

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 25, 2025
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 4/08/2025

Summary of Senate Business

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

President Van Hoy: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the March 25th, Faculty Senate meeting. I would like to call the meeting to order and ask Secretary Coulter-Harris to call the roll.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I'd be delighted. Good afternoon, everyone.

Roll call 2024-25

Present: Allred, Bellizzi, Benton, Bigioni, Brakel, Cioc, Cochrane, Coulter-Harris, Dagostino-Kalinz, Delaney, Diakonova, Dugan, Dwyer, Giovannucci, Harmych, Heberle, Herrera, Howard, Javaid, Kalinoski, Kaw, Kistner, Krantz, Lapitsky, Lee, McInnis, McLoughlin, Miner, Nigem, O'Connell, Osman, Padilla, Pryor, Reinert, Rouillard, Schaefer, Scheuermann, Semaan, Servick, Sheng, T. Smith, Suarez, Suchek, Sun, J. Taylor, W. Taylor, Van Hoy, Willey, Yonker

Excused Absence: Avidor-Reiss, Cheng, Eichner, Ekwenna, Elgafy, Ervin, Gilstrap, Johnson, Koch, Mungo, Sahloff, Van Hook

Unexcused Absence: Sindhwani

Senator Coulter-Harris cont'd: President Van Hoy, we have a quorum.

President Van Hoy: Thanks, Senator Coulter-Harris.

Senator Coulter-Harris: You're welcome.

President Van Hoy: David Giovannucci is here in the room and so is Gaby Semaan.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Yes, I have them.

President Van Hoy: Thank you.

Senator Coulter-Harris: You're welcome.

President Van Hoy: May I ask for a motion to adopt the agenda?

Senator Semaan: So moved.

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Senator Semaan.

Senator Padilla: Second.

President Van Hoy: Thank you both. Online, please put 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain' in the Chat to adopt the agenda or not. In the room, everyone in favor of adopting the agenda please say, 'aye.'

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Van Hoy: Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none. *Agenda Passed.*

Alright, next, we need to approve the Minutes of March 11, 2025. Are there any corrections to the Minutes? I'm not hearing any. Is there a motion to adopt the Minutes?

Senator Semaan: So moved.

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Senator Semaan.

Senator McInnis: Second.

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Senator McInnis. In the Chat, please put 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain' for the Minutes. In the room, all those in favor of adopting the Minutes please say, 'aye.'

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Van Hoy: Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none. Okay, moving right along to the Executive Committee report, which is also fairly short.

The 2025-2026 Faculty Senate nomination election closed yesterday. Thank you to all who participated. The final election for representatives to Senate for 2025-2026 should open on Monday, March 31, if we can get it all together in time. It will run for two weeks. In the next several days, please look in your email for a message from the Elections Committee, telling you that had been nominated. Because the way the Constitution reads, you are nominated unless you opt out within 48 hours of receiving that message, so we will be sending you reminders to look at your email.

Senator Semaan: And they will be sent over the weekend<laughter>.

President Van Hoy: We won't do that, but please pay attention to your email for the next several days.

Both the president and provost search committees are to the final candidate stage. The presidential search remains confidential and candidates will not be publicly available on campus. The provost finalists will be scheduled for campus interviews in April and those interviews will include the usual stakeholder groups.

The Executive Committee recently learned that the College of Medicine and Life Sciences Faculty Council adopted a resolution on February 28 calling for reforms in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs relating to clinical trial reviews and the IRB. We will append the resolution to the March 25 Faculty Senate minutes to make it available to faculty across the university.

At our April 8 Faculty Senate meeting, we will discuss the most recent version of the Student Success Plan from the provost office. The Faculty Senate office will send you the plan tomorrow so you can read it and come to the meeting prepared for the discussion. Angela Paprocki will answer questions and listen to our comments but will not give a presentation on the plan.

After today, there are only two Faculty Senate meetings remaining this academic year. Both meetings, on April 8 and April 22, will be held on the main campus in NI 1027 (the SSOE room). Please plan accordingly.

President Van Hoy cont'd: Would any member of the Executive Committee like to add anything? I'm not hearing anything or seeing---

Past-President Rouillard: President Van Hoy, I would. I am putting in the Chat box contact information the governor and our legislators for anybody who wants to veto, who wants to ask the governor and legislators to veto SB1. So you've got phone numbers for legislators, and if you click on that action network link, you can send a letter to the governor. Following was written in the Chat box: "Let's keep up the #VetoSB1 calls and emails to Gov. DeWine. Columbus (614) 644-4357 Western Regional Office (937) 285-6185 Northern Regional Office (237) 400-3580 Northwest Regional Office (419) 245-2445 Southeast Regional Office (740) 373-5150 Central Regional Office (614) 728-0457 <https://actionnetwork.org/letters/veto-sb-1hb-6-the-higher-education-destruction-act/11>"

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Past-President Rouillard.

Past-President Rouillard: You're welcome.

President Van Hoy: Any questions about the Executive Committee report?

Senator Semaan: Question. Would it be a good idea that this information be sent in an email to everybody?

President Van Hoy: It would, but I think for the Faculty Senate Office to do it, you would need a motion.

Senator Semaan: Motion.

Senator Padilla: Second.

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Senator Padilla. Okay, so there's a motion on the floor to send the information that Past-President Rouillard put in the Chat to all faculty-- is that what it is or to all senators?

Senator Semaan: All faculty.

President Van Hoy: To all faculty in an email. The Faculty Senate Office cannot do this unless Faculty Senate approves. Is there any conversation about this? Hearing none. Okay, put 'yes,' 'no,' or 'nay' in the Chat. If there is no discussion in the room, everyone in favor please say 'aye.'

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Van Hoy: Any nays? Any abstentions? It looks like the motion is going to pass. ***Motion Carried Unanimously.*** Are there any more questions?

Senator Willey: I have an unrelated question regarding the College of Medicine resolution. Is there an action item or is it simply going to be posted for review?

President Van Hoy: It was a resolution that they wrote and adopted that lays out their concerns with the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs about clinical trial reviews and the medical IRB, I believe. They then sent that to the Provost. And yes, they are hoping for action, but it doesn't layout specific action items, I don't believe. But it will be available in the Minutes so you can read it.

Senator Willey: Thank you.

President Van Hoy: Other questions? Hearing none. Okay, I think we're done with the Executive Committee report. It is now time for Provost Molitor's report.

Provost Molitor: Thank you, Dr. Van Hoy. I recently received recommendations of the Program Reallocation and Investment regarding low enrolled programs. Their analysis suggested that some of the programs they reviewed could be viable, although they noted challenges in the review of these programs because of uncertainty regarding university priorities, and variations in submitted content due to programs not seeing the evaluation rubric in advance, which was my oversight. I should also note that several of the programs under review are undergraduate programs that fall below the threshold for degree completions provided by Senate Bill 1 and House Bill 6. I am finalizing my review of their findings shortly and will be providing Faculty Senate and Graduate Council leadership with a list of programs that will be suspended.

At the previous Academic Leadership Team (ALT) meeting, Interim President Schroeder provided updates on executive orders and pending legislation. Undoubtedly, we will have to make changes and implement several provisions over the summer in preparation for the upcoming academic year. The Office of Risk Management is currently reviewing our processes, policies, published materials and personnel and will be providing leadership recommendations on areas that may require changes. We are committed to complying with legislation and to providing a safe and welcoming environment for all students, staff, and faculty, and we will do our best to implement any required changes while minimizing adverse or unintended consequences.

The President also provided updates on other legislative initiatives. The Governor's biennium budget proposes reallocating \$100 million in state share of instruction (SSI) to distribute based on employment outcomes. Although this should be good news for us given our suite of professional programs, we will have to await details on how this portion of the SSI will be distributed. There is also a proposal to provide automatic admission to any Ohio student in the top 5% of their class to any four-year public institution in Ohio, which could impact our direct from high school enrollment. There is also a proposal for Ohio to allow 90 credit hour baccalaureate degrees and require all four-year public institutions to approve at least one 90 credit hour baccalaureate degree in a high workforce demand discipline before the 2026-27 academic year.

Also at the previous ALT meeting, Connie Schall and Kim Thorn provided an update on issues surrounding research security, especially in the areas of international travel, international collaboration, and export control. The Department of Energy has implemented new training requirements effective May 1st, and we believe other federal agencies will be following suit shortly. If you are currently conducting or planning to conduct federally funded research, I would encourage you to refer to the email from Rick Francis on Tuesday March 18th for instructions on new CITI training materials that should be completed.

Finally, just a reminder that we will be holding a celebration for achieving R1 status next Wednesday April 2nd from 3-5 pm in Savage Arena. And we are still in need of judges for student presentations at the Midwest Graduate Research Symposium the following Saturday April 12th in the Memorial Field House. Thank you, and I would be happy to take any questions you may have.

Senator Heberle: Do you have a timeline for when you will let us know about the prioritization process?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, I anticipate it will be mid-April at the latest. We want to make sure we include the appropriate programs that are affected by the legislation, if the legislation is signed. My understanding is that the Senate agreed to the House changes and the bill is now with the governor to

sign, per Dr. Rouillard's comments. We have 90 days to implement changes, which would mean presumably those programs would have to be close to new enrollment before the fall 2025 semester.

Past-President Rouillard: I've put some links in the Chat to a very interesting article that was published at the pen.org site by Clare Carter. Her article is called "*Cuts to Academic Programs with 'Low ROI' Hide Political Censorship*," and this is on the pen.org website, <https://pen.org/cuts-to-academic-programs-with-low-roi-hide-political-censorship>. I've given you a citation also in the Chat box about what this actually represents; that it is overreach, that it is political censorship.

Interim Provost Molitor: Thank you.

President Van Hoy: Provost Molitor, will part of the preparations for SB1 include recommendations about syllabi changes?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes. The process for publishing syllabi is being finalized. We are planning for faculty to have their contact information updated on the myUT portal. Then we will create a standard template syllabi that will include the course name, when it meets, faculty contact information, items from the Banner course catalog, and a schedule of topics and required readings that faculty members will have to provide. We will be providing more guidance on that. That will be the external-facing syllabi and then you will still be able to have syllabi for your courses that you post on Blackboard.

President Van Hoy: And will faculty need to input that information during the summer?

Interim Provost Molitor: We will work out the timeline, but presumably it would be something that you could do quickly right before the start of the semester, the week you come back.

President Van Hoy: Okay. And then will there also be guidance about, you know---

Interim Provost Molitor: Controversial topics. We are going to have to review the final language and consult with the Ohio Department of Higher Education. We assume there is going to be some rule-making in this regard. Our legal staff and the state attorney general will probably have to weigh in as well.

President Van Hoy: So, if a group of people at the University are going to be making those decisions, I would like to recommend that that some faculty be involved in those---

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, absolutely.

President Van Hoy: Be involved in some of those decisions.

Interim Provost Molitor: Absolutely. And this is just my opinion, and our legal staff can tell me if I am wrong. My read of the bill is that it is not 'what you teach' or 'what you say' in class. It is how you are going to assess students and require students to say. In other words, I am going to give you an 'A,' but you have to say, 'x, y, or z' on an essay or an exam. I think that is going to be the bigger issue. I do not necessarily think it's going to be the content itself that's covered in courses.

President Van Hoy: Okay.

Interim Provost Molitor: Because the language in the bill says you cannot require students to do things to obtain a degree. And I think they use that language because they do not want to end up in court over free speech.

President Van Hoy: Okay, although I think they will regardless---

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, but I believe that was the approach they took in the legislation.

President Van Hoy: Thank you.

Senator Heberle: I have questions on two points. One, the legislation appears to be contradicting itself in so many ways. But in one very concrete way, and that is that it says in one place we have to put all of our information about where and when courses are, and then in another place, it says we don't. So, I just want to be very clear that we need to read this very carefully because it's not clear. I feel it is a surveillance bill anyway, but that would be, I think really out of order if we have to put the time/location of our courses, so anybody could just show up on the syllabi that's three clicks away.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay.

Senator Heberle: So, I just wanted to point that out. My other question is about the civics' education class that's being required. What kind of plans are afoot for covering that, and what relationship will those plans have with the college, Arts and Letters that already does that work? And I just wanted to be very clear that we need to be directly involved, especially Political Science, in anything that happens with that, including any negotiations or money being asked for to fund the ICTL in the name of supporting that course. So, I just want to emphasize that and make sure that we are part of that conversation.

President Van Hoy: Senator Taylor's hand was up. Past-President Rouillard's hand is up, I think.

Past-President Rouillard: Yes, it is, but Senator Taylor, if you want to go first, I will see to you.

Senator J. Taylor: Yes, I just had a quick question for Provost Molitor. You said that the syllabus template would have topic areas for us to cover. Can you clarify what you mean by that?

Provost Molitor: Yes. The idea is that in syllabi, you are supposed to have a schedule of topics that are presented in the course. We would have to have faculty input directly each semester to post a complete syllabus.

Senator J. Taylor: Oh, okay, that helps. My initial take was that you had topic areas for us to cover, but that is not what you said. We're good. Thank you.

Interim Provost Molitor: Sorry, what was that last part?

Senator J. Taylor: We're all good.

Past-President Rouillard: Alright, Provost Molitor, I appreciate your generous reading of the bill, but I don't think that SB1 is about forcing students to express beliefs that we will assess them on. I think this bill is about what is discussed in the classroom and who feels pressured to not say the 'unpopular' thing. The way the bill is written, any student can make any complaint, "you know, a teacher brought this up in class and I felt 'blah, blah, blah,'" and now the teacher is going to spend hours and hours, and days and weeks defending him or herself. This bill is absolute vicious, and it is an attack on academic freedom, and let's not call it anything else.

Interim Provost Molitor: Thank you for that comment. I would say that is one of the biggest concerns as well, this idea of reporting. We as an institution are going to have to address and investigate any complaint that we get regarding what goes on in a classroom. So yes, I share that concern with you.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay, I'm glad to hear that. This bill is the result of having been quiet for all these years and hopes that the legislature would be nice. Being quiet and being polite has bought us nothing.

Senator Giovannucci: Thank you. This might be specific for the College of Medicine. Is the Medical School also governed by the syllabi? Many of our courses are taught by team faculty, so it is like 40 or 50 faculty in one of our systems. How does this apply to the College of Medicine?

Interim Provost Molitor: At this point, I am not aware of any specific exemptions. We have several courses that are team-taught by several faculty, but somebody would be identified as the primary instructor or the course coordinator. That is the faculty member whose contact information would be posted.

President Van Hoy: A lot of SB1 only applies to undergraduates.

Interim Provost Molitor: Some language applies to undergraduate, but I do not believe the syllabus posting is limited to undergraduate courses, I believe that is for all courses.

Senator Willey: Is there an institutional plan for how to respond to complaints?

Interim Provost Molitor: Student complaints, no. In fact, we are probably going to have to consult with the ODHE and other institutions to determine what kind of process we need to comply with the legislation. We may need to assign a full-time staff member to deal with this.

President Van Hoy: And some extra lawyers.

Senator Miner: Hello.

President Van Hoy: Go head, Senator Miner.

Senator Miner: Thank you. I wanted to sort of dovetail on what Linda said. In that, I think this is a direct attack on faculty, which in fact has been going on for some time. Over the past couple years, I have had to talk students down from complaining about content that they didn't like, as they were potentially uncomfortable; they didn't like the way a professor had said something. I feel as though it is going to ratchet up because I think this bill emboldens pretty much everybody who wants a say about how education is delivered. I am anxious about the idea that our syllabi, our topics are going to be, it's frankly a little bit like putting a medical procedure out there, showing all the videos and everything else and then assuming that people aren't going to look in on it and say, no, I don't think you should do that when they have no idea how to do what is being presented. And I feel as though in some respects the same thing with our coursework. We have experts in the classroom. We are not indoctrinating students into a particular way of thinking. They are trying to get them to think. And so, I just want to go on record of saying, this has already had a chilling effect on instructors who have reported to me feeling as though they're not going to cover things that they don't feel are engagement worthy. I just find it very disturbing, so that's it. I also would love to know then, what the mechanism is when a complaint is raised? And to whom should we be sending students who don't like something? Or a general community member who

has now reviewed all the syllabi in a particular department for a course, you know, how much say do they have in what is taking place at the institution? So, I just find this incredibly disturbing. Thank you.

President Van Hoy: I think that's it.

Interim Provost Molitor: Thank you everyone, I appreciate it.

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Provost Molitor. Okay, it is time for the Undergraduate Curriculum report presented by Dr. Rob Padilla. Thank you. Hold the mic close.

Senator Padilla: Okay, thank you. Today we only have three items to approve, so this should be 'fun.' Alright, I'll go ahead before they show up, I think I can explain everything. Looks like we're having a cursor problem.

Alright, so we went through about 26 different courses proposals. We have approved three to send to Faculty Senate for approval. The first course is **DATA 2500** and **DATA 4500** are alpha code changes. Prior to this they were in the College of HHS. They're being moved to the College of Natural Science and Mathematics. Those are really the only changes that they have. The SLOs still fit, so starting learning objectives. So, the only real changes were the alpha code. And we approved those; we thought those courses were well done. So, those are the first two items. Then out of Learning, **AL 4950** is a Senior Capstone course, and the primary change is to move the course, redesign the course to emphasize career development and move away from research. The year prior, they had taken out one of the prerequisites that was a research-intensive prerequisite. So, it was just a shift in the course away from research towards career development. The rest of the proposal was fine. Everything was in order. So, I would ask are there any questions first? Okay, hearing none. This is going to be fast, I hope. Alright, so I'll ask online if you would like to approve these courses, write yes, or no, or abstain in the Chat. And in the room, signify by yes or by saying 'aye,' please.

Group of Senators: Aye.

Senator Padilla: Any nos? Any abstentions? Hearing none. ***Motion Passed.*** Alright, thank you guys.

President Van Hoy: Thank you. Dr. Padilla. We are now moving to the Academic Programs report with Dr. Jami Taylor.

