

**UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 08, 2024**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>**

Approved @ FS on 10/22/2024

---

---

**Summary of Discussion**

---

---

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

**President Van Hoy:** Good afternoon. It's 4 o'clock. I'd like to call this meeting to order and ask Dr. Coulter-Harris to call the roll, please.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Good afternoon, everyone.

**Present:** Avidor-Reiss, Barnes, Bellizzi, Benton (S. Smith), Brakel, Chakravarti, Cheng, Cochrane, Coulter-Harris, Dagostino-Kalinz, Diakonova, Eichner, Ekwenna, Elgafy, Ervin, Giovannucci, Harmych, Heberle, Herrera, Howard, Javaid, Kalinoski, Kaw, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Kumar, Lapitsky, Lee, McInnis, Miner, Nigem, O'Connell, Osman, Padilla, Rouillard, Sahloff, Schaefer, Scheuermann, Semaan, Serwick, Sheng, Sindhvani, Sun, J. Taylor, W. Taylor, Van Hook, Van Hoy, Yonker

**Excused Absence:** Allred, Bigioni, Cioc, Dwyer, Gilstrap, Johnson, McLoughlin, Moussa, Pryor, Reinert, T. Smith

**Unexcused Absence:** Sucheck, Willey

**Senator Coulter-Harris cont'd:** We do have a quorum, President Van Hoy. Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Hello, everyone again. First item today is to adopt the revised agenda that we sent out yesterday. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** So moved.

**Senator Semaan:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, everyone online, please put yes, no or abstain in the Chat. In the room if you approve adopting the agenda, say, 'aye.'

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy:** Any nays or abstentions? Hearing none. It passes in the room.

**Quinetta Hubbard, Faculty Senate Executive Secretary:** It passed online. *Approval of Agenda Passed.*

**President Van Hoy:** All right, next is approval of the Minutes from September 24, 2024. Is there a motion to approve the Minutes?

**Senator Semaan:** So moved.

**Senators Kalinoski and Coulter-Harris:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Are there any corrections to the Minutes? Hearing none. All right let's vote. In the Chat, please put yes, no, or abstain. In the room, say 'aye' to approve.

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy:** Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none. So, that was approved as well. *Motion Passed.* Alright, the executive report. We have a really packed agenda today, so I'm going to try and be relatively quick with the executive report. We also have a resolution to consider at the end of the executive report, so if I'm going too fast, tell me to slow down.

**Faculty Senate Executive Report:** The Executive Committee received three nominations for the Academic Honors Committee. We forwarded all three faculty member names to Mary Humphrys in the provost office. (Ritu Chakravarti, Jianglong Zhu, Gaby Semaan)

- Quick update on our invitation to Larry Kelley, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration and CFO to present at Senate this semester. He has requested to come to Senate in the Spring semester when the audited financials and full year enrollment numbers will be available. We are still discussing dates.
- The provost office has modified the final curriculum dates for this academic year. Course modifications must be fully approved through Faculty Senate or Graduate Council by March 3, 2025, to be available in the 2025-26 catalog. New courses, new programs and program modifications must be fully approved through Faculty Senate or Graduate Council by March 25, 2025, to be available in the 2025-26 catalog. Please note that March 3 is during Spring break. Please plan to have course modifications approved by Faculty Senate by our February 25 meeting or Graduate Council by their February 18 meeting.
- UT Online has asked us to remind faculty that Spring 2025 will be the last semester courses will run in Blackboard Learn 9. Beginning in Summer 2025, all courses will run in Blackboard Ultra. If you have not done so already, please attend a Blackboard Ultra training session. In my experience, course conversions are not difficult, but it takes time to organize course materials in the Ultra shell/user interface, which is quite different from the Learn 9 shell/user interface.
- Last Friday senators should have received an invitation to the November 20 UToledo v. Ohio University football game. A donor, working with the president's office, has paid for 24 tickets in box seats as a thank you for the work of Faculty Senate. If you are interested in attending the game, please click the link on the flyer and give us your name. If we receive more than 24 ticket requests, we will allot tickets using a random selection process.

The Executive Committee has drafted a resolution for your consideration. The resolution requests the Board of Trustees to commit to conducting a national search for a permanent president of the University of Toledo. We will consider the resolution now.

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** Quinetta has very nicely put it up on the screen. Can everyone online see it? You have to unmute and tell us. Are there any comments on this resolution? None in the room.

**Senator Brakel:** I'll comment. This is Tim Brakel. I think this resolution is well written. And having been the Senate President when, then President Gaber stepped down and the process went through with Dr. Postel, I highly recommend that Senate adopt this resolution so that we can be again on record that we expect a national search. Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** If you're online and you have a comment, please unmute then say it because with the resolution being shared, we can't see comments or hands very well.

**Senator Barnes:** I also second. I think this is a great idea and I really think all leadership position at the University should have national searches. So, if we extend it to other positions, I'd be equally happy. Thank you.

**Senator Miner:** This is Barbara Miner online. This is my first time on Senate and as a senator. I just need a little clarification if I could. I think in general this is a really good idea. I wonder if it is forceful enough. It's very polite. I wonder who is meant by the second to last, "Be it further resolved, Faculty Senate, respectfully request University stakeholder groups..." should there be more specificity? This feels very polite, and I don't know the politics of this so please forgive me. I perhaps would like it to be more urgent. That's it. Thank you.

**Senator Heberle:** This is Renee Heberle. I just wanted to say that the language of the resolution went through a couple of iterations. I wonder if we simply took out "Be it Further Resolved that the Faculty Senate respectfully requests University Stakeholder groups have an active and transparent role in the creation of the search committee, timeline and process" That would just add back in the Faculty Senate... The Faculty Senate should have this role and we're passing the resolution and we are making this demand, even though it is identified as a request. So, yes. If we take out Faculty Senate. If we say, Faculty Senate requests --- just take out the "respectfully" part because they know we are respectful. We're being respectful. It's a friendly amendment.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I second that as a friendly amendment.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, any other comments?

**Senator Krantz:** Yes, if I may? This is David Krantz from Natural Science and Math. This is somewhat rhetorical. Does anyone know whether the search is already ongoing?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** David, can you repeat that?

**President Van Hoy:** He is asking if there's an already ongoing search for a permanent president, correct?

**Senator Krantz:** That is correct.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Not that I'm aware of.

**President Van Hoy:** So, the Interim Provost says, not that he's aware of.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** We have completed the search for the enrollment management vice president who will be starting at the end of October. They are launching the search for the permanent provost. I believe they have launched the search for the executive vice president of health affairs, and they've just completed the search for the associate vice president for risk management. Those are the searches I am aware of to this point.

**Senator Krantz:** Is there a mechanism by way Faculty Senate can ask the question and get a direct answer?

**President Van Hoy:** I think it's pretty clear there is not a search going on at this moment, at least not an open search that's been announced to campus, right?

**Senator Heberle:** I just wanted to clarify if Senator Krantz is asking --- Senator Krantz, this is Renee. Are you asking whether or not we can ask the Board of Trustees, will there be a national search and get a direct answer?

**Senator Krantz:** No. Is there an ongoing search?

**Senator Heberle:** No, there is not.

**Senator Krantz:** Okay, alright. As long as we can confirm that, it's fine, and then the resolution has some meaning.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, I think we are in pretty good shape there.

**Suzanne Smith:** President Van Hoy, can I ask a question? This is Suzanne Smith. I just want to ask a question because I haven't really read one of these before. So, right before the "Whereas, the Faculty Senate is ready to participate in the search process for a university president," can I just ask about the word 'ready?' Is that strong enough? I don't really know what that means.

**President Van Hoy:** What would you like it to say?

**Suzanne Smith:** I suppose 'prepared,' or 'eager,' or something. I wanted to hear from the people who drafted this what their sense of the word 'ready' was.

**President Van Hoy:** I think mostly the Executive Committee was just trying to follow previous resolutions that we thought were similar.

**Suzanne Smith:** Okay.

**President Van Hoy:** But the wording can certainly be changed.

**Suzanne Smith:** Well, as I said I've never read one of these before, and it just struck me as an innocuous word. I just didn't know if it could perhaps be stronger.

**President Van Hoy:** Any other questions or comments?

**Senator Miner:** This is Barbara Miner again. I do want to say I appreciate the fact that this was drafted, and I think it's important and I hope that it leads to a stronger dialogue between faculty and upper administration, and I think that's awesome. So, thank you. None of my comments were intended to be overly negative.

**President Van Hoy:** I don't think we heard them that way. Okay, is there a motion to adopt the resolution with the friendly amendments that have been made?

**Senator Semaan:** So moved.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Is there any further discussion? Hearing none. So, to adopt the resolution with the friendly amendments, please put yes, no, or abstain in the Chat. Here in the room, all those in favor, please say, 'aye.'

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy:** Any opposed? Any abstentions? Hearing none. ***Resolution Passed.*** (\*\*Please note the following is the proposed resolution, not the approved.)

Proposed Resolution to Conduct a National Search for a Permanent President of the  
University of Toledo

Discussion with Faculty Senate: 10-8-2024

WHEREAS Dr. Gregory Postel was hired as the University of Toledo Interim President with no national search;

WHEREAS Dr. Gregory Postel was appointed as the permanent President with no national search;

WHEREAS the unexpected resignation of Dr. Gregory Postel created a vacancy in the University of Toledo's President position;

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees appointed an interim president with no consultation and transparency by the Board of Trustees regarding the appointment of a university president;

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate is ~~ready~~ prepared to participate in the search process for a university president;

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate recognizes that the Board of Trustees has the responsibility of the hiring of the University President;

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees is responsible for upholding norms and procedures of shared governance;

WHEREAS the University Administration and Faculty Senate on different occasions have affirmed their belief in shared governance;

WHEREAS it is in the best interest of the University of Toledo to hire a president by way of a nation-wide search to guarantee the University has done due diligence in hiring the candidate who has, through the competitive process of a search, shown themselves to be most experienced and qualified;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that a national search for the position of the president of the University of Toledo is in the best interest of the University of Toledo;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate respectfully requests that the Board of Trustees commit to a national search for our next president;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate ~~respectfully~~ requests University Stakeholder groups have an active and transparent role in the creation of the search committee, timeline and process;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in accordance with the principles of shared governance this is essential to respecting the integrity of the academic enterprise.

**(\*\*Please note, the Following is the Approved Resolution.)**

**Approved Resolution to Conduct a National Search for a Permanent President of the University of Toledo**

WHEREAS Dr. Gregory Postel was hired as the University of Toledo Interim President with no national search;

WHEREAS Dr. Gregory Postel was appointed as the permanent President with no national search;

WHEREAS the unexpected resignation of Dr. Gregory Postel created a vacancy in the University of Toledo's President position;

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees appointed an interim president with no consultation and transparency by the Board of Trustees regarding the appointment of a university president;

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate is prepared to participate in the search process for a university president;

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate recognizes that the Board of Trustees has the responsibility of the hiring of the University President;

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees is responsible for upholding norms and procedures of shared governance;

WHEREAS the University Administration and Faculty Senate on different occasions have affirmed their belief in shared governance;

WHEREAS it is in the best interest of the University of Toledo to hire a president by way of a nation-wide search to guarantee the University has done due diligence in hiring the candidate who has, through the competitive process of a search, shown themselves to be most experienced and qualified;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that a national search for the position of the president of the University of Toledo is in the best interest of the University of Toledo;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate respectfully requests that the Board of Trustees commit to a national search for our next president;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests University Stakeholder groups have an active and transparent role in the creation of the search committee, timeline and process;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in accordance with the principles of shared governance this is essential to respecting the integrity of the academic enterprise.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, very quickly. Are there any questions about the Executive Committee report? Hearing none. Okay, I think we're good. So next is the Committee on Student Affairs.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** We are waiting for the PowerPoint, but [we] also sent out was a rather detailed memorandum that has more specific details in it than the actual PowerPoint because the PowerPoint is going to take less than ten minutes.

This is the Faculty Senate Committee on Student Affairs. We act as a liaison between the faculty, students and administration. That was just a list of the people on the committee. I am the Chair and Sally Harmych from Natural Sciences and Mathematics is the Co-Chair this year, Arts and Letters is Suzanne Smith, Business and Innovation is Karen Green, Education is Berhane Teclehaimanot, Engineering is Samir Hefzy, Health and Human Services is Barry Scheuermann, Law is Katherine O'Connell, Library is Lucy Duhon, Medicine and Life Sciences is Dr. Paul Schaefer, Nursing is Karen Hoblet, and Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences is Sarah Aldrich Renner.

And let me tell you people that except for two people on the committee, everyone has been with me since the beginning, and this is the fourth year.

So, the introduction, here we go. Student Government President Lucas Will and VP Ashley Westgate sent FSCSA the four issues they want the committee to consider.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** So, we had our first meeting on Thursday, the 13 September, 2024. The committee determined by consensus that the issues directly tie into recruitment enrollment, and retention problems. So we brainstormed initial strategies for resolution of these problems. As we searched to make appropriate contacts, more strategies for resolutions will become more evident. So, we arranged the Student Government concerns according to what we felt were importance of the issue. We detailed the issues and formed subcommittees as we always do, established preliminary contacts, and decided to actually add a fifth concern on behalf of the students regarding summer classes as a recruitment and retention issue.

Next. So the first issue is DEI changes and minority scholarships. Our subcommittee, Sally Harmych, Barry Scheuermann, and myself report will be given to Faculty Senate on the 5<sup>th</sup> of November 2024. The Student Government requested a consistent statement regarding changes to DEI and info on the status of minority scholarships from the administration. The student government then will disseminate this to students. The proposed resolution, the subcommittee will ask listed contacts for written statements addressing concerns. They will coordinate and edit the statements to the satisfaction of the Student Government and its constituents for student distribution. Deborah will elicit a statement from Interim President Schroeder. You know, I sent an email to him right after our meeting and he replied immediately. So Sally will ask Interim Provost Molitor, I think she's already emailed you, and then Barry Scheuermann will ask Malaika Bell for the same. So, contacts are Matt Schroeder, Malaika Bell, Interim Molitor and also Floyd Akins.

Issue 2: Accessibility. FSCSA subcommittee: Sarah Aldrich Renner, Katherine O'Connell, Karen Green, and Samir Hefzy. Their report will be due on the 19<sup>th</sup> of November. Some prospective students this summer posted that they didn't think that our campus was particularly disability friendly and have decided to go to other places. So, a proposed solution that we came up with is email or call the contacts to gather a report on all buildings, restrooms, and athletic venues for ADA compliancy - where and how some locations can be improved and have there been any written complaints? Okay, so we will find that out. We are going to contact the Office of Disability. I'm sorry, that was a typo. It is Lisa Yost, Enjie Hall, Jason Toth and Michael Haar.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Enjie Hall is no longer with the University. It is Kurt Soltman.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Okay, thank you. The third issue is the faculty/student communications. Now, we had this issue a couple years ago; in the memorandum, I refer you to Appendix I and the reports that have already been given. So, the Student Government says they would love to work with Faculty Senate to improve communication between students and faculty this year. Students have had issues with professors not replying in a timely manner or communicating in ways that are not easily accessible. So, as I said, the FSCSA, our committee, responded to this issue in a report given to Faculty Senate on 15 November 2022 (See the Appendix I in the memorandum). Proposed solutions: a student survey, face to face meetings with students in our classes to gather more information on these issues. The FSCSA report responded to these issues on a report given to Faculty Senate on the 15<sup>th</sup> of November, 2022. Contacts: interview faculty or email a short survey to them that addresses these issues. The committee members are Berhane Teclhaimanot, Lucy Duhon, Sally Harmych, Suzanne Smith, and their report won't be due until 11 February. Thank you.

Issue 4: dining hall labeling/cross-contamination. Now, they did say in their email to me that much has improved in the dining facilities in Student Union. However, they are really concerned primarily, absolutely with Ottawa East. The subcommittee on that issue is Sally, myself, Barry, and Karen Green. As SG states here, Ottawa East has had some issues. Food quality has not been too much of a complaint this year. One claim is that the utensils, and that's in Ottawa East, may be used in multiple foods without being washed. I don't know how that could happen, but students are also still worried that allergens are not being properly labeled. Now one suggestion was the creation of an allergen freeze station, like the one at the Student Union. They say dining is definitely improving, but the dining hall at Ottawa East is slow to catch up. The proposed solution: we are just going to set up a short meeting at Ottawa East with the manager of Ottawa East Eatery. We are going to invite Don Bargo, Brian Kulpa, and Mike Dennis if they are willing to come and just see what's going on with this issue. Contacts are Don Bargo, Mike Dennis, Brian Kulpa and the manager of Ottawa East.

Now, FSCSA came up with this issue. Actually, this came out of a nice discussion that Suzanne Smith and I had for about a year. The FSCSA Committee issue is the allocation of summer courses. Members are Suzanne Smith, Lucy Duhon, Karen Green, Berhane Teclhaimanot, Samir Hefzy, Barry Scheuermann, and myself, DC-H. I mean, pretty much almost the whole committee is going to deal with this FSCSA issue on behalf of students. The decrease in summer offerings is posing problems for students, especially those on a timed/directed course path to graduation. Also, students are going to BGSU, Owens, etc. So, this has become a recruitment and retention problem and has implications for scholarships. Proposed solutions: interview Interim President Schroeder, Interim Provost Molitor, deans, business managers and delineate how the money is handled and dispersed. Questions should be asked if this issue is simply based

on UT's financial situation. Contacts are: Interim President Schroeder, Interim Provost Molitor, deans, business managers etc. That is the end. Thank you. Any questions?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** One quick question regarding the email issue. What is the policy? Is faculty, let's say faculty has 100 students in his class. What is the policy about replying to---

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** I don't know if there is an official policy. But I know, by having been here for so long, that in our syllabi, we are supposed to make a statement regarding how we respond to students, how quickly we respond. For example, I'd say, I will respond to you in within 24 hours. So, I don't think there is an official policy per se, but I think it is required of faculty to make a statement in their syllabi regarding this. Does that answer your question?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Yes.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Any other questions? Okay, thank you.

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

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

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, next, Dean Marc Seigar is going to present to us the School of Interdisciplinary Data Sciences in Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** I got a few slides. This won't take very long. I think at the end of the spring semester, NSM Council passed the resolution to create a School of Interdisciplinary Data Science back in the spring semester. It wasn't enough time to get it to Faculty Senate at the time. But that is what I'm talking about today, the School of Interdisciplinary Data Science to be created in NSM. This is going to be a hub for data science programs. Right now we just have a bachelor's program in Data Science, but we are working on a new masters in Data Science that'll probably be an online program. So really the idea of this is [to] innovate new means of understanding and analyzing data, and to innovate and apply cutting edge data analytical methods to diverse questions with the focus of educational program. Really what we're trying to do is bring together an interdisciplinary group of faculty from several colleges and also departments within NSM to deliver this program. I mean, that is what basically happening right now anyway. It is really just giving a home to the data science programs that – and I can talk a little bit about why we're doing this; I think it is on the very last slide, but let's go to the next slide.

The School of Interdisciplinary Data Science will be developing approaches to use data in modern society to run current and future programs in data science with the focus of educating students so they learn the entire spectrum of data science methods from data collection through interrogation, analysis, visualization, and communication of the results.

Here are the programs that we will be overseeing: B.S. in Data Science, all future certificates in Data Science, both undergraduate and graduate, and future M.S. in Data Science.

We have an Advisory Board, and not just with NSM folks on it but also from HHS (Criminal Justice program), and we have Liang Cheng from Electrical Engineering and Computer Science and a few more people from Engineering as well. So, anyone who is interested in helping us deliver this program, just anyone who is interested in data science, can join.

This is the last slide. EAB visited campus, I think it was back in the spring when I met with them. They basically just made the general comment that when you have an in-demand program like data science

with limited resources to deliver it, which is a struggle because we don't really have enough faculty to support it, but if you have an interdisciplinary school to house the program, it is probably the best way forward to bring people together who are interested in really delivering the programs. That's why we want to do this. Any questions?

**Past-President Rouillard:** Yes. What are the overlaps between this program and the Data Analytics Bachelor of Arts in the College of Arts and Letters?

**Dean Marc Seigar:** I did speak with Dean Gregory about this, and she was supportive of the idea of having a school. I think there's much less of a math background in the Data Analytics program. You can see that Scott Molitor has his hand raised as well.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** A school is a faculty structure for scholarship and other interests. This is independent of the two programs in the BS in Data Science and the BA in Data Analytics. And I imagine faculty who deliver the BA in Data Analytics may be interested in joining this group.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** They are more than welcome to join this group if they want.

**Past-President Rouillard:** So, when you spoke with the dean [from Arts and Letters], did she indicate that she's interested in having CAL faculty join this interdisciplinary school?

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yes, she did. I believe she's spoken with [someone in] the Economics Department if I remember correctly.

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

**Senator Barnes:** Sharon Barnes, Department of Women and Gender Studies. I'm just wondering if you could talk a little bit about the diversity of the makeup of the people in the consortium now? And given what we know about racism and sexism in the way data is gathered and analyzed among other things, is there an effort to address that issue in what you're working on so far?

**Dean Marc Seigar:** That's a really good question. I mean, I think most of the people on that working group right now are really focused on more of the STEM data side of things, but yes, I mean, we'd be more than happy to work with anyone who's interested in other areas of data science.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I was going to say that David Lilley's discipline is criminal justice and I believe he is probably aware of these issues in terms of bias related to his expertise and his scholarship. I would certainly encourage you to have a conversation with him.

**Senator Barnes:** How's the gender makeup of the group?

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yeah, I just realized it's all men, isn't it? I'll work on that. I'm thinking of some people now who might be interested who are female.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Another group that I wonder if you reached out to are the bioinformatic market group from the Medical School because some of them may be interested also.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yes. There's a question over there.

**Senator Heberle:** I just have the mean green question about resources and what kind of administrative work the school will be doing. I'm not sure what that will look like yet.

**Dean Seigar:** I mean, right now the school will not have any base budget because I don't really have anything to give them. However, there is research going on in the area of data science, especially, like, I

think the director has about a million dollars of grants so the overhead generated from those grants will go into the school.

**Senator Miner:** Hi there, this is Barbara Miner in the Department of Art. One of the exciting things about the data analytics program, the BA in Data Analytics is that one of our courses, which is Visual Literacy and Data Visualization is a requirement. I would love to see whether or not there are ways in which we can continue to participate as visually conferring information is a critical part of the disbursement of that information. So, going forward, I would love our department to help in any way we can to support this new program.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** I agree, and data visualization is an important part, especially the end product of what data sciences do. So I think that's in the BS in Data Science, that's a requirement too.

**Senator Miner:** It is. It is in there. And I think that the work that Alan Alda has done out at Stony Brook in visualizing data and whatnot, sort of lends weight to the idea that that is a critical part of the product, that it is transferable knowledge and visual translation is really critical, so thank you.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yes.

**Senator Giovannucci:** Dr. Seigar, I want to echo what Senator Avidor-Reiss brought up, which is in the College of Medicine, in addition to bioinformatics, which I think there may be interest from faculty there, but also medical informatics. A number of physicians have expertise and are engaged in those sorts of data collection and handling, so I strongly encourage—maybe I'll certainly telegraph this to them, but if you want to reach out to folks in the College of Medicine and Life Sciences, I think that would be well received.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** I will work through the Dean's office and maybe even contact you if you know anyone who might be interested. I think one name that didn't show up on that list is Rupali Chandar. I think she was actually on our Advisory Council as well. I don't know why that name wasn't on my presentation, but it should be there. So we do have one female, but maybe we need more.

**Senator Heberle:** I wanted to ask what we are approving? It looks like a collaboration, but is it to-- I'm not sure what we're approving because schools don't really have a---

**President Van Hoy:** This is just being presented for our information.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yes, I think this is for information only.

**Senator Heberle:** Oh, thank you. I am excited about it. I'm sorry, I thought we were approving some of our programmer funding.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Schools are structurally equivalent to departments, except in this case, no one is going to have a primary appointment in this school.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** That's right. Thank you.

**Senator Heberle:** So, an affiliation with...

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator Barnes:** This is Sharon Barnes again. I just want to say I didn't ask the question as a 'gotcha' question, but as something that I think is really important for a cutting-edge program like this to move forward in a really intersectional way. We'll make it more outstanding, and so, that really was the spirit.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** I appreciate it. And yes, we need to work on making sure that we have good gender diversity and other forms of diversity involved in the school.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Well maybe just to add, I think there are some famous...that may be a good fit to this program [that] you can reach out to.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Any more questions?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** [Indecipherable]...

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Can you repeat your question?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** [Garbled]... statistics.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Statistics can participate in the school, right?

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Why not? Anybody can.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Yes, anybody can.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** It is the interest of the faculty who wish to participate.

**Dean Seigar:** Yes. I reached out to all the Stats faculty to see if they were interested, and some of them said yes and others I didn't hear from.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, thank you so much.

**Dean Marc Seigar:** Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, moving right along. Next, we have a report from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Rob, are you there?

**Dr. Robert Padilla:** Yes. Jerry, I'm sorry we didn't get back to you on that. We had only worked through a couple of the proposals, so we're going to give you a report the next time we meet. Sorry about that.

**President Van Hoy:** Alright, we will take that time back.

**Dr. Robert Padilla:** Okay, thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Thanks, Rob. Next is a report from the Committee on Academic Programs. Senator Taylor, are you ready to give your report?

**Senator J. Taylor:** I hope so if my computer doesn't crap out again. Senator Coulter-Harris, if you missed me when you were calling roll, I'm actually here. Okay, I'm going to share my screen if that's okay.

**President Van Hoy:** Should be.

**Senator J. Taylor:** The committee met on Friday. We looked at eleven proposals. We are recommending the passage of nine of them. Three of these came from Theatre. They were program modifications where they were dropping the total number of hours from 124 to 120. We also had four certificates that were

program modifications where there were new program learning outcomes, and two of those did some minor changes around changing classes in and out of the certificate programs. And then we had two new certificates. These are post-production for Film and Video certificate and Audio Communications certificate. Again, both of these are new, and we recommend approval on all of those. Are there any questions about them?

**Past-President Rouillard:** Senator Taylor, could we see what courses are being used for the certificates since these are new?

**Senator J. Taylor:** If you give me just a second to pull them up, absolutely. Can you see this, Past-President Rouillard, Audio Production Communication certificate?

**Past-President Rouillard:** Yes.

**Senator J. Taylor:** The classes here are COMM 2210, Audio Production I; COMM 3210, Audio Production II; and COMM 3710, Podcasting.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay, and these courses already exist?

**Senator J. Taylor:** Yes. I clicked on it, and they showed up in the catalog.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay, and the other new certificate?

**Senator J. Taylor:** Okay, do you see this one?

**Past-President Rouillard:** Yes.

**Senator J. Taylor:** FILM 2320, FILM 3510, and FILM 3560.

**Past-President Rouillard:** And these courses also already exist?

**Senator J. Taylor:** When I click on them in CIM, they do show up with a course description, so, yes.

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

**Senator J. Taylor:** You're welcome.

**President Van Hoy:** Are there any other questions? Okay, Senator Taylor, I think you can call a vote.

**Senator J. Taylor:** All right. All in favor of approving these program modifications and certificates, please vote 'aye.'

**President Van Hoy:** In the room you can vote 'aye.'

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy:** Online, please put yes, no, or abstain in the Chat. Are there no's or abstains in the room? Hearing none. It passed in the room. It passed online, too. *Motion Passed.*

**Senator J. Taylor:** Just a couple of quick things that came up in the committee and I just want to share this with Senate. We discussed the need to make sure that program modifications and new proposals have their courses listed in alphanumeric order just so we can turn out a good-looking catalog. We also found out that there was a new field that has been added to the CIM system, where you have to connect your program learning objectives with institutional learning objectives. The programs modifications that we looked at for this session, they were exempt from that because they were input last year. I think going

forward, all new program modifications and new certificates will need to have these. So, just be aware of that, make sure you get that done. That was all I had.

**President Van Hoy:** Thanks, Senator Taylor. Are there any questions about the last comments that Senator Taylor just made? It doesn't look like it. Wait, hold on.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Actually, it may be more for Interim Provost Molitor than for Senator Taylor. If there is a new requirement in the CIM system, can these not be brought to Faculty Senate so that people know when they are filling out these forms? I mean, it is very disconcerting to be suddenly surprised when you're filling them out or reviewing these that there's suddenly a new requirement. We're not opposed to new requirements. I mean, we had this same issue last year with sudden courses that are going to be in the core had to be submitted for TAG review, and that just takes people unaware, and it also ignores the fact that faculty have a responsibility in curricular matters.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes. Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Alright, thanks, Senator Taylor. Next, we will have the Core Curriculum Committee with Dr. Sharon Barnes.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you. The Core Committee met on the 19th of September. We had been asked to review a course in Geography and Planning that was being updated to be and actually was submitted into

the OT36 with new learning outcomes. Because Alana (Malik) is really good with catching detail; she noticed that the learning outcomes on the syllabus in the UT core did not match the learning outcomes on the OT36 syllabus. So, they made changes to the course syllabus and asked us to review it. We prepared to look at the outcomes and then realized that it was not in the CIM system. And so, we reached out to the Geography and Planning folks, and they said, "Oh yeah, ok, we'll put it right in. We just sent it to Alana because the changes were minor," which led to a very long conversation about when a change is significant enough to require submission into CIM. And I would guess that a lot of us have found typographical errors at some point and just emailed and said, "Can you please fix this?" But it did raise for us a question about whether there is a standard or should we try to create a standard for when changes are submitted in CIM, because otherwise people don't know, and then there isn't a good paper trail or record of changes. I just realized that there was an Academic Rules and Regulations Committee, and this seems like something that I could 'kick down the road' to them rather than have our committee deal with it. I don't know if that is where it belongs, but we think there should be some uniform standards. I guess our committee spent a lot of time talking about where the line is for when you just call Alana and Kathy Zimmer and say, "Please fix this," and when you move it back through CIM.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** We previously sent a list to Faculty Senate and Graduate Council about changes that could be made administratively in CIM that do not require full committee approval like typos.

**Senator Barnes:** Yes.

**President Van Hoy:** Are those online, like, you know, in CIM?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I will check, that is a good point. We will do that.

**Senator Barnes:** This is my second year chairing this committee, but I think in the future when we onboard committee chairs, maybe they should come from these committees in particular, having already served on the committee so that they kind of understand the structure and activities. But also, there's a little bit of onboarding about issues like this; you know, it's sort of like everything is somewhere [and sometimes you just have to have some background knowledge.] And so just real quick, one more thing. We did ask for this ad hoc committee on the diversity SLOs, and I wanted to just make sure we explained why. The language is inconsistent around nonwestern vs. global for one thing. The diversity course student learning outcomes are not consistently known and utilized around campus. In fact, Alana and I have been talking about this last year, over the course of the year, and she was saying there were no SLOs, and I have them on my syllabus as indicated; you know, "Here are the university diversity SLOS" for two of my courses that meet both the global and the US diversity requirements. So somewhere they are listed, but they are not consistently known and utilized across campus, and they really should be. And of course, from Alana's perspective, they should also be assessed, and so this is I think where our interests meet in this regard. And then the state is encouraging us to submit those courses to the OT36 as well. And so, it is safe to say that our SLOs have not been updated for a number of years. I think Alana said she's been here working on it for more than ten years, so it's been awhile since they've been reviewed. So it would be good to look at the learning outcomes or the learning outcomes in relationship to what the state is expecting, and see if we want to align and if we want to then submit them. I would encourage departments who teach a lot of these courses to consider getting a volunteer to sit on this committee. I appreciated the announcement asking for representation from all the colleges, but I'm especially concerned that we have faculty on the committee who teach these courses, particularly in departments where a lot of these courses are taught, because I think you have the most experience and knowledge about what these should look like. And that is it for me if there are no questions or comments. Thanks.

**President Van Hoy:** Any questions for Senator Barnes? Okay. Next, we have a report from the Academic Regulations Committee from Dan Compura.

**Dr. Dan Compura:** Hello. Can you hear me, Dr. Van Hoy?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes.

**Dr. Dan Compura:** Okay. We did not get to this last time. This is the proposed revisions to the Academic Dishonesty policy. This came to us I believe at the beginning of the year. Yes, I think it was right at the beginning of the semester, and we reviewed it. This is more of a minor technical revision of an existing policy. Again, this was primarily to split this into policies and procedures. We had a couple of suggestions that we made to the Provost Office. Can you see this okay? Is that showing up fine? I can make it a little bit bigger.

**President Van Hoy:** We can read it pretty well.

**Dr. Dan Compura:** "Any academic work that represents another's contribution as one's own without giving proper credit is academically dishonest. Submitting such work to fulfill academic requirements constitutes plagiarism regardless of how that work was obtained." That is really trying to capture previous language that was referring to people, and we wanted to make it clear that this could be regardless of how it was obtained, also meaning artificial intelligence. We also added a reference to "person or artificial intelligence." "Plagiarizing or representing the words, ideas or information of another person or artificial intelligence program."

Just to kind of clarify, I believe that there is another committee working on the AI policy and I think that is really a good idea. There was some suggested wording here, specifically referencing ChatGPT. We made the suggestion that we should just generically refer to them as artificial intelligence programs. Other than that, we did not have any other suggestions for this. Most of this will go out for 30-day review and of course, today's Senate will have the opportunity to provide some feedback before these go through. Should I go to the procedures, or should I just take a vote on this one, Jerry or do I have to vote on it and just open discussion?

**President Van Hoy:** I don't think there's anything to vote on here.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I think we should be voting on it.

**President Van Hoy:** Oh, okay.

**Past-President Rouillard:** We should see the procedures.

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, we should definitely see the procedures, but I wanted him to first ask if there's any questions or comments about this?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Yes, I do have a question about 'artificial intelligence' because artificial intelligence is a powerful tool to search the literature, to edit what you're writing. It's very helpful for people with certain neurological disabilities. So how do you make sure that whatever you wrote really does prevent people from using it for those purposes?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Well, I believe that would have to be—now, this is just me saying it and not the committee. I believe that has to be the instructor who has to clearly define it for the students as to where that line is drawn. Right now I don't think we have a policy that does that, but that would just be my initial quick take on it. And I certainly don't speak for the University on this, it is much bigger than me.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** So I assume my question is, is it written there in the document that this artificial intelligence is defined by the syllabus? is there any quote that address that the syllables can give some definition about that?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** No. We tried to limit it as passing it off as "one's own work without proper documentation." I do not believe it says that anywhere here.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Does it say it in one of the other procedure documents? Is it addressing the other document associated?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** No, I do not believe it says it there. I will bring that one up in just a minute. But I believe artificial intelligence right now is without a policy, right now I think we are in a dangerous place if we don't. I established one in my syllabus. I know a lot of the English department members do as well. I'd probably defer to Dr. Molitor on this. I don't know if there is a university-wide requirement since I'm on sabbatical this semester. I don't know if there's a university-wide requirement to include an AI policy. I think I would have to defer to Dr. Molitor.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** We do not currently have a university-wide requirement to include a statement on AI in course syllabi. We do have our AI committees which will be kicking off soon and one of the committees will be looking at curriculum issues and another committee will be looking at policies that may be required. So, we can certainly bring that to the attention of those committees to explore that.

**President Van Hoy:** Dr. Compora, there are no changes in the procedures document, though, because this is just a renewal of the policy, right?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** With just the wording added to address artificial intelligence.

**President Van Hoy:** Right. So, faculty are still able, just as before to put artificial intelligence statements in their syllabi. Faculty are the ones who initiate any kind of action here. It's not like it has to be a university case of expulsion. You know, it can be a faculty member telling a student that they appear to use the AI tool that is not allowed in the syllabus.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Yes. That is how I understand it.

**President Van Hoy:** You're pulling up the procedures document?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Yes. I'm trying to get this to align. I'm having some difficulty. My apologies. Really, we didn't make any changes to this. I'll just make the font larger. Can you see that okay, Dr. Van Hoy from where you are?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Okay. The only suggestions that the Provost Office had made to this procedure was the instructor must notify the Register's Office if the course is to be notated as ineligible for grade deletion according to the repeating a course and calculating GPA policy, which we approved last time. The only suggestion I made to this, and my committee agreed with is this particular wording right here. In the previously stated policy, it said a student found to be academically dishonest may appeal according to the Academic Grievance policy. In practice, this almost never happens. It's pretty much instructing the student to go file a grievance immediately against the professor. When typically, the appeal goes first to the faculty member, then the faculty members department chair up to the dean. And so, most of the colleges said that that's the way that their colleges follow the process. So, we made the suggestion. I'm not sure if this has made it into the final draft of the policy that will be sent out for a 30-day review, but this was a suggestion that our committee made.

And I think it's important for me to clarify the role of our committee here. We have no real authority. Our job is really to review these policies as they come to us and we can initiate some, I believe that's something I haven't really addressed yet. But overall, it's just really to give some feedback before these go up to Senate and then after the Senate, these then go to 30-day review. So, while I can suggest and while Faculty Senate can suggest some revisions to these policies, I don't really have the authority to make them. However, I'm more than happy to field suggestions and forward them to the Provost Office and to work with them to make sure that you're feedback is heard. Dr. Van Hoy, did I clarify that well enough? I know this was something we discussed over the past.

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, I think you did a good job.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Okay.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** This is Don Wedding. I got a question for you. Did we do any looking at these types of policies at other universities?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** You know, I was on the committee over the last several years that never finished its work. We have, but this is something I believe has to be looked at again. For various reasons that committee never finished its work. We started in 2018, last year, nothing got done. I believe it needs new

leadership and I believe that we do need a university, a Faculty Senate, Graduate Council joint committee to really clarify. Our policy is very badly out of date. It's not very specific. However, this incremental change to the procedure and the incremental change to adding AI, makes it better than it was yesterday. And, for that reason I think that these are good changes. I do believe more change, but that's just my own personal opinion. You know, I haven't even addressed this with the committee, but I believe that this has been a failed task for several years and I think it's one that absolutely needs to be done. I would like to see it completed this year.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** I'm very concerned with due process and for students. And also at the same time, we cannot have students who feel free to plagiarize or cheat, so it's a tough one. But I do think that if we're going to error, we got to make a mistake on the side of due process on the process guide.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** That's why I put in the section of "appealing to the faculty member's department chair and dean." Because having a student be academic dishonest in a course, through a grievance process, it is very, very cumbersome. Most of the time, at least in my cases, these are resolved with a meeting between me and the student. If it isn't, then it goes to my department chair. In some instances, it occasionally goes to the dean, but I would say not very often, to be honest with you. I think it's just a terrible mistake to just make it a part of an immediate academic grievance because it's not an easy process for students to follow. Again, I don't think that this is a 'be all, end all policy,' but I think it's better than what we had yesterday or what we have today. This is an incremental change in my view.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Dr. Compora, I agree with you that your change to the policy to include artificial intelligence is very good. I'm a little concerned by the language that's added to the procedure. Does the added language that the student may appeal the decision to the faculty member's chair, does that mean that the chair could in fact change that grade?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** You know, this is where my knowledge kind of ends. I believe that the only academic—this is again, I am not sure, but from my understanding, the only academic officer that can change grades would be the provost. But that I could be wrong on that.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I don't think anybody is supposed to be able to change an instructor's grade. I'm wondering can we add some language here that separates the appeal from change of grade? The instructor should be the only one who can change that grade.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Does this mention grade?

**Past-President Rouillard:** No, it doesn't, but I'm anticipating that this is where this could end up.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Sure. Again, just from my experience on the appeals committee, my previous experience there, it's like it's usually for final grades in the course, not necessarily individual papers. But again, I've haven't been on that committee so long ago, I don't even remember when it was. So, I am concerned about this. It seems to me extremely cumbersome for the student. I would ask if you could send me those recommendations or suggested wording and I will make sure that it gets to the decision makers for them to consider before it goes up for 30-day commenting. I'd be more than happy to do that, Linda, and I share your concern. I think that this whole policy needs to be re-worked.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Thank you, Dr. Compora.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** If I may address that? I believe this is part of the Academic Grievance policy. I believe if a chair and/or dean side with the student on the appeal then they can request the instructor to

change the grade. And if the instructor refuses to change the grade, they can have the grade changed. Certainly, the Student Grievance Council, when they side with the student on an appeal, can request the instructor to change the grade and if the instructor refuses to do it, then the chair and/or dean's office will be required to do it.

**Past-President Rouillard:** But they would leave the opportunity for the faculty [member] in this appeal process to change the grade?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Absolutely, yes.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** I agree with Scott on this; however, the Sixth Circuit is clear, a professor cannot be forced to change a grade. That's a matter [where] it becomes the First Amendment Academic Freedom issue in the Sixth Court of Appeals with Tennessee State and the University of Toledo involved cases. However, the administration, the University of Toledo owns the transcript, and the Board of Trustees can change the grade when they want. They will delegate it to the president who delegates it to the provost and so forth. So, you're correct. It is a matter of the..., but to go back to the very beginning, a professor cannot be forced to change a grade.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I completely agree. We request instructors to change the grade and if they refuse, then an administrator will do it.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** That is correct.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Thank you.

**Dr. Dan Compura:** Thank you for that clarification. I did as much research as I could over the few years on this and I could never really ascertain where that power lie. And thank you for the clarification, both Don and Scott.

**Senator McInnis:** Hello Dan. This is Dan McInnis from Art. Thank you for your work on this, and the provost will correct me because he's sitting right here if I get it wrong. But my understanding is there are two subcommittees that are being formed and the AI curriculum subcommittee has three goals. One, examine best practices and resources to ensure our students can competently and comfortably utilize AI based tools. Two, understand acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI based tools in their respective disciplines. And three, disseminate information, resources, and best practices with our faculty. That's the goal. We haven't had a meeting yet, but those are the goals.

**Dr. Dan Compura:** Sure, and I believe this is very much necessary. Again, I don't think that this --- well, I kind of looked at this as this the 'first inning.' We are trying to win the first inning here, not win the world series. If we can make a couple small changes to this policy that at least protects faculty, protects students and protect its academic integrity, so I think these are good changes. They are certainly can move the needle forward. I don't think they move the needle forward enough, but this is the beginning of a long process.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Not to derail the conversation, but the main AI committee is meeting with the subcommittee chairs first to make sure they understand how the process should proceed and then they will be meeting with their subcommittees. So, thank you.

**Senator Barnes:** Dr. Compura, I think the process that you're describing in number five prior to that last sentence is actually—I think it's number five, I can't really see the highlighted part—but I think that's actually in the Academic Grievance policy. So, I think the sentence might be a little misleading in the

sense that the student should appeal to the faculty member, then the chair, then the dean first according to the Grievance policy. That's actually in the policy already - if that makes sense.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Yes, it does. I looked at the policy, and again, I'll admit I did this report a couple weeks ago, so I should look at it again. But I had looked at it before and I was a little unclear. It seemed to me that it kicked them right into an academic grievance. At least the way I read it, it seemed like that, but I can certainly look at that policy again. But if there's any wording changes you'd like to make, I'd be more than happy to forward those on, because at this stage I'm really just reporting on what our committee did. I'm not sure if we vote. Are we voting to endorse these, Dr. Van Hoy? Or just move forward with our suggestions?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, a vote would be to endorse the policy and procedures.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Okay.

**Senator Barnes:** Can I just say one more thing really quickly?

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Absolutely.

**Senator Barnes:** I have heard of administrative grade changes that were not communicated back to the faculty member, a long time ago, a long, long time ago. But I do think it would be good if somewhere in this process there was a cycle that included communicating to the faculty member that the grade had been administratively changed. Just so, you know, I can't imagine a student asking for a letter of recommendation in the circumstance, but the faculty member ought to know that this has happened. Thank you.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** To answer your question, that did happen to me once - a student once failed my class for academic dishonesty and did ask for a letter of recommendation. They had retaken the class though, so.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay, Dan, I think you are in a position to call for a vote.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** I'm just going to ask for those of you who accept our report that these were the suggestions that we made and that you are in agreement with them or if you are not, you are willing to send me some revised wording so that I can pass it on. So all those in favor of our incremental approval of this policy and procedure, please say 'aye' or put yes in the Chat.

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Sounds good, Dr. Van Hoy?

**President Van Hoy:** Let's give people a chance to say nay if they don't approve.

**Dr. Dan Compora:** Oh, I'm sorry. If you do not agree or do not endorse, please say no. If you do not wish to weigh in, please abstain.

**Past-President Rouillard:** While we're waiting for the vote, Dr. Molitor, the policy on course scheduling. I had heard that that had been posted for 30-day comment, even though we had tabled discussion and Faculty Senate. Was that policy removed from 30-day comment?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No, I believe it was posted for 30-day comment. You are welcome to continue the conversation. We gave you the opportunity to provide input on it.

**Past-President Rouillard:** For the record, my opinion is that it is not wise to proceed with public comments if Faculty Senate has not endorsed that policy without at least indicating that Faculty Senate didn't endorse it.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** You are welcome to provide that comment.

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

**President Van Hoy:** Thanks, Past-President Rouillard. It looks like the vote has passed. *Motion Passed.* Okay, we have a half-hour for Provost Molitor to talk about program prioritization.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Thank you. I did have a report. If you don't mind, I'll like to just quickly summarize it and then we can enter the full [report in the Minutes] ---

**President Van Hoy:** It is your time at this point.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I would like to make sure we have time to talk about program prioritization. If it is okay with the Senate, I just want to make sure that the full text of my report gets entered into the Minutes, but I will briefly summarize it.

**[Full Report]** Thank you, Dr. Van Hoy. I hope everyone is having a good semester. I cannot believe Fall Break is next week. I also hope everyone had a chance to participate in some of the Homecoming activities. One of my favorite events is the Homecoming Gala, where each college and the Alumni Association present their distinguished alumni awards. Every year I marvel at the accomplishments of our distinguished alumni. Their amazing stories demonstrate what an impact the educational programs we provide has upon our students.

I should also acknowledge that two of the 2024 awardees have a direct connection with our Faculty Senate. Dr. Amy Thompson, the College of Health and Human Services awardee and current Provost at Wright State University, was a former UToledo Faculty Senate president. Dr. Puneet Sindhvani, a current member of the Faculty Senate, is the recipient of the inaugural UToledo Health Distinguished Alumni Healthcare Provider award. Congratulations to Drs. Sindhvani and Thompson, and to our other awardees. If you have a few moments, I encourage you to visit [toledoalumni.org](http://toledoalumni.org) to learn more about all our awardees.

We discussed several topics at our most recent Academic Leadership Team (ALT) meeting last Friday. I will distribute a recording link from this meeting later this week. One of the topics was phase two of the program prioritization process, which we will discuss later today. Another topic was an outline of our draft student success and engagement plan, presented by Angela Paprocki and Shannon Neumann. To solicit feedback, we will be circulating a draft soon, and Angela and Shannon will be scheduling feedback sessions with various stakeholder groups. As you may recall from the previous Senate meeting, President Schroeder asked each of his senior leaders to provide a list of goals that include updates on progress and quantifiable performance as applicable. I shared details regarding my goals for the upcoming year at the ALT meeting and will provide a link to this document when I distribute the ALT recording link.

We also discussed issues regarding free speech given the ongoing situation in the Middle East and the upcoming election. Students, staff and faculty have the freedom of speech and expression as protected by the First Amendment. However, this right does not extend to conduct that unlawfully violates the rights

of others. We must ensure the safety of our students, staff and faculty, and we must also ensure that such speech does not interfere with the ability of our students to access their educational programs and does not interfere with the ability of our faculty to deliver these programs. You can find more information by entering “expression on campus” in the search box at [utoledo.edu](http://utoledo.edu).

Along these lines, these ongoing situations, along with other events such as the recent hurricane and the impending landfall of the next major storm, have created an inordinate amount of stress, especially for students, staff and faculty that have lost loved ones or have loved ones in harm’s way. I appreciate Dr. Semaan reaching out to me to see if we could remind everyone of the resources that are available, and to make sure we accommodate students that are struggling with these issues where possible to do so. Dr. Spann will be following up with an email sent to all students at the start of the semester to remind them of resources that are available, and I will be following up with an email to faculty asking for consideration when you see students struggling with these or other issues.

Please look out for others, and please take care of yourselves. If you have any concerns about the wellbeing of your students, please do not hesitate to utilize the Report a Concern link at the bottom of our web pages.

On a final note, I would encourage everyone to attend President Schroeder’s State of the University Address next Wednesday October 16<sup>th</sup> at 3 pm in the Student Union Auditorium if you are available to do so. Although the event will be livestreamed and recorded for those that cannot attend in person or have a schedule conflict, please try to attend in person if possible. Thanks again for your time, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Thank you, and now I will transition over to program prioritization unless there are any questions before I move on.

What I am sharing today was discussed at the ALT meeting, so if you missed anything, you may want to go back and look at the recording, that is available as well. The 2nd phase of program prioritization is going to include two parts. It will include a continued look at our offerings to see if there are programs that we should discontinue, and then we will also look at areas for investment, either in existing programs with potential for growth or programs we do not offer. The question I get a lot is why are we looking at reducing programs? The focus on reducing the number of low enrolled course sections, which will then provide the opportunity for a workload reallocation to other programs, delivery of core curriculum courses, improvement of other courses that have higher enrollment, or to areas of research, scholarship, and service. It can also reduce reliance on part-time and visiting instruction.

Over the long term, it can provide us flexibility as we decommission programs and teach them out, then if there is faculty attrition in those areas, this provides us flexibility to not necessarily have to replace faculty in those areas. Then with declining enrollment, if there are restrictions on our budget, that gives us flexibility to reduce expenses, or in a situation where our budget is not declining, it gives us the opportunity to reallocate and invest in other areas. I should also mention that the ODHE is requiring us to do this or at least requiring us to report our efforts in this regard. Every three years we are required to submit a report of low enrolled and duplicate programs and the duplicate programs are programs that we offer in our area along with other schools, namely in this case, Bowling Green. We also must report our actions with respect to low enrolled courses. In the past, this report had been a one-way communication — here are our list of courses, here are our list of duplicate programs, here are our list of low enrolled

programs. Then we would send it off to the state and never hear anything about it. Chancellor Duffey has made it clear that this round is going to be two-way communication. The ODHE is expecting to hear from us what we have done since the last report submitted in September 2022. Then we will be circling back with us three years from now when we suggest these are actions we need to take to make sure that we have taken the actions that we are proposing. This is something that the ODHE is going to be taking a much closer to look at and regulating moving forward.

How do we want to move forward then with these two processes? I will start with the reduction process for a lack of better term, and then I will talk about the investment process. We are at a stage where we identified another 26 programs in addition to the programs that we identified for closure last year. This additional 26 programs were going to be investigated to determine what actions we will take. We will provide data to the colleges, showing the list of your programs that were identified, and then we will also provide informational resources that they can access, in particular regarding low enrolled courses associated with those programs. There will be three options provided in this process. Option number one is to close the program and provide a teach out plan. Option number two will be to modify the program to eliminate or reduce the number of low enrolled courses that are associated with it. I do not necessarily mean to ‘eliminate’ courses specifically, but if you are going to retain courses that are low enrolled, what is the plan to increase enrollment in those courses? Option three is to justify the retention of the program as is.

To justify the retention of the program as is, you will need to provide information about the potential for increasing enrollment or how did that program contributes to supporting other programs that may have higher enrollment. For example, in a graduate program that produces teaching assistants for an undergraduate program, that is a potential justification for why we would want to retain that program. Or, if the program is contributing to the research or scholarship mission of the institution, such as externally funded research, or to other aspects of service to our university mission. We would also ask for supporting data, including other resources that are being provided to the programs. The email I will send out will have information about dashboards, in addition to the low enrolled courses dashboard, that can be accessed to provide some supporting information. We are looking at a new vendor to provide us with external information that a lot of universities use for evaluating the viability of programs. This includes a lot of information on the job market, on enrollment trends, and I suspect there might be some financial information as well. I will be participating in a webinar next week to see what is available. I hope to provide some information on that as soon as possible.

I will also say that there could be a combination of the last two options, we are going to modify some of the program, but we need to retain the program and some of the low enrolled courses associated with the program. Regarding the timeline—I will have data and the information on the process out to the colleges before the end of this week. I am requesting the colleges to determine which option they are going to pursue with each of the programs on their list, and then provide the additional information required, if the option is to either modify the program or to retain the program as is. We are going to give the colleges roughly two months to work on this, and we would like those responses provided to us by the end of the fall semester. Then I would like to convene a university-wide committee to review these to provide recommendations. That committee structure is still to be determined. I will certainly consult with Faculty Senate and with the Graduate Council regarding representation and the makeup of that committee. That committee review will then occur during January and February of 2025 with recommendations and

decisions from my office by the end of February 2025. Does anyone have questions on the reduction process?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** You said in your introduction statement that other universities are also required to go through this process. I recall our president last year being proud to say that we are the only university that goes through this extent to do this change at that level. I wonder if it was taken into consideration that a massive process like that takes so much energy from faculty. So, instead of focusing on the most pressing thing right now, really helping students to succeed so the enrollment can increase, instead we're going through this process. As there's a lot of things that need to be done here, this plan diverges our energy from this very importation mission.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I appreciate that. It certainly sucks a lot of my time and energy as well and so, I can appreciate it <laughter>. The ODHE announcement about the statewide interest in these processes, this was just announced to the IUC presidents and provosts at our recent meeting. So, this idea that the ODHE is going to be involved in this just came out. And so, I think a lot of other institutions have already been looking at similar processes, but now are certainly going to be required to do so.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** So maybe a follow up question is how do you make sure that these processes that we are continuing with do not interfere with enrollment, do not take all the energy from---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I appreciate that and yes, I understand there are two points to this observation. It is not only the process itself and the time that takes, but then we will be making decisions about programs that potentially could affect enrollment down the road as well. The first part, yes, I want to make sure this process is as streamlined as possible. I do not want to have colleges be required to submit pages and pages of information because number one, that takes a lot of their time and effort and then the people who are going to be reviewing it will also take a lot of time and effort. I would like to make sure that this is as a concise process as possible. Keep in mind that the review of these 26 programs will provide the basis for an ongoing process. I am envisioning what we are doing this year is going to help us determine a process that we will use moving forward in future years. We need to continuously look at our program offerings. The world is changing. There are new disciplines coming in, [and] there are disciplines that may not have the demand that they used to have. I would like to make sure that the amount of time and effort that is devoted to this process is of the overall conversation to make sure we can set up a process moving forward that we can utilize regularly, but at the same time, does not require a huge amount of time and effort.

**President Van Hoy:** You have a hand up online. Senator Miner, go ahead.

**Senator Miner:** Thank you. Thank you, Provost Molitor. So my question is kind of twofold. You're talking about 26 programs that are replete with very good, very smart faculty, dedicated faculty. So, part of my question is, this isn't a simple review in my opinion of programs and whether or not they're either still relevant or attractive to students. There is a human impact that is part of this, and I'm wondering what is the University's sort of stance on that is and how that dedication on the part of those faculty is going to be dealt with frankly, by the university.

And the second part of my question is, you're talking about a very specific number of programs that are being reviewed. Does the University, and I don't know if you can share this or not, but does the University have a certain percentage of those programs that will be retained, which will meet whatever benchmark and has already been established? I'm sure there are many conversations that have gone on

and, you know, we're being as transparent at the University, and I understand that. But I don't think for a moment that the faculty or maybe even higher, deans etc., know everything that's going on. So, is there anything you can share in terms of what is going to be enough?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** To your second question and if I am misinterpreting this, please correct me. Are you asking if there is a specific target in terms of the programs we have?

**Senator Miner:** Yes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** The answer from me is no, we do not have a specific number. We are looking at programs to see if they are sustainable or not. And that is not necessarily in terms of a specific number. If enrollment continues to decline, then we probably need to continue to look at offerings to reduce. If enrollment starts increasing, then we may need to look at where our offerings we need to invest in or add. I suspect the ideal number of programs aligns with the overall enrollment, but there is no specific metric to say we must have certain average of enrollment per program.

**Senator Miner:** Well, it was more from an economic standpoint. Is there, because all of this honestly goes back to a bottom line, and is there an idea that if we can cut 'this amount,' we're going to get ourselves closer to being in the black? And so that's what I was asking about. But I also, and I know you haven't had a chance to answer Provost Molitor, so forgive me, but my concern is for faculty and the alum of programs and how those faculty will be not mothballed, but how they will be treated in this process.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** That is a great point and I think that must be part of the conversation. When you are talking about closing a program, what is it that the faculty are already doing? How can they be reallocated? And if there is a program where all the faculty there can do is deliver these low enrolled courses, then yes, it does not necessarily make sense to get rid of that program, unless there are other things that those faculty can do. I think that has got to be the information that is a part of the responses I get from the individual colleges about the disposition of the programs.

**Senator Miner:** So the last thing I will say and I'll mute myself, is that people are sort of race horses in that we have our areas of knowledge and of expertise and we're not interchangeable.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator Miner:** I think that's really an important thing to keep in mind. And if we're worried about bettering the human condition, I really want to advocate that some of that human capital is us, the faculty. So, thank you.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** That is a great point. I also want to make it clear that options that could be available, for example, when we say either close a program or modify it, an option may be, could part of the program be converted to a minor or a certificate? Those are certainly options as well in terms of dealing with the workload issue.

**Senator Miner:** Thank you, Provost Molitor.

**Senator Barnes:** I just wanted to ask about the 26 programs and the options because my department was one of the ones that were put in a modify category last year. Are we back on the 26 or are we still---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No, we are not on the 26. Those decisions have already been made.

**Senator Barnes:** Those are moving forward with the process?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator Barnes:** Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** And then Senator Eichner has a question online.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Sure. Go ahead, Holly.

**Senator Eichner:** Hi there. [I] just kind of had more of, I wanted to put it out there. I met with a family today and I just think we need to be really careful as we continue with these processes because one of the questions that one of the parents had was, if my student who is currently enrolled in BG is thinking about transferring to UT to the Recreation Therapy program, and he said, if my student does that, what's the chance the program's actually going to be here in four years because I keep seeing programs closing? And I, you know, gave him assurance and that kind of thing, but I think because this happens very publicly, it does cause kind of this backlash where we're trying to get enrollment up and I think it leaves people feeling uncertain. So, although I understand the importance of getting to the right place with programs, I think we also need to keep that in mind as far as how it looks when we're recruiting.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No, and I appreciate that comment. I think that is a valid concern, absolutely. The rumor mill and inaccurate information can circulate pretty quickly in that regard as well. That is an important point.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** I have some points. Number one, Gordan Gee who did all the cuts at West Virginia. It turns out according to Chronicles that this did not make much of an impact. It costs a lot of programs, a lot of faculty got pushed out, but at the end of the day, it did not make much of a hit in their budget. I think it was \$70M. Our academic budget here represented by the general fund has shown a surplus since 2012. That is shown in both the Huron report, and it is also data that I've collected which was available from the Board from 2019 on. So, we are showing a surplus in the academic budget with the general fund. It's about \$400 million in revenues. The faculty represents (only the tenured faculty and lecturers) only about 15 or 20 % of that budget. We are not a big factor in the cost of this University. The cost of this University is elsewhere, in the general fund and elsewhere it's. I won't throw athletics at you, and I won't throw a hospital, but I will throw administration, and we do have a problem there. We have a problem with the administration being both expensive and not always the best in leadership.

The third thing is faculty should be involved in any process that is going to shutdown programs. As a university, we need to have programs that are low enrolled. I mean, that is what we're doing We're teaching. And frankly, these programs that are low enrolled also are not that costly. I don't understand the cost formula here that's used, if there's one at all. And I think that's my point.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I want to address two of the comments you made. First of all, on the budget issue, I do not see this saving us money immediately, but what I do see is the opportunity to reallocate resources. This idea of when there is faculty attrition - if we are still delivering a program, even if it is low enrolled and a faculty member leaves, then we need to hire somebody to teach those courses, right? If we work on discontinuing these programs that are low enrolled and then there is faculty attrition, then we can reallocate those resources to other areas that may be growing, that may be garnering more enrollment. I have deans coming to me saying I need more faculty in their areas. And some of the requests I get are in areas that could potentially grow and garner more enrollment, but I do not have the resources to do it.

That is the problem. This idea that programs are 'inexpensive' - again, delivering low enrolled courses, that is a chunk of a faculty members workload. If I can put a faculty member somewhere else, that either has higher enrollments or working on other things that could generate more enrollment and more revenue, then that is something that would improve our financial sustainability.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** One more piece of data. The lecturers on this campus represent, according to Huron and we've checked it, 53% of pay. the FTEs on campus.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Teaching FTEs?

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** Yes. They're the workhorse to this campus and they represent approximately, \$9 million dollars in total revenue. I think that's salary, that's 34 % more for their benefits. So, we don't have a cost driver or at least that part of it.

The other area that surprises me is getting rid of part-time faculty. You've heard that song, song. I don't understand it. A lot of these part-time faculty are coming in here and working at very, very low pay and they are doing it because they love the work. They are doing it because they got an expertise that we don't have on campus, and they do a good job, and they are doing it for low pay. I don't know why we would ever want to get rid of a part-time faculty who brings a lot to the party. I don't understand it.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** To that point, you are correct; I would agree that we have many cases of part-time faculty that we need because they bring expertise that we do not necessarily have in our full-time faculty, and that, we are not trying to eliminate. But there are other areas where we do have to hire part-time faculty, where we have the faculty expertise. We just don't have enough faculty expertise to cover those sections.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** All right, the last point I'll make, and I'll try to shut up, is [regarding] Article 19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Tenured Track which protects both tenured track and lecturers because under their Article 27, I think it is, flows back into our Article 19. You just can't get rid of tenured faculty on this campus by abolishing their positions.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** That is absolutely correct.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** It's a tough one, and of course---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Let me let me answer that. You can lay off lecturers if there is no teaching for them. But I am looking at the program where lecturers are teaching, and I cannot even imagine that happening at this point. I cannot see any ability to offload full-time faculty that we currently employ, whether they be tenure track or lecturers. The only ability we are going to have is the natural attrition when faculty resign or retire, then we can make decisions as to whether we need to replace those faculty or not.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** The average salary, I talked to Larry Kelly on this. The average salary for tenure, tenured track on this campus is \$136 thousand. The average for lecturers is \$66 thousand. But if you take out the high pay pharmacy, they are around \$63-\$64 thousand. And the only way you can get rid of a lecturer is as you pointed out, is under Article 8.6.1. They tried that at one college to not only layoff the faculty but replace her with graduate students and we won in arbitration on that one. They tried to replace a lecturer under that Article 8.6., and you didn't do it, but somebody else did. I'm really upset with that one, but we were able to prevail for the lecturers.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes. And knowing that history, I have no plans to pursue that article at this time.

**Dr. Donald Wedding:** Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** You can go over.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No other questions online? We have a few more minutes left.

**President Van Hoy:** We can go over a few minutes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** That was the reduction process, now I want to talk about the investment process. This will be looking at two different areas. Either existing programs that have the potential to grow, or new areas that we do not currently offer, but may be worth investing in offering those areas. We will again be asking the colleges to provide us proposals as to one of these two areas, and will provide the same data that we are utilizing for the reduction process, trends on enrollment in our region, workforce trends, etc. We will also request information about potential costs- what would be the amount of investment that would be required, and what would be the projected return on investment? Hopefully we are going to have some access to some good data that will allow us to make some accurate projections in that regard.

One of the areas we need to look at is what I call cannibalization. For example, we bring up a new program -- and I am going to pick on my friend David [Giovannucci] back there with the new neuroscience program, which has seen some significant growth in enrollment since we started. However, we have also seen a decrease in enrollment in the Biological Sciences program, which was expected because we knew some of the biology students would be interested in neuroscience. That is all well and good, but the question is, what was the net effect? Did we end up seeing a net increase in students in bringing this new program? There are other examples of programs like this that we have introduced that have been successful in garnering enrollment, but I suspect have been drawing at least some of that enrollment from other existing programs. I think that is an important issue that we need to look at and analyze. We know you cannot predict what will happen exactly, but I want some informed conversations about potential for that kind of draw of enrollment from other programs. I will also ask colleges, and I know this probably is not going to be very popular, but if colleges want to forward multiple priorities for investment, I would like them to determine a ranking – what is most important as far as they are concerned. Not necessarily that we will always go with the first choice and not consider lower choices when we go through our review process, but we do want to know what the college sees as its top priorities.

This information will go to this university wide committee, and after they complete their work in January and February on the review of programs for reduction, then they will, through March and April do a review on these proposals for investment. At this point, we will also know more about enrollment and budget for the upcoming years so that will help determine the overall amount of money that may be involved or could be allocated for investment decisions. Those recommendations and decisions will be made by the end of Spring 2025.

Again, I want to set up a process that is not just a one-time occurrence; this needs to be an ongoing process where we are always looking at programs that we potentially need to walk away from and other areas or programs we should invest in. Again, this process will not only be to look at these 26 programs

currently under exploration, and to look at areas of investment immediately, but [it] will also help us to solidify this process for future cycles. Any additional questions?

**President Van Hoy:** I have a question.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes?

**President Van Hoy:** Just two questions. One, when will this new vendor and their data be available, right? Because if we only have two months, at least for the first set of decisions. Then second, will there be directives from the Provost Office to deans about faculty involvement in these conversations?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** In terms of the vendor, I do not know if it would be available in time for the reduction process, but I am almost positive it would be available in time for the investment process.

Yes, I will be asking deans to make sure there is faculty involvement. I do not want to set up a specific number and percentage, but I will ask the deans to make sure that there is faculty involvement in these conversations. Keep in mind this is going to be reviewed by a university-wide committee, and I will be working with Faculty Senate and Grad Council to make sure we have adequate faculty representation on that committee as well.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** There are questions in the Chat.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** [Question from W. Cochrane] “Were the 26 programs named at the last ALT, or is this information only to be known later this week when the list of 26 is sent to the college deans?” Those programs were actually circulated to Faculty Senate and Grad Council last year.

**President Van Hoy:** And I think the college deans.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** And the college deans. I will make sure I send that list back out to Faculty Senate/ Grad Council, in addition to circulating to the colleges.

**President Van Hoy:** I think there’s a question above it too.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Sure. [Question from O. Mahasin] “Are we doing anything to retain faculty and alleviate the high attrition rate?” I know that is a great point and this goes back to the lack of resources to invest, so I am hoping that we can start turning things around in terms of our enrollment decline and in terms of balancing our expenses with our revenues so we can start having the opportunities to keep faculty. We have been, and deans have been able to make counter offers to faculty who have received offers elsewhere and we have retained a few of those, not all of them unfortunately. But yes, I think this again relates to that idea of not having adequate resources to invest.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** My one question about the investment: there was several programs that were created or invested in the last couple of years, but always this investment was very minimal. So my question is, would it be better to strengthen those investments, so they actually can be successful rather than open new ones that’s a lot of work?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I think that is a very valid point. That is something we would certainly want to take into consideration when we are reviewing these recommendations. Thank you for mentioning that.

**President Van Hoy:** Any more questions?

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** Yes, I have a question.

**President Van Hoy:** Go ahead.

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** Along those similar lines Scott, what kind of timeline do you give when you reinvest? You know, you make course modifications, maybe there's marketing dollars, there's changes that need to be marketed. So, what kind of timeline then do you use to assess whether reinvestment has been successful or not?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Are you talking about programs that we are modifying to retain or programs we are investing in?

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** Well, presumably even if you're investing in them, there might be some strategies to increase enrollment through modification.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Regarding the investment, we are going to ask the programs about the timeline for investment. We are also asking for projected costs and returns on that investment. Presumably there will be what we call a proforma where you show over the course of a few years what the projected enrollment is, what the projected revenue is, and what the projected increases in expenses would be.

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** Okay, thank you.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Did I answer your question?

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** Yes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Okay.

**President Van Hoy:** Any other questions?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Thank you.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Provost Molitor. All right, very quickly, are there any items from the floor?

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** I did have one question.

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, go ahead.

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** This is Colleen Quinlan from the College of Nursing again. Something came up at our council meeting about the idea of the scheduling of classrooms. A committee had made a recommendation about excluding some of the rules from clinical courses that have to depend on community partners, and the faculty senators thought that the Senate had not endorsed that exclusion and so it was left, I think, tabled.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Colleen, this is Scott. The policy is posted for 30-day comment, so if you want to enter that comment into the policy comment posting process, I am happy to look at that and take it into consideration.

**Dr. Colleen Quinlan:** Okay, because it was my understanding that a Faculty Senate committee made that recommendation as well, and so I thought it was a little further than just individual comments.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I cannot answer that.

**President Van Hoy:** I'm seeing heads in the room shaking no, so we're not sure. But you would want to look at the posted policy to see what's actually in it. Any other items from the floor? Is there a motion to adjourn?

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Deborah Coulter-Harris  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary