbed. What is the student body – are the undergraduate students being taught? Did I understand it right?

Dr. Smith: The teaching footprint of the Department of Neurosciences, we help teach neuroscience undergraduate major, which is a new major in its second or third year. We have undergraduates getting research education in laboratories at the bench or in front of the monitor. We have graduate students at the master's and PhD level taking graduate level classes, and the Neuroscience Department helps teach those. On the Psychiatry side of the street, there are faculty that help teach undergraduate medical education. They help teach research in front of the monitor and the clinic. They also have post graduate training with psychiatry residents and psychiatry fellows. Both departments have post-doctoral fellows here and there. So, it is a pretty broad education so far.

President Rouillard: James Van Hook had his hand up and now it's down. Did you have your hand---?

Senator Van Hook: No, my hand is still up. I was just trying to be polite and also listening rather than just saying. I'm in the College of Medicine in one of the clinical departments. I have a comment and question, and the comment may not apply here because it is a different area. But I have had experience with that in parturition research and reproductive research where they combined that when I was at one of the departments in Texas. And when I left there, they were number two in the nation and NIH funded. But my question really is, it seems like this merger not only in a traditional held sort of psychiatry department in what I would call neurosciences, [but] doesn't that synergy also occur in sort of the related corollary disciplines broadly and behavioral health and research, like substance use disorders and pain? Because reading that literature, both from basic science as far as clinical and additionally translational, that would seem from that standpoint from someone who is not an expert in this area, of course, that that would be an additional synergy. So, that is all I have. I'm going to be quiet and see if I can have this hand go down.

Dr. Smith: Arun had his hand up too.

Dr. Anantharam: Can I speak the final thing? I just want to say that we are undergoing a dean search, and it seems like this might be something that could wait until the new administration sort of decide on what their priorities are going to be. You know, I think we also feel like this is going to impact a lot of people and a lot of people's careers, sort of where they feel their future place is. I think it seems like it can be reevaluated when the new dean, he or she, whatever it is, comes on and sort of brings in their staff and then has the proper opportunity to do this without sort of the rush of having to get this through.

Senator Van Hook: I'm not trying to be rude, but I wanted Dr. Smith to answer my question.

Dr. Smith: I'll try to do it Dr. Van Hook. I think you were asking about potential for strategic growth of translational research across different domains that are impacted by sort of on the bench---.

Senator Van Hook: We need help from you in that area. Yes, you said it a whole lot easier and succinctly than I do. I have the disadvantage of 'Southernness.'

Dr. Smith: But on the clinical side or the bedside of that, you have horrific problems in the world and in this country, and in Northwest, Ohio, an addiction, severe mental illness, alcohol dependents, depression, suicide is an ongoing surge. On the research side, we desperately need amazing scientists like Dr. Giovannucci and Dr. Anantharam who are here and others in the Neuroscience Department and scientists in the Department of Psychology. Places where true synergy happens between those entities is where innovation, advancements in the field, new treatments, things like that, merge. So, that is kind of the vision. I don't disagree that there are challenges to that vision. I don't know if that answers your question.

President Rouillard: And there's a note in the Chat box that OSU University and Cincinnati both have this collaboration, but both schools still have very strong departments in neuroscience. We do need to bring this issue to a close for today. The idea today was to present the issue. In the past, my recollection has been, when there has been some restructuring, whether it was department in a college, or I think I remember it from the College of Nursing, that the faculty brought forward a statement either of endorsement or disapproval. And that was brought to Faculty Senate merely to verify that faculty had had a voice in the process. So today, that is what we're doing in a sense. We're verifying that faculty had input and also hear both sides of the issue. So, we may revisit this at the next meeting if faculty want to bring forward some sort of statement on either side of the issue – Faculty Senate can take that up again at a later day. But we are grateful to both sides to hear what your views are on this proposed merger. So, thank you very much for---

Senator Wedding: We do have a vote, though. Don't we?

President Rouillard: No, we're not going to vote today.

Senator Wedding: Not today, but do we have a vote on Article VII on the conduct?

President Rouillard: We will vote on verifying faculty input on restructuring.

Provost Molitor: I think the Senate can endorse it or not.

Senator Huntley: Point of order. There is a procedure on the Provost website on this very topic. And a vote, in fact, this is just supposed to be presented to Faculty Senate Exec. Not to the whole Faculty Senate.