Senator J. Taylor: Okay, give me just a second here. I need to share my screen. Unfortunately, my report is long.

President Van Hoy: But we have time.

Senator J. Taylor: Well, good cause we're going to need it because today is the curriculum deadline, and I am going to try to walk you through all of the many things that have come our way in the most painless way possible.

So, I'm going to start off by giving you just an overview of what the spreadsheet is. If it's blacked out, it can't go up. It was rolled back. So, we don't have to worry about those. If the text is red, these are things that my committee has approved, but we cannot take action on because the other committee did not approve whatever course, or course proposal, or course modification, so we can't bring them up. So, they're going to miss the deadline. Now, the ones that are in green are out of the constitutional thought center, which I'd like to cover first. We have two from there. Because this is a minor and also a program

modification through an existing certificate, we need to make no recommendation on it, but we can say that they filled out the boxes correctly. Can I have a motion to approve those if there are no questions?

Past-President Rouillard: Senator Taylor, we're not going to approve, right?

Senator J. Taylor: Well, I guess like a motion to advance this to say that they did check the boxes. They checked the boxes. We're not approving it.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay.

Senator J. Taylor: What did we do? Is that the way you guys did it for when Senator Padilla did it?

Past-President Rouillard: Well, last year when they submitted something, we did not refuse it. We simply said that they had not prepared the, I think it was the SLOs, and we recommended that they work with Alana Malik. But I think that in previous discussions this year, we decided that we're not doing anything with the approval or disapproval, and just let them do whatever they want to do with it as long as, as you said, they've checked the boxes.

Senator J. Taylor: Yes, our committee took the position that we weren't going to approve, but we were going to assess whether or not they checked the boxes appropriately. For two of the three proposals they have checked the box appropriately. There's one, Engineering Leadership Minor, because the other committee has not reviewed it and made their decision on that class. We can't do that. So that one we're not bringing up.

Interim Provost Molitor: This is Scott. All we need the committee to do is to advance the proposal in CIM, otherwise we will advance it for them. I believe that is what Dr. Taylor is asking permission to do, just to press the button to advance it.

President Van Hoy: So, we need a motion to advance without approving.

Senator J. Taylor: Yes, I would like---

Past-President Rouillard: Or what we could do is just let the Provost Office move it and not have Faculty Senate have anything to do with it.

Interim Provost Molitor: Thank you.

Senator Padilla: Are we going to advance the program even if it does not have all the courses?

President Van Hoy: No, that one is not included here because it is not ready yet.

Senator Padilla: Senator Taylor, you asked me which courses that we had to send back, and one was CLT 2750 because they had not given us a functional syllabus.

Senator J. Taylor: Correct.

Senator Padilla: Is that the CLT Minor or is that the Engineering Leadership Minor?

Senator J. Taylor: That's the Engineering Leadership Minor.

Senator Padilla: Okay, so that is the one that is being held-up because I went back to them, and they have to resubmit.

Senator J. Taylor: That is correct. We're not willing to click the button for that. Now, if the Provost Office would like to take our 'button pushing' ability from us, then that is up to the Provost. We weren't going to do that, but we're willing to push the button for the other two if Senate is willing to allow us to do so.

Senator Padilla: Yes, I agree. One must take great care in pushing buttons <laughter>.

Senator J. Taylor: Right.

Past-President Rouillard: I would move that we remove Faculty Senate from this process and just let the Provost Office do this.

Senator Heberle: Second.

President Van Hoy: And I see the Provost nodding his head.

Interim Provost Molitor: My only concern is that it does say in the Collective Bargaining Agreement that we must provide Faculty Senate an opportunity to provide input on undergraduate curriculum. If that is a blanket approval to not seek your input moving forward on these courses and programs, I am happy to do that. I just wanted to make that point.

Past-President Rouillard: I would say that we had input in that if, you know, the SLOs aren't appropriate or if the box haven't been checked that we can roll it back. But my motion is about not approving.

Interim Provost Molitor: I understand. Thank you.

Senator Willey: Can they be posted for review by Faculty Senate in a timeframe for input and then go to the Provost?

Past-President Rouillard: They are in CIM, so that would be where Faculty Senate would review them.

Senator J. Taylor: Everybody hold-up. Hold-up here. Changing the curriculum process is separate than a decision on these two programs. That to me would be a different issue, whether or not we're going to change the curricular process or that program. Am I correct, President Van Hoy?

President Van Hoy: Yes. And all Past-President Rouillard is suggesting is that the program and program modification that are reporting out of your committee that Senate allow those to move to the Provost Office.

Interim Provost Molitor: And then in the future, that is the process they will need. You will tell us when their courses and programs are ready to move forward.

Senator J. Taylor: The future me is not too worried about it because I'm not going to be the curriculum chair next year<laughter>.

Dr. Robert Steven: Can you hear me?

President Van Hoy: Yes.

Dr. Robert Steven: I'm just the Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee. There is an issue with respect to Ohio law. The SB117 bill that setup the Institute actually says, "*The director shall oversee,*

develop and approve the Institute's curriculum. The Institute shall be granted the authority to offer courses and develop minor, major and graduate programs and offer degrees." Essentially, they're saying we don't have any say.

President Van Hoy: Correct. But our process requires that curriculum move through the faculty governance system and so, that's why we're trying to work around all of this.

Past-President Rouillard: And what I'm trying to do is say, at least if we send it back for reasons of SLO development, or internal consistency or course description, that's one thing. But I'm saying we don't put our stamp of approval on it at the end.

Senator J. Taylor: I'm absolutely fine with that. I'd just like to push the button to make this 'Scott's problem.'

Senator Pryor: I have a quick question about potential overlap of areas and how that gets adjudicated because I mean, I totally understand. I'm not trying to put---

President Van Hoy: It doesn't get adjudicated because the law that created the Institute allows the Institute to create curriculum regardless.

President Rouillard: Although we could still point out overlap.

President Van Hoy: Right, and our committees do.

Senator J. Taylor: Right, we're free to point it out, but at the end of the day, they get to do what they want unless basically the university president says no.

President Van Hoy: Alright, Senator Taylor, I think you could probably move on to your other proposals.

Senator J. Taylor: Okay. Alright, so again, any of the ones with red, unfortunately we can't bring those up because even though our committee is willing to approve, the courses have not been able to make it through the curriculum system. So, the first one that we're going to do here that is not complicated is out of geography. This is a new major, Geospatial Science. We have a series of program modifications out of the College of Arts and letters. These are creative writing, English literature concentration, a general studies BA, which that one was a little bit more complicated because they are changing the name of the program. A theater, and I guess three out of theater where they're doing some program modifications with various concentrations. We have a couple out of education. Unfortunately, there are a few out of education that are not going to be able to advance because of the course issue. We have a modification, and most of these were due to science of reading. Early childhood education, middle childhood education, multi-age education. Then we're down to a couple items out of Engineering where we have construction engineering program modifications, mechanical engineering where they were using credit hours. And then all of the programs in the science and math college seem to want to do a program modification this year, and so we've worked to get as many of those through as we can. So, we have a biology, biology ecology and organismal biology concentration - did I say that right? Biology BS, chemistry, data science, and its various concentrations. We have four there. Environmental sciences, BS and BA. We have more program modifications out of math and their various concentrations. A couple of those is adding, I guess, some pipeline program information. The last one we have is the one, I'm going to leave this one up to Senate what they want to do, because it did not actually make the handout.... I could bring it up if you'd like. It was a program modification that we approved, but that they needed to fix a couple of small issues in

there. They didn't do it till this morning. But it has been fixed and I would like to be able to bring that one up to just get another one through the curriculum process. Were there any questions about that or are there any problems with bringing up that medical physics concentration? I'm happy to pull that up on the screen if you'd like to see it, even though it did not get out in the packet.

Senator Padilla: Senator Taylor, they ultimately met in your guys' ..., correct?

Senator J. Taylor: Yes, it is any of the ones that I'm talking about. I mean, even this Med Physics was in red. I mean, I did this spreadsheet yesterday. The last piece came in this morning, so I'd like to be able to advance it. It was a minor fix, but they need to address it before we get advance.

President Van Hoy: It is really up to your committee, Senator Taylor.

Senator J. Taylor: Well, we would like to advance it, yes.

President Van Hoy: Alright.

Senator J. Taylor: Are there any questions about any of the many items that we have?

President Van Hoy: No hands up in the room.

Senator Padilla: You guys have done a lot of work.

President Van Hoy: We appreciate all the work you're doing and your committee.

Senator J. Taylor: Well, thank you. I would really like to thank my committee members. They've put in some heavy hours over the past couple of weeks. We had to have an extra meeting with all the programs, and we're really sorry that we couldn't advance more of them before the deadline, but we did what we could for you. So anyway, if there's a motion to approve our items here, I'd appreciate it.

Senator Miner: Senator Taylor, I have a quick question.

Senator J. Taylor: Sure.

Senator Miner: On the Multi-Age Education, pre-k 12, Arts Education. Can you explain to me again the issue with that one? Or maybe it wasn't one, I might have gotten it wrong.

Senator J. Taylor: I think they had some science of reading stuff in there if I'm not mistaken. I mean, most of the stuff with them was science of reading.

Senator Miner: So, the Arts Education Concentration had science of reading stuff?

Senator J. Taylor: I'm just saying most of them did. I'm trying to go back. Here's the explanation here, "Exchanging AR 1000 for EDU 1000 as requested by Arts and Letters faculty."

Senator Miner: Okay, thank you.

Senator J. Taylor: You're welcome. But yes, most of the rest of their stuff was science of reading. Alright, well motion to approve.

President Van Hoy: You don't need a motion, just call a vote.

Senator J. Taylor: All those in favors, say, 'aye' or type 'yes.'

President Van Hoy: In the room in favor, say ‘aye.’

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Van Hoy: Any nays? Hearing none.

Senator J. Taylor: Any abstentions?

President Van Hoy: All good here.

Senator J. Taylor: Alright, thank you. I would like to say, I'm not sure whether or not our committee is going to meet again given that we only have two more meetings. I'm going to check with them what they want to do. But I know that they are deserving of a break.

President Van Hoy: But as much as we can get through, the better.

Senator J. Taylor: Alright. Thank you.

President Van Hoy: Thank you.

Past-President Rouillard: President Van Hoy, can I say something about Curriculum and Programs?

President Van Hoy: Yes, and you're going to have the floor anyways for the Core Curriculum Committee report, so you can just have the floor.

Past-President Rouillard: Okay. So first, I want to thank both of these committees for doing huge amounts of work and we are very, very grateful. The next thing I want to say is something that I feel I should have addressed when I was chair of Curriculum, and that is that some of these items coming through CIM—and this has nothing to do with these two committees these this year who have done a yeoman’s work. Some of the items that are coming through curriculum are submitted by department secretaries and some are submitted by advisors. Our department secretaries have more than enough to do. They should not be asked to submit curricular items. Our advisors have more than enough to do. They should not be asked to submit program modifications. And so, my recommendation is that from now on faculty, please make sure that in your department that submissions come from faculty. We are the ones who are responsible for this, and we should not be charging anybody else with these curricular items.

All right, so the next thing is the Core Curriculum report. I am not a member of the Core Curriculum [Committee], but what I will do is see if I can share my screen with this report unless Quinetta can bring it up. Sharon Barnes, who is the chair, asked me to bring this report to you because she couldn't be here today. So, I'm not sure that I can answer questions. But I'm hoping that some of the members who are listed on the committee will be able to do that. Let me see if I can go back and make sure that I can share this with you. Oh, maybe I can do it this way. Can you see it now?

President Van Hoy: Yes.

Past-President Rouillard: Yay. So, these are the course approvals. They considered eight courses and approved seven, tabled [one], and subsequently approved the last one; five are already in the core and they’re just updating SLOs and two were new. So, as you can see, there are seven courses that were approved by the committee. Those being **COMM 2840**, for Arts and Humanity's core. **COMM 2000**, Mass Communication and Society for Arts and Humanities. Note, COMM 200 is already in the core, but

it's updating SLOs. Next is **COMM 1010** which is already in the Arts and Humanities core, [but we're] updating SLOs for OT36. Next is **Geography and Planning 1100**, updating SLOs for OT36. And **Anthropology 2800**, already in the core, just updating SLOs for OT 36. And **Art History 1500**, already in the core and updating SLOs. **Anthropology 3500** is applying for non-US diversity core. **Anthropology 2750** is applying for Non-US Diversity Core. This is the one that was tabled but was later approved on March 20.

And so, I will leave room. Are there questions? Discussion? Hearing none. Then I will move for a vote to approve these changes to the core. Are those in favor in the room, please say 'aye,' 'nay,' or 'abstain.' Please vote in the Chat box. ***Motion Passed.***

Then the other thing is a mention of the Diversity SLO Subcommittee report. The committee continues to work on revising the diversity core slos, and we'll come back with a report at a later date. That subcommittee will be meeting again on April 22nd. Thank you.

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Past-President Rouillard. Okay, Dr. Steven, do you have a report for the Constitutional and Rules Committee?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Yes, I do. Let me share my screen with you. Can you see that?

President Van Hoy: We can see that it's saying that you're starting to share. Now we can see it.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: All right, so yes, thank you, Dr. Van Hoy. Good evening, everyone. There were seven issues that were brought to the attention of our committee, the Faculty Senate Committee on Constitutional and Rules, and so we addressed these issues recently. I'm going to go over each one separately; [we're] not going to vote on each one separately but separate probably just one of them. So, that's the first one here, Issue one. This has to do with the creation of two new standing committees. So, we had for the past few years these ad hoc committees, the Committee on Recruitment and Retention and the Committee on the Budget. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has recommended that we convert those to standing committee. And although there is some concern regarding the increased workload for Senate members resulting from the creation of the new standing committees, our committee recognizes the ongoing importance of the issues addressed by these two committees and recommends that they are converted to standing committees. We recommend that these committees and their charges are listed in Article 1.4 of the Rules document. The charges are written here. These were written by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and modifications, minor ones, were made by our committee. So, the charge for the first committee is to:

- "Identify opportunities to enhance the University of Toledo faculty involvement in student recruitment and retention initiatives. Define metrics for faculty involvement in these efforts. Advise university administrators on the resources and support needed to enhance collaboration with faculty on recruitment and retention. Provide analysis and input to university administrators on the recruitment and retention process."

And the second committee on the budget, their charges are to: "Work with the Provost Office, Office of Finance and Administration, and college deans to foster transparency in the budget

process. Provide analysis and input to the budget process at the college and university levels. Report college budgets to Faculty Senate to promote openness and accountability.”

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee cont’d: So, the results of our voting within the committee were 8 for, 1 against. Dr. Wedding did not write a minority report, but he did mention that he had some concerns with the overall number of committees and that the committee number in general should be addressed. I don't know if Don, you wanted to say anything more there.

Dr. Don Wedding: I voted against this in the committee. I think these are very important committees to have, but we have so many committees now and we're having difficulty staffing these committees and I think that these should pass. I do support them, but I think that we should be looking at either combining or removing other committees because we are having a staffing problem of getting people on committees. These two committees are very important. I will hold for them. I learn the opportunity to invoke that we have to do something about staffing.

President Van Hoy: I think a lot of us agree with that.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Is there any other discussion? Well, if there is no other discussion, I think it's appropriate to vote on this particular issue separate from the other ones that we have. So, if anybody. Oh, I'm sorry, Dr. Bigioni, did you have something to say?

Senator Bigioni: I was a little slow with the discussion. I was thinking exactly the same thing as Dr. Wedding. Has there been any discussion about how to offset this increase with a decrease in other committees, whether that be consolidation or elimination? Has there been much thought put into that?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: No, we didn't as a committee address that at all. It was just a question of should we have these two committees or not? That is something we could be tasked with for the future though.

Senator Bigioni: Okay. Perhaps that would be a good discussion in Executive Committee too.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Okay, absolutely, Dr. Bigioni.

Senator Bigioni: Thank you.

President Van Hoy: Past-President Rouillard, is your hand up?

Past-President Rouillard: Sorry, no, it shouldn't.

Senator Willey: This is Jim Willey. My hand is up. Just briefly, I think these are really important new committees. I think the way to offset it is to restrict the number of times they meet initially to the most important topics. So, have the committees, but try to be restrictive in terms of the extent of the work. I think that these things can be done in a relatively efficient way if we set them up right. Yes, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee should discuss that.

President Van Hoy: Thank you for that.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Any other discussion points? Alright, as we did with previous voting in the room, those in favors say, 'aye.' If someone could count for me or keep track.

President Van Hoy: All those in favors say, ‘aye.’

Group of Senators: Aye.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Any against say ‘nay.’ Any abstentions? And then we have the voting on the Chat box as well. Please write ‘yes,’ ‘no’ or ‘abstain.’ And if someone could count those as well, I would appreciate it.

President Van Hoy: Quinetta is working on it. It looks like they passed. *Motion Passed.*

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Thank you, Dr. Van Hoy. All right, so moving on to another point that was discussed by the committee, which is the issue of administrators or administrative faculty. As a definition in the constitution, when we are looking at the Faculty Senate membership eligibility, it has been a problem in previous years that, that has not been defined well, “administrative faculty.” So, our committee is recommending that “administrative faculty” be defined in the bylaws document under a new article titled ‘Definitions.’ Amending the constitution would be more difficult since it requires a vote of all UT faculty compared to bylaws changes which just require a vote here of the Faculty Senate members. So, the proposed definition is as follows:

- “For the purpose of determining Faculty Senate eligibility, “administrative faculty” are faculty members whose roles involve significant policy-making, operational management or executive duties in comparison to their required teaching research and or scholarly activities. This includes but is not limited to, roles such as deans, associate deans, assistant deans, provost, vice provost, the president, and vice presidents. Directors and coordinators who report above the level of department chair are also defined as administrative faculty. The Director of the Institute of American Constitutional Thought and Leadership, for example, is considered an administrative faculty member. Department chairs, however, are not considered administrative faculty for the purpose of Faculty Senate eligibility.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee cont’d: So, any discussion on this point?

Senator Willey: Yes, thank you. I think it's really important to define this. This has been an issue on the College of Medicine faculty group as well, so citing it as above department chair is pretty clear. I don't think that is the way we have perceived it before. Thank you.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Yes, that is the critical statement here. Some of this is a little bit of repeat in what is actually said in the constitution, but that sentence is definitely a new one that's important. Then clarifying what we've already discussed as a Senate before, that the director is not eligible for Faculty Senate memberships. We've got that written in it as well. Any other discussion points? I'd like to continue and vote on these things together because I believe that they're not going to be an issue for the most part.

Our committee was unanimous pretty much for, well, definitely for most of these issues. And one of them does not even require action on the part of Faculty Senate. We're going to talk about it first, but we will leave the voting until after the discussion. Alright, speaking of that Institute, ICTL; the question is, are the ICTL faculty eligible for Faculty Senate membership? And so according to Ohio law, which I mentioned previously today, SP 117, the ICTL is an independent academic unit and the ICTL director is solely

responsible for hiring and termination of faculty, and so there's some highlighted points here that just reiterate what I said.

Dr. Don Wedding: I have a question.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Sorry, can't I ask that you use the other microphone? People online cannot hear what that mic.

President Van Hoy: Speak loud into the mic.

Dr. Don Wedding: Can you hear me now?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: It is definitely the mic. If you can just use the other mic that Dr. McInnis has there.

President Van Hoy: Speak very loud into the top of the mic.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: It is definitely the mic.

Senator McInnis: Dr. Wedding, try this mic.

Dr. Don Wedding: I've switched microphones. Can you hear me?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Perfect.

Dr. Don Wedding: Okay, fine. Can you go back down to Issue 2., please? Could you move it back down to Issue 2?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Yes. Oh, you can't see this?

Interim Provost Molitor: No, scroll up Issue 2.

President Van Hoy: We see Issue 3. in the room.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: I see Issue 2. on my screen here. I'm highlighting it. You don't see that?

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay, now we do. It was a delay.

Dr. Don Wedding: The part that is shaded, "Directors and coordinators who reports to the level of department chair are also defined as administrative faculty." Do you have that?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Yes.

Dr. Don Wedding: Can you shade it for me, please?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Apparently it is delayed because I have shaded it, or maybe you don't see my shading, so I'll highlight it.

President Van Hoy: That's fine.

Dr. Don Wedding: I'm sorry, I was part in drafting this. It seemed like there was something changed. I was hoping this would read 'directors, coordinators, and others who report above the level of department

chair.' I want it to say 'and others' as an amendment I'm making from on the floor at this time. I don't know, how do I handle that since I'm not in the Senate?

President Van Hoy: It seems like a friendly amendment. What do you think, Dr. Steven?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: I would agree with that.

Dr. Don Wedding: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Thank you, Don.

Dr. Don Wedding: That's it.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: So, we'll vote on these next few as a collective, I believe, to save time.

Alright, so the Constitutional Thought and Leadership Institute, the best way we thought to deal with this is to change or define faculty within the bylaws as well. And so, in that same category that we have the new article that we're going to title definitions, we will put the following:

- "For the purpose of determining faculty senate eligibility, "faculty" are full-time, tenured, tenure track or lecturer employees of the University. Full-time, tenured, tenure track, or lecturer employees of the Institute of American Constitutional Thought and Leadership, however, are not considered "faculty" for the purpose of faculty senate eligibility due to their independent status within the University."

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee cont'd: Any comments or discussion there? That is Issue 3.

President Van Hoy: It's quiet in the room on that one.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Issue 4. So, this is the fairly a big issue I think, probably the biggest issue here, with respect to the cap that exists on eligible members from individual colleges. So, in our Bylaws, Article 1, Section 4, we have this issue that is the cap of 14, and this issue is particularly relevant to the Medical College as it reaches the cap with each election, and the cap will also affect CAL in the College of Education after the proposed CAL and Education merger takes effect this summer. The cap was likely put in place to keep larger colleges from overwhelming the representation of smaller colleges in Senate, but the Faculty Senate Committee on Constitution and Rules is not aware of the history of this cap. So, the main point is just in the Bylaws Article 1.4; [I] can highlight here "no college faculty shall have more than 14 seats" as a result of the apportionment. I can highlight that here. So, we discussed this, we discussed removing the cap, changing the cap, and keeping the cap as it is. The discussion reflected the classic long debated issue of how individuals in general should be represented in elections and for which there is no obvious answer. The majority of Faculty Senate Committee on Constitutional and Rules members recommend that the current cap of 14 senators from any one college be maintained and thus no action is requested on behalf of our committee. So, that was a little bit of a discussion there, 5 for, 3 against, and 1 abstained. So the result here is that we're not asking for any action on behalf of Faculty Senate, but just to leave the cap as it is. That's not preventing anybody from making a motion to change how it is written. Any discussion there?

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Dr. Steven. Senator Heberle has a comment.

Senator Heberle: Hi, thank you. This is Renee. I wanted to ask, oh my god, my mind just went so blank - oh, what the numbers are once, because it seems like with the merger of some of the colleges, it would feel like the College of Education or the College of Arts and Letters is losing representation if the cap stays at 14 when we merge and have a larger faculty. I know that we can have the 14 from a mix of Education and CAL, but I assume you talked about that. I don't know what the increase in numbers would be for our college, or for Nursing or HHS, but I was a little curious about how you talked about that.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: We didn't really get into the numbers for CAL. It is just going to be probably scraping the cap, maybe losing one or two as I recall from the apportionment discussion, we had in a previous Faculty Senate meeting. It's really the Medical faculty that's affected by this because I believe they would end up with like 17 or something seats. And so, they're the ones that are affected the most, but absolutely CAL and Education will be affected in the future if this cap remains.

Interim Provost Molitor: This is Scott. I do not have the data in front of me, but I believe that with the current apportionment, if there were no caps, the College of Medicine and Life Sciences would have had approximately 17 1/2 faculty, and I believe CAL and Education combined would have had approximately 15 faculty.

President Van Hoy: Yes, and so the ratio stays roughly the same.

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes.

President Van Hoy: Senator Taylor, your hand is up, correct?

Senator J. Taylor: I just had a quick question. So, in your notes here, Issue 4. was we're keeping the status quo. Is that correct?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Correct.

Senator J. Taylor: Okay, thank you.

Senator Willey: Can I just ask, I mean, as a senator from the College of Medicine, what is the argument for not having it proportional?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: The argument there is in the minority report which I should have read, I apologize for that. It is pretty brief. But the minority on the committee reason that a cap perhaps even lower than 14 and maybe even specifically on the Medical College itself would be fair. Why is that? Because they teach a small number of undergraduate students in their two undergraduate academic programs that they have in comparison to the larger number of undergraduates served in each of the other UToledo colleges. So, every other college, the majority of the students are undergrads, whereas the Medical College, the majority are graduate students. Another thing that was mentioned is that -- and this is a little bit of secondhand information, but maybe someone on the Elections Committee could give details on this -- it appears to be an issue getting representation on committees from the Medical College. I don't know what the issue is, but the members are maybe not as interested in participating in Faculty Senate committee discussions and even faculty Senate membership itself. I don't know if anybody else can comment it on that from the Elections Committee.

Senator Willey: Yes, so I think they're linked. The issue is what policies and issues are discussed in the Faculty Senate and which of those are strictly related to undergraduate curriculum, and which and how many are related to the University as a whole. And so, to the extent that it's restricted to undergraduate curriculum matters, obviously there'd be less importance of College of Medicine faculty being on the committees. But to the extent that there are other issues discussed and there have been a number discussed today, then it becomes more important for the College of Medicine faculty. So, I think maybe this needs to -- well, first of all, I would say that I'd like to keep the representational proportional. But secondly, I think we need to address the issues that are discussed and whether the Faculty Senate is appropriately focused on undergraduate curriculum as opposed to other matters, and what that proportion is. So, I think those are all important questions. Thank you.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Absolutely. Getting a formula to put it all together, however, will be difficult, we're saying anybody [is] welcome to try.

Senator Willey: Yes, I think I guess the question for the Executive Committee is to do some kind of analysis of the apportionment of the time in the Faculty Senate. How much is strictly related to undergraduate matters and how much to other matters that relate to the rest of the colleges, to the graduate colleges.

Senator Allred: I'm sorry, can I ask a really quick question? This is Ammon.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Oh, sorry, yes, go ahead.

Senator Allred: This is really a follow-up to Senator Heberle's question and also to Provost Molitor's numbers. I'm wondering, Provost Molitor, when you look at those numbers—you'd mentioned Education—did it also include the merger of Criminal Justice and Paralegal Studies? And the reason why I'm asking is because those are now moving out of the colleges that have not hit the cap, whereas the new college that's forming will hit that cap. You'll probably be shrinking the size of Senate by three or four seats, which is not huge, but given that we're talking about trouble staffing things, it sounds like a concern to me. So, I'm just wondering if we thought about those numbers because it's not just Education, but those numbers will disappear, but you will also lose some in the other colleges because of sustaining departments.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: I believe you were addressing your question to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee?

Senator Allred: Well, Provost Molitor had mentioned some numbers, and I was wondering if that accounted for that. Then more broadly, this concern that if we are having trouble staffing already committees, does shrinking Senate by, let's say, three members even further exacerbate that problem.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: What I recall from that apportionment discussion was that the merger is not going to affect the college other than the CAL and Education merger. The other merger, the numbers were small enough to not be affected by the cap as I recall. And then staffing committees is, yes, it is an issue. We even wrote in to the bylaws previously that if you are a small college, you can essentially opt out if you're interested in doing so, in terms of just foregoing your representation if you don't want to have the workload that would be required with respect to smaller colleges. But I think the colleges that are your main concern are the ones that have the large

numbers, so I don't think they're going to have any issues with committees and also committees don't have to be completely staffed by Faculty Senate.

Senator Allred: It is not exactly right, I mean, because there's also an issue of how many people is not in Senate and how many people are actually doing the work, right? So, my understanding from Don's comment was that there's trouble chairing committees et cetera, right? And so, if you're shrinking overall representation, you're shrinking the pool of people who can be involved in those kinds of activities. Maybe that's valuable, but it does seem like a concern that ought to be balanced against punitive concerns about college dominance when it's not-- you know, I understand that concern. It is a fair concern, but there's also concerns about having a body that can actually do all of its business. And so, I'm just concerned that that is not being considered here.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: I think in the end, there's a lot that needs to be considered and this is going to be a difficult job to get everybody 'happy' just like the basic question of having an electoral college in voting for government in the United States. Nobody agrees on what's the best way to do it. Here it is going to be the same thing, but we definitely need some analysis to at least come up with some proposals.

Senator Padilla: So, I just looked up our representation for this year. The merger between HHS and Nursing will not reach that 14 point, so that's fine. Judith Herb currently has two senators that are active, but they're apportion is three. And then when they merge with CAL the following year, we'll lose three positions. That is the only change that'll happen. So, I think the assumption that it is nominal is probably correct.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: One other issue, though that I don't know if it's really been discussed or if the College of Education is worrying about this, is that when they merge with the College of Arts and Letters, which is going to happen, maybe they will lose all of their representation. When they merge, then the College of Arts and Letters, maybe they can be voting for just the people that were previously in that college and the College of Education may be shut out. And I don't know if there's any way around that or if it a real issue.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Rob, this is Deborah Coulter-Harris.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: Yes, Dr. Coulter-Harris?

Senator Coulter-Harris: This is in response to Ammon Allred's comment. Forgive me if I'm not correct in this, but I think I am. Senator Allred expressed some concern that was an issue of being able to staff the membership of the Faculty Senate committees, right? But you don't have to be on Faculty Senate to be on the committee. So, I wanted to make that clear. Correct? Am I correct?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: Yes, I think I did mention that as well.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Yes.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: I agree.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Okay alright, that's all.

Senator Lee-Smith: I guess I will unmute because I have my hand up. To speak to the preponderance of undergraduate business in front of Senate vs. the University as a whole, you know, I think some of that can be addressed in the committee membership. Committees that deal specifically with undergraduate curriculum and undergrad programs are not dominated by colleges with graduate membership with primarily graduate programs. I think that is already addressed and so I don't think the lack of undergraduate programs by any college necessarily should affect their membership in the overall Faculty Senate, which has to do with faculty governance and not just undergraduate matters. So anyway, that's what I wanted to add to that conversation or to that objection.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Thank you, Wade. I would like to just say that I think it is more of a concern for the reverse where it doesn't really matter about the committees. The committees present proposals which are voted on by the total Faculty Senate. So, if you have an overwhelmingly large medical campus, for example, representation where they are not really involved with that undergraduate curriculum, they could really influence what's happening with the undergraduate curriculum. Is that something we should be worried about or not? It's something that should be considered.

Senator Willey: Yes, it's a really important point. Again, I think the Executive Committee needs to address these issues because it is not good and there's good harm that could come from graduate faculty making these decisions, as you say. Plus, that could speak to why there's a lack of attendance. So, I think we need to really think carefully about this because there are important issues that the graduate colleges including the College of Medicine need to give input through on the Faculty Senate. So, we need to think about how this time is spent and how the time is allocated without hopefully decreasing the proportion of College of Medicine faculty when those important decisions come up.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Any other points? I can't see hands going up, so anybody can let me know.

Senator Bigioni: My hands is up, Dr. Steven.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Go ahead, Dr. Bigioni.

Senator Bigioni: So, first of all, I don't want to minimize any of the points that have been already made. This is all good discussion and good points, but I'd rather bring up kind of a practical perspective of this. Just thinking back over the many years I've been involved with Faculty Senate, I honestly can't think of any particular instance where any group of people would have been saying, 'oh, if only we would have had one or two more senators in our college, you know, things would have been different,' right? So, as important it is to have representation, I think those instances where one extra senator or something along those lines would have made a real meaningful difference in the outcome of anything that we've been through - I don't think that's a critical point. So, I just want to put some practical perspective on this.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee: Thank you, Senator Bigioni. All right, if there are no other comments there. Again, that's an issue that we're not asking for any action with respect to the Faculty Senate today.

Moving on to Issue 5. then. What is happening here is that the Medical College, they previously did not have any undergraduate degrees when the Constitution, Bylaws and Rules were written, but now they do. So, the Medical Campus does grant undergraduate degrees. Previously, special mention was necessary to

give the Medical College membership on Faculty Senate committees because as written down here below, what we would say in the Bylaws is:

- “In addition to the members described in this Section of these Rules of Faculty Senate, this committee shall have two additional members; one each who represents (a.) the College of Medicine and Life Sciences and (b.) the College of Law.”

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee cont’d: So, the College of Medicine and Life Sciences now offers undergraduate degrees, so it's no longer necessary to give them special mention as is written here. So, we would like to change this to:

- In addition to the members described in this Section of these Rules of Faculty Senate, this committee shall have one additional member representing the College of Law.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitutional and Rules Committee cont’d: Any comments on that? Again, it is just the College of Medicine in the past did not grant undergraduate degrees and so they didn't fit into the definitions of how we populate committees. It was always we're going to have one committee member from each college that grants an undergraduate degree. Since the College of Medicine didn't, then we had to make this special mention. Now we're just requesting that we change it so that this special mention is gone.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I agree with that, Dr. Steven.

Dr. Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: One thing to highlight and I will put it here. I'll highlight it specifically. Can you see that highlighting? I didn't mention this yet, but it's an important point and I want to make sure everybody's aware of this. The Medical College only has as the Bylaws are currently written, they only have membership on four of the nine committees: Constitution and Rules, Academic Regulations, Student Affairs, and Committee on Committees - none of the other programs. So, if we change it in the way that we're proposing, the Medical College will have representation on all Faculty Senate standing committees from this point on. I just want to make sure that everybody's clear on that. It was unanimous in our committee that we recommend this change. No discussion there?

Senator Willey: Well, I think it's particularly important for the two new committees...

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee. Right.

Senator Willey: Because those will...as well too?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: Yes, because the way that the committees are populated, it's just by saying one member from each college that grants an undergraduate degree. So, that would now include College of Medicine and Life Sciences for all standing committees.

All right, the last two are very straightforward. The Honor's College no longer has full-time faculty, so we're just saying we're just going to scratch any mention of the Jesup Scott Honors College in the Rules. It had to do with representation on committees but since the college does not have any full-time faculty, they do not need representation. No comments or discussion on that? And finally, Issue 7 is very straightforward. It's just a duplication of information and we propose that we remove the redundant sentence that's duplicating information regarding to how committees are populated. Alright, if there's no

discussion or commentary there, we should go ahead, I guess, and vote on all of these issues that remain--
-

Senator Willey: I'm sorry, so regarding the apportionment issue, what was the final voting on the Executive Committee? What is the final decision on it?

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: Do you mean the cap?

Senator Willey: Yes, Issue 4.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: We are for, as a committee, not making any changes which would mean that the cap stays.

President Van Hoy: So, that would be a yes if we voted (for us).

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: But we're not requesting a vote. If you want to have a motion to make a change to the cap, that will require a motion, but that isn't anything we're asking for.

Senator Willey: Well, I think Senator Giovannucci and others have raised the question—I think we saw it to be proportional. Should we table that one or do you want to have a vote on it now? It sounds like to me maybe [we should have] more discussion on the floor on that.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: Well, as I'm saying, our committee has recommended that no action be taken. So, we're not recommending any action. If anybody in Senate wants to make a motion to make a change, you're welcome to do so.

Senator Willey: Like I said, I would like to make a motion to table it unless there's an urgency to make a decision.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: There's nothing being asked or requested, so I'm not sure what you want us to table.

Senator Willey: Issue 4. vote.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: Well, I'm not asking for a vote.

Senator Heberle: President Van Hoy, can you clarify what's going on?

President Van Hoy: Yes. So, just so everyone understands. On caps, because the committee is not recommending any change whatsoever, that is not part of the vote, right? They're just telling us that they discussed it and decided not to recommend any changes. At a later date, we can try and do the analysis that you suggest, Senator Willey.

Senator Willey: Okay, that sounds good.

President Van Hoy: We will bring that back later.

Senator Willey: Okay, I'd like to bring it back after the analysis. Thank you. That's fine.

Dr. Don Wedding: We are not going to vote on any of these?

President Van Hoy: Well, Dr. Steven is trying to get us to vote on the other stuff, yes.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: I was just waiting to see if there's any more discussion.

Senator Heberle: Do you need a motion?

Dr. Don Wedding: Why did we do all of this if we're not going to vote on it?

Senator Heberle: We're voting on everything except Issue 4.

President Van Hoy: Yes, we need a recap on what we're voting on.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: We've already voted on Issue 1. We don't need to vote on Issue 4. So, it is 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7.

Dr. Don Wedding: We're voting on everything, but Issue 4.

President Van Hoy: Correct.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee: Let me review. Number 2 is on administrative faculty, the definition. Are you okay with that or not? Number 3 is the eligibility for the Constitutional Thought and Leadership Institute. Are those faculty eligible? Number 5 is changing the special mention of the Medical College; it is no longer needed so it is just kind of an update. The same with the Honors College, an update. Then Number 7 is just fixing the typo of duplication of information. So, those are the five things that we're voting on. All right, so those in the room in favor can say 'aye.'

Group of Senators: Aye.

Dr. Rob Steven, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee cont'd: Those against, 'nay.' Any abstentions? And of course, the Chat box, yes, no, or abstain. It looks like the majority are yeses. Is someone else counting though?

Dr. Coulter-Harris: It passed, Dr. Steven.

President Van Hoy: It looks like all yeses. *Motion Unanimously Carried.* Thanks, Dr. Steven. Thanks for the good discussion. Okay, it is now time for Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, who is the Honors program Director, to tell us about the ongoing Honors College updates.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: Can everybody hear me online? Yes, I hope so. So, I'm here today to update you on where the Honors Council is at with regards to creating or drafting a new Honors' curriculum. A couple of pieces of information about this. This will not go into effect until the fall 2026. So, we have another full year to implement and go through all the approval processes etc. etc. with this. But this is just an update so that we let you know where we are at.

I also wanted to put up here who the honors council members were in case you don't know who represents your college. These are the individuals you go to with specific questions about how this new model, we're going to call it a 'model' will be implemented across all the colleges.

So, just so you know how this happened. We were given the parameters of what the new program can look like given that Honors' faculty were going back to their home colleges. And we will miss them greatly, I just want to say that personally. What will it look like within the new structure of the institution with Honors now being housed in the Provost Office? So, what we have come up with is a plan that we

hope will be more accessible to students, so that students from across the university in all programs, in undergraduate programs can participate in an Honor's experience. We are proposing a three-tier option, which would include the certificate, the cord, and the medallion. Those names came from the idea of actually, physically having something to give students at every level. It will be like a building process. So, you can get the certificate and then come back and get the cord, and then come get the medallion. So hopefully we will be encouraging more students to complete. Right now, our completion rate of students that enter Honors and then complete all the way through to the medallion is about 20 %. So, we're hoping to dramatically increase those numbers across these three.

So, the honor's certificate, this is simply a 9 credit, process with Honors' quality credits: honors' quality credits are going to be what is defined in your programs or colleges depending on the situation, what honors quality experiences are. Honor's quality experiences can be everything from a class that is embedded honors. That is basically cross listing your class with an honor's section, keeping the cap at the same, but cross listing it so honors can sign up. You just have a different syllabus for the honor students, they know what to expect. That's an example of how we're proposing to do that. We're still working through the fundamentals of it. Or what we are going to call a personalized honors contract instead of a learning contract, same kind of thing. Or any one of the other options made available by your college, we'll get to those in a minute. And a 3.5 GPA. So, this one was primarily brought about because of transfer students, students in pre-professional programs, students who start honors and then can't finish honors for whatever reason. We want to give them something for their work. We also want to have the ability to just give some freedom to have some type of honors experience, even if they don't want to move past that level.

The next one is the honor's cord. This will be one that hopefully captures a bunch of students. So, it will be 15 credit hours of honors quality credits, a completion of an experiential learning project or honor's portfolio, and a 3.5 GPA. So, this one is just about everything short of a thesis and capstone project. We have a number of students that get to this point [currently] and then can't finish it for various reasons. And so, we would like to propose that they be given what we're deeming the honors cord at that level. An experiential learning project and honor's portfolio will be done here at this university. So, one of the things that we've been tossing back and forth in Honors' Council is accessibility and what can transfer. And so, the main theme of what we keep talking about is how to hold students harmless. So, in this process with all of these different levels, if a student transfers in and they have 15 credit hours of honors, that's fine, but they'll still have to do their experiential learning project here and then move on to their thesis and capstone. They will have to be done here at the institution. So, being student-friendly has been the kind of the goal of this while still maintaining the rigor and the experience.

Then the next one, the final one is what we currently offer is the medallion, only we've lowered the credit numbers. Now when we did the research leading up to this and exploring other programs that have what we will call a non-traditional model, they had lower credit hours because, again, there's a big push for students to finish their degrees as quickly as possible to get out, to do all these things. So, we wanted honors to be rigorous. College Credit Plus, they're coming in with some of this already. So, we want it to be 'student friendly' while still maintaining rigor. They would have a 3.5 GPA completion of experiential learning project, or honor's portfolio, and a completion of a capstone experience project or thesis. So, the main thing you're going to see is when we flip to these, we're just expanding those definitions, okay?

So, an honor's quality experience, and this is where your -- So, where Honors Council is at right now with this is we've worked really hard to get to this point and tossed a lot of ideas back and forth. And so, the Honors Council has then taken this back to their deans or in the process of taking it to their deans, their chairs, and their program directors and started. Some colleges are further ahead than others. Some are more lockstep than others. Some have accredited pre-professional program plans that are already in place so how they will implement this is pretty clear. Other colleges are working to create these kind of plans. I'm asking for draft plans right now so we kind of have an idea of how this will all come together across all of these.

So, your Honors Council representative will be reaching out to individuals in a successive order. As time allows, we're going to hopefully get a bunch of these done before the end of April and then we'll return to it in the fall. And obviously, it has to go through all the appropriate curriculum reviews in the colleges for that to happen. But an Honor's quality experience is designed to enhance, engage, and challenge students in their programs to study. These can be honors designated courses or sections, honors embedded courses.

So, for example, if we have a bunch of students taking core classes, we can offer honor sections of those potentially or independent honors contract credits. And then exponential learning, research faculty collaboration, professional or community-based skills or additional areas of study that challenge students outside their area of study can also be that. They are meant to support leadership, communication, and connections contributions for student success. So, these are the things that we thought were important to highlight about an honor's experience. The best way I describe it is - what are all the experiences and wrap around experiences that a student can have in the Honors program that highlight and enhance their degree program? That's the best way we can put it. And obviously some programs are more restrictive than others, so there'll be less flex flexibility in some of them. So, examples of these honors' quality experiences can be: sustained community engagement, or civic engagement, research credits taken with a faculty member, publishing with a faculty member. They can be any number of things as defined by the colleges. I should say it's important to understand that we will also be teaching honors coated classes. We don't know how many yet, but we will be offering those kind of classes, like seminar classes. We feel it's really important to maintain the community engagement pieces that currently exists in the Honor's College. So, offering those as seminars in addition to the program classes, those can be options designated by your college. Then experiential learning projects include service projects, solving real world issues, solutions to problems, work in research, independent studies, civic engagement, community engagement, or any of the artistic endeavors that would qualify under those colleges. Basically they would then define what an honors' portfolio is. So, this can include: recitals, production engagement and independent filmmaking, women in STEM, teaching portfolio, or student exhibitions. So, we want to make this like, something that they have to do, but we don't want to make it so challenging that they decide also not to do it. So, somewhere in that very nicely blended situation. Then obviously, the capstone project has traditionally been a thesis capstone, but we're looking to include some of the other opportunities that students are given: artistic displays, exhibition, juried conference, presentations, things like that. But again, these will be defined by your colleges. These are just a wide variety of examples that we're putting up here.

- Then I think we decided on a PHA, Personalized or Customized Honors Agreement. One of the things we wanted to do was close the loop on these, and that is proposing the agreement with the faculty member, having it outlined, making sure there's a criteria or a rubric attached to it, and

then at the end of it following back up and closing that loop in that process was important to the honors council.

Is that it? Okay, so kind of very, very plainly. It's a three-tier model and we're hoping that we do have a lot of these under development across the colleges. So, please reach out to your representative or me if you have any questions about that. Are there any questions about the model itself?

President Van Hoy: There is one in the Chat. "Can this presentation be shared so that we can discuss with our department?" That was from Barbara Miner.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: Absolutely. Just know it's a draft.

Senator Giovannucci: Do we have another microphone?

President Van Hoy: Well, we can have Kasey repeat.

Senator Giovannucci: So instead of just speak loud into the top of the microphone. All right. Well, first of all, I really appreciate the work that's gone in and from the Honors Council. [Indecipherable]... and we have a small role at the moment. There are a number of faculty, myself included who are very interested in undergraduate education.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: I will come find you. Just like Dean Atwood has proposed a member from Library to serve because they're very invested in the undergraduate research process as well. So we will be in contact, and we will get you in the meeting schedule.

Senator Giovannucci: That's great. Since I have a microphone too, I wanted to mention the undergraduate neuroscience program, which is the College of Medicine Life Sciences collaboration with NSM. There were Students in that program...and they applied to our medical school and a hundred percent were accepted into the College of Medicine.

Interim Provost Molitor: And the Radiation Therapy program, which is an undergraduate program as well....

Senator Giovannucci: [Indecipherable]...

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, and that is the problem.

Unknown Speaker: I just have to complement your students out of that program. I have several of them and they're really outstanding, really fun to work with.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: I do think that this is a plan that is comprehensive that can be applied across all the programs, so that we can hopefully increase the number of high ability students that we're bringing in and really enhance their experiences for everyone. Before it was less friendly to the pre-professional programs, and hopefully Honors Council has done that. I do want to thank the Honors Council members because they have been very diligent in working on this consensus. And so, that's been the beauty of this process for me to watch is members from every college come together and come up with this plan together. So, I want to make that very clear that this has been very collaborative. Great, thank you.

President Van Hoy: Senator Heberle, you can go.

Senator Heberle: Were you going to speak, Senator Pryor?

Senator Pryor: No, after.

Senator Heberle: Hi, I have some clarifying questions that will help me conceptualize this. The first thing is, I feel like a discussion about workload and workload inclusion for honors specific courses and the independent work we do is crucial to making this work because we do honors thesis, we do honors contracts, and it's not recognized in our workload. I feel like the honor's program would both be more distinguished and recognized across campus and more participation would happen if that happened. So, that's for you Provost Molitor.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: We have started a discussion about how we implement this with the limitations surrounding those kind of things that has been part of the discussion.

Senator Heberle: Well, let's just put those limitations off. That'd be my preference. The other question was how was the council assembled? What was that process?

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: Those are appointments.

Senator Heberle: From the colleges?

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: Yes.

Senator Heberle: Okay. So, the colleges as colleges as units played a huge role in this?

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: Yes.

Senator Heberle: Okay. Are colleges going to approve or disapprove everything so there's no university level approvals for what is considered to be an Honors' cord, medallion or certificate?

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: My understanding is we are providing the model. The colleges are providing the program of study plan for their programs and their colleges underneath of that model.

Senator Heberle: So there will be no centralized place where we'll put in an honor's contract and say, is this approved and then it will go to the college office?

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: They'll still handle that piece. We will still be doing that work.

Interim Provost Molitor: This is the current process.

Senator Heberle: I know, so that's what I was asking is whether it's staying.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: It is staying that way, so all the Honors' contracts and the thesis and stuff to will come to me.

Senator Heberle: Oh, okay. So, you'll be approving giving final approval on all the work that the students do through these processes.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: I kind of like that Honor's Council said that hey, we need to close the loop on the learning contracts. It is one thing to sign off that they're happening. It's another for there to be follow-up on the back end to say, hey, they did it.

Senator Heberle: So, it will be a committee, right?

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: No, like in a digital format, like filling out the forms, yeah.

Senator Heberle: And that would be like a committee of people who are looking at all of that, the contracts and to see if the students are doing the level of work expected for the certificate for---

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: I think that would be the faculty they have a contract with, unless there's an issue. Does that make sense?

Senator Heberle: Well, this one doesn't work at all. You know, doesn't look in the real...so, so just a different perspective on the collaboration aspects. The contract with... unless there's an issue. Does that make sense? Well, I'm just I'm actually saying that like there's a committee for any course that is whacked, so it does have to go through some kind of approval. So that's what I'm asking is if there's anything that faculty need to do because I do have honest contracts and I fill out the form. But there doesn't seem to be any sense of whether or not it's approved or not, which is one way of doing it.

I just didn't know how the standards were going to be met across the singular colleges that are doing all of this stuff and make sure that the honors program is university wide because, that seems to me, to be a really important part of doing honors. University honors, not college honors, not departmental university honors, so I'd want to have that higher level of review and obviously a committee would be the best way to do that. Well, one of the things that honors Council has begun the discussions with is how can we create? Maybe a template to help guide that process first and foremost. Good. So I can take that back to them and ask them how they think that would best work. I will write I will write that one down and do that.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: And I think that's all I had.

President Van Hoy: Thank you. Are there any other questions online? What about in the room?

Senator Pryor: Okay, well so this isn't a question. This is just a different perspective on things and before I begin, I just want to say I will not only speak for myself, but my sense is some of you may feel the same way. So, this is just a different perspective on the collaboration aspects.

Dr. Kasey Tucker-Gail, program director for Jesup's Scott Honors College: Sure.

Senator Pryor: Colleagues, thank you for this opportunity to share my perspective on the current and proposed future honors program at the University of Toledo.

The headlines remind us daily that we live in an increasingly polarized age; for many, it has become more challenging to listen to views different from our own – especially those we might disagree with. Fortunately, this capacity for thoughtful engagement with diverse perspectives is a skill that can be practiced and developed. Development of this skill has been one of the main areas of our pedagogical

focus in the honors program. It is, therefore, troubling to me that proposed changes to honors— at least as I understand them—both short-term class size increases next year and long-term program restructuring— potentially limit the space and time students need to develop this crucial skill. It is especially concerning, too, that faculty with extensive honors experience (some with over a decade of engagement with honors) and professional connections to the National Collegiate Honors Council have had limited opportunity to share insights about effective tried and true best practices in honors pedagogy.

Students' ability to test their ideas, opinions, and beliefs requires an intimate learning environment— ideally, one in which Socratic *elenchus* or its equivalent requires the active participation of all classroom members. Our discussion-based classes and emphasis on clear and persuasive writing and argumentation demand spaces where intellectual risks can be taken and meaningful feedback received.

We stand at a crossroads. Five years ago, our cap in HON 1010 was 19 students. Today it's 24. Next year, we're told it will be 30. With each increase, something essential is lost. At 30 students, the personalized attention, small-group activities that require floor space and mobility, and individualized conferences that define our approach become practically impossible to maintain (for instance, the street epistemology game that I play each semester requires room to move, as does the mock trial of Socrates, improv icebreakers, reader's theater performances, and other weekly studio/lab applications —events which allow students to test the texts they have studied).

Sadly, this happens precisely when employers report graduates lacking the critical thinking and professional skills our curriculum is designed to develop. If you are unfamiliar with these stories, please Google college graduates fired at alarming rates. Here is but one of the many stories: <https://fortune.com/article/why-are-companies-firing-gen-z-employees-workplace-bosses-workers-jobs/>.

Troubling, too, are the circumstances that brought us here. As far as I understand it, no formal assessment of the JSHC curriculum has occurred in the past two years. For the past four years, the JSHC administration has made no effort to visit the classrooms in person. (The last time there were teaching observations was AY 2018-19). When it was announced that we would revert to an honors program, JSHC dedicated faculty were promised meaningful input, yet found ourselves excluded from Council (historically, we always held one faculty seat in council) until six months into the process and even then, we were not provided with information about the proposed program until AFTER the meeting.

I invite the Senate to consider the following questions:

What does it mean for our institution when we redesign programs without fully drawing upon faculty expertise? This extends beyond honors—all academic programs benefit when disciplinary knowledge is valued in decision-making processes.

In an era of AI and skepticism about higher education's value, how can classes of 30 provide the foundation in the humanities our students need to become thoughtful and engaged citizens of the world? Can meaningful discussion and close reading of texts —the humanities' primary pedagogical tools— occur in such settings?

How do we develop informed citizens when students arrive with significant knowledge gaps? Many students couldn't identify Stalin or Socrates this semester and reported never reading a complete book in

high school—only excerpts and fragments. (Here, I went off script to observe the variable quality of CCP programs and high school preparation more generally).

I assign blame to no individual—institutional transformation without consulting those closest to the educational process creates unintended consequences and problems.

Quality education requires an appropriate scale. We simply cannot compete in a rapidly changing educational landscape by continuously increasing class sizes and diminishing the personal connections that make learning transformative. Our success stems from creating environments where every voice is heard, and every name is known.

Thank you again for allowing me the opportunity to share my perspective.

President Van Hoy: Alright, thank you, Senator Pryor. Is there anything more? Thank you very much for that presentation. Are any items from the floor? Is there a motion to adjourn?

Senator Heberle: President Van Hoy, ... when will you be sending out the other email about...?

President Van Hoy: Well, it's in the Executive Committee report. It'll come out at the appropriate time. But yes, there will be a message about nominating people for Senate Executive Committee, but we have to get to a point where we have elections done. Okay. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Senator Heberle: So moved.

President Van Hoy: Alright, thanks everyone. We are adjourned. I will see you in two weeks.

IV. Meeting adjourned @ 6:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Coulter-Harris
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary

