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**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, Daniel Compora, Vicki Dagostino-Kalnik, Maria Diakonova, Holly Eichner, Hossein Elgafy, Elyce Ervin, Diana Frantz (proxy for K. Green), Sally Harmych, Samir Hefzy, Cindy Herrera, Jason Huntley, Gary Insch, Dinkar Kaw, Lauren Koch, Linda Lewin, Kimberly McBride, Daniel McInnis, Thomas McLoughlin, Kimberly Nigem, Katherine O’Connell, Mohamed Moussa, Elaine Reeves, Linda Rouillard, Eric Sahloff, Paul Schaefer, Gaby Semaan, Kathy Shan, Suzanne Smith, Stan Stepkowski, Steven Sucheck, Weiqing Sun, Jami Taylor, William Taylor, Kasey Tucker-Gail, Jerry Van Hoy, Randall Vesely, Donald Wedding

**Excused Absences:** Avidor-Reiss, Sorin Cioc, Rene Heberle, Samir Hefzy, Jason Huntley, Catherine Johnson, Barry Scheuermann,

**Unexcused Absences:** Elissar Andari, Bruce Bamber, Terry Bigioni, Ritu Chakravarti, Collin Gilstrap, Cyrus Hagigat (proxy for A. Jayatissa), Mitchell Howard, Revathy Kumar, Mohamed Moussa, Jennifer Reynolds, Chunhua Sheng, Puneet Sindhwani, James Van Hook, Aela Vely,

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

**President Rouillard:** Thank you, Senator Smith. The first order of business is to adopt the agenda, which you should see on your screen. All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by typing ‘yes,’ ‘no,’ or ‘abstain’ in the Chat box. And those in the room who approves the agenda, please signify by saying, ‘aye,’

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Rouillard:** Nay? Hearing none. Or abstain? Hearing none. ***Agenda Passed.***

All right, we don’t have Minutes for this week, so we will proceed to the *Executive report*: Good afternoon. By now, you should have received the FS nomination ballot for your college. That ballot opened March 18 and will close on April 1. We expect the final ballots for elections to go out on April 5 and close on April 19. Our final meeting of the academic year is on April 23. Our first meeting of the new academic year will immediately follow on April 23. At that meeting we will elect the executive committee: a President-Elect, Secretary, 2 at-large members from HSC, and 2 at-large members from Bancroft campus. We urge you to attend the April 23 in person, though it will still be available remotely. We also ask that those attending in person bring a device on which to submit their votes.

Please also note that the 2 final meetings for Faculty Senate will take place in NI 1027. Today is our final meeting on the HSC campus.

Faculty in HHS, NSM, and Pharmacy should have received a link from the Faculty Senate office to fill out an evaluation for their dean. That survey opened on March 25 and will close on April.

Interim Provost Molitor met with the CAL College Council last week to talk a merger between the JHCOE and CAL as a way to share resources. The merger would become effective in 2025. He said that the faculty involved would be asked to vote, and of course, we expect this would come to FS as, in observance of our constitution Article II.A.e and f which recognized the responsibility and jurisdiction of FS: “to participate in shared governance for the academic affairs of the University...To participate in a meaningful manner in any University long range strategic planning or prioritization, including budgetary, policy, fiscal and facility planning.”

When asked about the effect this merger will have on programs announced for suspension, the provost replied that some of our strategies have conflicting goals and that this merger may rekindle these decisions.

Are there any comments from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee? Senator Brakel, do you have any further information on HB83?

**Senator Brakel:** Not at this time. The House doesn’t meet again until April 10th.

**President Rouillard:** On the topic of really scary news, I would like to point out that the Arizona legislature is considering a bill that would basically end shared governance on their campuses and put everything in the hands of the president. So, if you really don’t want to sleep tonight, do think about that. Anything else? Senator Barnes?

**Senator Barnes:** Indiana passed a really distressing bill saying that boards of trustees will be voting on tenure for faculty based on whether or not boards think they will be likely to promote “intellectual diversity.” It seems another attack on diversity, equity, and inclusion, and also academic freedom.

**President Rouillard:** Well, it is official, I am not sleeping tonight. Okay, so we will move on to the Provost report.

**Provost Molitor:** Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Rouillard. As you are aware, a lot has happened since the last meeting. Early last week, Mike Toole resigned as Dean of the College of Engineering in response to an ongoing Title IX investigation. Although I cannot provide any details about this investigation, I do want to state publicly that no students were involved. Whatever the outcome of the investigation, I am grateful for Mike’s service to the University. He has made substantial contributions in moving the College of Engineering forward, and I am indebted to him for the impact he has made on my career and on me personally.

I am also grateful that Mohammad Elahinia has accepted my offer to serve as interim dean through June 2025. Mohammad is a Distinguished University Professor, and has a long history here as successful teacher, scholar and leader. I am confident knowing that the College is in good hands, and I believe the College of Engineering faculty and staff will continue their success under the direction of Mohammad and his leadership team. We will initiate a national search for a permanent dean during Fall 2024 with the goal of having a new permanent dean in place July 2025.

And as you are also aware, Dr. Melissa Gregory has accepted my offer to serve as the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters. Dr. Gregory has done an excellent job as interim dean, and I am very confident that the College of Arts and Letters will thrive under her continued leadership. During my negotiations with Dr. Gregory, I initiated the idea of exploring a potential merger between the College of Arts and Letters and the Judith Herb College of Education during the upcoming academic year and moving forward with a merged college effective July 2025 if the merger is approved.

I would like to provide a little insight regarding this revival of discussions surrounding college mergers. Some of this recent conversation relates to the multiple campus master plan recently approved by the Board of Trustees, which will result in the physical relocation of several academic departments. This has led to conversations regarding organizational realignments that may follow.

In addition to physical relocation of units associated with the multiple campus master plan, another argument for any proposed mergers lies with recent initiatives for program prioritization, strategic enrollment planning, student success, and marketing and communications. All these initiatives are moving forward in an environment with ongoing financial challenges. I am concerned that smaller colleges will not have the staffing to fully implement university-wide initiatives for recruitment and retention at the college level. Pooling of resources through mergers can alleviate this concern. I would like to strongly emphasize that I do not view this pooling of resources as an opportunity to reduce budgets or to eliminate staff positions. Even with merged colleges, we will at least need the staff we currently have, if not more staff, to effectively implement these initiatives, and to ensure all programs, large and small, can benefit from them.

In terms of the process, I have met with faculty from both colleges to initiate discussions. I requested the formation of a joint committee with 3 – 4 faculty from each college, along with a representative of each dean and a representative from the Provost Office. The committee will explore the benefits and challenges of the proposed merger and operational issues such as administrative structure, governance structure, bylaws and elaborations. The deliverable would be a brief report for the respective deans and me summarizing these findings.

In terms of a timeline, I would like to get this work started before the end of Spring 2024, with tasks identified that could be addressed by administration during Summer 2024 with the goal of immediately resuming the conversation with the committee throughout Fall 2024. If the proposed merger is viable and does not pose any significant challenges, I would present a merger proposal for Senate, President and BOT approval during Spring 2025 with the goal of working toward a merged unit to begin the 2025-2026 academic year.

I will stop here and answer any questions before I move on to discuss a new program data dashboard.

**President Rouillard:** I just like to thank you for being so deliberate about these mergers and taking the time to get the input from faculty. It is a significant departure from previous experiences of mergers.

**Provost Molitor:** Thank you and yes, it does involve a lot of work. I know we do have a history here with mergers and un-mergers. In the current environment, I cannot see an un-merger in the next three to five years given our resources and the directions that we need to have to pool resources and make sure everyone has what they need.

**President Rouillard:** Does anybody online have -- Okay, there is a question here. “Continue search for director for the Honors program?”

**Provost Molitor:** The search is ongoing. I believe Dan Hammel is the chair of that committee, and I will check with him to see where we are with this. My understanding was that we were going to have a public forum in the next couple of weeks. I will check with Dan on that. Thank you for the reminder.

**President Rouillard:** Anybody else?

**Provost Molitor:** I will share my screen here.

I apologize that it is so small. I could not find a way to magnify it. I will make sure everyone gets the link when the permanent version is available. This is still a beta version. This is a dashboard that was developed by Institutional Research to provide us information on our various programs. There are two tabs here. You see at the bottom, there's the ‘internal program dashboard’ and then at the right of that there's another tab that says, ‘external program dashboard.’ Currently, we're looking at the ‘internal program dashboard.’ What this has is a list of all our active degree and credential granting programs. This includes certificates at all levels. What you see in first of these five different panels is admits by academic year. This is the total number of unique students admitted during a given academic year. For your reference, academic year starts in this previous summer and goes through spring. For example, 2019 academic year is Summer 2018 through Spring 2019. The second panel is for enrollment trends over five years. The enrollment is split into two columns for each academic year. The first column is the primary program enrollment. You have students who will be enrolled in multiple degree programs. The primary enrollment, which is listed as their first or primary program, will be on the left side of that column and then the secondary enrollment on the right, because we do have several degree programs and majors where students will enroll in multiple programs. The third panel is for total completions, either degrees or completed certificates. The fourth panel includes measures on one-year persistence. That is the number of students who were enrolled each year who either graduated/completed the program or continued to be enrolled in the following year. The fifth and final panel shows the six-year graduation rate, which is mostly applicable to undergraduate four-year degree programs, but it is still the same measure that is also displayed for graduate and certificate programs. This is the internal data.

Then Institutional Research also took it upon themselves to identify a source of external data. What you see here - on the left panel is IPEDs completion data, and it is for several states in our region. Although IPEDs provides nationwide data, IR limited this to the Midwest, which I believe includes Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin. This data only goes back three years. The reason it only goes back three years is when the CIP codes that are associated with each program changed. CIP code stands for Classification of Instructional Program; this is a coding system used by the Department of Education. Since these codes were changed in 2020, IR limited these data because otherwise they would have to go back and do a complicated crosswalk. However, you still can see the trends and absolute numbers. It is useful to compare programs to one another. The nice thing about our analysis, unlike what Huron provided in their academic portfolio review, is that IR is limiting these data to the appropriate degree level as well. It's not just all enrollment for a CIP code. It is specific to the credential - certificates, associates, bachelors, masters, etc. So you can compare the enrollment of one of our bachelor's degree program under a certain CIP code to the regional enrollment in bachelor’s degree programs under that CIP code.

On the right side is some employment information, which is available from two sources. One is the State of Ohio labor market information and the other one is the National Bureau of Labor Statistics. They chose Ohio because it was easier to get relevant one-to-one relationships with the degree program and the credential level. The national data could only associate the job market on the CIP code, and would not differentiate the difference in jobs related to whether you were in an associate degree level, a master’s or a doctorate level. These data show 2020 employment and then projected employment in 2030. They have a change in percent and the number of total positions or employment; projected number of annual openings, and then salary information. Once the final dashboard is available, you can go through this data yourself, and I hope to get that to you shortly. To find a program, you can filter on several characteristics. You can select a college. You can select a degree level. You can select a program code, etc., to find the programs you're interested in among other filters, and look at the information that you may be interested in finding.

These are for degree programs that are under exploration right now. Again, the goal of this is to minimize the faculty workload spent on low-enrolled courses, which leaves three options. The first outcome is to retain the program and provide a plan to increase enrollment, in particularly those low-enrolled courses. The IR dashboard will be most useful for this. For example, if you can identify a low-enrolled program here that is garnering more enrollment in our region, then we can start investigating what is it that they’re doing that we’re not doing to garner more enrollment? Similar differences may be observed in placement and employment outcomes. That would allow us to perhaps market the program differently and attract students or maybe even work with employers directly to see what we can do to increase enrollment. The second option is to modify the program to increase enrollment in low-enrolled courses or to reduce the number of low-enrolled courses. What kind of program modifications could you suggest to improve that situation? The last alternative is to suspend admissions to the program or to recast the program from a full degree program to a certificate or a minor. With that, I will stop there. When we first started talking about the timeline, we were talking about having these reviews done by May 1st. I don’t think that is possible at this point. I’m hoping to have these reviews done by the end of September 2024, so that we can make decisions. I would like those decisions to be made sooner than they were made this year so we can suspend admission and communicate with Marketing and Enrollment Management in a more reasonable timeframe. I am going to stop there, and ask if there are any questions? .

Question from the Chat. “Would there be a way to challenge decisions in which occupational titles are attributed to various degrees?” Good question, Jami. The IR report aligns programs with what’s called the SOC code (Standard Occupational Classification Code). There is a crosswalk between the SOC codes and the CIP code. However, you can go through this list and identify occupations associated with different degree programs if students in your program also go into these occupations. Yes, you're more than welcome to include that information. We won't be able to change this report itself, but in a manual review, you would be able to include that information.

**President Rouillard:** Provost Molitor, I have a question about using the Ohio employment data because obviously, all of our students don't stay in Ohio.

**Provost Molitor:** Absolutely not. That is correct.

**President Rouillard:** So, are there ways of including decisions of national statistics?

**Provost Molitor:** Absolutely. If you do want to find additional information that you think is helpful, by all means, yes. This is just our quick first pass for making this widely available.

**President Rouillard:** Okay. Any other questions? Senator Black.

**Senator Black:** Is this available to all the chairs?

**Provost Molitor:** I’m hoping to make it available to all faculty.

**Senator Black:** I’m skeptical of the data from Institutional Research because it seems to underestimate a number of majors in our department on a consistent basis. The evidence that for that is our department gives out scholarships to all of our majors every semester, and a number of scholarships we give out are always at least 10% higher than the number of majors listed by Institutional Research.

**Provost Molitor:** If you have specific data you want to forward to me, I’d be happy to forward that to IR and have them look at it. The one thing that I would like to point out is if I go back to the internal enrollment data, your missing enrollment may be reflected in this table under secondary enrollment. You may be referring to reports where we only show enrollment in the first or the primary program. For example, you may be giving scholarships to students who have economics as a first major or as a second major. I don’t know what your rules are in terms of scholarship awards. Hopefully these numbers will reflect that. If you go back and add the primary and secondary enrollment, hopefully those will align. If not, please let me now.

**President Rouillard:** There’s a question online and then we will go to Senator McInnis.

**Provost Molitor:** Primary enrollment and secondary enrollment. There are many students who will have multiple programs, so you might have a student, for example, in the College of Engineering where we have a lot of students who did computer science in engineering as a first major and then electrical engineering as the second major or vice versa. You might call them dual majors or dual degree recipients. Ordinarily when we report enrollment—because we don't want to duplicate our overall headcount—we just report the student’s first major or first program. In this case, we wanted to make sure we provided a reflection of all students, because those students will be in courses in both programs. The whole focus of this is to reduce the number of low-enrolled courses. If you have students that are pursuing multiple degrees, presumably they're enrolled in the courses in both of those programs. And the second question is, “How about a low-enrolled program that is running on low resources?” Presumably there are resources being used by any program, but this could be part of the information that programs provide. If you can demonstrate that we're not devoting faculty workload to low-enrolled courses, then that is something we need to consider.

**President Rouillard:** Senator McInnis, you had a question?

**Senator McInnis:** Thank you, Provost Molitor. Do you have a timeline when this might be available to the faculty?

**Provost Molitor:** I am hoping in a week or two. I know that IR rushed to get this to me so I can show it to you, but they had some more things to finish up before they could push it out.

**Senator Barnes:** In previous meetings you’ve talked about this being a rolling process of looking at---

**Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator Barnes:** So, you presented us with a timeline today for---

**Provost Molitor:** For the programs that are identified as under exploration. I believe we can utilize this tool for this review. I would like to develop an ongoing process by which we can identify programs that we may need to look at because enrollment is going to change, demand is going to change. We also need to figure out a way to use this in the opposite direction. What are we missing or what do we need to do to allocate more resources to?

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** Anything else?

**Provost Molitor:** I just want to show one more thing, and I think it was a question that Dr. Barnes previously asked me. I forget if it was at ALT or a Faculty Senate meeting. You had asked me—I believe it was you, and I'm sorry if I am not correctly attributing this—what is the magic number of programs that an institution may have?

**Senator Barnes:** I’ve asked that.

**Provost Molitor:** Good. The answer is, I don’t know if there’s a ‘magic number,’ but I wanted to provide you with some data that Institutional Research came up with. They came up with a set of peer institutions that are identified on the IR website; I believe this list goes back to Dr. Gaber’s days. These include regular peers, aspirational peers, and then our Ohio peers and Mid-American Conference schools that are outside of Ohio. What is on this list is for each of these peer schools is all degrees and certificates on the left side here. Now I’ll scroll over to the right side where it is just degree programs. This shows the total student FTE, the total headcount, and then the total number of degree and certificate programs. You can see there is a wide range of degree programs going from the low 100s to 500. This is degree and certificate programs. On the right most column, you take the student FTE and you divide by the number of programs. That gives a measure of how many students on average are enrolled in each program. And I will say we're not the worst on this list, but we're certainly not the best. We are on the lower end, which probably means if, you wanted to improve your allocation of resources, you would probably want to have a higher ratio of FTE per program. I can share this with the Senate leadership if they want to distribute this to all senators.

**President Rouillard:** Thank you.

**Provost Molitor:** This is the same data, same FTE and headcount. It is just that now they’re basing it on a total number of degree programs. The assumption here is that most students who are enrolled in certificate programs are probably also enrolled in a degree program. We have very few students who just come and enroll in the certificate program on its own. Again, we're not the worst, but we're on the lower end of this. And then in terms of the number of degree programs, it ranges from the low to mid 100s to the 400 range. It varies by school. Again, there is no ‘magic number;’ we're not the worst and we're not the best. We seem to be closer to the lower end of this. That's probably just a reflection of our overall enrollment related to some of these other schools. I wanted to provide that information just as a FYI for you. Keep in mind, we don't have a specific metric here. Nobody has set a target number of programs or a target FTE per program.

**Senator Barnes:** So part of the question that I asked was about the size of the faculty relative to the student population because historically we’ve heard that we have too many faculty for the size of our institution.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator Barnes:** I think this kind of addresses that, but---

**Provost Molitor:** Well, it doesn’t address the number of faculty. It just addresses the enrollment.

**Senator Barnes:** Students. Right. Well, if that information is available, I think that would be useful. But [it would also be useful if we could have similar data comparing] the size of administration because we talked about are we sacrificing at parallel rates---

**Provost Molitor:** Understood. I know we are submitting information for what’s called the Delaware Study, which is a comparison of different institutions. When we submit that, I can see what they have in terms of faculty counts. I think that is usually on a program-by-program basis, but perhaps we can aggregate it across the institution. This would give us an indication in terms of faculty numbers for comparison. And I know they do fulltime, parttime and things like that.

**Senator Barnes:** And the sizes of administration, at our peak size and now.

**Provost Molitor:** I don’t know if they have it available or not.

**Senator Barnes:** No one seems to be paying attention to this. The other thing is, I remember Matt [Schroeder] saying that he thought, well, he said, “I don’t think we have peer institutions because of our unique---"

**Provost Molitor**: Mix-of schools---

**Senator Barnes:** Set of professions.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes, and that is a great point.

**Senator Barnes:** Well, I thought he mentioned Wayne State University as a potential peer.

**Provost Molitor:** In terms of the distribution of programs?

**Senator Barnes:** No, just generally as a peer institution. I think because of -- well, you do have Eastern Michigan, so you do have some Michigan schools over there.

**Provost Molitor:** I do not know how this was determined. I do know that it is at least a decade old. I think it's certainly worth revisiting. So, I appreciate that.

**Senator Barnes:** Thanks for revisiting it.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes, no problem.

**Senator Black:** Does the number for UT include the Medical Campus?

**Provost Molitor:** This includes all our credential granting programs. This would include the Health Science Campus.

**Senator Black:** My point is if some of those universities don’t have a medical campus, don’t they by definition have fewer degree programs and therefore, their numbers---?

**Provost Molitor:** Yes, absolutely. We have by virtue of all our professional schools, a larger number of programs. Now, in the College of Medicine, the one primary program is the MD program. We also have some graduate programs associated and we have a few professional programs like the physician assistant program and a few others. So, yes, having the Medical College does increase the number of programs - as does having a College of Pharmacy, a College and Nursing, HHS, Arts and Letters, Engineering and Natural Sciences and Math in our wide range of programs. We are a very professional program heavy institution, there’s no doubt about that.

**Senator Black:** Well, my guess is if we take out the Medical College then we would jump up.

**Provost Molitor:** Well, we would have to take out their headcount in FTEs. Roughly, the MD program has about 700 FTEs associated with it in one degree program. So, removing them may actually make our numbers look worse, I don't know.

**President Rouillard:** But this also begs the question of the purpose of cutting programs. It doesn’t seem to translate into increasing enrollment.

**Provost Molitor:** No, but the idea is, if you think about low-enrolled courses, the more FTE you have per program, the more likely it is that you’re not going to be teaching courses to small numbers of students. It is a measure of efficiency.

**President Rouillard:** Efficiency can be defined oddly. You can say you’re being efficient because you have more students, but if those students aren't getting a good education, then you aren’t really being efficient. So, that’s not the only---

**Provost Molitor:** I understand. That’s a good point.

**President Rouillard:** But what I see here is their University of Alabama got 20,000 students with only 159 programs. But then you’ve got Eastern Michigan with fewer students, but yet more programs.

**Provost Molitor:** Look at Buffalo. Buffalo is twice our FTE and twice the number of programs.

**President Rouillard:** So, you know, I really question Huron’s recommendations about efficiency.

**Provost Molitor:** I am not going to argue that with you - you and I agree on that. I was asked a question and so I wanted to provide an answer.

**President Rouillard:** Thank you.

**Provost Molitor:** And I’ll be honest, I’m not drawing any ironclad conclusions from this. I just wanted to share.

**President Rouillard:** Any questions online? Any other questions?

**Past-President Insch:** I have one question really quickly. I’m just curious if we have any updates on next year’s budget?

**Provost Molitor:** We are working on sending a memo out to the units by April 1st, with the goal of having budgets uploaded by May 1st. When I say ‘we,’ [I’m referring to] Dr. Postel, Matt and I, and our respective teams are working very, very hard to identify areas to cut outside Academic Affairs and outside of the student experience. We believe that we are to a point where any further cuts in those areas will do substantial damage to our ability to enroll more students or to retain more students.

**Past-President Insch:** Just a quick follow-up. What concerns me is that we've had conversations where we were going to have preliminary conversations about budgeting back in November. And now with this new timeline, faculty will be gone when those decisions are actually starting to hit the pavement. So, there's not going to be any real interaction with faculty---

**Provost Molitor:** The budgets are going to be loaded by May 1st, and faculty will still be here at that point.

**Past-President Insch:** During finals week and without--you know. I am curious why, and I don’t want to put Dr. Postel in this, but we know what enrollment is in the fall.

**Provost Molitor:** Right.

**Past-President Insch:** We're not that bad at guessing that. We have people do their budgets in November and then make adjustments. It’s just puzzling why this continues to be an issue.

**Provost Molitor:** I think in ‘normal’ years we would want to be doing this earlier, but don't forget the FASFA issue. We really don’t have a good handle on the fall enrollment because we haven’t packaged financial aid yet. I think we are just about ready to get these packages out now. Ordinarily two months ago we would have had packages out and we would have been seeing much more in traffic in terms of enrollment deposits and confirmations. This is one challenge we are facing in terms of predicting fall enrollment.

**President Rouillard:** Although I do remember that Matt [Schroeder] has said on a regular basis that they develop the budget and build in an expectation of a 6% enrollment decrease.

**Provost Molitor:** That is correct. That is based on mostly the numbers of students that are going to graduate. But we're still trying to figure out how many new students we’re bringing in.

**President Rouillard:** Any other questions?

**Senator Barnes:** Just one quick question.

**Provost Molitor:** Sure.

**Senator Barnes:** At an ALT meeting recently, and I forgot which one, we got this report of what students are looking for and how---

**Provost Molitor:** Yes, the Art and Science Group.

**Senator Barnes:** Yes. One of the things I was pleased to see is that students appreciate small classes and getting to know their professors.

**Provost Molitor:** That’s true.

**Senator Barnes:** I wonder if you can comment on how we’re going to do this really fundamental work if our goal is eliminating small classes when it seems to be one of the things that students say that they appreciate?

**Provost Molitor:** That's a fair question. We are working on eliminating our smallest classes, but we have to define ‘small.’ Second, I view it as a workload issue. Can we allow faculty to devote workload to fewer courses, which would then, even if you have more students in those courses, will give you more time to get to know those students and interact with them and to do things like the Art and Science report was talking about? It is also an important issue. And there are conflicting---

**Senator Barnes:** Yeah, I think it is different, though, if you have a small class vs. a bigger class that you can spend more time on.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes, but is ‘small’ five, twenty-five?

**Senator Barnes:** Did they drill down at all in terms of what students meant by it?

**Provost Molitor:** Nobody did anything in terms of that. It was just a question- what do you think of larger vs. small classes? I’ve had experiences where I had courses as large as 150. Obviously, that is a big class. Personally, I define a small class as anything under 30. When the class is over 30, then I would classify it as a larger class. I think it was 40 when I reached the limit where I didn’t have the ability to learn everybody’s name by the end of the semester. This varies by faculty member, and it may vary by program and the type of instruction.

**President Rouillard:** I’d like to throw two things in here. Number one, workload is not just teaching.

**Provost Molitor:** I understand.

 **President Rouillard:** We have to keep that in mind.

**Provost Molitor:** Absolutely.

**President Rouillard:** And I think Huron decidedly avoided that issue.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**President Rouillard:** The other thing is we have to keep into account what kinds of assessment is a class of 300 using. Are you using essay assignments?

**Provost Molitor:** I agree.

**President Rouillard:** Or are you using scantrons? Do you have one instructor, or do you have three TAs? I’m not hearing that those things are being included in the discussion.

**Provost Molitor:** That’s a great point. Could you take faculty workload instead of having one instructor teaching a course of 300 and one instructor teaching a course of five? To get rid of that course of five, could you have two instructors teaching two sections of 150 each?

**President Rouillard:** Well---

**Provost Molitor:** So that’s all I’m saying.

**President Rouillard:** That means I’ll go and teach engineering, then and you can come over and teach French <laughter>.

**Provost Molitor:** You might be a better engineer---

**President Rouillard:** But that is the other part of this isn’t being considered, is that we’re not interchangeable...

**Provost Molitor:** Absolutely.

**President Rouillard:** I think part of the problem with this whole Huron report is that it doesn’t recognize the value of expertise.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes. I think that is an important part in this whole review process, what is it that we have faculty expertise in, and what are we devoting that expertise to? I think that's a great point and we do need to consider that.

**President Rouillard:** Any other questions or comments? Senator McInnis.

**Senator McInnis:** This may not be an appropriate question. If Matt was here, I’d probably ask him. If you don’t have this information or want to answer it, that’s totally fine. I remember Matt gave us some pretty dire information regarding cash flow at some point.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator McInnis:** It was like---

**Provost Molitor:** Cash on hand.

**Senator McInnis:** Yes, cash on hand. This spring do we know where we are with cash on hand?

**Provost Molitor:** My understanding, (from what I recall and I will ask Matt to correct me) is that our cash on hand trajectory still isn’t great. It improved a bit with budget changes and what has happened over this year where we’ve come in. If we continue business as usual, my understanding is that we are going to run out of cash. If I remember correctly, it is by the end of 2025. We’re still not out of the woods, and that’s why we’re going to have to find additional things to cut.

**Senator McInnis:** Thanks.

**President Rouillard:** Anything else?

**Provost Molitor:** Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** Thank you very much, Provost Molitor. And if you can forward to us the dashboard link, that would be great. I know people would be interested in seeing that. So, thank you.

**Provost Molitor:** Will do.

**President Rouillard:** All right, that bring us to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report. It is rather heavy, but I think we can get through it relatively straightforwardly.

The first thing we have are four new courses, and I will ask for a vote on the first new courses and then I’ll ask for a vote on the 24 course modifications. I will also ask that if you have questions on any of these courses at any point, please ask questions, okay.

The first course is **PHM 4780, Internship in Drug Discovery and Design** for 3 hrs. You have the catalogue description there. You have the prereq. One of the prereqs is proof of an accepted internship offer. The rationale is that this is simply developed for students in the Bachelor of Science and Drug Discovery and designed to meet the practicum requirement.

New course number two is **PHPR 2000, Introduction to Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.** This is a 1 hr. course, and it is designed for pre-pharmacy students to connect with the college, explore career opportunities and so forth.

New course number three, **PHPR 3150, Essentials of U.S. Healthcare Delivery and Pharmacoeconomic Evaluation**. This is a 2 hr. course. Understanding of the essential components of health care delivery. This course was developed to align with program learning outcomes for the proposed drug discovery and design program.

Number four, the last new course. **THR 2700, Introduction to Dance**, 3 hrs. This course is an introduction to the art of dance and so forth. Rationale, the department has offered this course successfully three times as a special project course and has been successful.

**President Rouillard cont’d:** Any questions on the new courses? In that case, I will ask those of you online to indicate whether you approve, disapprove, or abstain on these new courses. And I’ll ask the same of the people in the room. All those who approve of these new courses, please indicate by saying, ‘aye,’ disapprove or abstain. ***Motion Approved.***

Then the other course modifications, as I said, there’s about 25 of them and a lot of them are in blocks. While Quinetta is looking at the votes, some of these course modifications are pretty straight forward. So, I'll get started with some of them until we can pull the list up again.

The first course modification is **CHEE 2230, Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics**. The only change here is that it will be open to chemical engineering and environmental engineering majors only, and updated SLOs in accordance with ABET accreditation.

The second course modification is **CI 3430, Phonics and World Identification.** This is the title change to phonics and word identification. You have here the catalog change. The new language is green, the old language is red, and updated SLOs. And I believe I’ve already corrected that language because I was given permission to do so by the presenter of this course.

Number three, **CI 4930, Internship/Student Teaching**. This is a grade change from standard letter to satisfactory/unsatisfactory, and addition of coreqs.

Number four, **DST 2980, Special Topics**. This is a change in credit hours from 3 to a variable 1 to 4, repeatable up to 6. Same thing with course five, **DST 3980, Special Topics in Disability Studies**.

Course six, **DST 4640, Disability Law and Human Rights**. It is a title change only.

**DST 4980, Special Topics in Disability Studies** is in accordance with the other special topics courses, changed from 3 hours to 1 to 4, with a max of 6 hours, and a change in catalog description.

Then course number eight, **FINA 6480, Student Managed Portfolio; also listed as FINA 4480**. This is a change in credits from 3 to 6 hours because the students are completing this course over two semesters and there are updated SLOs. Any questions so far or concerns? Everybody’s okay?

And then we have course number nine, **HIST 2000, Methods of Summer**. It is adding the WAC designation, changing credit hours from 4 to 3 with a max of 6. And they've given you the rationale for doing this down below.

Course ten, **MBC 3100, Ethical Practice in Research**. There’s a title change, change of CIP code and updated SLOs to improve alignment with program learning outcomes.

Number eleven, **MBC 4470, Advanced Immuno-Therapeutics**, is removing the pre-req.

Number twelve, **NUR 3310, Mental Health Nursing** is adding a co-req. This is according to new guidelines from their professional organization.

Number thirteen, **NURS 3320, Medical Surgical Nursing 2**. They are modifying the pre-reqs and modifying the co-req as well.

Fourteen, **NURS 3330, Pediatric Nursing**. They are modifying the pre-reqs and modifying the co-reqs. And again, this is to modify the curriculum in accordance with their professional accreditation.

Number fifteen, **NURS 4510, Population Health**. Modification of the pre-reqs and of the co-reqs.

**NURS 4620, Precepted Clinical Practicum**. It will not be offered no longer in the summer. Change new pre-req and a new co-req. Same thing for **NURS 4630, Management of Care**, new pre-req and new co-req.

Number eighteen, **NURS 4700, Nursing Care of Persons and Families with Complex Care Needs.** New pre-reqs and a change in CIP code.

Number nineteen, **NURS 4760, Professional Nursing Competency**, new pre-reqs.

**President Rouillard cont’d:** That is it for Nursing. Any questions or concerns so far? Anything in the Chat box? No. Okay, we will keep going then.

Course number twenty, **PHCL 4780, Internship in Pharmacology/Toxicology**. Credit hours are changed from 6 to 12, to 3 to 6, and it can no longer be repeated and there is a new pre-req.

**PHIL 3710, Philosophy of Law** is being reactivated for the philosophy and law certificate.

**PHPR 3620, Cosmetic and Fragrance Product Development**. It’s changing the semester that it’s offered and adding a new co-req.

Course twenty-three, **PSY 2100, Statistics Methods**. It's no longer repeatable for credit and a whole new slate of pre-req choices, and they've given you the rationale.

**SPED 4380, Transition Process from High School to Post-Secondary Settings for Students with Disabilities.** This is a number change and a title change, cross-listed as 5380, no longer repeated for credit, a change in the catalog description, and a new pre-req.

Final course, **SPED 4930, Internship/Student Teaching in Special Education**. Change of semester offered, spring instead of fall. Change from standard letter to satisfactory/unsatisfactory, modified pre-req and modified co-req.

**President Rouillard cont’d:** Any questions before we call for a vote? In that case, online, all those who approve of these course modifications, please indicate by saying ‘yes,’ ‘no,’ or ‘abstain.’ And in the room, all those who approve these course modifications, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Rouillard:** Any ‘nays?’ or abstains? Hearing none. Okay, very good. I will let Quinetta do the calculation on that. ***Motion Passed.*** We can move to the Academic report, Dan Compora.

**Senator Compora:** I’m here. We have only two program modifications today. Pretty simple. They both are name changes. This was both University Studies, **Individualized Program**, BA and BS. The contact person was changed from Kim Pollauf to Mary Humphrys. They removed one course that required a little bit of rewording of the major, so that course is no longer required of the major. That was really it; it was mostly the name change, the contact change, and elimination of one potential course. Are there any questions?

**President Rouillard:** So, Senator Compora, the only change for these two programs is removing AL 3500?

**Senator Compora:** Yes.

**President Rouillard:** Got it. Thank you.

**Senator Compora:** And the name change, of course. I can’t see the Chat, but if there aren’t any questions, I will call for a vote. All those in favor, please signify by voting ‘yes,’ those opposed please vote ‘no,’ and if you wish to abstain, please do so.

**President Rouillard:** And I’ll call for the vote here in the room. All those in favor of these two program modifications, please signify by saying ‘aye.’

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Rouillard:** Any ‘nays?’ Abstain? Hearing none. Okay, Senator Compora. ***Motion Passed.***

**Senator Compora:** Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** That’s it?

**Senator Compora:** That’s it.

**President Rouillard:** All right. This is efficient. Next, we have Sharon Barnes on Core Curriculum. Stand in front of the mic right there and you should be okay.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you. We have four issues, including a couple of course approvals and a couple of other things we were asked to consider. I think you are going to share. Quinetta is sharing. The first was, we had been having conversation pretty much all semester about the multicultural core courses. It was identified as a gap in our assessment in our last or North Central evaluation. Alana asked us if it would be possible to do some work on the assessment of those multicultural core courses. And we sort of came to see it as a set of bigger issues in that there aren't shared student learning outcomes in the courses, for one. The second issue is that there seems to be a real lack of clarity about the Non-Western diversity requirement. Is it Non-Western? Is it Global? Is it Non-U.S.? There’s been some slippage in that terminology over the years, and it just isn’t clear. So, we discussed amongst ourselves and thought that this requires some deeper analysis and thought;, we think it's a worthy project to get some shared SLOs in those courses to make sure they're doing the work that we want them to do. This will also have the benefit of making assessment better and easier and, of course, getting clarity on the definition would help. So, those three issues are the charge of the committee. We think it should be a subcommittee of the Core Committee to specifically focus on this. And what we would like to do is through Faculty Senate, through the college curriculum committees, and hopefully with direct interaction with the faculty who teach these courses, we will solicit volunteers to sit on a subcommittee to do this work so that folks who are deeply invested in these courses, are the people thinking about learning outcomes and thinking about assessment measures, etc. So we're hoping that senators today can take this back to their departments. I’m going to personally reach out to all the college curriculum committees, but we really want to get the word to the faculty who are teaching that we’re interested in forming a subcommittee to do this project. And the hope is, that we would seat the committee before the end of this year, so that in the fall, they will already be set with their charge and can begin working right away. What I heard from Alana again, from the Provost's Office perspective, is that as long as we can show progress in our mid-cycle review then that’s really sufficient for them. So, we have some time to be deliberate and just to make sure that, especially given all the attacks on diversity happening right now, [we are doing a good job of reflecting the faculty’s values on this issue.] I think people might naturally be a little bit skeptical and anxious, and I think we want to make sure that we're doing this to guarantee that the students in these courses get a high-quality experience, and that's really what this is about. So, our request for help from the senators is just to make sure that this word gets out, even though I’ll do my best and I think the committee will too, to spread it. Are there any questions or comments?

The second, and I did these in order -- I thought it would be easy. We had only two proposals, **Political Science 1200**, is already in the Social Science core. They updated their catalog description. **Women’s Studies 3010** is already in the core as a non-U.S. diversity core, but it was seeking to be added in the social science core. Both of those proposals were approved by the committee.

**President Rouillard:** So, we want to call for a vote.

**Senator Barnes:** And so, I would like to call for a vote on those two, but I'm happy to entertain questions as well.

**President Rouillard:** Any questions?

**Senator Barnes:** So, all those in favor in the room, can you say ‘aye’?

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**Senator Barnes:** Any ‘no’s?’ Any ‘abstentions?’ Same for folks in the Chat. ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you.

Then, I mentioned this in my last report. We had a request from the Provost’s Office by way of the Military and Veterans Affairs Office, asking if we could waive the Non-Western, or Global, or Non-U.S., or whatever you want to call it, core requirement for military veterans- and I would suppose active military too, who have served overseas. And we deliberated. There are several folks on the Core Committee who have military experience, and it was very helpful. We also got input from the Provost’s Office and other folks on campus. And with one dissenting vote, we think that veterans and students serving in the military should be guided by the Prior Learning policy, which really, actually, states in the policy that they can apply for prior learning credit, experiential portfolio, training, all the things that would seem to be relevant. We already have a policy, and so we are recommending to the Senate, and I don’t think we need to vote, but we think we should just allow that policy to dictate what happens with veterans. I can communicate that back to Eric unless you wanted to do it.

**Provost Molitor:** No, that is fine, I can mention that to him. I believe I already did after last Senate meeting. We also talked about the military TAGs; it may be possible that there is an equivalent course attached to the military experience. These military TAGs represent an automated prior learning assessment credit award system.

**Senator Barnes:** Yes.

**Provost Molitor:** Like if you’re an electronics technician, you get credit for online…

**Senator Barnes:** Unfortunately, I think what Eric was asking for is to waive the Non-Western diversity core requirement---

**Provost Molitor:** Correct.

**Senator Barnes:** Which wouldn’t be in the TAGs.

**Provost Molitor:** We were wondering if there were TAGs that would have awarded credit for a cultural competency course or something along those lines.

**President Rouillard:** It might be in the OT36; OT36 has a category now for these kinds of courses.

**Provost Molitor:** Alright.

**President Rouillard:** So they could fall under that.

**Senator Barnes:** We looked at that as well, but I thought---

**Provost Molitor:** And you didn’t see anything?

**Senator Barnes:** I mean, I think there are course equivalencies, which I would imagine they’re already doing for their students (if there are course equivalencies). So, it seems to us that [the prior learning policy] was the most likely to be relevant. But I think where the TAG policy makes more sense, they should use that.

**Provost Molitor:** Yes, absolutely. Okay.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay. And then the last issue for us, at Senate’s request, the committee wrote up a proposal to respond to the requirement that new courses be submitted to the OT36. The Provost’s Office position is that this requirement is just like requiring you to submit a new course in CIM. You should have to submit a course to the OT36; it doesn’t have to be accepted, but you should have to submit it. And so, we said we would write up language [indicating that we disagree] for you to vote up or down. So the language that you see here is the language that we developed, and special thanks to Frank Hall, who helped get it into its final shape. Basically, “The University Core Committee recognizes the benefits to students of submitting our courses for inclusion to the OT36; however, we believe that the decision to submit courses should not be imposed by the Provost’s Office, but rather, left in the hands of the faculty members creating the course.” That was the position of the committee - six in favor and one abstention. I don’t know if that requires a vote.

**President Rouillard:** We could---

**Senator Barnes:** We could endorse this statement. I don’t know if it changes the Provost’s position or makes any difference, but I think it’s worth saying that we think this is one of those places of shared governance or affirming faculty responsibility for curriculum. Right?

**Past-President Insch:** I apologize for my ignorance on this. But could you explain to me the downside of applying for that program?

**Senator Barnes:** I don’t think there’s a big downside. It takes a little bit of time. In conversation with Alana--again, she’s been sitting on the committee helping us with all kinds of things--she said that [the requirement] was actually her suggestion. It would streamline the process for faculty so that they would just do it when they were submitting the new course. And so, I don’t think she was thinking of the implications of who’s controlling what happens to their course when she suggested it, because she just wanted to make it easier because it is a very good thing for students. So, I think the downside, just in terms of individual faculty members, is it takes a little bit more time to do it, to make sure you're aligned with learning outcomes, etc. But I think the other more significant downside was that folks felt that it impinged or infringed on faculty control of curriculum. That was, I think, a more significant issue. So again, we’re saying, we recognize that it’s beneficial; we just don’t think the provost should be requiring it.

**Past-President Insch:** Okay, what I just heard was it is better for students---

**Senator Barnes:** Yes.

**Past-President Insch**: It is better for the programming, and we're kicking against the crux because someone said that we have to do it?

**Senator Barnes:** I think it’s a -- go ahead, President Rouillard.

**President Rouillard:** I think the issue here is that this should be a faculty decision. I don’t have a problem, I personally do not have a problem with having faculty who are submitting a new course in the gen ed. core, submit it to OT36. But I have a problem with administration requiring us to do that. This should be our decision because this is about curriculum. My fear is that the next step will be ‘your course won’t go into gen ed., unless it is approved by OT36.’ And now we're having even more outside control over our curriculum. The state does tell us, yes, you have to have courses in social science. You have to have courses in math. You have to have courses in English. But, we determine which of those courses meet those requirements. And now we're going to outsource disapproval completely outside of the University when we take that next step. I believe that it is a good thing to take this step now before anything else, before our responsibilities for the curriculum get overstepped again.

**Senator Herrera:** So just to clarify, you’re saying this OT36 cannot have the ability not to approve the course?

**President Rouillard:** Part of my concern with this is in fact projection. I’m looking to clarify that faculty have the responsibility for curriculum. And yes, the administration does weigh-in after we weigh-in. But the faculty did not get a chance to weigh-in on this new requirement in the process.

**Senator Barnes:** And I think the first part of the statement recognizes the value.

**President Rouillard:** Yes.

**Senator Barnes:** So, it's really just saying we see this is a valuable thing to do, but we don't think that the administration should have imposed the requirement on us. It should’ve been our purview to do it. And we think it’s a good idea. It is good for students. It is good for transfers, particularly. So, it is really just a statement saying we really don’t think you should force us to do this. This is not your purview- ‘stay in your lane.’ Any comments or questions from the online folk? Seeing none, I am going to call for a vote. All those in favor either post ‘yes’ in the Chat or say ‘aye.’ All those against say ‘no’ and post ‘no’ in the Chat also, obviously. Abstentions? And feel free to abstain online. Two abstains ***Motion Passed.*** Thank you very much; that was it for me.

**President Rouillard:** And thank to your committee for that work. So, we have a brief report from Past-President Insch on a Tech survey, and then we will move to Malaika, who has been here waiting very patiently through all of our deliberations.

**Past-President Insch:** Thank you, President Rouillard. I appreciate that very much. Just a quick review for the Senate. Last year we did a tech survey at the time to specifically discuss the interest around synchronous online teaching. Meaning, that you're teaching in a classroom and there’s a couple of ways to do this: (1.) hybrid being that there are kids in-class and there are kids at-home. I should probably call them students, and I apologize if I offended anyone. (2.) synchronous teaching is where everybody is online, but they have the opportunity to participate. So, just some real generalities.

First of all, thank you all who participated. Over 270 people participated in this. Here's the, and I’m sure President Rouillard can share this. There’s lots of good comments in it as well. Just kind of a quick outlook on who makes the decisions. A number of people who box-checked one of these were saying, sometimes it is a mutual decision between me and my chair or a program manager. So that just gives you a quick kind of overview of who's making the decisions on the modality of classes. It's a little bit across the board there.

This is basically those who are teaching or have taught synchronous. So, a vast majority hadn't, but 50 respondents did, which is a pretty good number. They have some insight into what the experience is like here at the University of Toledo.

The next one is whether or not the program themselves is taught solely online or in a hybrid program. So, you can see that, you know, basically 1/3rd was a complete online program, where the rest, 2/3rd, are sitting in some kind of hybrid format. Here’s some general information about the format last and previous semester.

Here is kind of how much synchronous courses are actually offered in the program. So, interesting, there are six programs, and they are all synchronous and then there's some others. You can get a sense of the different programs that teach that. We didn't ask what specific programs they were, but I think there are some programs that lends themselves to synchronous teaching more than others. And then basically, how many do you teach a semester, and there's a wide variety there. Obviously, the large number is one to two.

The next question is, (and this is probably the interesting one) how do they go about doing it? Collaborate on Blackboard is clearly the most often used. I think it’s because it is the most cleanly supported at the time. So that is good, and interesting to know.

The next one is basically how satisfied you are with the technology? We didn’t get a ton of responses here, but interestingly enough, more than half felt they were okay. And those who struggles with technology, you can read the comments - they really have struggles with the technology. But for some people it--well, certainly those who responded and answered the question--it certainly seems like they weren’t having that big of a challenge with it.

The next one was, do you get common complaints about synchronous online learning? And again, the majority of respondents said that their students were not complaining. But obviously, there was a number that did, and those ones who have taught in this format, you can just imagine what those are.

This is the question I think that’s most interesting, probably. It is, I am interested in teaching a hybrid course face-to-face and synchronous online. Those who would like to teach mostly synchronous courses where all learners are online, and then people who said I would prefer not to teach synchronously at all. So, you know, roughly give a few percentage points here, right? For the math people in the room and statisticians, I apologize, but it's fairly evenly split there across those three different modalities of issues.

Here, nothing really surprising, other than most people are saying, I'd like to have better tech support, which makes sense.

And then the next three that have a large number of responds too are basically enhancing the experience of people who are either in the classroom that can have a camera focusing on them, so that students at home can see them and having a microphone that works. So that people when they speak in the classroom can be heard more clearly. And a better way to monitor/display people who are participating online. And none of this technology is unheard of. When I was in West Virginia, many, many years ago we taught synchronously to three sites. They had microphones and cameras. It's not hard to do. It's just a matter of fact of, do we want to invest in this technology. You can see the rest of those comments there.

Then the last one, and this was really the main point of this. If we were able to dedicate some classrooms to synchronous education which would have some of those bells and whistles that we’re talking about, the technology, would you be interested in teaching in that? To no surprise that over 70% said that they would be willing to do that.

This is just some quick takeaways. Obviously, tech support and having appropriate equipment are critical. There were some concerns about just the technology itself wasn’t very inducive. I thought this was interesting, having more uniform class technology across the campus. I think it would be good if you did it across campus and across rooms. Some people have much better technology than others.

**President Rouillard:** Prime example, right here.

**Past-President Insch:** Right. Which we didn’t get the feedback for some reason that we do. It was designed not to do that, but that is a different story. Also, potential standardization of some training and some suggestions for equipment that students may want to have so you don't have these computer issues. Because obviously, hybrid learning, to try to do it on an iPad or a phone is not as quite as useful as maybe a different type of technology. And so, there was some standardization for students. That was a great comment, a couple people mentioned that.

Concerns about, which I think a lot of people have, what’s the learning happening within a hybrid class vs. a face-to-face class vs. synchronous class vs. strictly online concerns. Concerns about when you have synchronous in class and out of class that it is more work. Particularly, if you're teaching face-to-face and asynchronously in the same class, that hybrid model kind of feels like you’re teaching two separate classes, and it might be some teaching workload associated with that. Provost Molitor is running out of the room because I’m talking about resources<laughter>. And then some standard requirements, basically a reiteration of the first one.

So, that’s just a real overview. We can share that information with you. But I think the takeaway for us at the Senate level, is we may want to (hate to say this outload) find some ways to find--maybe with our online people-- a couple of dedicated rooms to try to upgrade the technology and then get some training for students in what they would need to participate in those types of classes. Thank you everyone who participated, and thank you all for patiently listening to me, and thank you President Rouillard for the opportunity.

**President Rouillard:** And you will forward it to us, and we will send it out.

**Past-President Insch:** You got it. And you got the whole thing as well, it’s in a Word document, right?

**Quinetta Hubbard, Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant:** Yes.

**President Rouillard:** And thank you, Past-President Insch. So finally, I get to introduce Malaika Bell who is the Director of the DEI Office. We thank her for her patients. I sometimes try to give speakers an anticipated start, but it is really hard to know how long things are going to go and how much time curriculum will take up. So, we appreciate your patience.

**Malaika Bell, Director for Diversity and Inclusion:** Good evening. My name is Malaika Bell. So, if you think of a ‘lake,’ a beautiful body of water. That is how to pronounce my name. It helps people remember how to pronounce my name. I take it very seriously. So, my pronouns are she, her, hers. I am here only to talk about the trainings that will be available to all faculty and staff out of the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the coming couple of weeks.

So what our office is going to be focusing on is the accomplishment of goal number 5. of UToledo’s new strategic plan, which is about creating a campus where people feel included and feel like they are a part of our campus community. So that's where my work is going to focus, on creating connections and quality communication between us as individual people on this campus so that we can create a community of people - and community requires connection. And so, that's where I'm putting my efforts. I do want to take a moment and say this. I recognize as an individual person, that part of the roles of DEI offices, historically and in this nation currently in some states is to deal with things at a high level [such as] looking at policy and procedure, and those types of things. I'm going to leave that up to my supervisor. I am going to focus on you, and you, and you, and I, getting to know who we are as individual people so that we see each other in that way, as opposed to our outward external identities.

So, all of these trainings that I'm going to talk about are to that end. The first is Rocket Revolutions. You may have heard of these. We've been doing them for a couple of years now. Rocket Revolutions, we were trained out of the American Association of Colleges and Universities at their Truth, Racial Healing and Transformation Institute on our healing circles. And so, we have adopted that for our campus. This is an experiential process by which through storytelling and deep listening, we can embrace our common humanity, learn to see ourselves in one another, and approach difficult issues and needed policy changes through the lens of empathy and compassion.

The next opportunity or workshop, if you will, we are moving also away from the term ‘training.’ Because it's not my goal to input a lot of information into people and then just send them out. I'm trying to create experiences by which we all have the ability to learn and grow closer to one another. So, the second opportunity is cultivating cultural competency, a journey of self-reflection. So, if you've been at the University since the creation of the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, initially, we had a three-hour training that was available to all faculty and staff. This is a newer fresher version of that. So, this is the longest of all the training opportunities.

The next one is unpacking our biases. This one has existed since 2022 as well. It's an introspective experience designed to help participants explore their unconscious biases and develop strategies for mitigating their impact on both personal and professional contents.

The next is understanding and navigating generational differences in the workplace. I don't know if any of you were at, we had a visitor who was on campus, brought by our undergraduate Admissions Enrollment Management Office. And many people attended. That room was packed. I really believe that many people were in that space thinking they would get what we will be offering out of our office. So, what this is, is a look at the different generations, what the trends are, what the preferred mode of communications are for the different generations in an effort to improve communication between faculty, staff, and students. But specifically, our office focuses on faculty and staff- I’ll circle back around to that in a little bit here.

Breaking barriers, disability awareness and inclusive accommodation. So this one and the next one is in collaboration with the Office of Accessibility and Disability Resources. And so, the other is neuro diversity, enhancing campus communication. This is in the workplace. Participants will gain insights into the diverse ways individuals experience and navigate the world with neuro divergent conditions, such as autism, ADHD, and dyslexia. So, my hope is that participants will learn practical communication techniques, promoting better collaboration, and reducing potential barriers in professional and social interactions.

Then we've got building bridges, ally-ship, and advocacy for inclusion, intersecting identities, understanding and applying intersectionality, religious, diversity and inclusion. Then there are a couple others that I want to mention. One is gender neutral pronouns. So, many of the comments that we in our office hear from faculty or staff, even, is that they’re afraid to make mistakes in using people’s pronouns. The solution to that is practice, like everything else. Right? And so, this training is a space where people can comfortably practice the use of gender-neutral pronouns. That one is in collaboration with Aleiah Jones who is the Director of the Office of Multicultural Student Success. I do not want to miss this opportunity to promote their work as well. The Office of Multicultural Student Success has trainings that are available for students. They do have a diversity certificate, which is a four-part series that students can complete and get a certification in. They also offer safe place training, both for students, and faculty, and staff. So, I guess I do want to pause and see if there are any questions. Oh, let me share one other piece. If you go to our website right now, these are not listed there. What we have been doing throughout the semester aside from treading water is we've been trying to build up ways that we can do our work and make our campus better without ‘bumping’ up against anyone or anything. I think that building community and building connection on our campus, I don't see how that could be detrimental or problematic, and so that's the direction that we're going. On the webpage now, if you look up utoledo.edu/diversity/trainings, you will find a link where you can sign up for consultation. So, you sign up and then I give you a call and we figure out what your team, your group, your department, your unit needs- the best support that our office can offer for your area. And so, I'm encouraging everyone right now to do so. We would need the group to be at least 15 people and the time period to be at least an hour. So, keep that in mind. But please sign up and book me for the rest of the semester.

**President Rouillard:** This is this is an incredible range of trainings and particularly important, given all of the anti-DEI legislation that we’re facing. But I'm also very interested in the training that you do in neuro diversity. Unless you're in special education, most of us don't get that kind of training for the classroom.

**Malaika Bell:** Oh, okay.

**President Rouillard:** Could you just give us kind of a quick overview?

**Malaika Bell:** Absolutely. Can I read something? “In this workshop, participants will gain insights into diverse ways, individual's experience, and navigate the world with neuro divergent conditions such as autism, ADHD and dyslexia.” Let me tell you where the idea for this training came from. Anyone who knows me knows that I love to TikTok. I have learned so much from TikTok. I know that there are those of you that don't believe that, but it's true. One of the things that I learned is there's a man and wife that I follow. He describes himself as neuro typical. She describes herself as neuro divergent. And they often have videos where they discuss the ways that they interpret very common things. For instance, if she came home, and there was a piece of wood sitting on the table, he would go over and say, what's this? And she would say, it's a piece of wood on the table. Whereas what he means is why is this here? How long is it going to be sitting there? What's its purpose? And so, that's just an example of one of the things that we would unpack in this session. I really am trying to create spaces where we can have intimate learning together so that we can grow together.

**President Rouillard:** And we are increasingly seeing students who are on the autism spectrum. Do you have any statistics about that?

**Malaika Bell:** I do not. But in the training, those are there.

**President Rouillard:** Okay.

**Malaika Bell:** And I’m in the process, I’m going to tell you the truth. The truth is, I couldn’t wait any longer to let our campus know that I’ve been sitting on these. Not ‘sitting on them,’ but nurturing them, growing them, and creating them. And so, of these, I would say about half of them are absolutely complete ready to be presented. The others, I'm waiting on as time goes on. I'm hoping I can have this summer to work on a budget and get it solidified and increase the catalog. Because, like, that's the goal, right? Is for an area to be finding that there's an issue in terms of diversity or equity and say, hey, our campus provides resources for faculty and staff to utilize that will be helpful for them. That’s my goal.

**President Rouillard:** Well, I apologize for this wide repertoire of training sessions. Any comments or questions?

**Senator Barnes:** Yes, thanks. I’m echoing Dr. Rouillard. Thank you for this impressive list of options and opportunities. And I think you answered it, but I want to underscore, these are going to be ongoing opportunities? I don't want to think that I have to try to do this in this term.

**Malaika Bell:** No.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay. This is going to be available throughout the year?

**Malaika Bell:** Yes. So, what we are not going to do, which we've tried in the past, is schedule them, like, publicize or market saying on Tuesday and Thursdays, there’ll be at this time and this location. We’re not going to do that because I think it would be better if we have more, I guess, structure to the area that we’re helping. We want to be able to give them the help that they need. And yes, these all will be available once they're created. They're not going away, unless for some sort of legal reasons we're not able to provide them.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you.

**President Rouillard:** Anybody online have any questions? Okay, thank you very much for coming. And for your patients as we were going through our agenda.

**Malaika Bell:** We will stay in touch.

**President Rouillard:** That brings us to something we haven’t had time for in a while, items from the floor. Are there any items from the floor today? Hearing none. If not -- are you sure there are no items from the floor? This is your chance. We had packed agendas. If not, is there a motion to adjourn?

**Past-President Insch:** So moved.

**President Rouillard:** Is there a second?

**Senator Hefzy:** Second.

**President Rouillard:** Okay, all those in favor, please indicate by typing ‘yes’ in the box or saying ‘aye’ in the room. ***Meeting adjourned.***

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 5:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted: Suzanne Smith

 Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

 Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary