

**UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 22, 2024**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>**

Approved @ FS on 11/05/2024

---

---

**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:** Allred, Avidor-Reiss, Barnes, Bellizzi, Benton, Brakel, Chakravarti, Cheng, Cioc, Cochrane, Coulter-Harris, Dagostino-Kalinz, Diakonova, Dwyer, Eichner, Ekwenna, Elgafy, Ervin, Gilstrap, Giovannucci, Harnych, Heberle, Herrera, Howard, Javaid, Kalinoski, Kaw, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Kumar, Lapitsky, Lee, McInnis, McLoughlin, Miner, Moussa, Nigem, O'Connell, Osman, Padilla, Pryor, Reinert, Rouillard, Sahloff, Scheuermann, Semaan, Sheng, Sindhwani, Sucheck, Sun, J. Taylor, Van Hook, Van Hoy, Willey, Yonker

**Excused Absence:** Bigioni, Gilstrap, Johnson, Schaefer, T. Smith

**Unexcused Absence:** W. Taylor

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

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you so much.

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

**President Van Hoy:** Hello, everyone. The first order of business is to adopt the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda?

**Senator Semaan:** So moved.

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

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Avidor-Reiss. Okay, all those in favor of adopting the agenda online, please put yes, no or abstain in the Chat. In the room, all those in favor say, 'aye.'

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy:** Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none. *Approval of Agenda Passed.* Alright, the second order of business is approval of the October 08, Faculty Senate Minutes. Is there a motion to approve the Minutes?

**Senator Semaan:** So moved.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Semaan. Is there a second?

**Senator Heberle:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senator Heberle. Are there any corrections or comments about the Minutes? Okay, hearing none. [I'm] happy to vote. Online, please put yes, no, or abstain in the Chat. In the room, please say 'aye' if you approve.

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy:** Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none. Thank you, everyone. *Motion Passed.*

So, onto the **Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report:** As I'm sure you know from the news, the Board of Trustees is launching a national search for a permanent university president. The Board of Trustees is hoping to have the permanent president in-place before the provost candidates have campus interviews.

**Group of Senators:** What?

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** So, this means if all things go according to plan, the permanent president will choose the next permanent provost, which tells you a little bit, without knowing the actual timeline, what the search timelines must look like, right?

The resolution in favor of a national search for university president adopted by Senate at our October 8, 2024 meeting will be available in the minutes and in the resolution archive on the Faculty Senate website.

Please note that the Course Scheduling Policy was posted for the 30-day comment period last week. If you have concerns about this policy, be sure to leave comments on the policy website.

As he promised to do at the last Senate meeting, Interim Provost Molitor has shared with the Executive Committee the memo he sent to deans describing the program prioritization process for this year and identifying the 26 programs marked for review to be modified or discontinued. The Faculty Senate office is sent that email to all faculty today to help make the process as transparent as possible. Dean Seigar in NSM contacted me to say that the MS in Geology should be on the list that was circulated.

The Faculty Senate office has received several concerns from faculty researchers that they do not have space on the university website to display their current research results. This can be a problem when seeking grants from funding agencies or recruiting new students. The Executive Committee met with Kathleen Walsh, Director of Web Development and invited her to give a presentation to Senate on December 3 to begin a discussion about what is possible and permissible on the university's website.

Several faculty have also alerted the Executive Committee that student study abroad travel funds are no longer being offered by the Center for International Studies and Programs (CISP). Faculty are concerned because the funds are believed to be funded by student fees and can make it possible for students to afford to study abroad. Past President Rouillard discussed this issue with Sammy Spann, who reported that he had no control over it. I have discussed it with both Interim Provost Molitor and Interim President Schroeder. The Interim President was concerned that something funded by student fees would be swept and said he would investigate it. He also said the university should help students with study abroad funding. President Elect Avidor-Reiss will follow-up with Interim President Schroeder this week.

Last, but not least, senators should have received an invitation and a reminder to sign up to attend the November 20 UToledo v. Ohio State football game.

**Senator Heberle:** It's Ohio University.

**President Van Hoy:** Oh, you know what? I had it right here [in my EC report]. Thank you, Senator Heberle for the correction. **Executive Committee report cont'd:** Only a small number of senators have signed up to request their free tickets for our box seats. Please take a moment now to request your ticket to the game.

Thank you for the correction, everyone. Alright, are there any questions or more corrections on the Executive Committee report?

**President Van Hoy cont'd:** So, don't forget to sign up for the UToledo v. Ohio University game.

**Senator Herrera:** How do we sign-up?

**Senator Heberle:** There's an email.

**President Van Hoy:** We sent an email with both the flier and a link. You know what? If you don't have it or you can't find it, or it went to your Spam folder, just email the Faculty Senate Office and we will add you to the list.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Is it here?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** In the President's Box.

**President Van Hoy:** It's a home game. I don't think we have the ability to get tickets for other games and box seats. Good question, though. It is just so close to Thanksgiving; I know for some people that would be an issue. You know, come anyways. It's for us. Alright, moving along. It's time for Interim Provost Molitor's report.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I am sure I will have somebody suggest a correction for me as well.

**President Van Hoy:** I swear, UToledo v. Ohio University was right in front of me.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Thank you, Dr. Van Hoy. Just a brief report today. I hope everyone had a great fall break last week, and I hope you had the chance to attend President Schroeder's State of the University Address when you returned on Wednesday. If you did not have the chance to participate in-person or livestream, I would encourage you to watch the recording online.

Just a few quick updates on some ongoing initiatives. Angela Paprocki and Shannon Neumann have been meeting with various stakeholder groups to provide details and receive feedback on the student success plan. They have or are working to schedule a meeting with Faculty Senate leadership. If you are interested in participating in a stakeholder meeting, please let Angela know. On a related note, we are moving toward implementation of centralized advising. We have hired Adam Hintz as our university advising administrator and are working to hire three advising managers to oversee various areas. We are in the process of hiring new advisors to replace advisors that have left UToledo, and we are in the process of onboarding these new advisors under the new advising structure.

I have also distributed the list of low enrolled programs to the colleges to explore for the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of program prioritization. I also shared this information, along with details regarding the review process, with Faculty Senate and Graduate Council leadership. I believe this was forwarded to all faculty earlier

today. We are in the process of developing a process to review areas for investment with the goal of soliciting proposals during the Spring 2025 semester.

As part of the low enrolled program review, we shared a PowerBI dashboard developed by Institutional Research to identify low enrolled courses. In preparation for our low enrolled course report due to the ODHE early next Fall 2025, I have requested that all the deans review this dashboard to identify their low enrolled courses regardless of whether they have programs on the list to explore. We will be required to provide a follow up report on the results of our actions to increase enrollment in these courses or to reduce the number of low enrolled courses.

On a final note, this Thursday at 3:30 pm we will be hosting our annual promotion and tenure reception for all tenured and tenure-track faculty that received tenure and/or were promoted at the beginning of this academic year. The event will be held in room 1005 of Carlson Library. Thanks again for your time, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** Has there been studies made of how these course reductions will impact overall enrollment or even specific enrollment in various departments? Has there been any enrollment study at all made on these courses?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** On the low-enrolled courses in terms of---?

**Dr. Don Wedding:** Well, you got 26 courses.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Oh, 26-degree programs.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** Yes. What studies have been done to show that what impact this will have on our student enrollment overall?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** We do not have any specific information on that. What should happen with these 26 programs is the individual colleges are going to provide us information about the programs, whether we should discontinue the programs, whether we should modify them in some fashion or justification for continuing. If there is perceived to be a significant impact on enrollment, that would certainly be a justification for continuing.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** The second question is, what about cost reduction? West Virginia did this and it did not impact their deficit.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Correct.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** What impact will these have on our costs?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Immediately we anticipate they will have little or no impact on our costs. If there is part-time or visiting instruction associated with the program. That is an exception. In the short term, you have the opportunity to reallocate faculty workload to other things. And then over the long term, when there is faculty attrition, if the program is no longer being offered, then you are not obligated to replace the faculty in those areas to continue teaching out of it. It is more of a long-term strategy.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** I feel badly for you and the president of having to implement this, because I think that the people behind it—people, called the Board of Trustees—who are the most clueless people on this campus.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Well---

**Dr. Don Wedding:** And you didn't say that. I did.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Professor Wedding, what I will tell you is every time I go to an IUC Provost meeting, this is one of the regular topics of conversation. Almost every public institution in Ohio is undergoing this process. It is not just us.

**Dr. Don Wedding:** No, I get that. I read the Chronicles.

**Senator Semaan:** I think President Van Hoy did mention that the scheduling policy has been posted for 30-day comment. I do believe when we discussed this before, we suggested to get student's feedback. Was there any effort to get any feedback from the students?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, we talked to Student Government, and they will be collecting some feedback and posting it during the comment process.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Linda Rouillard has a question online.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Sure.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Provost Molitor, Professor Wedding asked you about studies that would look at the impacts of cutting these programs, impacts on lost revenue, impacts on enrollment. Are you charging the deans with doing those studies and doing that modeling?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** If they want to provide that as justification for continuing the program, yes.

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

**Senator Pryor:** So maybe this is just an observation, but it is balanced by something I think of. If a course in every university college is seeking consultants from the outside that run on the same ideological models of revamping universities to remaking them, it's no surprise the same language and the same things are happening across the country to solutions to very real problems geographically, financially, etc. I did think I heard, though, and I hope it is true that for those department units on the list, there is opportunity to just say, for instance, that the value of the liberal arts, the enduring values may not easily be captured simply in this economic model of efficiencies etc.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Understood.

**Senator Pryor:** And it might be an appalling thought for instance, not to have foreign languages, philosophy upon which the theoretical models of all the disciplines at the university are built.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I appreciate that but realize that a four-year degree program is not the only way to deliver that kind of instruction. Another consideration is what are the alternatives to deliver this curriculum that may have a more far-reaching impact on our student body?

**Senator Pryor:** Just the rejoinder is that it's not simply about teaching, but also being pulled in for grants. Like right now I have the privilege of working with several members and engineering on grants that need some philosophic expertise. So if we are all teaching more and more sections, particularly outside of areas of expertise, it makes it harder to function as a university with these very important areas of expertise.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, I think that is somewhat the point of getting rid of low enrolled courses. It is removing these courses from workloads so faculty can be reallocating their time to other things.

**Senator Pryor:** If it makes...

**Interim Provost Molitor:** If it makes sense to do so.

**Senator Pryor:** One of the disturbing trends I see is, despite its real attempts to be transparent which I think we're all thankful for...when it comes to this idea of faculty consultation or what...the administrators making the decisions have any clue about how we're trained, what we do, it makes us often feel interchangeable, because without any appreciation that says, if I went into a different discipline and said, oh you know you can teach without any sense of nuance. So this is a deep concern as far as what we're doing for our students, but then also our functioning on day to day operations, writing grants...

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Understood, and I appreciate that comment.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Jami Taylor has a question and then Barbara Miner.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** And then I think Dr. Brakel [who is sitting] in the back. Go ahead, Dr. Taylor.

**Senator J. Taylor:** I'm kind of in the dashboard right now and I'm looking at some of the data in here, and I'm concerned that we're not getting necessarily good information. I'm looking at one of the programs I'm affiliated with, the occupational title for Public Administration, the MPA program, right? It says that we're matched with urban and regional planning, and it's not even what we do. That's a separate program. Can we do something to check the data?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Which tab are you looking at? Are you looking at the workforce, enrollment or ---

**Senator J. Taylor:** Yes, where you go in and look at the CIP codes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** This information is taken from a federal website that does a crosswalk between CIP codes which are associated with curriculum, and SOC codes which stands for Standard Occupational Codes. The crosswalk that associates the academic program to the employment classification. If there are comments on that, I would be happy to take them forward. I am not quite sure where to submit them, but I believe it is a collaboration between the Department of Education and the Bureau of Labor and Statistics.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Yes, it is just kind of concerning. We don't do that, but one of the things we do is management and that's not even listed there.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Okay.

**Senator J. Taylor:** That is kind of where the degree is.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I am glad you raised that point. You may notice in that tab there is a way to look up occupational categories. If you feel like your students are graduating and doing something in a different classification that is not listed and tied directly to your program, you are welcome to provide information on that.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Alright, thanks.

**Senator Barnes:** Provost Molitor, do you provide it there or who do you provide it to?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** This is part of the justification that---

**President Van Hoy:** Excuse me. Also, people when you speak, please identify yourselves for the recording.

**Senator Barnes:** Do you enter it into the dashboard or do you----?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** No. You are taking information from the dashboard and then putting that into the justification that you are submitting.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay. So, if we have an issue with the CIP code, put it into our justification?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, and indicate that you believe these employment classification categories should also be reviewed.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Who is next?

**President Van Hoy:** Barbara Miner.

**Senator Miner:** Hi, thank you for taking my question. I am, Provost Molitor looking at your email that was shared with us about midway through. Part of the areas is we work through this phase of program prioritization, blah, blah, blah. I was trying to move myself forward. So, number three says, "provide flexibility and replacing fulltime faculty when attrition occurs." You also just mentioned that with these prioritizations, I'm assuming you mean the dean is not obligated to replace faculty in the programs as we move forward if they are being looked at, which I understand that. But that to me implies what I have experienced over the last umpteen years, almost a hiring freeze. Does this indicate almost a loosening of the hiring freeze? Does this mean that programs are able to have hope that there will be additional faculty available or am I missing your point? Thank you.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I believe that is the point. The question is when will we reach the ability to start making decisions that we can replace faculty that we are losing? We are still in the process of trying to get our revenues in line with our expenses. We are not quite there yet. We have made some significant strides. And hopefully we do get to the point where enrollment and revenue generated from enrollment balances the expenditures among other things. There are other sources of revenue and expenses here at the institution. But we do not want to make decisions to replace faculty based on commitments to teach low-enrolled programs. The idea is those faculty lines could be reallocated to other areas that are potentially growing. That is the basis of the idea.

**Senator Miner:** I understand that, and I just want to follow-up briefly. The budget structure that was rolled out a couple of years ago has been morphed and has been, you know, the hope for balancing mechanism has not happened yet. And I understand there are lots of things affecting that. But I'm wondering if there is a projection about when some of this is going to stabilize. I'm sure you would hope it was yesterday, but I'm looking at this, thinking about our program and trying to figure out next moves, but I would love little bit more concrete information about benchmarks that you feel or that you can share with us that indicate an accomplishment along those lines.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** That is a great point. I would have to think about that. There are a couple questions in there. Number one, when are we going to get there? And number two, what kind of information we have that we are making progress towards getting there? Does that accurately sum-up what you are saying?

**Senator Miner:** Well, yes. I always get excited, Provost Molitor if I'm trying to lose weight and if I get one pound down - I'm really excited. I've got a goal of 40 pounds, but you know what? I got one down and I can show myself that accomplishment. I just would like to feel like I've got some tangible benchmarks about what it is we're after here. It will make my stick-to-itiveness easier and more palatable. So, you know, as we're all moving through this difficult time, I would love to hear about some wins. And, you know, to be snarky, one of the wins is not that we have the highest paid football coach in the 'whatever' league we're in. So I don't consider being at the top of that chart a win necessarily. So, thank you.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Fair point. I will certainly take that under consideration and see what I can do. I agree with what you are saying in terms of the ability to show progress. Dr. Brakel?

**Senator Brakel:** Just to comment. Last week Senator Cirino, our good friend with Senate Bill 83 had a summit with the Board of Trustees from across the state. He's been doing this now for the last couple of years, a month. During that summit, it was stated either by him or Matt Huffman who's currently the Senate Speaker who is going over to the House and will probably be—there's a good chance—the House Speaker. It was stated that if universities do not cut the programs, the legislature will.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I have not heard that. That has not been communicated with the IUC provosts. Thank you for passing that along.

**President Van Hoy:** There's a question in the Chat that's been waiting and then two more online.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** [Chat Box Question] "When you suggest workload reallocation. How will this be done and who decide what courses I will teach?" That process is well established in our Collective Bargaining Agreement. This is determined by department chairs and then that process flows up through the Dean's Office and ultimately to the Provost Office. I would refer to you to Article 10 of the tenured and tenure track collective bargaining agreement track process.

**Senator Revathy:** I do have a follow-up question. And that is, based upon the list that was sent, I was wondering what happens if graduate courses are cancelled. Will the faculty have to teach all undergraduate courses?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** That is a possibility. Your workload could be all undergraduate courses. I am sure there are many faculty who teach exclusively undergraduate courses and there are faculty who teach exclusively graduate courses, and I am sure there are faculty who teach a mix.

**Senator Revathy:** Thank you.

**Past-President Rouillard:** I think part of your answer to Dr. Pryor faded out a bit. She was talking about the importance of liberal art courses and what happens if those courses disappear. And then I heard you at some point say something to the effect of, well, maybe, you know, these are not the best way to deliver these courses. Did I miss something in between?



**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, I was talking about four-year degree programs.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** You do not necessarily have to have the four-year degree programs to deliver the curriculum, and perhaps there are other ways like minors or certificates to reach a wider audience.

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

**Senator Barnes:** I just want to ask about a process. We had a graduate certificate that was largely just paying customers, trying to get certified to teach women's studies. Some of them were from other universities, faculty members from other universities etc. That certificate was put in storage or whatever--

-

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, it was put on suspension.

**Senator Barnes:** That has affected our upper-level course enrollment negatively because the courses were cross listed. So they had different numbers, right? It was a 5000-level number and a 4000-level number, but it was the same; the students were actually doing extra work, common practice here in small programs. And so, what I want to know is, is there a process for asking for reconsideration because we're attempting to work on the enrollment in those courses and this decision has actually negatively affected some of our upper-level courses?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** A process on reconsideration on a certificate?

**Senator Barnes:** Yes. Who do I talk to? I mean, I asked Dan Hammel in the hallway, but that's probably not the most effective way.

**President Van Hoy:** You're going to want to repeat that.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** The question was, if a certificate had been inactivated that is potentially affecting enrollment in upper-level courses, is there a process to bring back a certificate? Absolutely there is a process. You would have to have that discussion with your dean. I do not know the story of why the certificate was inactivated in the first place.

**Senator Barnes:** Low enrolled. Not very small numbers of people, but they were paying customers.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, certificates are not a part of this process. We are looking at degree programs in terms of the program review process.

**Senator Barnes:** So, start with the dean?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay, thanks.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Holly Eichner is next.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Go ahead, Dr. Eichner.

**Senator Eichner:** Yes, I am revisiting my question from last week. You know, when I saw this list come out today, I had this like cold sweat happen because I thought when this gets out in public again, it's going

to be this story again that UT is cutting a bunch of programs. So, I'm wondering what is the plan from administration to get ahead of this in the public if we're considering cutting all these programs because I'm again very concerned that new students are going to take the school down south and go to BG, because they are not getting this kind of constant cuts. Like I shared last week from a parent who asked, "will my kid be able to graduate when they are cutting programs?" This is a huge concern - how are we supposed to increase enrollment and retain students. What is the plan for that as we're looking to cut things again?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, I share your concern. You are absolutely correct in that; we do not want to create a negative public perception. We will be working with Marketing and Communications to develop a strategy on how to roll this out for programs that are discontinued.

**Senator Heberle:** I just had a thought. We keep hearing about how many colleges and universities in the state system are undergoing this same process and I'm wondering if from the university council provost-- I'm sorry, what's it called?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Inter-University Council.

**Senator Heberle:** Yes, Inter-University Council with the provost, if there's any pushback from that council to these kinds of policies? And what are the ways in which the provosts, who are advocates for the academic mission of universities, are responding to these cuts because they're obviously an attack on the public education system? They are not rational at all. They are not helping us grow or expand our mission in the state of Ohio. And so, I'm wondering if there's pushback or any news that you can give us or any way to understand why Cirino and his folks are being so successful.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I will say, all these initiatives in terms of program prioritization and discontinuation of programs, none of this has been coming from ODHE. We must submit a report every three years to let them know what we are doing in terms of low-enrolled programs, low-enrolled courses, and duplicate programs. But there were never any mandates that you have, or you must. What Dr. Brakel is saying is probably true moving forward, there may be that kind of initiative. But right now, currently my understanding is all these different institutions who are undergoing this process are doing it internally as a measure of balancing revenues and expenses---

**Senator Heberle:** Even though it is so much damage, the Ohio---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** The frustration is yes, we are in this situation, and we must do this. Why are we in this situation? First, proliferation of institutions and programs, the competition that has now been created that we do have so much duplication. We were just in contact with the chancellor recently about a particular program that our neighbors are looking to introduce. We shared with him that given the demand and our capacity there is no need for a new program in this area. That is an area of frustration. Second is the state support of instruction, these funding models are an area of frustration as well as other legislation.

**Senator Pryor:** [Indecipherable]... because of particular landscape, and it is reflective in the kind of---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I do not know if it was the political landscape or the academic landscape.

**Senator Pryor:** [Indecipherable]... And it is not just from one direction and that's why... But again, all we have to do to observe the parroting of the same words, the same structures that really lack a kind of moment of resistance or pause or creative thinking otherwise. Like it would just be refreshing if it wasn't

just all so much in lockstep... [Indecipherable]. The other question that I have which is very straightforward is, can we help if we dust off certificates and resurrect things that may in part have languished because they were never advertised? Can we hope that with our ingenuity—and again, let's try to reinvent the wheel a hundred times again—count on the institutional supports to actually market these properly---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** So---

**Senator Pryor:** Prioritize the marketing and make sure that each unit has its fair--

**Interim Provost Molitor:** This is another problem with the proliferation of programs. We do have limited bandwidth and we end up competing against ourselves. You cannot just say 'come here to The University of Toledo and you can do this, you can do this, and you can do this.' You have to focus and target your resources because we do have limited bandwidth. That is just the reality of the situation. I appreciate what you are suggesting, but, yes, we do not have the manpower and the resources to do that for everything out there. And if you did, you would just be creating a lot of noise that people would end up just tuning out.

**Senator Pryor:** Well, clearly...signature or something very different than what is happening down the road...[Indecipherable]. If we come up with a new thing, it is given a fair shake with...Hopefully what we will see this time is if we come up with a signature new thing, it's given a fair shake with---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** That is the investment process. We will be looking at plans that will be submitted, absolutely.

**President Van Hoy:** This would have to be the last question because we must move along.

**Senator Herrera:** From the College of Nursing, can I drag you back to the policy form?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Sure, why not?

**Senator Herrera:** It's a question on clarification because I have colleagues that were questioning it. At two meetings ago it was kind of a discussion about it and from my understanding, he was going to take it back to his committee to discuss it and then bring it back to Faculty Senate, which it was not brought up at the last meeting, Faculty Senate, I assume due to time or whatever. Then I saw the policy came out. Was that the policy you were referring to, up for 30-day comments?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**Senator Herrera:** My question is about the process again. I thought it was going to come back to Faculty Senate, but it didn't, it was already posted and now my colleagues are wondering.

**President Van Hoy:** Do you want to go or me?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** You.

**President Van Hoy:** So, essentially, we were told that we were given an opportunity for consultation, right? That consultation happened and they were going to post the policy. They were not going to go back and forth with us and wait for us to come up with a version that everyone agreed on.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Why? Why not consult it and discuss it?

**President Van Hoy:** Well, because they want this policy to implementable for the fall, right?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes.

**President Van Hoy:** Which means it really has to be implementable now while we are scheduling for classes. So, I would have preferred that this happened maybe last spring because then it would've been a lot more appropriate time to have this conversation. But this is why it got pushed along, and that is why I'm emphasizing, please go out and comment on it.

**Unknown Speaker:** Right, I understand that part.

**President Van Hoy:** Even if your comments are: "... why would you move this along without Faculty Senate?" I mean, that would be fine.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** It was your Faculty Senate's decision to table the conversation and bring it back later.

**Unknown Speaker:** Yes.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** But we do not have to necessarily wait for that.

**Unknown Speaker:** Okay, thank you.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Alright, I think we are moving on.

**President Van Hoy:** There are two online, although we really do have to move on. Dr. Rouillard, is your hand actually up?

**Past-President Rouillard:** Yes, it is. I just had a quick comment. In your response to Senator Heberle's question about is there's no pushback from IUC, you didn't really answer the question. You said that there were no mandates for this from the ODHE. So, clearly the IUC is not supporting its universities.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I think the IUC pushback is the fact that we are in this financial situation that we must do this. The pushback is not 'you're making us review our programs.' The pushback is 'enrollment is spread too thin around our state, and we are not receiving adequate financial support from the state.' That is what is being communicated.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay. My other comment is, how many more times we are going to have this embarrassing administration behavior such as what's been happening with this next football game where BG has been disinvited after a long tradition of their band playing at this game? Why do we keep having these missteps in public?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** The band was not disinvited. They do not have a timeslot to perform at halftime. There is a full section devoted to their band at the stadium. The issue was timing. It turns out our own band is getting a reduced timeslot to accommodate an event that was planned for months. Our Athletic Department had been in contact with Bowling Green's Athletic Department for months about this. This is not a surprise to anyone. How the messaging got out like this - yes, that was embarrassing to us.

**Past-President Rouillard:** Okay.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** All right, thank you so much.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you. Jayden, please come on down. Next, Jayden Bollinger. He is going to talk to us about a ‘common hour’ proposal.

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** Hello, everyone. As mentioned, my name is Jayden Ballinger and I’m here today as the Campus Culture Committee Chair representing the University of Toledo Student Government. As you all know, it is our duty as an organization to advocate for the wants and needs of the student body of UToledo, and to the benefit of all who attend this great institution. And so I'm here today to not only oppose this new course scheduling policy that is set out by the Provost Office, but also to advocate for a potential separate policy, a ‘common hour.’

Before I can address why we should adopt the ‘common hour,’ I first need to emphasize why we shouldn't adopt this new course scheduling policy legislation. Long talks with fellow students, and members of Student Government, and faculty have truly brought to my attention the gravity of this proposed policy shift. The policy would seek to mandate lower division undergraduate courses, require a minimum of 24 students, upper division undergraduate courses require 15 students, master's level graduate courses require eight students, and doctoral level students require six students or else they will be canceled and/or merged. When we face staggering enrollment and retention issues, why is that we throw away one of the core strengths of our university, our small class sizes? This policy enforcing minimum enrollment requirements undermines the university's mission to provide personalized learning experience by limiting access to a smaller, and more intimate classroom environment where students can benefit from individualized attention and mentorship from faculty members. I'm aware that this was already in effect to some degree and was not fully enforced, but I think there might have been a reason that it was not fully enforced. It's these smaller classes that students get the most specialized attention and often the most unique experience they can get out of any college. And really, it's usually these smaller classes that are more specific to what they want to pursue after graduation that are the most helpful when they get their degree.

Furthermore, this policy would seek to mandate that at least 15 % of all classes should be given Friday sections. As faculty, you understand these courses historically have always suffered from low enrollment and low attendance. It is clear to see that more classes on this day is not in the university's students’ best interest. Similar to why having mandatory classes on Fridays should be contrary to the progress of the University, forcing at least 5 % of classes from 8-9:00 am puts unneeded constraints on faculty's ability to schedule their own classes and forces students to take courses they don't wish to participate in.

To continue with why students’ take issue with this proposal policy, this policy would seek to mandate the classes longer than one hour that occur once per week must finish before 10 a.m. or start after 3 p.m., or take place on Fridays. Classes during these times significantly interrupt accessibility to dining resources, employment opportunities, and general campus involvement. Many students, notably commuters often have more limitations to when they can be on campus, may have difficulty getting transportation to these inconveniently timed classes. This policy, in its entirety does not fit with UToledo’s mission statement for student centered learning and is contrary to our current aspirations to increase student enrollment and retention. This policy feels like a solution to a problem that has not been clearly explained and currently does not hold enough sway to merit this kind of over-the-top response.

As a final note on this legislation, I would truly like to emphasize that decisions, like this, which have a very real impact on students, must include the opinion of those same students. If we continue to pursue a new direction for the University by the facts, figures, and numbers you leave those same students you hope to represent behind. You foster in an environment that feels cold, uncaring and robotic that is simply not conducive to University wide wellbeing. We must bridge those gaps between administration, faculty and students that have surfaced in recent years and allow these conversations to happen. As soon as we stop being a student-oriented University, we stop being UT. I understand a lot of the outside factors that go into this decision have to do with governor and state policy, but as is with politics, there is usually ways we can find compromise and there's always ways we can persevere as a University, to try and fight those policies that we as a University feels are unjust. And for many reasons in our last Senate meeting, UTSG unanimously voted in opposition against this prospective policy.

To transition, I would like to propose something entirely separate, but something that is intricately tied to how we think about scheduling at UT while taking into consideration our student's quality of education, retention percentage, student-faculty interaction and the future of this University. For those of who are unaware, a 'common hour' is a period of time on any day during the week where there are no classes scheduled. During this hour there would be campus wide events, student organization meetings, meal breaks, study sessions, faculty/student interactions, and an electrified campus feeling that we have seldom seen since our enrollment peak of more than 23,000 students in 2010. Ideally, this would be implemented on a biweekly basis every other Tuesday and Thursday from about 12:15 pm. to 1:15 pm. as is the norm for many campuses across the country with this policy in place.

At UT, it is no secret that our enrollment has been struggling. And while we could improve our recruitment, what we really need to improve is our retention. Every year we lose countless students often because they do not feel that their time here is well spent and they lack support groups. Oftentimes, these same students are simply going to class and immediately going home without taking the time to see what else our campus has to offer, only seeing the homework and clogged parking as the immediate result of their enrollment here.

What the 'common hour' does is it takes many of these students and gives them a section of time where they are on campus, but not in class. A time where every other student at the University is as well. A time where they are speakers, events, life on campus – and above all, opportunity to meet and interact with fellow students. When students get to know others, get involved, and have the chance to make support groups, I believe that person is much more likely stick around. 'Common hours' have been at the center of many Universities' scheduling policy since the 70's and 80's, being especially common in Pennsylvania colleges as well as Eastern Ohio and on the East Coast. Notable examples are Kenyon, Slippery Rock, several Penn State campuses, Dickenson, Baltimore, Neuman, St. Thomas, Cleveland State, Muhlenberg, and others. Most of these universities and colleges run on the same Tuesday-Thursday common hour set up that I am advocating for. However, there are exception with some favoring a one day a week common hour on Wednesdays, three day a week model on Monday-Wednesday-Friday. And some with shorter periods of time five days a week. Regardless of the type of common hour or the University it is implemented at, this policy is one that sees consistently strong support from the students it affects.

In 2018, Penn State Altoona Student Government proposed that they alter their current Tuesday-Thursday common hour which ran from 12:05-1:20 to a five day a week common hour at the same time. In order to

validate that this was a change, students wanted to see on campus, their Faculty Senate organized a survey which included all majors and student backgrounds.

- When students were asked if the common hour resulted in any scheduling conflicts for them, 65% of students said conflicts seldom or never happened with a further 23% reporting sometimes and 11% reporting often.
- When asked if they were in favor of the five-day a week plan, only 19% were in favor of this change with 52% wanting the common hour unchanged.
- When asked if the common hour should be eliminated there was a resounding no. Only 12% of students were in favor of total elimination.
- In their final report, the Faculty Senate concluded that despite common hour providing a limited slot for activities and sometimes extending classes into the evenings, the benefits seen by students still make it a viable policy that increases student engagement and enhances the student experience.

As mentioned in their final report, there are flaws to the ‘common hour’ policy.

- For one, the dining services might struggle to keep up with the number of students choosing to eat at this time, resulting in possible issues with seating and meal preparations.
- For another, this would result in classes being pushed to later or earlier meeting times which can be difficult for certain students to schedule work and other responsibilities around.
- Lastly, having a high amount of classes directly before and directly after ‘common hour’ could lead to classes being compressed together, making scheduling conflicts more pronounced.
- However, despite all of these challenges, every University and College have rescheduled while studying the common hour, with the exception of Utah State, has found ways around these challenges and maintains their common hour as being beneficial to students and staff alike.
- For dining, we work out adequate preparations for these rush hour events so that no student goes seatless.
- For students dealing with these spread out schedules, there is now an hour for them to finish things they would have needed to do at home regardless, leading to less late or incomplete assignments for busy students.
- For scheduling conflicts, most students polled from the previous survey did not have any major issues with this and we also have the facilities at UT to handle to influx of classes at certain times of day.

And as for Utah State and why they dropped their Common Hour.

- They simply had the opposite problem that we do, they had too many students. They did have adequate facilities to schedule around these times.
- Along with this, they also had the one day a week common hour which uniquely disturbs scheduling classes in a Monday-Wednesday format, even though it was originally proposed to be Tuesday-Thursday from 12-1:15 pm in 2009.
- And even in 2014, a year before the common hour was eliminated by the administration, 62% of students polled in a campus wide survey still favored the common hour initiative.
- This elimination was almost exclusively an administration led initiative. That being said, this proposed policy wouldn’t just benefit students.

That being said, this proposed policy wouldn't just benefit students. A professor at Neumann University said, "A common hour communicates 'community' It sends a message that the university is for everyone, and we value the intentional times to meet, connect, and engage together in capacities beyond the walls of the classroom," said Professor of Educational Psychology, Dr. Marisa Rauscher. Another professor at the same university had also said "I think the common hour has been beneficial for faculty, as it provides dedicated time to schedule meetings and casual get-togethers and provide us time to have lunch together and with our students. The time slots are to have lunch together and with our students. The time slots are definitely filling up but having the shared block has made scheduling easier and has allowed our community to gather in ways we haven't been doing in a long time and the campus feels electric!"

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative cont'd:** In closing, I hope that these testimonials go to show just how excited many of these campuses are about implementing this change. As a campus, I think we need that kind of energy here as well. This change is not only impactful and beneficial to students, but also one that comes at no real cost. As a university that has increasingly become focused on conserving the money we do have, we should truly take time to consider these kinds of policies that could completely change life for the better here on campus without any expense to the university. I truly hope that this proposed policy is one that you might consider pushing for in place of current suggested scheduling policies for the benefit of our student body and the future of our great institution.

**President Van Hoy:** Senator Allred, go ahead.

**Senator Allred:** Thanks, Jaden, it's nice to hear from you too. I really appreciate that you've put some thought into this. You know, one of the things that we brought up a couple of weeks ago, Provost Molitor sort of glossed over this, when we recommended tabling it, one of our concerns was that the Provost and the President made it clear that they hadn't consulted with students. So, I really appreciate that you've come forward and consulted with students. I think this gets to the point where we can be really thoughtful. You know, we don't need a policy change for one year's scheduling. We can actually already do a lot of flexibility of scheduling - the Provost and the President have those tools. So, I think your point to the fact that we actually really ought to be, we ought to be more thoughtful than a one-week period where the Provost and President admit that they've not consulted with students and simply cast expirations on faculty before we make large changes. I think something like this is a great idea, and I would certainly support a committee between faculty, students, and administrators to explore truly student-centered ways to bring life to campus. Thanks.

**President Van Hoy:** Other questions?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** I just want to clarify, you stated that the administration did not consult with you about this policy?

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** We did have a meeting, so it was Ashley, our Vice President and Lucas, our President, met with Dr. Molitor earlier this week. But it was not an address to all of Student Government, it was just our president and vice president and there's been no other communication other than that.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** And what was the response to your suggestion, the one that you presented?

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** Well, I was not at that meeting, so I was not able to make that suggestion there. So that's why I'm making it here.



**President Van Hoy:** Linda Rouillard put in the Chat, “Well said.”

**Senator Semaan:** Just for clarification. You’re saying that they met with Student Government, the Provost and the President after the policy was suggested or maybe even posted for 30-days?

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** Yes, that meeting was setup actually before that policy was recommended. That meeting wasn't even for the policy. It was just a meeting that had been scheduled that happened to fall at that time.

**Senator Semaan:** So, the Student Government is suggesting opposing this policy?

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** Yes, we voted unanimously against it.

**Senator Semaan:** Okay, thank you.

**Senator Pryor:** I just wanted to thank you. What a beautiful example of such a well together argument. It was just a great presentation. My son's talking to students and on Fridays they are often returning home. I know a lot of my students’ work or a combination of both, so I was wondering if you at Government had surveyed students to find out whether they'd even be available for Friday classes.

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** Well, we haven't directly surveyed about Friday classes in a long time, but there's a general consensus among almost all of our members, everyone I've talked to, everyone in the Student Government has said that Friday classes aren't necessarily something that students are excited for. Usually, most students try to get that Friday break in their schedules even if sometimes they can't. And usually, when people do have Friday classes, it's a one-off thing where they have to do it for a semester but avoid it the rest of the time, and those classes are always low enrolled. But we would definitely be open to doing more surveys, surveying the students on how they feel about Friday classes.

**Senator Pryor:** Thank you so much. And for the Provost, I guess I just wonder is administration open to evidence if students basically suggest that they're not terribly interested in Friday classes, they're not available because of the complexities of their lives, or whatever the rationale is? Are you all open to considering that or to finding out that information? Or is there actually something else that is driving the process?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** We offer a range of classes to a range of student populations. Yes, if there are courses that are inaccessible to students because of timing, we will certainly work with the colleges to make sure we offer the courses when the students need them.

**Senator Pryor:** But my question is if we have preponderance of evidence the students are uninterested and have---

**Interim Provost Molitor:** We have plenty of courses offered on Fridays that have enrollment.

**President Van Hoy:** So, the answer is no, Senator Pryor. The Provost Office is not interested in more evidence---

**Senator Pryor:** Okay, got it.

**President Van Hoy:** They want the policy implemented.

**Senator Pryor:** Okay, thank you.

**Senator Allred:** Sorry, one follow-up question. So, if we have plenty of classes already on Friday, putting the policy in now is not about next year's schedules because we can already do that, just to be clear?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Are you saying that the policy is not about next year's schedule?

**Senator Allred:** I'm saying that the reason to rush the policy when it clearly hasn't been thought-out with faculty and students is not a concern about scheduling next year because we already do schedule classes at the time of discussions. It is about setting a policy that requires certain things for all years. So, I just want to be clear on what we're actually discussing.

**President Van Hoy:** Senator Allred is talking about the long-term consequences. It's not just about next year, it's about all future years.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Correct. We need to realize where this is coming from. We are reducing the footprint of our classroom buildings. Our classroom portfolio is currently underutilized. It is expensive to maintain buildings, especially older buildings. And we need to consolidate our facilities.

**Senator Allred:** Right, and I think we all are agreeing with that, but we're wondering why it's been rushed since it is such an important consideration. Why it's being rushed? Again, dismissive, consistently dismissive of faculty and students' concerns.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Because some buildings are already coming offline. We need to prepare---

**Senator Allred:** Okay, I got it.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Thanks. This is a question for Provost Molitor. I mean, the policy that's in question is up for notice and comment, right? For public input. But you just said that there's no evidence that, or at least implied, that that would change your mind. Is that the way the policy process works?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I said there was no evidence that Friday classes had low enrollment. We do take all comments and feedback in the policy process.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Okay, I just wanted to be clear about that. It's just the way it was being portrayed, it just sounded like hold on, you can't do that. But anyway, alright, I just want to be clear. All right, thanks. Thanks.

**Senator Heberle:** I was reading Linda's comment. Thank you, Linda. So, if our enrollment is low, the reduced footprint shouldn't be a problem? I'm just wondering if the reduced footprint, if you're saying that space is underutilized, then have we counted the classrooms and number of students. I mean what's the data point that we're using to make this decision so quickly without consultation or real input?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** We had an analysis before the most recent version of the campus master plan that looked at the utilization of our space and showed the percentage of time offerings that a classroom was in use, and it showed the capacity of those classrooms when they were in use. We were roughly at a number of long lines of 25 or 30 % of utilization, which is way too low. We should be at 60%, 70%, or 80 %. Then it is expensive to maintain buildings that you are not using to the fullest compacity. That is where this is all coming.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes, I have a question, and this has been something that my colleagues and I have been talking about. It refers to the Field House where most of us teach. When I'm leaving, usually my teaching schedule ends at about 3 o'clock or a little later. It's an empty building. I mean, the classrooms are empty, and [so] I was just wondering, why we don't offer a later classes and evening classes to attract nontraditional students, you know, to accommodate them with their work schedules. There are plenty of people who are working full time who would like to get a degree or finish a degree, but they can't because they don't get off work until four or five. You know, 20 years ago, I mean, you know I have some institutional memory also, 21- 22 years ago, they were always evening classes up until, like 09:00 p.m.. They were full and plenty of people enrolled in them. And even younger students would kind of like that, so they could sleep in in the morning, or whatever, or do more work. But I'm really thinking of non-traditional students because that is an audience, and that is a pool that we are not affecting at all.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Dr. Coulter-Harris, you are preaching to this choir of one over here. I think that is one of the things we do want to accomplish with this policy. We ought to recognize that after 3 o'clock we have a lot of empty classrooms. If you look at the policy, we are specifying there are certain times we want things to be scheduled that are not currently scheduled. As Dr. Taylor mentioned, for 2 or 3 hour courses that meet once per week, we are requesting these courses meet after 3 pm on Monday through Thursday. Once-per-week courses are generally the type of courses like the that not traditional students do enroll in. Absolutely, I think that is right on target.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** In the past, we had a lot of those nontraditional students, because I used to work those hours when I first came here. I don't want to work those anymore, but I did once a time, and the classes were absolutely filled to compacity with people ranging from 18 to 60-year-olds. We have to make better use of students' spaces.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Amen.

**Senator Semaan:** I have a question.

**President Van Hoy:** Is this going to be quick, Senator Semaan

**Senator Semaan:** Yes.

**President Van Hoy:** Because we have to move this along?

**Senator Semaan:** Couple of things. Question for the Senate – one, is the Senate going to vote on this policy? And then the second, now we've heard what the students want, what they would prefer- [can we] keep that in mind, although I'm not sure when we will be doing that?

The other comment is to our dear administration: can we with a clear conscience, when we hear Student Government saying they are opposing a schedule that you are suggesting, still be saying that we are a student-centered university when we don't seem to be thinking what the students?

And finally, since our Interim President talks about courage and transparency, it is interesting that we do see some kind of overlap with his vision, *I want to bring back life to this campus and I want to schedule it in a way that many [students do not approve]*. It is propaganda because it's the same number of people, false advertisement that we have, like, okay.

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** Wow. I actually do have one question for you, Dr. Molitor. Have we considered in taking a lot of these old buildings that we don't utilize, and this is going to make me sound like a complete student, which I am. Have we thought about the impact on parking? Because when we take all these classes in different parts of the University that allows us to park in different lots, if we put everything in Memorial, Lot 13 is going to be more of a mess than it already is, including other lots around there like Lot 10. It's almost impossible to find parking there and any commuters, which is 60 %; I think a large student population is going to have to walk very far from lots that are connected to buildings that don't exist anymore. Why don't we just take the classes we do have at these more concentrated times and spread them out further instead of spreading those classes out into the same buildings?

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Okay, again, spreading them out further means more buildings, more rooms. That's what we're trying to avoid the rooms.

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** We already have the rooms.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** I am sorry I did not hear you.

**Jaden Bollinger, Student Government Representative:** We already have the rooms. It's just a matter of maintaining them.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** Yes, but that is the problem. It takes money to maintain them. We have buildings that we need to completely overhaul and renovate if we want to continue to occupy them. And we are not fully utilizing them across the entire range of time slots. Your question on parking is a great comment, and that is something that is being reviewed as part of this overall master plan. How are we going to accommodate parking? I should point out though, if we spread out course meeting times when you do not have everybody coming between Monday through Thursday, 10 am through 3 pm, then you will also be spreading out the parking as well.

**Senator Heberle:** I just wanted to go back to Jaden's proposal about the 'common hour' and maybe just have a moment for the Faculty Senate to either move to endorse or say something to let the Student Government know that we are taking this up, or that we hate it, or we're going to talk to them about it.

**President Van Hoy:** Are you asking for an endorsement at this time?

**Senator Heberle:** Sure.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Good.

**Senator Allred:** Hey, sorry, point of order. I don't think you can endorse a motion that's not new business, but we could refer it to a relevant committee, which I think is a great idea.

**Senator Heberle:** Student Affairs or can't we do, should we just do it in new business?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Well, I'm the Chair of Student Affairs, and I endorse it.

**Senator Allred:** Right, but you can't endorse new business in a meeting that it is brought up.

**President Van Hoy:** We can move it down to new business, right?

**Senator Heberle:** Yes, new business. Thank you, Senator Allred.

**Senator Allred:** Right, and then you would discuss it in two weeks, or you would refer it to a committee, one or the other.

**President Van Hoy:** Right.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Can the Executive Committee---

**President Van Hoy:** We can bring it back in two weeks.

**Senator Heberle:** [Indecipherable]...

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, we can bring it back in two weeks if we want to, okay? So, we're moving on. And to answer Senator Semaan's question about the core scheduling policy, it's been tabled, so, we can certainly put that on the agenda if you want to un-table it and have a vote, right? Again, in two weeks.

Thank you so much. All right, we're now appropriately behind schedule - because of good discussion. So, next is the Undergraduate Curriculum [Committee] report, and that will be Rob Padillai.

**Senator Padillai:** So, we had 24 course proposals to go through and we passed these nine. All of them I think are solid and I'll go through each one for you, except for DST 3700, the committee kind of waffled on that. I'll show you what happened, and we can vote on that and tell us what you want to do with that.

And so, DST 3030, and I think all four of disabilities courses, these are all existing courses, so these are modifications they're making. All of their modifications were to change the course description to reflect the way the course is currently taught. So, those were pretty basic. When we went through it there were not a lot of changes; it was really just the course description that changed. And so, we recommended that we okay and we finish up with this one because they did fit. So, we have the proposal there and then this is the course description from the syllabus that does match what they want to do in the proposal. Would you guys like to go through the three and then---

**President Van Hoy:** Let's go through all of them at once.

**Senator Padillai:** Okay, so the next one I'd like to vote on separately, though because that's probably problematic.

**President Van Hoy:** So, do you want to skip it?

**Senator Padillai:** Yes, can we skip it. So, DST 4000, the proposal is the same to teach, to change the course description of the catalog to reflect how it's being taught. And then this was the course description they're using in the syllabus.

Then, DST 4200. It's pretty much the same thing. We have the catalog course description that they're offering and then the language is different, but the committee decided that the spirit of what they were putting in the syllabus is close enough. So we try not to be too pedantic about these things. And sorry, the ESM is my mistake, it should be EMS.

**President Van Hoy:** Okay.

**Senator Padillai:** This one was a little odd and we weren't sure what to do with it. What the committee decided to do was that because this was addressing a statewide initiative to have all EMS programs similar; we decided that in the interest of what the industry recognized credential standards that we would

okay it. So that's one that you may want to consider. So this is the course catalog description which is basically the...from..., so we were okay with that. So if anybody has an issue with that consider this one for EMS 2300. You can go to the next one, thank you.

**Senator Pryor:** That is simply a typo, it shouldn't be ESM? It should be EMS.

**Senator Padillai:** Yes, I apparently was saying emergency service... FILM 3730, this is just a change in the title of the course because it was too similar to other courses and that confused students. That was weird.

NSM 1000, this is not difficult to understand. It's an orientation course and what they determined was that instead of having one course offered in the fall for two credit hours for orientation, they would change it to two courses, one in the fall, one in the spring, each one credit hour. The credit hour would be the same, but they wanted students to have be exposed to one year of mathematics orientation. So, we're okay with that and highlighted the first year. That really is the significant change.

And then PPHR 2040, this is an 'odd' one. The CIM system has it being offered in the spring and the fall. Apparently, it's been quite a while that pharmacy has not offered it in the spring, only in the fall. So we asked them for their most recent syllabus for this course and they gave us that. It's been offered in the fall. We confirmed that it historically has been offered in the fall, so that's pretty basic.

And then THR 3150. The change here is that originally THR 3150 was going to focus on performance, and they wanted the history of the theater be applicable to everybody that's engaged in all parts of theater production. And so, they then changed the SLOs and then the course description changed so that everybody involved in theater writing, design or performance could benefit from it. It was a pretty decent change. I think that's it.

Can we go back to the second one? I think this is the problematic one. If you think it's fine, we can pass it and if you think it's not fine, we'll just send it back. So this is DST 3700. The proposal is to change the catalog description to see how it matches what they are currently teaching. And this is what they propose to change. The red light up – which are items of the things that they're omitting from the course description. And then you have the green, this course uses tools and perspectives of... But then when you look at the course syllabus that they offered, they gave us the wrong sort of description of the course. They just sort of copied the original. I think it's just a simple oversight, not unlike my ESM, right? All right, so we really only have two options. This is the 'sad' part. We can tell them no and send it back to them and that's normally what we would have done; it was an oversight on our part. So, you guys can vote on that, and you can let us know if you want us to let them have this discrepancy in it, this different description than what they're offering, or if we should send it back and all they have to do is give us a new description of this. We could probably get it to the committee and to the Faculty Senate by the next meeting. Would that be okay? What do you guys think?

**Senators Cheng and Heberle:** Send it back.

**Senator Padillai:** Should we send it back with anger <laughter>? And then for all of the other proposals, were you all okay with those, the other eight?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes.

**Senator Padillai:** Okay, we're probably going to have about a dozen or more next meeting as well, and I'll try to be clear and go through it rather quickly. I can't promise that it'll be exciting, but that's what the provost wants.

**Interim Provost Molitor:** <Laughter>.

**Senator Padillai:** Thank you. Was that it?

**President Van Hoy:** Yes. You done a good job. Thank you, Rob. Was there any voting that happened, by the way?

**Group of Senators:** No.

**President Van Hoy:** Hey Senator Padillai, did you run any votes?

**Senator Padillai:** Yes, we did a quick vote in my mind.

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

**Senator Padillai:** So how do we do the formal voting?

**President Van Hoy:** So you're going to need to tell people what proposals they're voting on, right?

**Senator Padillai:** Proposals one, and then three through nine because we skipped two. Do we have a yes or no?

**President Van Hoy:** So, in the Chat, people can put yes, no, or abstain to approve or not approve those proposals. In the room, all in favor say, aye.

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**President Van Hoy:** Any opposed? Abstentions? Now you're free. *Motion Passed.*

**Senator Padillai:** Thank you, sir. Oh, and number two we're sending back.

**Senator Van Hoy:** Okay, you roll it back.

**Senator Padillai:** All right, thank you sir.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you. Okay, Academic Programs, Senator Taylor.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Alright, give me just a second, I'm sharing screen, hopefully. Okay, we met last Friday, and we had one item that has come to us. It was the Paramedic Certificate from the Medical School. They were updating the learning outcomes. We voted to approve. This was done in conjunction with the state. As, as Rob had said, I believe the class that he was talking about was one of the ones that had been modified is part of this. So, it's state initiative. We approved it and that's all we're recommending. So I'd like to call a vote out.

**President Van Hoy:** Any questions? It doesn't look like it.

**Senator J. Taylor:** All those in favor say, aye.

**Group of Senators:** Aye.

**Senator J. Taylor:** Opposed? Any abstentions? Hearing none. All right, that's it for me.

**President Van Hoy:** Everyone online, please put yes, no or abstain in the Chat. *Motion Passed.*

Okay, so, we were scheduled to have Floyd Akins speak, but he saw how behind we were running and asked that we reschedule him because he wants to have a longer conversation about advancement and the scholarships. So, we will try to bring him back to our next meeting in two weeks. Are there items from the floor?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Oh, wow, it's 5:30.

**President Van Hoy:** Yes, we are going to get some time back. All right, is there a motion to adjourn?

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

**Senator Semaan:** Second.

**President Van Hoy:** Thank you, Senators Avidor-Reiss and Semaan. Okay, everyone, we're done today. Good discussions today.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Deborah Coulter-Harris  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary