

**UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 11, 2025**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>**

Approved @ FS on 03/11/2025

---

---

**Summary of Discussion**

---

---

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

**President Van Hoy:** Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome. All right, I'd like to call to order the February 11th, Faculty Senate meeting. Deborah, would you please call the roll?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, I would be delighted. Good afternoon, Senators.

Roll call, AY2024-25

**Present:** Allred, Bellizzi, Benton, Bigioni, Brakel, Cioc, Cochrane, Coulter-Harris, Dagostino-Kalinz, Delaney, Diakonova, Dwyer, Eichner, Ekwenna, Elgafy, Ervin, Giovannucci, Harmych, Heberle, Herrera, Howard, Javaid, Kalinoski, Kaw, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Kumar, Lapitsky, Lee, McInnis, McLoughlin, Miner, Mungo, Nigem, O'Connell, Osman, Padilla, Pryor, Rouillard, Sahloff, Schaefer, Scheuermann, Semaan, Servick, Sheng, T. Smith, Suarez, Sucheck, Sun, J. Taylor, W. Taylor, Van Hook, Van Hoy, Yonker

**Excused Absence:** Avidor-Reiss, Cheng, Gilstrap, Johnson, Reinert, Willey

**Unexcused Absence:** Sindhwani

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** We do have a quorum, President Van Hoy.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Coulter-Harris.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** You're welcome.

**President Van Hoy:** Good afternoon, everyone. The first order of business is to adopt the agenda. I would just like to note really quick that item 'g' on our very long agenda, the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum report, is not ready, so we can cross that off the list for this time. There will be a long curriculum report in two weeks. Also, depending on when Dan Compora can join us, we may go to the resolution on Academic Freedom before we can do the Academic Regulation's report. Okay, hearing those changes, is there a motion to adopt the agenda?

**Senator Semaan:** So moved.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Semaan.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Coulter-Harris. All righty. Everyone in the Chat, please put yes, no, or abstain to adopt the agenda. In the room, please say 'aye' if you are in favor.

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** Please say nay if there are any nos. And then, are there any abstentions? Hearing none. **Agenda Passed.** We also have January 14, 2025, Minutes, which correct me if I'm wrong, those were sent out yesterday.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** I believe Friday.

**President Van Hoy:** Friday, okay. So, you've had them for a little while. Are there any corrections to the Minutes? I'm not hearing any. Is there a motion to approve the Minutes?

**Senator Semaan:** So moved.

**Senator Lapitsky:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you. In the Chat, all those in favor please put yes, and those against please put no. If you abstain, please put that. In the room, all those in favor please say, 'aye.'

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Hearing none. It looks like it passed in the Chat.

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

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** So, the Minutes passed. *Motion Passed.*

So next is the Executive Committee report:

On January 31, the Executive Committee met with Don Wedding, chair of the Committee on Elections and Rob Steven, chair of the Committee on Constitution and Rules, to discuss this year's Faculty Senate Elections. The discussion centered around Senate apportionment and how the merging colleges of Arts and Letters and Education, and Nursing and Health and Human Services, should be handled—as separate colleges or as merged colleges. The Executive Committee decided to apportion Senate and run elections with the current (un-merged) college structure. This is because the mergers do not become official until July 1, after Senate elections are completed this spring. We also believe this is the best choice because there are ongoing searches for university president and provost. While it is unlikely that these mergers would be reversed by new university leadership, we prefer to play it safe rather than changing Senate apportionment, only to have to change it back.

We also discussed if revisions of college curriculum requirements should be reviewed by Faculty Senate curriculum committees. Rob Steven, chair of the Committee on Constitution and Rules, reported that the Senate constitution, bylaws, and rules do not address college curriculum and revisions to these requirements have not traditionally been reviewed by Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee believes this is appropriate, but we invite colleges to present their curricular requirement revisions to Senate for informational purposes and transparency.

Today, among the many reports on the agenda, we will present a resolution in support of academic freedom for discussion and a vote. The Executive Committee believes this resolution is a good way for Faculty Senate to respond to Ohio Senate Bill 1.

Interim President Schroeder is hosting a suite at the men's basketball game vs BGSU on Friday, February 21 with tipoff at 6:00pm. (The game was originally scheduled for Saturday at 2:00pm.) With the interim president's permission, Faculty Senate is occupying the suite to watch the game and build community spirit. We still have some tickets for the game. Please email the Faculty Senate Office (facultySenate@utoledo.edu) to request one or two tickets. If you are a member of Senate or serving on a

Senate committee, please request tickets and join us for the game! And honestly, if you are a faculty member and you want to attend the game, just email us. I think we have about eight tickets left, eight or ten.

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** Would any of the Executive Committee members like to add anything to my report? All the silence. Are there any questions? I'm not hearing any. Provost Molitor, are you with us?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I am here.

**President Van Hoy:** Alright, we are ready for you.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Thank you, Dr. Van Hoy, and apologies that I could not attend in person. As I imagine you are aware, there is a lot of work in Columbus and DC that currently is impacting higher education. The bathroom bill goes into effect toward the end of this month. We are finalizing a website with the locations of single occupancy restrooms and are looking into updating signage to increase the visibility of these facilities. Senate Bill 1 and its companion House Bill 6 are working their way through the Ohio legislature. The current timeline has this legislation clearing the Senate at the end of this month and clearing the House at the end of April, when it would be forwarded to the Governor's desk for signature. It is not clear when the various provisions would be enacted if signed by the Governor.

As I mentioned at the previous Senate meeting, we are getting questions about whether we need to immediately alter any current practices that would be affected by this legislation. Again, this legislation has not been signed into law yet. However, I would encourage you to review the text and/or summary of this legislation if you have not already done so, and we are proactively conducting a review of areas that could be affected if this legislation becomes law.

The Governor has also forwarded his biennium budget for consideration by the House. My understanding is that the Governor is requesting additional funding for direct student aid including the Governor's Merit Scholarship introduced two years ago, the Ohio College Opportunity Grant and Choose Ohio First. There are also proposals to increase work-based learning and to tie a portion of our state share of instruction to employment outcomes. The biennium budget must be approved before the end of June 2025 and will become effective during the 2026 fiscal year which begins July 2025.

You may also be aware of executive orders to discontinue federal funding of DEI initiatives and to reduce the federal budget deficit. We have received general directives from a few federal agencies that direct expenditures on DEI initiatives must cease immediately and agencies will not reimburse those. We have received a few general stop-work directives from some federal agencies and have received one modification on a specific funded project. Research and Sponsored Programs staff are reviewing federally funded projects to assess which awarded projects may be most vulnerable to the broad language in executive orders and potential changes in allowable expenditures. As those are identified, or as notices are received, faculty will be contacted by Research and Sponsored Programs to address any changes needed. We are also looking at options for students currently funded by these projects to prevent any disruption in their ability to complete their degrees.

This past Friday, the NIH posted a notice to indicate it is immediately reducing the indirect cost recovery rate to 15% across the board. This could result in a loss of a significant amount of revenue required to maintain our research infrastructure, as our indirect cost recovery rate is 52.5% on the Main Campus and 56% on the Health Science Campus. Connie Schall sent a memo to faculty yesterday regarding this issue.

This morning, we learned a federal judge blocked the NIH from unilaterally imposing this reduction of indirect costs, and another judge has issued an order to continue funding for foreign aid, diversity initiatives and green-energy projects until a final determination can be made regarding executive authority over congressionally approved expenditures. Agencies do still have some ability under federal regulations to modify or stop work on awards. It is not clear how federal agencies will respond to these orders, and we are closely monitoring this situation given the potential impact on our ability to conduct funded research.

I also wanted to provide an update on the program reallocation and investment process. The committee, chaired by Prof. Thomas Atwood, Dean of the University Libraries, is currently working to review low enrolled program proposals, and is working to provide an assessment on the viability of these programs before the end of February. They will next turn their attention to proposals for investment, which must be submitted by the deans to my office on or before 5 pm on Friday, February 21<sup>st</sup>. As a reminder, investment proposals must be submitted by the deans so they can prioritize proposals in case their college is submitting multiple proposals. Thanks, as always, for your time, and I would be happy to take any questions.

**President Van Hoy:** Are there any questions?

**Senator Semaan:** So, we are looking at low-enrolled programs. We are starting to hear about classes that are being cancelled for spring 2026, in order to cut more of the very few part-time instructors we still have, knowing that part-time instructors are very low cost. I know this sounds like a broken record, but we are going through that process and at the same time, we continue to invest in administration. Last year in August, the interim president told us, "Oh, we did cut," and it was two vice president positions. Now we have about three or four vice presidents. The last we heard about two or three weeks ago at Senate... I know we have this great initiative investment programs and stuff, but the classes do bring money even if they were relatively low enrolled, especially with low costs. When are we going to start make proportioning as well-- the cost of the class, how much money it makes? Because it seems we are shooting ourselves in the foot, even it a class fits 20 students, and that class costs us \$3000-\$4000 a semester. I mean, our...revenue?

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** Yes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I will address the revenue on the courses. The majority of our students, if not the vast majority of our full-time students, have enrollments that fall within our plateau pricing. This does not necessarily increase revenue to have an incremental addition of courses. Keep in mind that students are taking courses in such a way to fill out their schedules. If we can increase efficiencies by reducing low enrolled courses, reducing the number of part-time instructors or reducing the faculty workload assigned to those courses, we will still likely bring in a similar amount of tuition revenue. Then we can more efficiently utilize our instructional resources. In terms of administrative costs, we are always looking and have a reduced administrative cost in several different areas and continue to do so with various initiatives.

**Senator Semaan:** Well, so you're saying, Scott that it's not necessarily we're making revenue, but it's also not necessarily we're saving money, correct?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** If you think about it, we can reallocate resources. So yes, we would potentially only be saving a little bit in terms of part-time instruction, but we can devote faculty workload to other areas that may help us potentially grow enrollment or generate revenue in other areas.

**Senator Semaan:** And when you don't have faculty that can fill those canceled classes taught by that low paid [professors], what's happening then?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I am sorry, could you repeat that question?

**President Van Hoy:** So, he's asking when you move these resources around what happens when you don't have any fulltime faculty to teach the courses?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, we do need part-time instructors in those situations, and we do have part-time instructors in those situations.

**President Van Hoy:** Any other questions for Provost Molitor?

**Past-President Rouillard:** President Van Hoy, I have a question.

**President Van Hoy:** Go ahead, Past-President Rouillard.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I put in the Chat, and maybe I misheard you Provost Molitor, but SB 1 is being voted on today in the Senate.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No, I think it is tomorrow---

**Past-President Rouillard:** Well, the committee is voting today. They're hearing opponent testimony. No, I'm sorry, they are hearing opponent testimony today. The committee is voting tomorrow, but what we're hearing is that they plan on moving it to the Senate floor tomorrow afternoon as well. This could happen very, very quickly.

But I have another concern related to this, and that is that the University has historically taken a neutral position on these controversial issues and these controversial bills, citing the need to not 'irritate' Columbus and have us be punished. But that position of neutrality has clearly not protected us because we are once again under attack. So, at this point, why is our institution not perhaps joining with OSU, which has spoken out against this bill and against other negative bills that attack higher education? It's time to speak up. Between what is happening at the state level and the federal level, it is time to speak up and protect higher education for our students. What has happened with the NIH is another example of people not protecting education in this country and in our state.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, I agree education is under attack by various legislative initiatives and executive orders. And yes, it is a very fine line we walk.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Well, I think it's time to stop walking the fine line and to start standing up. This institution has an opportunity to do it now. Will it do it or is it going to stay quiet and wait for the next blow of the axe?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I cannot comment on that right now, Dr. Rouillard.

**President Van Hoy:** Senator Coulter-Harris?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Hi, Provost Molitor. This is Deborah Coulter-Harris. I'm very concerned about DEI being eliminated in Washington and then coming then down to Columbus, right? That they don't want anything to do with DEI. Are we going to replace DEI with something else? I am very concerned. I mean we have wonderful staff in that DEI office. I would hope that they can transition into, I don't know, something resembling DEI, but not DEI. I'm just wondering if that is a possibility.

**Senator Semaan:** Rebranding.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, we are having these conversations. One of the things we really need to keep our eye on the ball here is the success of our students, our staff, and our faculty, who all come from a range of different backgrounds. The right solution is to figure out how we can take the legislation and the executive orders that are coming at us and reposition ourselves so that we are serving all of our populations. But what that is going to look like, what various titles are going to be, who is staffing it, and what those initiatives are going to be is, is a work in progress.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, thank you Provost Molitor. Any other questions for Provost Molitor? Anything else online? Thank you, Provost Molitor, I think that is it.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Alright, thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you. All right, it is you next Senator Coulter-Harris.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Oh, okay.

**President Van Hoy:** Next, we have a report from the Student Affairs Committee with Senator Deborah Coulter-Harris and probably colleagues.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, and Lucy Duhon. Actually, the subcommittee who worked on this are: myself, Lucy Duhon, Sally Harmych, Suzanne Smith, and Berhane Teclehaimanot. This was the third topic that we were dealing with, which was faculty-student communications. This is actually not a 'new' topic because my committee dealt with this topic back in 2022. As you can see, both in the PowerPoint and also in the very detailed memorandum that we sent out, you can see what we did on November 15, 2022, in the Faculty Senate Minutes and the memorandum that was sent out. Officially, the Faculty Senate Committee on Student Affairs is charged with the following: *The Senate Committee on Student Affairs should act as a liaison between the faculty, Student Government and the administration on matters of common interest that fall within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Senate and shall study and make recommendations on such matters.* Now, on our first meeting of FSCSA, which was held on Thursday, September 19, 2024, we reviewed what the Student Government had sent us. They stated:

- “The Student Government would love to work with faculty to improve communication between students and faculty this year. Students have had issues with professors not replying in a timely manner or communicating in ways that are not easily accessible.”

So, the subcommittee remarked on the fact that this very issue had been addressed, as I've said. As a recap in November 2022, our then subcommittee suggested three approaches to improve faculty/student email communications specifically.

- On the student side, academic support services included the resource to the Writing Center website to promote guidance and training on email etiquette.

- On the faculty side, Dr. Jeanne Kusina recommended faculty develop their own email policy in class and/or address this issue on their syllabus.

We also suggested making email etiquette training and incentive as part of the first-year experience or orientation. Some of the items discussed at FSCSA's September 19, 2024, first meeting, the subcommittee confirmed that there was not enough time to conduct a formal survey of all students and/or faculty during the spring semester 2025. But the subcommittee conducted a search for existing institutional policies and documents that refer to expectations for faculty and/or students regarding their email communications. We confirmed Suzanne Smith's and Coulter-Harris' findings that there was no extent, except for this document— student guidelines for the use of official student email addresses. Supporting DC-H's findings also, the subcommittee found that, although this document still links to a 2003 policy on email usage— that particular policy no longer exists.

So, items discussed at FSCSA's 19 September meeting included continuing items. The subcommittee discussed the functionality of course messages sent through Blackboard. There was a question raised, I think it was by Suzanne Smith. In addition to notifications sent to users Outlook email, could Blackboard Ultra be configured to send notifications to students' phones? That is text message alerts to check their or emails or Blackboard messages. I think we'd have to contact the appropriate people for that.

**President Van Hoy:** That is UT Online

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Exactly. Is there a one-way mechanism like this that students could opt into? This maybe is something to look into to increase their engagement. So, action items planned and then we'll get into some other things. Dr. Sally Harmych decided to follow up with Jeanne Kusina, Director of CETL on whether there is an email policy template faculty can use for this syllabus, including any suggested links. Well, if you look on in the memorandum on page two, the memorandum that was sent out, there is a footnote there that provides all of that information. CETL already includes suggestions and welcome emails under faculty resources for student success. There's also a syllabus resource page. There is a link to the Provost's Office syllabus guidelines etc.

Dr. Harmych actually polled her students about general satisfaction regarding email communications with 119 students to assess their satisfaction with professor response times. We're going to show you some graphics on that in a few moments. The results show that most students are either very satisfied or satisfied with response times: 48.7% are satisfied and 30.3% are very satisfied. So you can see, please refer to appendix 1. And now Lucy will take over.

**Lucy Duhon, FS Committee on Student Affairs:** Thank you. I just want to make a side note that for better or for worst, I was the one who came up with the thought that Ultra Blackboard could be configured to send notifications to student's phones.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Oh, it was you?

**Lucy Duhon, FS Committee on Student Affairs:** Yes.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Alright, I didn't know whether it was you or Suzanne.

**President Van Hoy:** Good question.

**Lucy Duhon, FS Committee on Student Affairs:** Like Deborah said, Sally followed-up with Dr. Jeanne Kusina and I attempted to follow-up with Tia Tucker from Academic Support Services. We didn't quite connect, but my question to her was: "Did you received over the past two-years any requests for training in email communications?" She did not have any data for that. I can continue talking with her about it. Verbally she does not remember having any requests for that kind of training. But it's a very nice webpage. The email etiquette rules and tips provide lots of samples, displaying various subject line types and situations that a student might find the need to create an email for. Other subcommittee members were invited to submit feedback from their own students. And as Deborah Coulter-Harris already mentioned, Suzanne Smith forwarded the full results also. Those results are in appendix two. She forwarded several long narratives from students that are very interesting to read. I encourage everybody to look at both appendices. So, I think we're on slide eight.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, slide eight.

**Lucy Duhon, FS Committee on Student Affairs:** So, of the total of 119 students who responded, which I think was a wonderful sample that Sally got, most students either were very satisfied or satisfied with their professor response times. And when asked how long does it take for your professors to respond to your emails? As you can see, nearly 30 % of students indicated it takes less than 12 hours, 48-49 % indicated it takes 12 to 24 hours, and really only 1/5th said one to two days. So, it's a great sampling of open-ended comments that are also included in her in her results. So, I think that most students feel like they get responses within 24 hours.

So, slide nine. So, question one, how often do you email your professors during a typical semester? As you can see, it varies for question one. On question two, how long does it take for your professors to respond to your emails? The vast majority indicated that they get a response within 48 hours, so nearly like 99 %, maybe, within 48 hours, which is a good finding, I think.

So slide ten, question three and four. Question three, what is your preferred response time when emailing a professor with an academic question? The vast majority, again got a response within 24 hours and only a small fraction, like probably a quarter or less feel that this could be improved. Question four, how satisfied are you with the responsiveness of your professors to your emails? Again, the vast majority are very satisfied or satisfied, with only about a quarter of neutral and no indication of dissatisfaction.

So, I'll just quickly read through some samplings from Sally's students. What suggestions do you have for improving communication between students and professors via email? One, "There needs to be an email back between twelve and 24 hours. There cannot be an expectation for us to be prompt and professors [are] not." Good point. Two, "Students should not reach out so late. Some professors can respond right away." Another good point. Three, "I feel like some professors don't respond. Sometimes you have to email them twice. I feel like some professors should look at their email more frequently because I once had to email a professor three times and she didn't answer. It took three weeks for her to respond." Now, as I understand it, Sally got nothing but good replies from these students. So, and there is another great Appendix two, another great example which was put together by Suzanne.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** I'm going to do that one.

**Lucy Duhon, Committee on Student Government Representative:** Okay.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** So, appendix one in the memorandum, you will see that there is a lengthy list of statements that Sally gathered from students regarding the emails. And in appendix two, Suzanne Smith gave her students an assignment and only three responded. So, I'm just going to read these: "I've had a few times with professors that could have been better. One time I emailed the professor about an assignment deadline and it took over a week to get a response. That made it hard to plan and stay on top of things. I do check my email regularly, but with so many messages from different professors, it can get overwhelming. It is not always clear which emails are urgent or how quickly I should expect a reply. There were also times when I'm unsure if it's better to email, message on Blackboard, or just go to office hours. It would help if professors set clear expectations about communications, so I know the best way to reach out."

- So, I think that we all need to be cognizant of that and to be very, very responsive to our students. But then on the student side, I think they have to also respect the workload of the professors, and I think 12-24 hours or 48 hours turnaround time is really sound. And that's it. So, thank you very much for listening. Do you have any questions? Anyone have any questions? Yes?

**Senator Lapitsky:** So, thank you for a great report. It sounds like for the most part students get responses promptly and are satisfied with the communication.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes.

**Senator Lapitsky:** But in some situations, that does not happen which could affect potentially both retention and how likely those students are to recommend UT to their friends and family. Are there any steps that we as an institution can take to really emphasize the importance of clear and prompt communication to all faculty so that everyone at the institution is on the same page?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, that's a great question. I think that the 1st step is to create an official policy on emails because none exist, okay? I think this policy has to include both faculty, what their responsibilities are, and also include what student responsibilities are. So, Yes, I think that's one of the first steps that has to be made. Yes, Don?

**Dr. Don Wedding:** It's less than one or 2 %, and you're going to create a policy and we're going to have another 50 meetings over at HR.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Oh---

**Dr. Don Wedding cont'd:** I can't see why you would want to create a policy with 98 % or more of the faculty are already doing it.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Okay, I see your point. Absolutely.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** I would not give the administration any more ideas on policies.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Well, that's a great idea because some students will, if they don't receive an email within 48 hours, they will make a complaint, right, Don, to HR and then, you know, get the faculty member in trouble 'blah,' 'blah,' 'blah.'

**Senator Semaan:** I'm not sure if you have mentioned—I had to step out—was there any indication what percentage of these classes were problematic with emails, or not emails but face-to-face, or online?

**Lucy Duhon, FS Committee on Student Affairs:** That, I don't think was not recorded.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** That was not recorded.

**Senator Semaan:** Okay.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Maybe there's a difference between face-to-face. Thank you for suggesting that and we will pursue that.

**President Van Hoy:** It is a good question, and also between fulltime and part time faculty.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Absolutely.

**President Van Hoy:** Alright.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** But I'm going to take Don's advice and not ask for a policy. Thank you very much.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, Thank you, Senator Coulter-Harris.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** You're welcome.

**President Van Hoy:** Dan, are you there?

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** I'm here.

**President Van Hoy:** Alright, next we have a report from the Committee on Academic Regulations.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Hello, everybody. Let's see. I'm bringing up just a summary of the changes on the Missed Class policy. Are you able to see that okay?

**Group of Senators:** Yes.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Okay. We reviewed four policies and the changes to this one seemed relatively minor to me. The committee raised no serious concerns. After our committee deliberated, somebody decided to send a couple comments and I did forward those to Angela Paprocki, but they weren't really substantive, and had already kind of addressed it in the larger committee.

So, the Missed Class policy revision removes the term 'immediate' when defining a family member. Somebody had mentioned, I think one of the comments dealt with putting in something with domestic partners, but I feel the current wording, and I did have those policies sent to you yesterday. I hope that you received them. I didn't think it was necessary, but somebody did so I forwarded those to Angela, and I'll let her committee look at that. It also included a statement allowing instructors to use your discretion and allowing absences not specifically defined in the policy. It removed a requirement for students to provide documentation for their absences, and it includes a statement requiring students notify instructors of planned absences as soon as the student is aware of the scheduling conflict. Since most of these things are in my own individual policies already and I've always followed the university policy, I didn't really see any issues with this particular one. However, if anyone would like me to bring up the actual policy, I

can do that, but it should have been sent. So, any questions or comments on this one? Does anybody want me to bring up the actual policy revisions?

**President Van Hoy:** I'm not seeing any hands up in the room.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Okay, so I'm going to move down to one another one that I think is as easier, and then I'll get to the one that I think it may have a little bit more explanation needed.

The Emeritus Faculty policy had three notable changes. It includes all faculty on both campuses. That was I think a good change. I also felt that the change in retired or otherwise was a positive change because it will allow more people to attain the status if they're so deserving. And it removed the privilege to obtain a permanent ID card which is no longer required to purchase parking passes. So, pretty much those were the only real substantive changes on that policy and the committee was in agreement on those. I believe somebody raised a concern late, but it was very minor. So, I forwarded that to Angela. They came in so late after I had prepared this report; it didn't really look like anything that was worth bringing to the floor of Senate. Any questions on this one or would anybody like me to bring up the actual policy as revised?

**President Van Hoy:** Not seeing any hands.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Okay. The other one would be our Transfer Credit policy, and I am going to bring this one up. There is a policy and a procedure. This has been newly developed, and it aligns with the Department of Higher Education transfer and assurance guidelines. I looked at those guidelines, and I looked at the policy. The committee looked it over as well. I'm going to bring this up, let me look. I think it is the first one. I apologize, I was scrolling through. So, this is a ground up policy. It's new for the ground up. It does have the procedures in a separate document. I can leave this up here. Is that readable to people in the room?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Can you make a little larger, Dan?

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** I can try.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Thank you.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** It doesn't usually work on PDFs. I can go a little bit bigger.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, that is good.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Does that work?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Let me scroll down for a couple seconds. Yes, this is a completely new policy. While it was in the packet, I still think it is important that I allow people a chance to look it over. If I'm scrolling too fast or too slow, please let me know. As an English professor, I read very quickly. Then there will be a procedure. Were there any questions on the policy portion of this? Dr. Van Hoy, I can't see the Chat, so I apologize.

**President Van Hoy:** You'll find that the Chat is quiet, and the room is quiet.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Okay. And then this is the, I believe this is the procedure number. I'm going to scroll slowly for this. This is the same procedure for this policy.

**President Van Hoy:** Dan, Linda Rouillard has her hand up.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Okay.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Dan, I have a question. I skimmed the policy and the procedures pretty quickly, and I didn't see anything related to the use of the online program, Transferology. Am I correct that there's no mention of that in this policy or procedure?

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** I don't recall seeing that either now that you are mentioning it.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Good, because I'd like to bring up a point here that using something like that—and I believe we have some people that are using that to evaluate transfer credits—is pretty problematic. At some point, that becomes a kind of an echo chamber. So, university 'A' awards credit for course number one, because it's listed on Transferology as having been awarded credit by institution number 'C.' And institution number 'M,' you know, awards credit for this course because institutions 'A,' 'B' and 'C' have awarded credit for it. I'm curious as to how much of that is being done right now in transfer credit. But I will say, I am greatly relieved that there is no mention of the use of Transferology in these documents. Is there anybody that address that?

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Is Angela online because I know it came from her, I do not recall? Again, it has been a few days since I actually looked at this policy thoroughly, but I don't recall that [being] in here at all as I'm looking for it.

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** Dan, I do not believe that is in this policy.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** I didn't think it was either. Thank you, Angela for responding because yeah, I mean since I didn't write it, I mean, of course I reviewed it very thoroughly, but I just don't remember seeing anything about that.

**Past-President Rouillard:** And that's okay, I appreciate that. But Angela, can you tell me if Transferology is being regularly used to evaluate transfer credit?

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** Yeah, it is used but to evaluate. It's just used as a mechanism to look at and to put in our information, but I do not believe it is used as an evaluation tool.

**Past-President Rouillard:** So why would we put our information in it?

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** That is a request of the state.

**Past-President Rouillard:** A request or a demand?

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** Well, it probably---

**Past-President Rouillard:** And I asked the question because we can see all the things that the state has been trying to do that really undermines the integrity of education. I think if institutions are serious about doing valid transfer credit, yes, we follow the guidelines with the state regarding OT 36, we follow the guidelines regarding TAG courses and so forth. But I don't necessarily see the value of Transferology. You know, there's no evaluation there. It's just, okay, this is what we gave credit to. And I think that we're participating in a system that undermines integrity of transfer credit rather than adds to it. And so, if there's an option to not enter our information in this, I would suggest we not.

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** I will look at that. I do not believe that is the case, but I will look into that for you Linda.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Thank you very much.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Can I jump in here?

**President Van Hoy:** Sure.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I am not aware if it is specifically still Transferology or another version of this, but we do want to enter our information into the system so students at other institutions know if they come and transfer to the University of Toledo, the courses they are taking at their institution whether those courses will or will not apply to the degree program requirements they want to pursue at the University of Toledo.

**Past-President Rouillard:** But we've already said OT 36 and TAGs do that.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No, but there's also---

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** But this is---

**Interim Provost Molitor cont'd:** There are also transfer evaluations that are done outside of OT 36 and TAGs that may apply to specific degree programs. Somebody might take a course in foreign languages that is not tagged, or in pharmacy or engineering that is not tagged, and somebody makes the evaluation to say yes, that is equivalent to a course that is required to our degree program. We want to make sure transfer students have updated information as to what will or will not transfer.

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** Right, but I think that it is just the conduit. It isn't actually the process of the transfer, if that makes sense.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Correct.

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations:** It is what they used to say that the course has actually been evaluated, and then they put it in there, so that students have access as Scott is referring to.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Exactly.

**Dr. Angela Paprocki, Vice Provost and Chief of Academic Operations cont'd:** But it isn't the mechanism that is used to say, oh, such and such school does it so we should do it. That is not how it is utilized.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Exactly. I am not aware of Transferology or whatever the tool is called, being used during the evaluation process. I am only aware of it being used on the back end after evaluations are completed so students are aware of what will count...

**Past-President Rouillard:** So, we're not using it to when students are transferring courses into our institution?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, we are exactly using it. If a course has been evaluated, that is a repository, I know we keep a record of it internally, but that is an external repository for students to see that information.

**Past-President Rouillard:** But what I guess I'm trying to get at is the information that we're accepting is that other institutions have accepted this as transfer credit as opposed to our institution having---?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No, it is our institution that has accepted this as transfer credit for students coming into our institution, and then presumably if our students are transferring to other institutions, that institution would provide a similar---

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay, alright, that clarifies it. Thank you.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Okay, no problem. Thank you.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Thank you, Scott. I appreciate the clarification. I guess at this point we would—Jerry, I believe I would call to see if the Faculty Senate supports endorsing these policies to move forward to the next process.

**President Van Hoy:** That's correct.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** Okay. Would all those in favor of forwarding these with the Faculty Senate endorsement to the next step of the process, please signify by saying 'aye' or putting 'yes' in the Chat.

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations cont'd:** Those oppose put 'no' in the Chat or say 'no.' And anybody wishing to abstain, please do so. I think that concludes my work, assuming the votes come through. *Motion Passed.*

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Dr. Compora.

**Dr. Dan Compora, Chair of the Committee on Academic Regulations:** You're welcome. Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Alright, can you bring up the resolution next? So, the Executive Committee is presenting this resolution for the consideration of Senate. And Quinetta, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe I have to read it into the Minutes?

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

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** [[Note, the proposed resolution was read into the Minutes as follows]]

WHEREAS: Academic freedom protects a community of scholars whose inquiries pursue truth and the advancement of knowledge;

WHEREAS: Education is a public good. Similar to broad arguments for freedom of speech, academic freedom promotes the common good through a dynamic process of debate and discussion in the pursuit of truth. External political interference in these activities threatens the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. In a well-functioning system where academic freedom is valued and protected, faculty exercise judgment governed by the professional norms of their disciplines both in research and in the classroom;

WHEREAS: Faculty utilize their training and experience to provide an ethical model for students of what it means to be a scholar. They demonstrate: excellence in judgment, methods to rigorously evaluate evidence, make responsible arguments, and communicate ideas. Academic freedom recognizes that faculty have a professional obligation to students to respect them as learners;

WHEREAS: Academic freedom protects the development, communication, and dissemination of knowledge; it prepares students for life-long learning and for participation in broader public deliberations;

WHEREAS: Outside political interference creates a chilling effect leading faculty to self-censor or avoid controversial topics, thus undermining a rigorous university education and the central mission of promoting the public benefits of truth discovery and knowledge creation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo rejects efforts to legislate the content of curriculum in higher education;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate rejects the encroachment of partisan political perspectives on the academic enterprise in higher education in the State of Ohio

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** Okay, we are open for discussion.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** Can you put it back up?

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

**Dr. Don Wedding:** You have 'outside political interference.' Why not just political interference? Were you talking about outside political interference?

**President Van Hoy:** It seems like it is a reasonable friendly amendment to me. Other comments?

**Dr. Dan Wedding:** Can you scroll it down?

**President Van Hoy:** Go ahead, Past-President Rouillard.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I just want to thank Senator Heberle for taking the initiative to prepare this resolution and bring it to Faculty Senate. Thank you, Senator Heberle.

**Senator Heberle:** I've had a lot of help from my colleagues, so I don't want to take the credit, but thank you.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** Can you scroll down some more?

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

**Dr. Don Wedding:** In the second ‘whereas’ you got again ‘external political interference.’ Shouldn’t it be broader, [such as] political interference? I’m concerned about the Board of Trustees. They are inside; they are not ‘external.’

**Senator Heberle:** I think it is unnecessary to be-- it can be removed.

**President Van Hoy:** That can be removed, sure.

**Dr. Will Suarez:** Can I make a statement?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes.

**Dr. Will Suarez:** We have really gone down the rabbit hole when we as academic professionals have to put out a statement like this. And I understand that it is absolutely necessary in the time, but I’m really disheartened by the fact that we have to go to this length to do something that supposed to be innate right of the universities in this country. So, I applaud the statement/the proposal, but I just can’t believe in this day and age we have to do this. That’s all I have to say.

**President Van Hoy:** I don’t think you’re alone.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes.

**President Van Hoy:** Any other comments? Senator Miner?

**Senator Miner:** I would just say that it is exactly because we are in this day and age that we do have to put something like this together. I don't think we have the time not to put something forward to make some kind of statement. As much as I understand that the university treads a very fine line, has a hard time coming down on one side or the other of issues like SB 1 etc., I think that as Past-President Rouillard said, it's time that we as faculty members, independent thinkers to push back, and I appreciate that this document is out there.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Miner. Any other comments? Is there a motion?

**Senator Bigioni:** President Van Hoy, just a quick comment. In the second ‘whereas,’ it talks about the ‘pursuit of truth.’ Just as a scientist, that strikes me as not the way I would say it. You know, pursuit of knowledge and understanding, and truth of course is a politically charged word nowadays. Maybe that's why you want to use it. I don't know, but I don't particularly like it for the reasons I stated.

**President Van Hoy:** Pursuit of knowledge, would you prefer that?

**Senator Bigioni:** Knowledge and understanding.

**Senator Heberle:** Senator Bigioni, I totally agree when I read that in the draft. I was like, oh. So, thank you for bringing it up.

**Senator Bigioni:** Yeah. There is another ‘truth’ later on that is a little less offensive, but you may want to take a look at that too.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Bigioni. Anyone else?

**Dr. Don Wedding:** I’m wondering if we can get a change for someone to read it over a couple of times. I think it is good, but I think we should be reading it.

**President Van Hoy:** Senator Heberle, do you want to read it out loud with the proposed changes?

**Senator Heberle:** Okay. Can everyone hear me?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, we can.

**Senator Heberle:** I mean online. Do I need to shout?

**President Van Hoy:** Can you tell us online if you can hear Senator Heberle?

**Senator Miner:** Yes.

**Senator Heberle:** Resolution on preserving academic freedom. **[[**Note, the proposed resolution was read into the Minutes as follows**]]**

WHEREAS: Academic freedom protects a community of scholars whose inquiries pursue ~~truth and~~ the advancement of knowledge;

WHEREAS: Education is a public good. Similar to broad arguments for freedom of speech, academic freedom promotes the common good through a dynamic process of debate and discussion in the pursuit of ~~truth~~ knowledge and understanding. ~~External~~ Political interference in these activities threatens the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. In a well-functioning system where academic freedom is valued and protected, faculty exercise judgment governed by the professional norms of their disciplines both in research and in the classroom;

WHEREAS: Faculty utilize their training and experience to provide an ethical model for students of what it means to be a scholar. They demonstrate: excellence in judgment, methods to rigorously evaluate evidence, make responsible arguments, and communicate ideas. Academic freedom recognizes that faculty have a professional obligation to students to respect them as learners;

WHEREAS: Academic freedom protects the development, communication, and dissemination of knowledge; it prepares students for life-long learning and for participation in broader public deliberations;

WHEREAS: ~~Outside~~ Political interference creates a chilling effect leading faculty to self-censor or avoid controversial topics, thus undermining a rigorous university education and the central mission of promoting the public benefits of ~~truth~~ discovery and knowledge creation;

**Senator Pryor:** Wait. Can I say something?

**Senator Heberle:** Yes.

**Senator Pryor:** So I just want to say, I guess I’m old fashioned. I would like to make an appeal for the epistemic modesty that’s still implicit, the ‘pursuit of truth’ that we are not claiming to have or knowing, but that this has traditionally had a bit of a central value to higher education. I would at least be sad of saying truth just disappears. The pursuit of truth is something that we should continue to strive for even...there is truth we are pursuing as if there may be...That’s all.

**President Van Hoy:** Thanks, Senator Pryor. So, for those online, in case you couldn't hear Senator Pryor, she made an argument for keeping at least one of the statements around 'truth' as pursuit of truth.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** I think for the first time, the preamble, it was good there.

**President Van Hoy:** Does that make sense, Senator Heberle?

**Senator Heberle:** Yes.

**Senator Pryor:** I love it, it's the middle way - compromise.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** I think you're right.

**President Van Hoy:** Do you want to hear it again or does someone want to make a, a motion?

**Senator Semaan:** Yes, I'll make the motion.

**President Van Hoy:** You move to endorse the resolution?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** I second it.

**President Van Hoy:** All right, is there any more discussion? Okay, all those in favor of endorsing the resolution on academic freedom, please put yes, no or abstain in the Chat. In the room if you approve say 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? It passed in the room. It looks like it passes online. ***Motion Passed.***

**[[Note, the proposed resolution was approved by Faculty Senate, and it read as follows]]**

### **Preserving Academic Freedom**

#### **Resolution unanimously endorsed by University of Toledo Faculty Senate, February 11, 2025**

WHEREAS: Academic freedom protects a community of scholars whose inquiries pursue understanding and the advancement of knowledge;

WHEREAS: Education is a public good. Similar to broad arguments for freedom of speech, academic freedom promotes the common good through a dynamic process of debate and discussion toward the advancement of knowledge, cultivation of understanding, and the pursuit of truth. Political interference in these activities threatens the discovery and dissemination of knowledge.

Whereas: In well-functioning democracies academic freedom is valued and protected and faculty exercise judgment governed by the professional norms of their disciplines both in research and in the classroom;

WHEREAS: Faculty utilize their training and experience to provide an ethical model for students of what it means to be a scholar. They demonstrate: excellence in judgment, methods to rigorously evaluate evidence, make responsible arguments, and communicate ideas. Academic freedom recognizes that faculty have a professional obligation to students to respect them as learners;

WHEREAS: The exercise of academic freedom on campuses prepares students for life-long learning and for participation in broader public deliberations;

WHEREAS: Political interference creates a chilling effect leading faculty to self-censor or avoid controversial topics. This undermines the purpose of a rigorous university education and the mission of promoting the public goods of discovery, engaged discussion, and knowledge creation central to sustaining a robust democracy;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo rejects efforts to legislate the content of curriculum in higher education;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate rejects the encroachment of partisan political perspectives on the academic enterprise in higher education in the State of Ohio.

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** Are you ready?

**Dr. Monica Holiday-Goodman:** Yes.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, next is an update on the Carnegie Community Engagement application from Dr. Monica Holiday-Goodman.

**Dr. Monica Holiday-Goodman:** So everybody, I hope you guys are doing well. It's good to see everybody today. I just wanted to give you a brief overview of where we are in regard to the Carnegie application. The application deadline is looming, April 1, 2025; I think exactly seven weeks from today. So, I'm hoping seven weeks from today I'll be somewhere having a good time and celebrating instead of sweating as we try to hit the submit button. But I'm hoping we get a little farther than this in the next few weeks. So, I just wanted to kind of give you an overview of the type of information that we have collected, what we have done over time.

So, as you recall, the application has ten sections. It's a pretty expansive application, very, very similar to an accreditations report. I have done several accreditation reports in the College of Pharmacy and believe me, I have never seen anything that's extensive before. I know Valerie is probably just being a little patient with me because you know as a scientist, I want to see the answer and be able to explain it clearly, make direct connections, and sometimes the way they ask questions is just not easy to do that. So, we're doing our best. But in regard to the sections that are included, there are several sections, Sections 1-3 and 9. These sections just gives general information about the university, what is our stance on community engagement and how do we make sure we are connecting with folks in the community, that kind of stuff.

**And also, Section 9. especially, how does community engagement align with other university's initiatives such as strategic planning** or other types of goals and major things that we have in mind. So, we kind of have to explain ourselves. Section 4. talks about the specific academic partnerships. If you guys recall from the last time I presented, an academic partnership is one in which there is mutual benefit in regard to resource sharing, reciprocity, goal sharing, all kinds of things. So, it's not your typical community outreach type thing. It's basically where you're actually partnering with a community entity in order to get the previously agreed upon results or outcomes. We have had several folks that have submitted examples of partnerships and I'll talk about that in a little bit later. Section 5. is about faculty

and staff engagement. How are we working with our faculty and staff to help them become more involve with community engagement. One of the key questions here is in regard to faculty and staff development. What are we doing to help you to learn what community engagement is about? How do we provide you the resources and support that you need to be involved in community engagement? It also asks about things such as the various promotion- policies that may talk about engagements specifically, and also recruitment and things of that nature. One of the questions this year also that I think is different from the last time, they are looking at examples of faculty, staff, and students' scholarship in community engagement. So, we have to provide ten examples of faculty scholarship, staff scholarships, student scholarship related to community engagement. So, I'm sending out a lot of questions out there, so guys just be patient with me.

**Section 6. is about curricular engagement.** This is where we give them an understanding of the types of classes that we have that we consider community engaged or as we call here at the University of Toledo, service-learning classes. Everybody can have their own name, but we've decided to call them service-learning classes. We have particular criteria that we set in place in order to consider a course as a service-learning course. I have counted probably a little over 30 of those that have been submitted to me and I have to compare the number now compared to the number we had in 2014, the number of faculty that are teaching these courses, the number of students that have taken these courses. So, this application is very, very big on where you were in 2014 when you first got your status and where are you now? How have you grown? How have you developed? How have you changed?

**Section 7. is about the co-curricular engagement,** things such as study-abroad and different types of student organizations and things of that nature. How are they getting involved in community engagement? Section 8. is about civic learning and life. I was listening to you guys and the questions that you were just asking about the resolution makes me sweat a little bit because we have to answer how we are making sure that our students are able to express things in a manner of free speech and how are we encouraging them to know what specific engagement is. So, we will see how that rolls out after we finish writing the proposal, and I'm hoping there are no major initiatives the state changes regarding what we can put in there. It's making me a little nervous.

**Section 10. is reflection and any additional information** that we did not answer in any of the other sections that we felt we would like to include. I'm assuming that I would include a little bit more information about some of the things we're doing at UTMC, because the focus here mostly is an academic engagement. But we're doing a lot of wonderful things here at UTMC that impact our students well, so we're probably include some of that information there.

So, if you guys' recall, I sent out two surveys over the fall semester.

- Survey 1. was sort of like, and just to give me an idea, who had information related to community engagement? I got about 60 unique responses to that. People telling me about their community engaged partnerships, about community outreach out efforts they had, about service-learning courses, or about civic engagement type of activities they were involved in. Survey 2. was kind of like a follow-up to survey 1. We probably got about 30 or so responses to that.

So, I said if you have a community engaged partnership, can you please provide me this information? Or if you have a service-learning course, can you send me the specific assessment mechanisms you use so on and so forth? So, of course, the traffic on survey 2. was a little quieter because I didn't have as many people that I was responding to. But you know, we're really pleased and grateful for all of the people that have responded. I think I have responses from all across the university, just about every college and several non-academic units such as Student Affairs, UTPD, and UTMC have responded. And so, we're so grateful for that.

As far as the community engaged partnerships, I had about 40 faculty or staff that submitted ideas for their partnership being considered community engaged. But going by the specific guidelines, I would say probably, maybe 20-25 actually meet the Carnegie definition of community engaged partnerships. We are allowed to focus on up to eight in this application. So, what I've done is sent out requests for additional information from about 15 partnerships and from that, those that I get the most comprehensive responses from, I can include up to eight of those in the application. Now, that doesn't mean that all that other information is going away. I am also preparing a spreadsheet that shows all the partnerships that were submitted, contact persons community group that that they are impacting, so on and so forth.

We will have a wonderful spreadsheet related to community engagement, partnership and outreach for the university's use once we submit this application. So, in a sense we're still gathering some information. They want specific wording on policies. We can't just say, well, our promotion policies says service promotion is a part of the evaluation. No, they want to see community engagement or service, you know, looking at the community service in regard to how that is evaluated or used in the promotion for recruitment materials that we have. They are also asking a lot for assessment mechanism of learning outcomes, so we have to get deep. How exactly are you ensuring that your students are actually learning the outcomes that you say learning? I can't just say, well, we have an assessment committee that looks at the learning outcomes for every class. No, they provide specific examples of how that is being assessed in classes. So, I am just asking you guys to be patient with us as we reach out to you for additional information. Many other questions I have to give two to three examples, 500 words each. This takes a lot of information to fill up 500 words, so please be patient as we reach out to you for more information. And also, in regard to civic engagement and learning, we have a couple subcommittees that are actually looking at those particular areas individually so that we can compile the best responses from across the university to show how we are a civically engaged university.

And despite all of the stuff that's going on right now around us, you guys are doing amazing work. I cannot wait for you all to see the spreadsheet of all the great things that we're doing at the university. So, if anybody has any questions for us. Valerie, I'm sorry I should have put your email there.

**Valerie Simmons:** No, no, I'm behind right now.

**Dr. Monica Holiday-Goodman:** Jerry told me I need to submit this by 5 o'clock yesterday, so I was in my office typing fast at 4:45 pm. But I would like to see if they have questions. Does anyone have any questions for us?

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you for your hard work.

**Valerie Simmons:** Well, first I want to recognize the fact that this application will come out of the Office of Community Engagement, but I just want to recognize Dr. Monica Holiday-Goodman. She is the lead,

and I am truly her support in this application. So, I appreciate you graciously volunteering to lead on this effort. Secondly, there's one section on the application where they wanted to know about community accountability, how we say that we are Toledo's university? So, how is the community holding us accountable? And quite frankly, how are we holding the community accountable? So I'm in the midst of a little bit of a qualitative study. There are 20 community leaders where we have asked them about university perception, the accountability piece, and if there was anything remotely negative in our conversation, I'm asking them for suggestions for resolutions. So, they are recorded conversations that will also give us even more data to share within the Carnegie process. Last but not least, although the Carnegie application is due in April, there is also the innovative economic prosperity designation that is due in December. So, Monica and I are working concurrently on two designations. The good news is a lot of the Carnegie information I can use for the IEP process. But when I come back, please be gracious and nice to me about responding information. So, thank you so much for your patience.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, next we have the Office of Accessibility and Disability Resources. Kurt Soltman and Lisa Yost are going to talk to us without a PowerPoint. In case you're online and you're wondering, 'can I see it,' there's nothing to see. But they're going to talk to us about the resources in their office and take questions from us.

**Kurt Soltman, Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** Yes, we don't have a PowerPoint. Part of that is on purpose because I tend to prefer more of 'we're here because we're in partnership with all of you,' so more of an interactive process vs. presentation aspect. So yes, that is on purpose.

Again, my name is Kurt Soltman and thank you all for having us here. I know we're already running over, so we'll try and be really brief. I just appreciate the opportunity to be in front of all of you because I know we're kind of the 'mystery office' in the corner that nobody knows what we do other to cause more work for you all. So, just getting out and being able to talk with you all is very appreciated.

One thing that has come up recently to start is where do we fit in all this DEI change? There has not been a lot that came out related to disability with all the DEI change. It's been interesting during all the DEI that's happened in the last few years, we've always kind of been on the side going, 'yes, disability is part of that too.' And now, we're kind of being on the side of 'it's almost a benefit' at this point. So, there's been a few things come out from potential legislation on employment down the line, but not a lot, not as much as come out on everything else. So, there is no changes since Section 504, the Rehabilitation Act was put in and since the Americans with Disabilities Act. They both were kind of unfunded mandates, so there's not a whole lot to pull back at this point. So that's where that is at. We also, real briefly, just wanted to go over our process and what is entailed when you get a memo from us, what has gone through the process up to that point and kind of how did the student get there. So, the Lisa Yost is our Assistant Director. She does a lot of the day-to-day operations in the office, oversees our accessibility specialist, so she knows that process better than anyone.

**Lisa Yost, Assistant Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** Again, thank you so much for having us here. Couple things that I just wanted to share briefly, just some numbers. I know we like numbers and so we're hoping you do as well. We just saw the numbers come out the 15th day of the semester as to how many students we currently have here at the University of Toledo. We wanted to share our numbers in comparison to the total student body. So, we're currently serving a little over 1400 students at the University of Toledo through our office. We're looking at about 10 % of the student body,

which is a really good number. We wish we were higher, but that is a really good number when we compare it to new numbers from our K-12 system. We are hearing 16 to 20 % of students in K-12 here in the Toledo area are individuals with disabilities, so we're seeing about 10 % of that here at the University. So again, we'd like to see the number higher, but this is where we are at right now. I think we're looking really good. Last spring semester, just to kind of compare where we were last spring and where we are this spring - at the end of spring this semester 2024, we have received 3519 accommodation requests. Thank you all for ensuring that those accommodations were put in place. As of today, right before we left the office, I did a quick little number dive and currently for this semester, we currently have 3030 requests for accommodations in the system and we're only at week five. So, those numbers going to continue to grow.

A little bit about what we do as an office, we onboard students every single day, every day of the week. One of us is doing an initial appointment, and that's why you're getting information as the semester continues to move forward. And so again, we appreciate that you read and review those advocacy letters and you put those accommodations into place.

So, how does a student get affiliated with our office? Sometimes it is a referral from a faculty [member] because the student is in your office or talking to you through office hours and is bringing concerns to your attention and so, you are referring those students to us. We're out in the community. We're at every Rocket Launch. We're at every orientation. We're at every admission fair. We get invitations to go to other schools to do virtual presentations about the university throughout the state of Ohio and up into Michigan. And so, we try and be at everything so that students know that we exist and that we support students here at the university. So, we did see a huge uptick since COVID with the numbers of students who have chosen to affiliate with our office. I think COVID brought a lot of things to the surface that maybe students didn't feel they could talk about in the past, but now they feel it is essential to be supported. So, for a student to affiliate with our office there's basically a three to four step process. The first step is the student does have to do an application. It is very quick. It is very easy. It is on our website. They answer five quick questions about themselves and then they provide us with some medical documentation. We tell students all the time that the medical documentation is the 'naughty necessity.' We have to have it, we have to have a diagnosis. It is imperative. It can't be a student saying, well, I think I have, or I wish I had or someone told me I have. They truly have to have it diagnosed and documented. It is essential if we're audited and we are supporting and providing accommodations for students who don't meet those criterias, we will get in trouble for that. So students do have to go through some rigorous testing to be considered accommodated through our office.

And then what we do, Kurt, myself and my colleague Sarah Sobert, we sit down twice per week. So, every Monday and Thursday we meet at 9:00 A.M. and we review every application that comes through the system. We make sure that the documentation meets the criteria. I had a couple questions just a week ago from some faculty, like, have you ever had some falsified documentation? I hate to say it, yes, we have. Those students were put through the Student Code of Conduct and unfortunately are no longer University of Toledo students. So, we are really digging into the documentation to make sure that it meets criteria that it is done by licensed professionals. We really vet that information, we take it very, very seriously. And then once it is determined that the student's documentation meets their ability to connect with us, we send them out an email. So, twice per week we are usually reviewing anywhere from six to sometimes 22 applications twice per week. And so, students are getting that information from us and then they're assigned a specialist. Currently, right now, we are down a specialist. We had one of our staff

members leave the beginning of January. We do have that position open. We have nine candidates who have applied for that position, so we are thrilled, and our search committee is starting to dig through those applications. We hope within the next month we will have a new staff member on board, and we will onboard and welcome that person and get things rocking and rolling.

So, we have everything broken down by college. If you look at our website recently, we just made that change so that you can see which specialist each of those students would work with based on their major. And so, currently right now, my, before our staff member left, my colleges are the College of law, the College of Education, and a portion of Health and human services. So, I work with students who are social work majors, paralegal, and criminal justice majors. Kurt works with all our students on the Health Science Campus, so he is handling all those students and currently all those...to the Health Science Campus. I've also taken on the College of Engineering, the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics in the meantime. Then my colleague, Sarah Sobert takes care of all the other students as well as all of our college credit plus students. So, that's kind of how we break things down. Each student has to meet with one of us and we have a private meeting with that student where we talk about how they feel their disability impacts them in their academic journey, in their living arrangement, in their housing needs, in their dining and dietary, being able to be part of a campus community, whether it's virtual or on campus. We have those conversations. Those meetings last anywhere from an hour to an hour-and-a-half, and then we do have students who want to meet with us regularly. So, we have some students who we are meeting with weekly, biweekly, as needed, email. It is just like the rest of you, you know, we're chronically working with students, and we document each and every one of those interactions. So, every time we talk with one of you, we're documenting that conversation. Every time we email one of you, we're documenting that. And so, it's intense work, but it's wonderful work. And we are just thrilled to have such great partners in all of you in working with us and working with our University of Toledo students who choose to affiliate with our office.

**Kurt Soltman, Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** Real quick, one other step, too, that we do look at is what's called history of accommodation. If we're getting students from high school that have had certain accommodations or from previous schools, that's another piece that's listed in there as well. Before I go on to the next step, did you have a question?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, just real quick. Three or four years ago the Committee on Faculty Senate Committee on Student Affairs had received a message from the UT Student Government saying that faculty were not responding to the Disabilities Office emails right for accommodations. We worked with you all and so I'm just wondering, has that improved?

**Lisa Yost, Assistant Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** One hundred percent. I can honestly say there are some faculty who have some templated responses and as soon as they get an advocacy letter, they send off that templated email to the student and they copy our office so that we are aware that they are engaging the students to ensure that they're being accommodated and that their accommodations are in place.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Thank you.

**Lisa Yost, Assistant Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** It's been really, really beautiful. We have lots of conversations for a variety of reasons and so, we just want you all to know that you are part of our team. It's not us making a mandate to you. We work in conjunction with you. Deb met

with us, with Kurt and I and her team just [this] fall semester about some concerns and so we were able to address some of those concerns and ensure that our visibility is there. You know, we were using social media. You as faculty have access to our system so you have a faculty portal, I don't know how many of you know that. But you can go in there. We have to individually send you those individual letters, but you can go into your portal and see everything. I think it has helped. I know in the past you had faculty that carried on, what's all these folders, what's all these letters, and every time I get another one, I have to add it to the folder. So, our hope is by opening up that portion to the system, it is allowing you to feel more comfortable and confident in your role and in your job and making sure that students are satisfied. So, we appreciate it greatly.

**Kurt Soltman, Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** Real quick. The biggest thing that brought us here, and thank you again for the opportunity, is we really want this to be a partnership and a seamless thing, and so please let us know anything that we can do to help you all through this process. One of the reasons that we do break our caseloads up by colleges is so we get to know the faculty in those programs, so we get to know the assessments, like helping students if they've got graduation, national board, things like that. One of the things that we are working on too, is historically a lot of times offices like ours are kind of tucked in a corner and we just do our thing, away from everyone else. We really want to be out into the University.

We have office hours now in probably half a dozen programs, and we're always more than willing, if you have departmental meetings or you and/or your colleagues have questions, we are always happy to come to you. We've been known to, if a faculty calls us up and says I have a student across campus, we will come over here if we need to meet with students, or I'm at the Health Science Campus a couple days a week. One, always feel free to reach out to us. Two, if you would like us to come to the departmental meetings, if a bunch of your colleagues have questions, we are happy to do that. Like I said, we're working on doing office hours in particularly programs and things like that so we can be more visible, more accessible, not just to students, but to all of you. That's really a huge goal of what we're trying to do. And that's about all I'm going to talk about because you probably have questions, and I like to leave it open for that.

**President Van Hoy:** Past-President Rouillard, go ahead, unmute and ask.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Thank you for that presentation. Thank you for the work that you do for our students. I know the number of accommodations is huge and with good reason. My question is, do you go beyond just coordinating accommodations and do you work with students to advance their skills and to find ways to work around learning disabilities or whatever the accurate term is these days? I mean, I get regularly students who need accommodations, some of whom have really intense reading difficulties. And I do what I can for them, but do you have workshops or skill developing sessions that can help them work around these things?

**Kurt Soltman, Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** A couple of different things and I'm going to address that at two different levels. One, we do have some students that Lisa kind of alluded to, once we set up the accommodations, we do regular case management with them. Sometimes it is social skills, sometimes executive functioning, sometimes study skills. We actually piloted a program last year once we lost success coaches to do some peer mentoring with some of our students. So, we do have that. There is a lot of technology out there that can be very effective for students. A lot of which now is

becoming very low cost, even free. So, we have several students a semester that come in and may not have a diagnosed disability but still struggle. We're still more than willing, we may not be able to officially set up accommodations for them because we don't have that diagnosis, but we'll show them all kinds of different assistive technology. You mentioned the reading difficulties---

**Past-President Rouillard:** Yes.

**Kurt Soltman, Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** Microsoft Edge, Google, those will actually read anything online for you and that's built in there for free and so, we will show students that. We actually get several students during the semester who come in with English as a second language, which doesn't fall under a disability category, but we know we can be very limiting so we help connect them with resources, whether us showing them, or showing them different technology, or connecting them with resources around campus that we can do. So, we do that kind of on multiple levels.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay, I appreciate that. And the other thing is, do you do any diagnoses in-house or does the student have to come in with a diagnosis from an outside specialist?

**Kurt Soltman, Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** The student does have to come in with a diagnosis from an outside specialist. Actually, one, we don't have a clinical psychologist on staff for us, the university does, and counseling services, and the psychology clinic. So, we do refer students over there. So no, we don't do them in-house because we don't have anybody that is licensed to do those kinds of things, but we do refer out. The ADA is very clear that at the college level, because we're working with adults, it is their responsibility to private documentation. At the twelve level, schools are responsible for testing students, but at the college level, the student has to provide it. So the most we can do is to help with referrals.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay, thank you. And I would just encourage you to maybe think about doing a presentation to faculty with some of this technology that we may not be aware of and that all of our students could benefit from. Thank you.

**Kurt Soltman, Director of Accessibility and Disability Resources:** I would be happy to. That's where again where I found, unless you can tell me a better place, those departmental meetings, we're happy to come in and do those kinds of presentations. Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you so much. So next we're going to have a report from the Academic Regulations and the Student Affairs Committee together on the Student Common Hour Proposal.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** I hope Dr. Compora is here. Dr. Compora, are you still here? Okay, he's not. Well, this will take less than three minutes. Jayden Bollinger from the Student Government came in the fall. He gave a presentation to Faculty Senate on 'Common Hour.', Dan Compora and I were asked, the Committee on Student Affairs and the Committee on Academic Regulations, to coordinate over several weeks to come up with this statement. So, here is the statement:

"Implementing a common hour at the University of Toledo alongside the new course scheduling policy may be challenging. The Faculty Senate minutes indicate that there is ongoing discussion between members of the Student Government and Faculty Senate about a potential separate policy for a 'common hour,' but it has not been implemented yet.

- The new course scheduling policy, set by the Provost's Office, appears to be focused on addressing low-enrolled courses and reallocating faculty workload.

- This policy is being implemented in response to broader trends affecting public institutions in Ohio, including potential pressure from the state legislature to cut programs.
- Given the current focus on efficiency and workload reallocation, introducing a common hour might face obstacles. The university is already dealing with:
  1. efforts to remove low-enrolled courses from faculty workloads;
  2. concerns about faculty teaching outside their areas of expertise; and
  3. pressure to implement changes quickly, as evidenced by the rapid implementation of the new scheduling policy.

While a common hour could potentially benefit students and faculty, it would need to be carefully balanced against these other priorities and constraints in the current academic environment at the University of Toledo.

**Arguments for common hour:**

1. Promotes community involvement by providing a dedicated time for club meetings, faculty meetings, and office hours.
2. Allows students to attend campus events without conflicts with classes.
3. Ensures students have time to eat between classes, addressing concerns about back-to-back schedules.
4. Facilitates multi-lecture courses by allowing common hour exams, which reduce the number of different exams and ensure consistent evaluation standards.
5. The common hour would have benefits in UT's community by improving student engagement, increasing faculty-student interactions, boosting retention rates, and would be an attraction to prospective students.

**Arguments against common hour:**

1. May cause overcrowding in dining areas during the designated time.
2. Can create scheduling conflicts between different events and meetings due to limited time.
3. Disrupts the flow of classes, potentially creating inconvenient gaps in students' schedules.
4. May require rescheduling of existing classes, potentially to less desirable time slots like early morning.
5. Benefits may not extend to all students, particularly those not involved in extracurricular activities.
6. Disruption of existing class schedules, potentially requiring extensive rearrangement of courses.
7. Difficulty in accommodating classes that span multiple time slots or require longer sessions.

**Considerations for implementation:**

1. Timing is crucial as some argue for afternoon slots rather than mid-morning to better accommodate student preferences and energy levels. If we establish a weekly (or twice weekly) common hour, it certainly will take out a scheduled class time slot in the middle of the day that is generally favored by students—let's say between 11-1 (or any portion of that).
  - Classes usually scheduled at these popular hours will need to be pushed to another time, and that may very well be at 8:00 a.m., later in the afternoon, or even the evening—time slots that students may object to because they interfere with their work schedules. It could even move those classes to Friday, which seems to be an

unpopular option. So, the arguments against the revised class schedule and the common hour don't seem to coincide very well.

2. Frequency matters as daily common hours versus weekly or bi-weekly can impact effectiveness and scheduling challenges.
3. Duration and placement in the week can affect student and faculty participation.
4. Ultimately, the effectiveness of a common hour policy depends on careful consideration of the specific needs and constraints of the institution and its community.

**Final Analysis:**

While the Common Hour would be beneficial to students, faculty, and staff, the implementation of the Common Hour is not achievable for 2025-2026. After that academic year, implementing the Common Hour would require major changes to the recent scheduling policy. A 4-to-5-year plan for execution would be the best course of action to make the Common Hour a reality.

- The idea of a common hour could be studied for a year by a joint FS committee of faculty and student representatives. We need to know how it has worked at other universities and how it has impacted their course schedules. We also need to be sure to compare the demographics of these universities with UT which has a large commuter population as well as many (most?) students who hold down jobs while in school.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Thank you very much.

**President Van Hoy:** Are there any questions or comments?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes?

**Student Government Representative (...):** I agree that we should definitely take time considering this proposal, weighing our options, seeing what other universities have done, definitely, especially very comparable universities like Cleveland State or arguably Slippery Rock, but Cleveland State definitely is the closer institution. I do think that four to five years is quite a long time though to be---

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Okay, maybe two or three?

**Student Government Representative (...):** Yes, I could definitely see that. I mean, we clearly can't implement this next year.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Well, it depends on the Scheduling Policy, and we're just putting this together. We put this together with the idea of the new scheduling policy and what is happening. And of course, we have to keep in mind the transition that is happening in our administration also. We don't know who the president's going to be. We don't know who the new provost is going to be. So, there are a lot of 'ifs' and 'maybes' and things like that. But we would love to see it implemented within two to three years, but I think right away there should be a committee formed. Right? Of Faculty Senators, faculty and student government to work on this.

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, Renee?

**Senator Heberle:** I was just going to add that I think that something like this also just requires some publicity, some generalized discussion on campus so everyone can see come to some general consensus, not unity as to it being a good idea. I personally am very in favor of having something like that if we can work out the logistics, which is what this report's all about. But I also think that the time will allow us to kind of communicate with one another and just get people on board in a broader way.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, so we have to get the administration on board this year.

**Senator Heberle:** Well, there is the administration. And I hope the Student Government will continue to be persistent. Persistence is key around here. If you're not persistent, then you can, as I've learned, you got to be persistent. So I do hope that we follow-up with it and continue to talk about it.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Absolutely. So we were asked to do the statement, and we did work on it and we considered, and there was a lot of input from both committees, and so we coordinated well on this. Okay, any other questions or comments?

**Senator Semaan:** Yes. Just one comment. We're very pessimistic even if we endorse it. I mean, we heard the Student Government on the policy of scheduling. We heard the Senate not endorsing as well, and then it happened two days after. So, it's good to see the optimistic view that, even if we all agree on that it may pass.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Well, shall I change that last four to five years to two to three?

**Group of Senators:** Yes.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Okay, so I'll do that and then resend it out. How that? Thank you so much.

**President Van Hoy:** I just wanted to say that there's a comment in the Chat that says, "It's important to let students know that we hear them." Yes, I certainly agree.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** We do.

**President Van Hoy:** All right, getting through our long agenda, aren't we? So, a reminder that there's no Undergraduate Curriculum report this week and so we are onto the Core Curriculum and Subcommittee on Diversity SLOs. I believe Monita Mongo, you're going to give this report, correct? Monita?

**Senator Miner:** She was here. I believe she left and put a message in the Chat for you, Quinetta.

**Senator Dagostino:** Yes, she left a message in the Chat.

**Senator Kistner:** Monita said she had to leave for another meeting.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, we will come back to this in two weeks then. Moving on to the last item on our agenda, the Academic Programs Report. Senator Taylor, are you ready?

**Senator J. Taylor:** I am ready, willing and able. The Academic Programs Committee met on Friday. We decided to take action to recommend approval on three items. These were the items, **Applied Physics**

**Concentration, and Physics Concentration, and Medical Physics Concentration** within the Physics Program, where they were adding a pipeline program. I got an email from Physics asking us to roll back the Medical Physics Concentration. That one will not be going up today. So, the only two items that we have are the two pipeline programs, Physics Concentration and the Applied Physics Concentration. The committee are recommending approval on those two items. Are there any questions? Dr. Rouillard has a question. Go ahead, Dr. Rouillard.

**Past-President Rouillard:** For some reason I can't pull-up nor see the attachments that were sent. Can you just briefly summarize what the components of these programs are?

**Senator J. Taylor:** Sure. They were adding a pipeline program to – let me pull it up. Hold on a second.

**Past-President Rouillard:** And I don't understand why I can't open the attachment, so I apologize.

**Senator J. Taylor:** I don't know either because I couldn't open it either. The biggest thing is they're adding a master's pipeline. The other one has almost the exact same language. They have concentrations. Yes, that is it. The other one is almost identical.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Alright. Okay, thank you.

**Senator J. Taylor:** You're welcome. Are there any more questions?

**President Van Hoy:** Nothing in the room.

**Senator J. Taylor:** All those in favor of approving these two items, please vote yes or say 'aye.'

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Any opposed? Abstain? Hearing none. Did it pass?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, looks good. *Motion Passed.*

**Senator J. Taylor:** That's all I have today. Can I make a motion to adjourn?

**President Van Hoy:** Let me ask if there are any items from the floor first. Any items? Senator Heberle?

**Senator Heberle:** If folks have recommendations to what to do with the resolution at this point, I am sure the Executive Committee would appreciate that. So, just email...and we will talk about how to make sure...

**President Van Hoy:** All right, Jami, make your motion.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Motion to adjourn.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Good night, everyone. I'll see you in two weeks.

VI. Meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Deborah Coulter-Harris, Executive Secretary

Tape Summary:  
Quinetta Hubbard, Administrative Secretary