President Rouillard: Faculty Senate Exec. wanted to bring this forward.

Senator Barnes: They did present it to us.

President Rouillard: All right, we are on a very tight schedule, and we may run over. But again, I thank you all for coming and discussing this here today. I'd like to move now -- and we're probably going to go over a little bit, and I'll ask your indulgence in that. I'll like to introduce to you Mr. Greg McDonald who is the Interim Vice President of Enrollment Management, originally from the Huron consulting group, correct?

Greg McDonald, Interim Vice President of Enrollment: Yes.

President Rouillard: Okay, so welcome. And I'm sorry, I forgot your name.

Christy Sevier, Assistant Vice President of Enrollment: Christy Sevier.

President Rouillard: Christy Sevier is going to talk to us about enrollment management. Welcome.

Mr. McDonald: Good afternoon and thank you for the invitation. On my drive over from Libbey Hall, I noticed it was 72 degrees outside and with Daylight Savings, I have a feeling many of you are hoping to be grilling outside in a matter of minutes, so I will do my best to make that possible. First, I would like to introduce my colleague, Christy Sevier. Where I come from, it would be [pronounced as] Sehvie', but she insists it is Christy Sevier. Christy, do you want to share a little bit about your background?

Christy Sevier: Sure. My name is Christy Sevier. I just joined the University of Toledo in August of last year, so still relatively new to the University and to this area. I moved up here from South Louisiana last

summer. I'm very excited to be here joining the University, and I'm excited to serve as the assistant vice president for undergrad admissions.

Mr. McDonald: We had a busy day, almost 400 students on campus for the Latino Youth Summer. When you're in enrollment management and have big events, the first thing you worry about is the weather. So, check, we got that right today, very thankfully. Again, my name is Greg McDonald as introduced a moment ago. I'm with the Huron consulting group. I've been with Huron for a grand total of two years. Prior to that, I was 35 years on college campuses; mostly at private, small colleges, and some comprehensive universities. I started my career 30-plus years ago next door at Case Western Reserve in Cleveland Ohio, followed by 12 years at University of Rochester, and then 14 years where I just retired as vice president of enrollment at Lafayette College. We're still residing in Lehigh Valley for another 10 days before my wife and I move a little bit further south. I joined the University of Toledo at 8am, on Tuesday, January 2nd. I'm pretty sure I was the only person on campus at that time and hour. But it was nice to see the campus come to life in the weeks following. This is my eleventh week on campus, and I must say I've been welcomed with open arms, and it's been a lot of fun. I am contracted to be here until July 1. It is my intent in the next 10 minutes to share my impressions of where you can help us and where we need the help, and then I'm happy to take any questions.

Soon after I arrived in early January I was presented with a Recruitment and Retention Committee report, just a mere 34 pages, but easily laid out and easy to digest. It was like a Las Vegas buffet, in terms of digesting it. Shortly after reading the report, I had the pleasure meeting with the RC committee co-Chairs, one of whom I believe is in the room here tonight. Professor Yakov is here. Professor Tomer was in a meeting with me at 2 o'clock this afternoon from overseas. Is he (Prof. Tomer) on here? It would be very late if he is with us this evening or this afternoon. But we had a chance to talk about the RRC report. And so, I thought I would touch on a few things that I most agree with, a couple of things I'm not in complete agreement with, and then I'll share my opinion on where I see enrollment going here and what our major challenges are. If there's time, I'm also happy to share the six areas of emphasis that I have the enrollment team focused on for the six months that I am here on campus. The first thing that I'm in most agreement with—and I hate to start in such a basic way, but it is such a major opportunity—and that's the campus visit experience. The University of Toledo needs attention [to that area] and quickly. It was one of the first conversations I've had with Christy when I was appointed in the interim role. Christy's been at a number of places as well, sort of focusing on the recruitment and event aspect, even more than I was in my career on the way up. For both of us we said, and I hope I'm not speaking out a turn here, but this is the first place we've been at where it wasn't an absolute honor for prestigious role to be a tour guy. I'm getting some nods in agreement. I think it was like that here at one time, but I'm not sure it was COVID, I'm not sure it was just the current generation that we're dealing with now. But we have to get that back. Even prior to my arrival, Christy had contracted with probably 'the expert' in campus visitation and campus tours. His name is Jeff Colley. He was here the last week of January. I hired him two or three institutions ago, 10-12 years ago. And he was the last person I had on campus talking with tour for our guys before COVID in 2020. Jeff was here the last week of January, and he will be here again next Tuesday doing a talk in Doermann Theatre at 3 pm, March 19th. Invitation went out campus wide. I sent it to the deans and to the VPs again this afternoon. I encourage you all to come; we have plenty of seats. But we're going into the most important phase of the enrollment cycle, what I call guild season. And this is the time of the year where we need the whole campus to come together. Frankly, now that they are getting through the admissions and financial aid process, this is where we have to turn our admitted students over to the rest of the campus. I'm not advocating responsibility, but I saying we have to join together and collaborate to make sure that we are able to meet our enrollment goals.

One of the things that I was handed on February 1st, from my colleagues at Huron was what we call an enrollment diagnostic report. And I think some of you in this room/online as well participated in the creation of that report. Well, there were 39 recommendations coming out of that report on things that we needed to do immediately. We put a committee together, Sunday Griffon, Christy, myself and others, and we assigned those 39 recommendations to teams and individuals. We created deliverables and we created due dates, and how we're going to measure our success. Improving the campus visit was one of the most immediate needs in that. So, we are in complete agreement on that. I believe it was recommendation 2.1.1 in the RRC report that commented on the website and not being equal caliber to our peer institutions. That's also on tracker. That's also something that needs attention, and we are attending to it. That challenge didn't 'land on our laps yesterday.' I think this is an ongoing challenge. There are a lot of broken links. There are a lot of parts of the website, if you visit other mass schools, frankly, much more impressive than ours. I agree that that definitely needs some attention. I was pleased to see that a report written by faculty mentioned that faculty are under-utilized in recruitment efforts in the recruitment process. The three previous institutions that I was at faculty were a key part with the recruitment process. It was a hand in glove situation. The worst thing you could hear as an enrollment manager, if you're coming into a new institution, is to hear the faculty are overwhelmed and they don't care and they don't want to be involved. This report tells me just the opposite. This is a group of faculty that want to be involved and for whatever reason haven't been engaged in the process. I'll come back to that in a moment. But on this item, I am meeting with all the deans. I'm on my second trip around the 'sun' with the deans and we are talking about ways to get faculty more involved. Christy is going to share more on that as we start to wrap up.

Recommendation 2.2.5, communication and collaboration between the enrollment division and the colleges also needs immediate attention. My team and...have been hearing me talk about communication and collaboration/collaboration and communication. I've been here for 11 weeks. It's very apparent and it's very obvious, and it's not going to be fixed easily, but it needs to be attended to. I think some of the communication problems, this is my opinion, probably stems from the fact, I believe I am the fifth interim vice president. Is that about right? Maybe the fifth in the last ten years.

Senator Wedding: A revolving door.

Mr. McDonald: It has been a revolving door. That has to change, and we need stable leadership here as quickly as possible. A search has started for the...<Garbled>... and with search firms, we can develop a strong pool. But that is what we need more than anything. And that is what I reported to the Board when I was at the Board meeting on February 28th. We have to develop a strong pool and get someone who wants to be at the University of Toledo, because I see all the opportunities that exist here. When I started my admissions career 30 years ago at Case Western Reserve University, I remember a fellow by the name of Dick Eastop. Some of you might recognize that name. He got two plaques on the wall on the side of my office. So, this is back in the mid-90s, when I was starting in this profession, the Ohio public had very stable leadership in enrollment management. I'm not going to say it was easy then, but it is easier than it is now. My 35 years of doing this work, the first 30 were actually quite fun. The last five, less so. But the challenges in enrollment management are significant. I know you don't want to hear about the demographics being the cause of this. It is part of the cause, but it is not the only cause. But this work is so much more sophisticated and so much more complex than it was even 15 years ago. The instability in enrollment leadership at the University of Toledo, you're also seeing it in the other Ohio public schools. Presidents are turning over more quickly, vice presidents are tuning over more quickly, and you're seeing it in enrollment management. I have three dear friends, all in their mid-fifties, who worked at some of the most selected private colleges in the country. They were walking away from their jobs 10 years before

they would normally retire. They were very successful in their roles, but they were just tired and beating down.

So, on that happy note. Recommendation 6.3, centralized enrollment strategy plan is needed immediately. Yakov, were you on the meeting at 2 o'clock with Huron today? Tomer was there. That is happening right now. I made reference to the enrollment diagnostic. That was just an eight-week crash course in what needs to be done immediately, right now for fall 2024. We're building on that now. Huron has been retained to do a full strategic enrollment plan that will sort of chart out what the roadmap is going to be for the University of Toledo in the next five years. Our goal is to have that report and ready to be delivered at the June 4th meeting. One area of the RRC report that I disagree with slightly, but actually, Yakov, over the weekend, as I was sharing my talking points with him and as I read it, I may have mischaracterized the disagreement. This was in relation to the shift in recruitment strategy from the colleges to central administration being the primary cause of enrollment decline that we have experienced here in the last 10 years. I'm not sure that that's true. And if the argument was for blowing up the enrollment division and going back to a decentralized approach, I think that would be suicidal frankly. As I mentioned a moment ago, this work is more complex, more sophisticated than it's ever been and having nine or ten different admission offices on the campus at the same time would be disastrous in my opinion. But with the help of Yakov and others, [we can turn this around]. What I think you were referring to is actually some of the positions in the colleges. Is that right?

Dr. Yakov Lapitsky, co-Chair of RRC Committee: Yes.

Mr. McDonald: Being taken away and being reduced or something. I think I mischaracterized that. I think there is absolutely room to have admission people in your colleges, and I am working with Christy and others on that. Somehow these are really good people functioning and collaborating at very high levels, but it is not consistent across all the colleges, and that is what we need to get to. I will wrap up with what I believe are four factors that are most responsible for the decline in enrollment here and other places. I actually touched on all of them already in my remarks. Number one, it's the lack of stable leadership and the enrollment seat combined. You have to acknowledge the demographics, particularly in Northwest Ohio. Please don't forget there was a global pandemic. That was a factor. It was a factor, even at the most selected colleges in the country. And we can't deny there is a decline in public trust in higher education and in institutions in general. That is something we all have to overcome. I see some people are ready to roll, and I can see some people agreeing with a lot of what I said. I do appreciate the affirmation. I'm going to have Christy come up and just share a couple of things that we would like on your radar as we go into yield season, including Tuesday, March 19, Jeff..., Doermann Auditorium at 3 pm.

President Rouillard: I'm just going to ask consent to extend the meeting for about another 15 minutes. Would that be okay? So, unless I hear any great disagreement, I ask indulgence for Senate to continue another 15 minutes.

Christy Sevier: Thank you for your time and for staying a little after today. We really appreciate that. As Greg mentioned, there are opportunities for faculty involvement in enrollment management. In fact, earlier this week I actually had lunch with some faculty members to talk about some ideas of how they can help stimulate and increase the enrolment in their program. We had a great conversation, and we had some real actionable ideas that they are going to be able to take back and implement. So, we're really excited about those types of conversations. When Greg comes back next week to just talk, one of the things you're going to hear him talk a lot about is how much the perspective students and the perspective parents really want to hear from current students. And so, that's one area that we really could have your help with. You're in those classrooms. You can identify those students that are really an outstanding

representative of what it means to be a Rocket and would be a really great ambassador to talk to prospective students and parents. So, that's a little key area that he could really use your help in. Greg talked a little about we're putting a lot of focus on the campus tour experience and the campus visit experience. One of those main areas that we need help with, we need more tour guides. We only have 22 tour guides currently on the roster and about 16 of them are actually active. The others, maybe one or two a semester. A university of this size should really have about 60 to 80 active tour guides at a minimal. So, we really could use your help in identifying students that would be great tour guides. These are students that are very enthusiastic about being a University of Toledo student and can help tell the story of what that means. So, that's an area that we can really have some great conversations with.

Faculty wanting to be involved in admissions work and recruitment work. So, if you have friends, or colleagues, or connections with teachers in high schools that will allow you into their classes to have those conversations with their students, particularly if it's an area that's really a good fit for your program. That's a great opportunity for you to help spread the message of the opportunities here at the University of Toledo. We ask that you do that in collaboration with the Admissions Office. So, please let us know when you're going out and doing those conversations; we'd be happy to support you, whether it's sending a person with you to have those conversations, or just sending you the materials. However, you need to be supported. We would love to do that for you. I actually got an email today about a faculty member that's going to be doing that in the next two weeks, and we're going to happily send an Admissions representative with them to make sure that they can answer any questions that they may not be able to and have all the materials there for the students.

One of the other things we'd like, we'd love some help with is using social media accounts to promote and champion the events that are happening on campus. Students just aren't attending events. This generation just aren't attending events as much as they used to. So, any help getting that word out about those events, that's a great opportunity to help us get more students here to experience the University of Toledo campus, see your lab, see your classrooms, and hear about the great opportunities that you offer students, and the support that you offer students in those classrooms. Also participating in those events, we have a lot of events on our calendar. We have two big ones coming up. We have Preview Day coming up on March 29, which is really geared towards underclassmen that are just starting the college search process. And then we have an Experience Day on April 5th that is really geared towards admitted students and getting them to that next step-- paying that enrollment deposit, signing up for orientation, all that fun stuff. Those are great opportunities for faculty to be involved and have those connection points with students. We are engaging in this way. I also encourage you to think about how you can engage with parents. The parents of this generation are much more involved than we ever seen in higher education. Ten years ago, we were talking about helicopter parents. And frankly, I want them back. They were much nicer. And they were much easier to work with than the parents today. Gen X is just not the nicest parents. So, there is just so much more involved than they've ever been. So we have to think about how we engage them as well. It is not enough. You know, I remember when I started out as admissions counselor at LSU, we were taught to talk to the student. You know, you have to talk to the student. You know, say hi to the parent, but you really engage with the student. Right? We can't do that anymore. We just can't, they're just too involved and honestly these students have really outsourced things to their parents. A lot of times we'll ask a student a question, and they'll turn and look at the parent waiting for the parents to answer for them. So now we have to think about ways that we're engaging with the parent as well whenever they're here for these types of events.

We also have a product with Thankview, which allows you to record very quick videos. We also have another product that's coming online called Good Kind. But Thankview is already being used in the

academic colleges as well. I encourage you to think about how you can use a video platform to communicate with students. They're a video first generation. They're not going to read a lot of emails. You're lucky to get them to open emails, let alone to read them. Text is great, but we're starting to see them ignore text a little bit more. Video is really the main thing. And again, back to that current student perspective. If you have a current student who talk about their experience, short, concise. They're not going to sit through a five-minute video. You've really got maybe 60 seconds on the long end. But if you have a current student that would be a great ambassador for your program and [would] talk about the experience, recordings and videos and sending those out, we can help facilitate that. That is a great way to do that. Also, in terms of communication, one of the things that we did in the fall is we reestablished the liaison program from Admissions to the academic colleges. I believe that existed prior to COVID, but it kind of had gone away. We have reestablished that. I'm happy to share with you who the liaison is in each of the academic colleges if you're interested. That's a great person for you to have conversations with in your academic college to find out what admissions is doing, find out what events are coming up, and also to share with them information of what's exciting about things that are happening in your college. Did the student win a national award? Did they patent something? Are they working on some big research project? Please share that with your academic liaison, because the charge from them is to bring that back to us so we have those talking points when we're out talking to students and talking to families about what it means to be a UToledo student and what great opportunities we can have for them here. Also, if you have openings in your research labs, if you're willing to take a first-year student, please let us know, because those can be really good recruitment tools, particularly when we're here in guild season to talk about students. I have a long list, but I know we're short on time. Those are just a few ideas to get us started and we're happy to continue this conversation as we move forward. Thank you.

President Rouillard: Thank you. Is there time for one or two questions?

Senator Wedding: There's a question in the Chat.

President Rouillard: "What is your perspective on why enrollment at BG was growing or falling only slightly when ours is falling sharply in the past 10 years?"

Mr. McDonald: That's a good question. I'm not sure I know the answer to that, but can I follow-up with a question? I've only been here 11 weeks, but why is this campus so fixated with BGSU?

Senator Barnes: Because their enrollment is high and ours isn't.

Mr. McDonald: I don't know---

Senator Semaan: I can't say 'fixated' with probably just BGSU. Cincinnati increased. Everybody increased and we dropped. We've been hearing sometimes blame coming to the faculty, like, we are the ones who are the cause of it. Often forgetting that faculty are recruiting whether they are at the Honors market, or whether they are at the athlete market, or whether they are recruiting new students. Frankly, our retention has been because of faculty, and not because of anything [fancy] that administration is doing.

Senator McInnis: I don't know if I would call it an 'obsession' as much as we have colleagues or friends at BGSU. My wife teaches there. It is very close geographically. We share a culture in Northwestern Ohio, so I think that the relationships there are closer than we might think, even though we -- I mean, just to say, we are in competition with them. I think it would be hard for us not to do that.

Senator Lewin: I won't go into detail because of the time, but the ad hoc committee had a number of details. A faculty committee pretended they were secret shoppers...and had pretty concrete examples of how to change things.

Mr. McDonald: I read that in the report.

Senator Lewin: Yes, you can look at that.

Senator McInnis: If I can follow-up with, like, if your question is how can we not be so -- There's some distinct differences between these two schools, and I talk about this all the time. So, if we are on board, then how can we emphasize how our programs are different and maybe even better? That's where we should start.

Mr. McDonald: I've spoken with my counterpart at BGSU, and our Director of Orientation, Emily has offered to take me down. I'm curious about how they do campus visitation, and I'll be going down there in a few weeks. And the campus consultant is coming next week. He's worked with half of the MAC schools, including BG. But it is my understanding, the campus life experience and the campus visit experience at BG has a certain positivity, and excitement, and sizzle than perhaps here. As I've been here, I said to Diane on a couple of occasions—this is my opinion, just my opinion—Toledo seems to have a little bit of an inferiority complex. And the reason I say that—I'm so certain of that—because I'm Canadian and we all have inferiority problems north of the border. We shoot ourselves in the foot here. So many of our injuries are self-inflicted, and that's what needs to change.

Senator Heberle: My husband graduated from UT in the 70's and he went to Law School here in the 80's. He would agree that the context of Toledo in Northwest Ohio, UT still has the 'TU' reputation. But I also want to point out that BGSU is a residential campus. And one of the things that I always have focused on at UT is the special quality of our metropolitan city existence. We have commuter students, we have students with families, and we have students who work full time. I will guarantee you that at BG, they don't have that kind of student who is working their way through. So, I just think that in terms of our admissions, in terms of our discussions with people, we can't treat them as if they are like BGSU students who are going to come here and spend fulltime being a student, because they're not. And so, the fact that they're residential contributes to that 'buzz' you're talking about; and the UT student, we have to really think differently about our campus culture. We are not going to have the same campus culture as they do at BGSU. That's not going to happen. Because we have a different set of students with different sets of needs who come here.

President Rouillard: And that could be one way of branding UT as being more welcoming to commuter students as a way also of saving money, because students can save money by living at home. Senator Allred, you had one. Let's make that the final question. I'm sure if we invite you again, you'll come.

Mr. McDonald: That is actually...it's been covered...

Senator Black: Do you have an email address that we can send---

Mr. McDonald: No, I don't have an email<laughter>. It's Gregory.McDonald@utoledo.edu

Senator Black: There is a resource that is underutilized here by not just faculty. I was at the women's basketball game Wednesday night, and it was a fabulous game. We've got band members that are strong advocates for the University. We've got a dance team, cheerleaders, and mascots. It was senior night. We won the MAC championship. We are number one in the women's basketball game. The auditorium was maybe 2/3 to 3/4 full. I mean, it was a wonderful event. These kinds of things need to be---

Mr. McDonald: Toledo has so much going for it. As an enrollment management professional, when you think of the major medical center, the med school, the law school, the engineering school, the business school, the great undergraduate programs, the athletic success, a city with half a million people, between two major league cities, on Lake Erie, close to Canada. I mean, come on. What more do you need? This should be attractive. There's so much going for this place and there's so much opportunity for the next enrollment manager to take the leverage and...

Christy Sevier: And to speak to the athletics part of it, we are meeting with Athletics every other week now, and talking about ways to partner. We've already partnered multiple ways. In September we did a transfer tailgate specifically targeting adult and transfer students. We've done some basketball games, inviting some counselors to basketball games and good things like that. Also, now if you register for a campus visit and if it's the day of the game, we have a link that you can actually get up to four free tickets for the game. So, if they want to go to a basketball, or what have you, that kind of thing. So, we are continuing to partner and do more with Athletics and we've already got some plans for next fall as well.

President Rouillard: Okay. Thank you very much again for coming, and I hope you will accept another invitation. Keep us updated.

Mr. McDonald: Thank you.

President Rouillard: Almost a fellow Canadian to another<laughter>. Okay, is there a motion to adjourn? I don't have to ask for a second. Meeting adjourned at 6:26 pm.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Smith
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary

