

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 10, 2024
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 9/24/2024

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, Eichner, Chakravarti, Cheng, Cioc, Cochrane, Coulter-Harris, Dagostino-Kalinz, Elgafy, Ervin, Giovannucci, Harmych, Heberle, Herrera, Howard, Javaid, Kalinoski, Kaw, Kistner, Koch, Krantz, Kumar, Lapitsky, Reeves (Proxy for W. Lee-Smith), McInnis, McLoughlin, Miner, Moussa, Nigem, O'Connell, Osman, Padilla, Reinert, Rouillard, Sahloff, Schaefer, Scheuermann, Semaan, Sheng, Sindhvani, Suchek, Sun, J. Taylor, W. Taylor, Van Hoy, Yonker

Excused Absence: Bigioni, Diakonova, Eichner, Johnson, Koch, T. Smith

Unexcused Absence: Dwyer, Ekwenna, Gilstrap, Van Hook, Willey

Senator Coulter-Harris: President Van Hoy, we have a quorum. Thank you. Thank you, senators. And please, if you come in late, please notify me through email. Thank you very much.

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

Senator Coulter-Harris: You're welcome.

President Van Hoy: Alright, thank you everyone for being here today. Our first order of business is to adopt the agenda. Just one quick change to the agenda. We will not have the report from the Committee on Academic Regulations, Chair Compora cannot be with us today. So, that will be moved back to the September 24th meeting. And with that one change, is there a motion to adopt the agenda?

Senator Semaan: So moved.

Senator Brakel: Second.

President Van Hoy: Alright, all those in favor of adopting the agenda on Webex, please put 'yes,' 'no,' or 'abstain' in the Chat [box]. In the room, those in favor, please say, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, the agenda passes. ***Agenda Passed.***

Next is approval of the Minutes from August 27, 2024. Are there any corrections to the Minutes? Hearing none. Is there a motion---

Senator Benton: Excuse me. This is Sheri Benton. Were the Minutes sent out, I didn't see them in an email?

President Van Hoy. The Minutes were sent out. I also think that Deborah Coulter-Harris was about to remind me to say that only senators can vote.

Senator Coulter-Harris: No. I was going to say that for the first time we've done a one-page executive summary of the Minutes, okay? For people who don't have the time to read all of the Minutes, they can go ahead and just read just one-page. All we include are the major speakers and the major points that they make. A one-page executive summary, so that is new. Thank you.

President Van Hoy: To answer the question that was asked from WebEx, the Minutes were sent out yesterday. Were there a large group of people who did not receive the Minutes?

Senator Benton: I only got the agenda. This is Sheri Benton again. I only received the agenda. I did not see the Minutes. They were not attached to the email I received yesterday.

President Van Hoy: The Minutes came separately from the agenda I believe.

Senator Semaan: She should check her Spam mail.

President Van Hoy: What was that?

Senator Semaan: Her Spam mail.

President Van Hoy: Did you check your Spam mail?

Senator Benton: I will, thank you. I just wanted to confirm my attendance because I had come in late, and so I wanted to know before I approved. So, sorry to---

Senator Coulter-Harris: Yes, I have you down as present, Senator Benton.

Senator Benton: They are not in my main inbox, so I will double check which is unusual.

Senator Brakel: The Minutes went out at 4:04 pm.

President Van Hoy: The Minutes went out at 4:04 yesterday, if that is helpful. Thank you, Senator Brakel. Okay, is there a motion to approve the Minutes?

Senator Semaan: So moved.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Second.

President Van Hoy: Alright, on WebEx, all those in favor of approving the Minutes from August 27, please put 'yes,' or 'no' if you do not approve them, or 'abstain' in the Chat. In the room, all those in favor—senators who can vote—of approving the Minutes, please signify by saying, 'aye,' 'no' or 'abstain.'

Okay, moving on to the Executive Committee report: I will try to keep the Executive Committee report short. Today we have Interim Provost Scott Molitor here to discuss the provost office reorganization. He will be presenting the new provost office organizational chart and addressing issues such as centralized advising, the restructuring of DEI, program prioritization, dean searches, and more. The Executive Committee has asked the Committee on the Constitution and Rules to explore the following potential changes to the Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules and bring their recommendations to the EC and Senate.

- a. Convert the Ad-hoc Budget and Ad- hoc Recruitment and Retention committees to standing committees.
- b. Clarify administrators not eligible for election to Senate.
- c. Remove the Honors College from committee representation since it does not have faculty.

- d. Convert the College of Medicine and Life Sciences to an undergraduate college to give them representation on more committees.
- e. Work with the Committee on Elections to determine if the 14-senator cap on representation should be changed in light of the college mergers between Arts and Letters and Education and Health and Human Service and Nursing.

At our Faculty Senate meeting on August 27, Senator Ammon Allred raised an issue about the Bylaws requiring Senate approval for reauthorizing ad-hoc committees. To my knowledge, this had not been Senate practice in the past, including since the revised Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules were put in place. The Executive Committee asked Rob Steven, chair of the Committee on Constitution and Rules, to provide an interpretation. His interpretation is that the Executive Committee can reauthorize ad-hoc committees without seeking a vote from Senate. In a few minutes I will present the ad-hoc committees to Senate and ask for approval of the non-senator committee chairs. If there is a dispute about how the Bylaws should be interpreted, it is up to the Senate to decide how to proceed.

- As you probably know, the Executive Committee chose to send a message reminding faculty and staff that Angela Paprocki is the Provost's designated point person for addressing barriers to recruitment and retention. We have been pleased by the rapid response to this message from faculty, staff, and Angela. The Provost's office has now created a new email address for your requests for help. Please send your messages to rocketroundtable@utoledo.edu.

Finally, a note about search committees. Interim President Schroeder has decided that search committees will be small and that no one who would report to the position being hired can be on the committee. For the provost search, this means that no deans or members of the provost office are on the committee. For dean searches, this means that no faculty or staff from the college can serve on the search committee for their new dean. This is a significant change from how searches have been run in the past. Interim President Schroeder is promising that parties excluded from the search committee will have access to candidates brought to campus. Please note that these campus visits will be very important for providing input to the search process for groups excluded from search committees.

- Update on search committees: On September 11, Interim Provost Molitor informed us that Interim President Schroeder has no issues with faculty members in their college serving on search committees for their next permanent dean. They would like to avoid having direct reports (ADs, chairs and staff) serve on these committees unless absolutely necessary.

Would anybody from the Executive Committee like to add anything?

Past-President Rouillard: Just a comment and response to Interim President Schroeder's statement that no one reporting to the new hire can be on the search committee. It seems to me that that violates concept of shared governance.

President Van Hoy: Thank you, Past President Rouillard. Dr. Allred, I see your hands up.

Dr. Ammon Allred: Thank you, President Van Hoy. And again, I'm not going to try to belabor this too long. I do want to read our own Bylaws and also note, I appreciate that you guys addressed this explicitly

because as you yourself noted, this is not something that we have done in practice. In fact, I don't think we ever, whether it was the Executive Committee or Senate, ever authorized either committee last year. Again, I don't have an objection to the committee's existence necessarily. However, I do have some concerns about procedure which show up when we do these sorts of things. I do want to read our exact ...you're saying it is from the Executive Committee. It is just a little puzzling to me. This is our document. *"... ad hoc committees are temporarily created for special or unique concerns that do not need continuing study. Their lifetime should not extend beyond a Senate year. If they are to continue beyond that year, the next Senate shall reauthorize them."*

Now, I think we've both agreed that last year that didn't happen. That's not the end of the world; it's okay as the committee actually never made any official recommendations, so it is what it is. But I'm a little puzzled that we don't have a chance to vote on that. I also noticed, though, that you did say that there should be a standing committee. That makes a lot of sense. Again, I'm not going to belabor this too much, but I do hope that if we're keeping in mind this is supposed to be "special" or "unique" concerns by both our own Bylaws and Robert's Rules of order, that shouldn't overlap with other committees and no committee.

If the Executive Committee disagrees with this, it's going to be odd, but you know maybe you will, I don't know. It seems that a committee can make recommendations directly to anybody other than the Senate without the Senate as a whole formally approving them. As long as we do those things and follow procedure. If we're going to have an ad hoc committee for three or more years, that's kind of nebulously defined, I would hope that the Executive Committee could give us like a three-sentence explanation of what each ad hoc committee's scope is. And if they are going to continue indefinitely, I would hope we could turn them into standing committees so that we can actually follow procedure, have transparency, ensure equal representation, and make sure that they're really focusing on their specified area of concerns. I hope that's not too much to ask. Thanks.

President Van Hoy: Thanks, Senator Allred. Well, we will be putting up on the screen a list of the ad hoc committees for this year except for one of them, [with] mostly three sentence explanations. Then, you know, Senate can tell us whether or not they want to vote to authorize the committees or if they want to leave it to the Executive Committee. Are there other questions or comments for the Executive Committee report?

Senator Sindhvani: I just have a question. This is Puneet Sindhvani. You mentioned something about the College of Medicine and Life Sciences now being given representation on the undergraduate. Can you clarify that? I didn't catch that.

President Van Hoy: We asked the Constitution and Rules Committee to explore whether the College of Medicine and Life Sciences should be considered an undergraduate college for the purpose of seating people on committees, so that they would have more representation because that college has now become involved in several undergraduate programs.

Senator Sindhvani: Thank you. We appreciate it.

President Van Hoy: No problem.

Senator Miner: I have a question. Could you go back, Ammon. I'm sorry, President Van Hoy to the interim president's suggestion/mandate that no one who serves under the position being sought can be part of the search committee? Can you tell me what prompted that?

President Van Hoy: I really can't. As far as I know, it's a dictate from our president. I'm going to hand the mic to Scott Molitor though, and he's going to give it a shot.

Interim Provost Molitor: So I believe the point is he does not think it's appropriate for somebody to be directly involved in hiring their own boss, given the potential perception of conflict. I would also like to address Dr. Rouillard's comment about shared government. This does not mean that faculty will not be involved in the search committees. It just means that the faculty involved in the search committees will come from different colleges.

Senator Miner: Can I ask another follow-up question? The nuances of, and some of them are not nuances, but the stark differences between and among the colleges makes me wonder how someone outside of that college would feel, just as though I couldn't do a good job as a search committee member for a position in the College of Medicine. Conversely, I'm not sure if someone in the College of Medicine could appropriately assess the needs of the College of Arts and Letters. And so, this is a concerning and rather confusing mandate/dictate and it just doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

Interim Provost Molitor: Barbara, this is Provost Molitor again. I understand your point and I agree to a certain extent. However, I believe, and this is where we'll have to be judicious. I want to make sure I consult with faculty leadership and the faculty in the appropriate colleges. We do have plenty of faculty who do work across colleges. And so, I believe you would be able to find folks from outside your college who at least have, you know, to a certain extent, a knowledge of the college and the disciplines. So, that's the approach I intend to take.

Senator Miner: I appreciate that. I would respectfully disagree with you strongly but thank you Provost Molitor.

President Van Hoy: So, I'm on the Provost Search Committee, and he announced it there. But it has also been discussed at ALT, when Tomer and I had met with the president, and when Tomer and I have met with the provost. It's been mentioned several times.

Senator Heberle: I agree with my colleagues, I absolutely disagree with this policy. We'll argue against it as vibrantly as I can, but I wanted to highlight what was said in the explanation about not being on a search committee for your boss. I don't think of the dean as my 'boss' because that is not what shared governance is about. We're not equals in terms of her capacity to distribute resources, and to ask me to do certain things, and to tell me how to schedule my classes. I understand all that, but this is such a violation of the principles of shared governance where there is some level of understanding that we are colleagues, not bosses and employees. And the idea that we have a conflict of interest in hiring somebody that's going to be our dean violates everything I came to the academy to avoid in terms of corporate America. Thank you.

President Van Hoy: All right. Let's, let's go to Senator Taylor online first. Go ahead and unmute, Senator Taylor.

Senator J. Taylor: I missed one of the questions there. Does this policy also apply to the provost search?

President Van Hoy: Does it apply to the provost search? Yes.

Senator J. Taylor: So nobody from the academic side of the house, which in the last meeting that the President said, ‘that’s why we have a Provost’ and that the Provost was going to be the expert on the academic side of the house, not the President. I mean, is that being fully thought out? I mean, that would be like hiring an AD and you don’t have any from the Athletics Department in there. Maybe you do need some expertise at times. I do understand the conflict thing, but I’m a little concerned that you’re missing necessary expertise.

President Van Hoy: I understand it completely. I have my own concerns, which I’ve expressed to the President. But there are two faculty on the Provost Search Committee.

Senator J. Taylor: Oh, okay, so it’s not being held too specifically for the provost search?

Interim Provost Molitor: Let me talk to the President. This is Provost Molitor again. I’ll communicate this concern to the President when I meet with him tomorrow and I’ll report back to Jerry and Tomer about the outcome of that conversation because there is a difference between a direct report and somebody who’s down under. As you point out, you’re, you are on the provost search as well and I believe Barbara Saltzman, right?

President Van Hoy: Correct.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay.

Dr. Martin Ohlinger: Excuse me. I’m not a senator, but I would like to speak.

President Van Hoy: I’m sorry, I was distracted. Say it again.

Interim Provost Molitor: He’s not a senator but wants to speak.

President Van Hoy: Go ahead.

Dr. Martin Ohlinger: This is not to agree or disagree. The concept of... [*Indecipherable*]... I just want to clarify direct reports vs. ...[*Indecipherable*]... likewise the dean.... Thank you.

President Van Hoy: Thank you. Okay, a comment is in the Chat [box] from Senator Kumar. “This lack of participation in selecting the dean is even more worrisome in the context of mergers such as the College of Arts and Letters and Education,” which is a good point in terms of who is represented.

Senator Semaan: It sounds like we are an enterprise, not an educational...And the second one sounds like, yeah, maybe you come later, and we can find someone who does eye surgery, not orthopedic surgery [which is what you need]. It sounds very similar.

President Van Hoy: I would say it is a similar approach. It is this notion, I think Provost Molitor said it, what the Interim President is saying is that an employee should not be involved in choosing their boss. I agree with you, that sounds a little ‘corporate America.’ Alright, are there any more questions or comments?

Senator Kalinoski: President Van Hoy, this is Andrea Kalinoski from the Health Science Campus.

President Van Hoy: Speak into the microphone.

Senator Kalinoski: Is there representation from the Health Science Campus?

President Van Hoy: Yes, and I raised that concern to the President, and I do believe that he has agreed to add someone from the Health Science Campus, but I don't know if anyone has been invited yet. Senator Giovannucci, do you know?

Senator Giovannucci: No.

President Van Hoy: Okay, well, I'll follow-up with the President on that. Question from the Chat [box]. "Does this apply to the eventual president's search?" I can't answer that question. Another question from the Chat [box]. Who will serve on the president's search? Depends on how soon we can have one. Well, and also remember that our Interim President said when he was at Senate two weeks ago, that if you have concerns to write him or call him directly. So, I suggest you do that.

Interim Provost Molitor: Let me talk to him first.

President Van Hoy: It might help you if he gets some emails<laughter>. All right, can you put up the ad hoc committee descriptions? Here are the three ad hoc committees for this year. The new one on top is the Committee on Student Learning Outcomes for the diversity core. This was requested by the Core Curriculum Chair, Sharon Barnes to address the student learning outcomes for multicultural diversity courses, which I also think is something the Provost's Office has been asking us to work on.

- **Description:** *"Address the Student Learning Outcomes for multicultural diversity courses."*

Then the two that we've been having this conversation about for reauthorization are, of course, the Recruitment and Retention Committee (RRC), which has done a lot of good work over the last couple of years and work that the Executive Committee would like to continue. There's a brief description of what it does and then down below. Then down below, there is a list of recommendations from the previous year's committee of what they should do this year:

And then also the Budget Committee, chaired by Aliaksandr Amialchuk, and that committee has also been doing good work and we would like to continue it because it is primarily about transparency in how the budget is put together and how decisions are made, both at the university level and also at the college level.

- **Description:** *"Work with the Provost Office, Office of Finance and Administration, and college deans to create transparency in the budget process. Provide analysis and input to the budget process at the college and university levels. Report college budgets to Faculty Senate to create transparency."*

President Van Hoy cont'd: Okay, two chairs of the ad-hoc committees, Recruitment and Retention and Budget are not senators, so we need a vote to approve those chairs. All right, is there a motion for approving the non-senator chairs for these ad hoc committees?

Past-President Rouillard: So moved.

Senator Barnes: Second.

President Van Hoy: Those online, please put ‘yes,’ ‘no’ or ‘abstain’ in the Chat. All the senators here in the room say, ‘aye.’

Group of Senators: Aye.

President Van Hoy: Any opposed? Abstain? Hearing none. All right, thank you. *Motion Passed.*

Unknown Speaker: There was one abstain in the Chat.

President Van Hoy: All right, well, if we need to count, we will count. But we can count while Interim Provost Molitor is speaking.

Interim Provost Molitor: Are you ready?

President Van Hoy: Yes.

Unknown Speaker: Dan is not giving his presentation today?

President Van Hoy: No. As I said before we approved the agenda, Dan couldn’t be here [today] to present them, so we moved them to two weeks from now.

Interim Provost Molitor: If you want to share my slides. You are welcome to hang up here or I can flip the pages, it doesn’t matter. All right, can everybody hear me? Thank you.

Well, I appreciate the opportunity to spend a couple hours with you guys. So we've already covered the dean's search topic, so I'll cross that off my list. I do appreciate the offer. A quick note before I start, an email was sent at about 04:00 this afternoon from the Provost Office. We are seeing a resurgence in COVID cases. I'm sure many of you are aware of that. Our ‘old friend’ is back revisiting us again. We are asking that if students report symptoms or a positive test, do not require any medical documentation. Please work with them to give them remote access. And if that is not possible or feasible for the particular course, then we would ask that you give the student an excused absence until they say they are no longer displaying symptoms. We would like to do everything within our power to prevent the spread of COVID. We are also working, Angela, my ‘problem solver,’ has reconvened the COVID taskforce and we will also be talking about plans to distribute the updated COVID vaccine whenever it becomes available. So, more to come on that. Dr. Taylor, do you have a question?

Senator J. Taylor: Yes. I did see the email about the COVID policy, and I think we all wanted to do that. Is this policy being extended to the faculty as well if they contract COVID because we have been instructed that we are not going to change modality, or faculty FLMA and those sorts of things?

Interim Provost Molitor: So, what we have decided, (I forgot if it was the last ALT of last year) if a faculty member reports COVID or COVID symptoms, we are asking chairs and deans to allow those faculty members to teach remotely, if possible, to do so for the week. We don’t want the entire courses for the rest of the semester being changed in modality. But if there are a couple of course sessions then that would be acceptable to having someone else cover the course or having, you know, alternative work provided for the students. Does that answer your question?

Senator J. Taylor: Perfect. Thank you. That is what I wanted to hear. I just wanted to make sure that you were going to treat faculty that way.

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes.

Senator J. Taylor: Thank you.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay. All right. So, I am here to talk about changes that have been happening under academic affairs. And so, where I thought I would start is a bit of a summary of the changes that are being made and the rationale for these changes. And then I know many of you are very interested in the topic of centralized advising, and so we will talk a little bit more about that as well. Then a discussion of a few other initiatives for the upcoming year. And then I appreciate the Faculty Senate leadership for collating and sending me questions ahead of time, then I will proceed to go through and answer questions that may not have been answered and through the previous information I'm providing. I'm happy, and I know I only have an hour and 15 minutes, so I'm happy to come back and pick it up if we don't get through this. I will defer to the Faculty Senate leadership if that is desirable.

Alright, so let's get started. The first slide actually brings in some of the context for why we're making the changes, and there's going to be a couple slides after this I'll have Quinetta forward. So, where this started is we were given the opportunity to engage with the National Institute for Student Success to see what we could do to potentially improve our retention and graduation rates. This actually started back late fall, early spring of last year. So, the National Institute for Students Success is a group started by Georgia State, where about a decade ago they undertook a similar review, and they drastically increased retention and graduation rates as a result of this work. But in addition to that, more importantly, they significantly increased graduation and retention rates for the students who came from Pell eligible populations or from underrepresented groups such as black and brown students. For them, it was extremely important because the majority of the students at their institution come from those populations. Here at the University of Toledo, a very large percentage, not necessarily the majority, but still a very significant number of students come from those populations. And so, this engagement with NIST consisted of two parts. First, they did what they call the diagnostic, which is to look at IPEDS data and then to do a survey, whether that consisted of a questionnaire. And I forgot, how many people did they send the questionnaire to?

Dr. Angela Paprocki: About 40 to 50 leaders.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay, so it was about 40, 50 leaders and then they also did some follow-up interviews. Those came from individuals in a number of different areas, in a number of different roles. And so, what I wanted to start with is the data that they came up with from IPEDS. So, what you see here are retention rates for first-year, first time, full-time students. What you can see is we've done some remarkable work increasing our first-year retention rates, however you can also see we're still lagging our peers. And if you go to the next slide, that shows six-year graduation rates.

So again, we've done significant work increasing our six-year graduation rates, but again, we still do lag our peers across the state. If we go to the next slide, now we're starting to break things down by different populations. And so, what you can see here is we still, despite our efforts, have significant what we call equity gaps. So, we are not graduating all populations of students and retaining them at the same rate. This is the six-year graduation rates and can see we have a 25-percentage point difference between our overall rate in black students, and we have a ten-percentage point difference between Hispanic students in our overall six-year graduation rates. And then if you go to the next slide, this shows the same thing for PELL eligible students. And given the number of PELL eligible students we have here at the university, if we close this nearly 25 % gap in our six-year graduation rate, our overall six-year graduation rate would

increase by ten percentage points, which is a very, very significant increase in the six-year graduation rates. Dr. Avidor-Reiss, yes?

Senator Avidor-Reiss: Compared to other universities, a university of our size, would you compare the number of graduation rates...?

Interim Provost Molitor: In terms of these equity gaps?

Senator Avidor-Reiss: Yes.

Interim Provost Molitor: I would have to look back at the report, but I suspect the answer is yes, we are. Thank you for pointing that out. Okay, so this is the context here. And I should say ‘happy census day.’ Today is our official enrollment day. And so, we just off the press have numbers from our fall 2024 enrollment, thanks to Anne Fulkerson and her group. So, more good news in terms of overall rates. Our, our first-year, full-time retention rate increased by 1.4 %, from 75.9 % last year to 77.3 % this year. However, we saw a decrease in that same rate for PELL eligible students, and I believe, unfortunately I thought I wrote the number down. But I believe it was like one-and-a-half percent. It was from 68 to 67 % or something in that range. So again, we've done great work, we've made great strides. So, pat yourself [all] on the back for it, for these efforts. And especially under the resource constrained environment we're in, I think it is remarkable the work we're doing. But, we still have more work to do.

And so, we really need to rethink our processes and the way we're going to support students. So that's kind of the first area that is going to lead to the rationale for the changes that we are proposing. We've also, at the request of the Board (and President Schroeder is very much engaged in this as well) is doing whatever we can to improve the student experience and student life on campus. We also want to do everything in our power as the President says, to “win our backyard.” But also, if you go back to the Art and Science report, connecting our students with our community is a very important aspect of not only our students’ success, but the ability to recruit students and bring them here to the University, and again, strengthening our connection with the community. And so that's another area we are tasked with working on.

We also want to do everything we can to increase the number of experiential learning opportunities and making direct career connections between our academic programs and the careers, again, direct connections between the academic programs and the careers that students will be pursuing. This is something that came out of NIST, this is something that came out of Art and Science, and this is something that the President and the Board are very interested in as well. So, we are putting all these elements together. We'll talk about how that affects the organization of academic affairs as a whole and we are also then putting those pieces together into a student success plan that a number of my colleagues, including Angela Paprocki and Shannon Newman who's back there, has been working on, what we're calling the Academic Success and Engagement Plan. And so, this plan is going to incorporate recommendations from the NIST playbook, which was the second part of the NIST engagement after the data in the survey. And we will integrate, again, these other components. So, it's going to be an integration of academic success, student experience, and community engagement; and with regards to the data I showed you on the equity gaps, integration of the efforts of our colleagues who are working on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

So, we are in the process of finalizing the draft where we're thinking about a couple of weeks, I think I had set a goal for the end of September, then we would like to distribute that and solicit feedback and input from a wider audience on this plan. So, opportunities for stakeholder input about these initiatives will be forthcoming.

Okay, so with that context, we can go down to the next slide, which nobody's going to be able to see the full thing, but I'll go ahead and just put it up. This, I was asked by Jerry (President Van Hoy), hey, could you have an org chart ready?

President Van Hoy: Because the Provost Office got so big <laughter>.

Interim Provost Molitor: Exactly. Which does not fit even on the screen. In fact, I think there's an area off to the side there. When this is final, we will distribute this to everybody. We want to make sure we get all the appropriate changes. So, we are welcoming a few groups into the Office of the Provost. Again, keeping this overall focus on students' success and these different initiatives in mind. So, the division of Student Affairs is moving under the Office of the Provost. This was an initiative that actually started last spring and was completed with the start of new fiscal year. And so Sammy Spann who had been the title of Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, now has the title of Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students. He and his entire Student Affairs Group are in the Office of the Provost. His leadership team includes Sarah Clark, Julie Fischer-Kinney, Shelly Drouillard, Aleiah Jones, Latasha Sullivan, Xinren Yu and Alex Ernickle. They are essentially moving wholesale into the Office of the Provost. Otherwise, they are maintaining their organizational structure, and again Sammy now will report directly to me. We have also brought in the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion into the Office of the Provost.

We discussed this a little bit at the last Faculty Senate meeting, and I think I see Malaika [Bell] back there. Malaika will report directly to me. She was, I think on the far right of that org chart over there. She is going to continue to oversee campus wide DEI efforts, including the development and implementation of programming for faculty and staff, and leading efforts to achieve our strategic plan goals related to a people centered culture. She's also going to be working with Angela and her colleagues on student success initiatives to ensure a more inclusive and equitable support for all students regardless of background.

We're also welcoming into our office, Regina Kynard, who had the title, she was executive assistant to the vice president, but in a previous role, she was an academic advisor. And so, Regina is kind of changing-up her role a bit and utilizing her expertise from her advising days as well as her expertise that she gained working with her DEI colleagues in that office. She's going to work directly under Angela on various student success initiatives such as inclusive advising training and helping to redesign our first-year experience programs.

And then, the remaining two members of the DEI office will work under the division of Student Affairs and continue with their role. So, Danielle Lutman will report to Sammy. I believe she has at least one staff member who reports to her as well. She will report to Sammy and continue her leadership of the Catherine Eberly Center for Women. And then Gentry Willis is going to be working with Aleiah Jones and their colleagues in the Office of Multicultural Student Services. She, Gentry will continue her work on the multicultural Emerging Scholars program, the Belonging Excellence program and working in partnership with the African Studies program to help oversee the center for Racial Equity and Black Student Excellence.

So, another group we have brought in, again, so the components we're talking about [are] student experience, we're talking about equity, and making sure all populations of students are successful. And again, we are also focused on community engagement and making sure, again, "we win in our backyard" and make those connections between our students and our community.

And so, with that, the last group we're bringing in is Valerie Simmons-Walston, who, had the role of a special assistant to the President for our community engagement strategic partnership. We're still working on finalizing her position. She will continue with her team, which includes Cynthia Fisher and Monica Holiday-Goodman, who's an Associate Dean of Pharmacy, but also spends some of her time working on community engagement. So they will continue their efforts on community engagement and outreach, but we'll expand their focus, again on this idea of expanding opportunities for our students to engage with the community and opportunities for the community to engage with students on our campus.

Alright, so I am going to stop there and ask if there are any questions.

Senator Coulter-Harris: That is a lot of people.

Interim Provost Molitor: Thank you. Yes, there are a lot of people. Yes, Dr. Krantz?

Senator Krantz: It is a short question so you can repeat it. The state recently changed the DEI regulations. How does that apply for the success of minority students?

Interim Provost Molitor: So, the question was, the state recently changed DEI requirements? How does that affect our ability to monitor students from underrepresented groups? It's actually not the state, it was the Supreme Court ruling on admissions because the state has not yet passed any legislation except for the Ohio Campus Act, that talks about issues regarding harassment for students, not only from racial and ethnic backgrounds but also religious backgrounds. So, at this point, the only legislation, quote/unquote, we have was the Supreme Court ruling on race-based admissions and then the follow up from the State Attorney General about using race towards scholarships. I think at this point, nobody has told us we can't stop monitoring students like we're providing data on equity gaps or anything like that. And, if any of my colleagues from Legal Affairs are online, they can correct me if I'm wrong, but that was my understanding. So, we don't have to stop reporting that.

Senator Miner: Hi, thank you. My question goes back to a couple of slides ago, and it has to do with 'winning our own backyard' etc., etc., which you had mentioned all very good things. You mentioned NIST and you mentioned the Arts and Science Group reports. But what I didn't hear was anything regarding the implementation or working directly with the RRC, which is faculty driven help along these lines. So, I'm wondering if you could expand on that a little bit.

Interim Provost Molitor: Sure. We are continuing to work with the RRC, and my understanding has just been [they were recently] approved and reconstituted. The Art and Science initiatives we're talking about, particularly regarding creativity in the curriculum is a conversation I would like to pick up with and look at possibilities for incorporating that throughout our curriculum. And so, that's one particular area. And again, on this overall student success plan, we are going to be soliciting the feedback of various groups and I certainly anticipate the RRC is going to want to weigh in and want to have discussions with my office about that, which I'm more than happy to have. Does that answer your question?

Senator Miner: Sure, for now it does. Thank you.

Interim Provost Molitor: Anything else? Yes, Dr. Heberle?

Senator Heberle: Questions...[Indecipherable]... Executive Committee... Experience within the Provost Office... Question right now although... as to where this might be intended. [Indecipherable] ...because we have lots of field experiences, lots of ways in which students are engaged, and so we should get them engaged in the community. [Indecipherable]... I'm just wondering if there's any effort to sort of streamline it by which we can organize and make that work, make that more...[Indecipherable]... And think about what the fact we are in terms of community, their levels of community. Like, there are people who do all kinds of stuff, but the field experience and internships and supervised academic experiences have been... So, I mean, it's really different. And I just wonder how much thought is happening.

Interim Provost Molitor: Sure. Actually, these are very timely questions, and that is that we are also engaged currently led by Valerie and Monica, our Carnegie Engagement Reclassification. Part of this is a survey of all of these community engagement efforts that you talk about and these kinds of experiences. What we need to do is to implement a process because right now they are scrambling to assemble all this data. This process occurs once every ten years as recertification. So, the last time we did it—which was the first time—which was I think in 2015. So, what I have asked Valerie and her team to consider is a way that we can make this data collection process ongoing vs. a one-time scramble. And so, I think that will be very helpful to these efforts to get a handle, much like what the RRC was doing with creativity in the curriculum, to find out where we are doing these things and to figure out how we can support those things that are being done, and to figure out areas where these things are not being done so that we can support initiatives in that regard. So, yes, I think that is very much on our list. Dr. Giovannucci?

Senator Giovannucci: [Indecipherable]... It's a lot of jet chairs moving around.

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, but we are not the Titanic<laughter>. Yes? At this point at best, I would say a little bit of savings or cost neutral. So, we have not increased any expenses by doing this reorganization.

Senator Coulter-Harris: So they're all keeping the same salaries, is that it?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, so we're working with HR and making sure that is so. All right, anybody online or are we good? All right. So, now the topic that you're all interested in. So let me go down and increase this. I want to move on and talk about centralized advising.

Alright. So, we also had a survey, and I wanted to show some of the findings for this survey that will provide the context for what we're thinking about in terms of our advising structure. What you see here is half of our students change their major, and in many cases, those major changes are from one college to another, okay? And also, data that shows when we have students changing their major. What's interesting there, is the majority of the major changes occur after the first year, okay? And so, you can see that 88 % of all major changes occur after the student's first year. Now, this has implications not only for time to degree, but also a potential financial aid implication as well. We want to make sure that we have advisors who are aware of the issues and appropriately trained to address that.

If you can scroll down to the next one. So, survey questions about the coordination of advising, how is it that we can take one student from one college to another and make sure that we are getting a consistent approach to advising those students, but also making sure we're sharing the appropriate information and then issues regarding the advising caseloads. We have drastically different caseloads - in some cases

within individual colleges or across individual colleges. You can see some of these comments that came from the interviews with various constituents in response to these survey results.

You can scroll down to the next slide. In terms of our advising probably out of necessity, out of just the workload of our advisors, and again, I've stated this in the last meeting. We have wonderful people who do advising. It's not an issue with the people; it's the issue with all the things that they are doing, right? So, are we doing things proactively? Are we identifying students with issues before it's too late? Are we using the data to identify those students in issues like, hey, this student is coming upon the number of credits that's going to prevent them from being cut off from financial aid? Things like that. This student is potentially missing or off plan, are they changing majors or are they just wandering around trying to find their way through a program? We need to make sure that we are utilizing and collecting data consistently across all the different programs.

Then finally, if you want to scroll down to the last one, it has to do with more on us than on the advisors - making sure our students have a pretty clear map of what their programs of study entail and making sure that we're rescheduling courses appropriately. And so let me give you an example of this. You might find out that if you align students' programs of study that instead of offering a course twice a year, particularly if it's a course that has a low DFW rate and generally not many students have to retake, do you have to offer that course twice a year? Can you offer it once a year, which would then free up resources, free up faculty workload or provide us the ability to offer a course that does have more challenges in terms of DFW rates multiple times a year so that students don't have to delay their time to graduation if they have to retake a course? So, these are issues that we are trying to address. As a result, and you can go down to the last slide here.

President Van Hoy: May I ask a question?

Interim Provost Molitor: Sure.

President Van Hoy: The number of respondents appears to be 43, right?

Interim Provost Molitor: Right.

President Van Hoy cont'd: How do we know these participants were representative of the university? And two, who are these people?

Interim Provost Molitor: Can you answer the "who are these people?"

Dr. Angela Paprocki: They were people selected from across campus with various appointments. So, we had faculty, we had people from the Register's Office, we had people from advising offices, any student service office. We basically took that level of leadership and put them into that group at the recommendation of NIST.

President Van Hoy: Forty-three is a small number of interviewees. As you break the data up into several categories, it is less reliable. So, I was thinking that that is a very small group of interviews to base major changes on.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay, fair point. Again, this is a process that they've been doing with a number of institutions over the years and have demonstrated a lot of success in terms of—at these various institutions—coming up with recommendations based on this process.

Senator Avidor-Reiss: I have a question. So all of this information for the University of Toledo was made before you saw the data?

Interim Provost Molitor: I guess we never collected it in this form, but yes, this knowledge was probably out there.

Senator Avidor-Reiss: So this was a post-decision? So, the decision was made until after the NIST engagement, right?

Interim Provost Molitor: No, the decision to centralize advising was not made before the NIST engagement. It came after.

Senator Avidor-Reiss: My question is, why are you not showing this information [to everybody] before announcing we're going to centralization?

Interim Provost Molitor: I'm showing it now.

Senator Avidor-Reiss: There has been a lot of anxiety and emotional energy.

Interim Provost Molitor: I understand.

Senator Heberle: [*Indecipherable*]... systems... See how they are doing and then make decisions how to help them and support them... [*Indecipherable*]... help them with advising goals, and for most of advising it will help us ...[*Indecipherable*]... instead of centralization... at the college level. I just cannot...the centralization model to standardization to conformity model. And so, like, one of the things that I hear from students all the time is when I went to Rocket Launch, they handed me a schedule and I had another, right? So, I understand the difficulty of trying to figure out how to manage this, but I don't agree with centralization which also means standardization. The students then don't get the kind of stuff... So, I was just wondering why we need to start with apologies at that level and why we went to centralization instead of saying, look, we had... services, so, let's work it out.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: We have a couple of comments online saying they cannot hear anyone in the audience. Maybe you can summarize the comments.

Interim Provost Molitor: Sure. The comment was rather than going right to centralization, why haven't we consulted with the colleges to see if we can perhaps make changes within each college that maybe necessary based on the data? Does that kind of summarize?

Senator Heberle: Yes.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay. I would say this. I would say, first of all, we are engaging the colleges to figure out how the different processes work in each college. We want to make sure there are unique and specialized things that need to continue in each college. However, what we're finding, though, is if we give individual colleges control, we have a number of different problems that we are having trouble resolving. And so, I'm going to give you my 'engineering hat' right now and tell you about the issues that we are trying to address in our advising redesign.

Number one, we cannot have one advisor limited to a major or a set of students. In other words, if a student only has one advisor to talk to, then what happens when that advisor is out or is busy doing other things? We also see across the colleges disparate advising loads. And I should point out, it's not just in terms of headcount of students. It's also the workloads that advisors have been given. We've been surveying the colleges and the advisors in terms of, well, tell us all the things you're doing. The list of duties varies greatly. And obviously, there's a need for that – they are doing jobs that need to be done, but are they doing things that are also taking away from their ability to work with students? I should also point out we have these equity gaps that have [obviously] different populations of students that have different levels of need. And so, the advising caseloads not only need to factor in just an overall number of students, but the types and the populations of the students you're working with and the challenges that those students have.

The inability to ensure implementation of best practices in terms of things like data collection, in terms of proactive vs. reactive advising, in terms of financial information, we are having challenges making sure that those best practices are being uniformly disseminated.

We also have an issue where students get the run around, [such as] 'I don't know,' 'go see so and so.' We have to stop that. We have to make sure that the advisor who is there with the student rather than being all hurried and all these other things to do has the time to say let me pick up the phone and call somebody or let me find the answer and follow up with you, rather than giving students the run around. And again, this idea of decentralized record keeping, again, with proactive advising.

And also, the lack of data on the quality of advising services. People keep asking me, well, you know, tell me which college. I've had deans saying, show me that the advising quality of my college that needs to be improved. We just have anecdotal information based on whenever we get a complaint from a student. We don't systematically survey our students. And again, we have great advisors. I'm not trying to say, oh, this advisor is horrible and not doing a great job. I'm trying to find out where we need support, where we do have advisors potentially who have caseloads that again, given the types of students and the situations that they're working on are potentially comparing their ability to reach those students. And then again, there is this issue of advisors working outside the scope of their positions. So, at least centralization allows us a way to ensure that we're meeting those objectives vs. leaving it up to the individual colleges. I don't know who was next.

Senator Lapitsky: [*Indecipherable*]...

Interim Provost Molitor: Again, I don't believe they interviewed any students, and all we have is anecdotal data from students because we don't systematically survey our students about advising services.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: There was a student, this committee through Student Government last year, and she went to every college and spoke with every dean, and we have that information. So that was a student driven process that's feeding into this.

Interim Provost Molitor: And I should also point out now that Angela mentioned that. We also have data from the National Survey of Student Engagement that asks about advising quality. We are below average in terms of how our students perceive our advising quality.

Senator Lapitsky: [*Indecipherable*]... How similar is Georgia State to the University of Toledo?

Interim Provost Molitor: I do not know about the range of programs, but I assume they have a very large range of programs. Georgia State has 60,000 students. It is a very, very large multi-campus institution. So I would guess, and maybe they don't have chemical engineering but I assume they have other engineering programs and a similar range of program offerings. Again, they've been doing this, the National Institute for Student Success, and I don't know how many institutions they work with. They've worked with a number just in our area, like they work with Bowling Green. Did they work with Eastern Michigan and Wayne state?

Dr. Angela Paprocki: Yes, we have a list.

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, there's a wide range of institutions they've worked with, so they have a lot of experience.

Senator Lapitsky: [*Indecipherable*]...

Dr. Angela Paprocki: Scott, they can't hear.

Interim Provost Molitor: The question is, given all of the other things that advisors are involved with such as recruiting, such as making sure students feel connected to their programs, how do we make sure that these things don't fall through the cracks? Well, number one, this is why we are surveying all the advisors in the colleges about these extra duties. We need to figure out if an advisor isn't going to be doing this, who is? And that's part of this overall, you know, redesign. We want to make sure that these things, if advisors can't do them, we need to identify somebody who has the bandwidth and the ability to do it. I should also say, we're not trying to sever the connection between the advisors and the faculty with whom they work and the academic programs with which they work. We are trying to make sure we solve the issue of providing student advisors with the tools they need and the time they need, to proactively support students, to make sure we're addressing things when students change majors, to make sure we're addressing financial issues, all these other things that do affect the ability of our students to be successful.

Senator Lapitsky: Thank you.

Interim Provost Molitor: Question online, Dr. Eichner.

Senator Eichner: Hello. Thank you so much. I just need some clarification, I think. I'm reading that it says it's about standardizing these systems and protocols. I heard you just say that. So, from a day-to-day perspective, and I'm sorry if I missed this if you said this, will the advisors still be within the colleges, but we are just talking about standardizing the ways things happen and making sure that resources are equitable amongst the colleges? Or are we literally talking about losing our advisors and every advisor will be an advisor to our college and every other one? Because that's the point I think that's really concerning because of that loss of expertise, if it's that way. If we're just talking about systems and resources, that makes sense. Is that question clear?

Interim Provost Molitor: Oh, yes, that makes sense. So the question is, are we essentially completely severing the connection between advisors and their programs and just making everybody an advisor for everyone? And the answer to that is no; we still want to make sure we do have advisors dedicated to the colleges and the academic programs. They will still be housed in those areas so that students, you know, who are taking courses or working in those buildings will have offices that they can go into to talk to those advisors. But at the same time, we want to make sure that we equip those advisors with the tools

they need to have kind of a broader view of institutional processes, handling students who come from other majors, or handling situations where students are thinking about going to other majors. One of the things we came up with, and I forgot if this was, let's go back to the change major slide.

I think that would address this and I probably have it in one of my questions that I answer. Alright, this was a concern to NIST because of how many students changed their majors after their first year. That is problematic. Again, in terms of financial aid, in terms of time to degree. So, if we have a more coordinated group of advisors yes, I am still devoted to my program in public health or I'm still, you know, kind of attached to a program in chemical engineering, but yet, I'm answering not to my department chair or to my college, but I'm answering to Academic Affairs as a whole, then we have an opportunity to proactively reach out to students and say, you know what? Given your interests, given the courses you seem to be exceling at, given your career goals, have you thought about X Y, and Z? So that if we are going to have half of our students changing majors, which is likely, we're not going to be able to prevent that, right? We don't catch students coming in - they apply to particular areas of interest. But if we can do things in their first year to make sure they settle on and find the right academic program there, that will make a huge difference in the ability of our students to succeed. Does that help kind address what you were getting at?

Senator Eichner: Yes. Thank you.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay, do we have another question online? Okay, yes, please, Dr. Semaan.

Senator Semaan: Last meeting I believe somebody mentioned Bowling Green as you just gave an example of. They, Bowling Green, moved to centralized and then they mentioned they decentralized. Did we have an opportunity to talk to them to see what's going on?

Dr. Angela Paprocki: So, I have a request to speak to upper administration, but they are not reversing. We have confirmed with advisors on the ground at Bowling Green that they are remaining centralized.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I understand what you all are trying to do. You're trying to centralize advisors and standardize how they're trained, right?

Interim Provost Molitor: Right, among other things.

Senator Coulter-Harris cont'd: And going back to something you said about 20 minutes ago, that really, you're trying to improve the time to graduation, right?

Interim Provost Molitor: Among other things.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Among other things, but one of the things is that, and to avoid any duplication of the courses, or unnecessary courses that these majors do not have to enroll in. Correct?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, among other things.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Right. So, I'm going to veer off just a tiny bit and ask you. For example, I know that engineering students have a requirement to take ENGL 2950 because I've been teaching Science and Technical Report Writing for decades. I know this is a requirement for engineering students. But there were no summer courses offered this summer in that particular course. I'm wondering if that delayed any

of the engineering students from their path to graduation. So, you know, that was a concern of mine. I mean, the English department only offered three summer courses, and they were all for, I think, college credit plus students. It was just Composition I, but they were all high school students. And you know, I had one of the courses and I was very happy to teach and it was great. But I was very concerned about 2950, the Science and Technical Report Writing requirement, and then also 2960, which is your Professional in Writing course in the English department, which is also a requirement, I believe, for the business degree. So, I'm just wondering if that is going to change at all? Thanks.

Interim Provost Molitor: And I appreciate it. That's an excellent point. Again, I am not aware of students because we did talk to the deans in particular about summer offerings and not only summer offerings, but, you know, offerings during the academic year to make sure that if courses were required and on particular plans of studies in particular, semesters that they get offered. So this was a priority of ours. However, without any systematic, you know, review of this information, which I really believe is important, then we don't have the information we need to make these kinds of decisions to say, guess what? The English department needs to offer this course in this particular semester. And that's something we need to fix.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Right, and also pre-med students.

Interim Provost Molitor: Right, we don't know. Alright, who is next? Dr. Heberle, yes?

Senator Heberle: Thank you. A few years ago, we eliminated the program for student success coaches, and it seems like that would have been a program that would really help with what you're getting at here in terms of the first year students not quite knowing, having their feet on the ground and maybe changing majors after they're in their first year, and not being able to decide what major they want. But I also, again, I wonder if we're solving a problem of the first-year students coming to campus and being undecided. We had a quest program, we had the student success coaches, we've had all kinds of different ways of doing that. I'm concerned that with this yet anew advising structure, a lot of my students thought success coaches were their advisors, and they weren't.

A lot of students don't know that they go to the student advising office in the college first and then they're supposed to come to their major advisor after they decide their major, and that kind of thing. So, I'm wondering if 'advising' is actually the target for the questions that we're raising about students and their graduation rates, and their retention rates and getting lost in the system because I totally agree that they do, and I've witnessed it, and I worry about it. But whether or not there are some other ways of, again, getting on the ground and helping students know who it is. You say you don't want to be sending students off to another office, but I don't know if that's the problem. It's like, we don't know all the answers but somebody in the central office is going to know all the answers. But they're not going to know all the answers.

Provost Molitor: I don't know, and let me go over here to make sure everybody heard that online. But I think the comment was, given these challenges, do we know the solutions just lie in what we've identified for the advising changes? And how do we ensure that students know who they are supposed to be talking to – and Dr. Heberle mentioned the success coaches. So let me start with the success coach issue. Yes, success coaches were eliminated. They were great people who did great work. But guess what? Our first-year retention rate actually went up after we eliminated success coaches. Now, as you pointed out, they were not doing academic advising, they were supposed to stay separate, but yet some students thought

this was my academic advisor. And so that was, I think potentially we were creating some kind of confusion. I think where our model is, is to look at the workload of advisors to make them that one stop-shop so that the person they're talking to is the person who can provide academic advising, can provide information about financial issues, can help them solve problems right there and then vs. 'oh, go see Rocket Solutions Central,' 'X, Y and Z.' That I think is one of our goals in this project. And I don't know if you have anything to add to that. The other thing I want to point out, and Shannon Newman is here and has been working with the University College advisors for a number of years. I think there they have a model that we are trying to extend to advisors across campus. They have students who come in, not knowing exactly where they're going to end up, and they have to work with those students to try to identify appropriate programs and to make sure they are putting the students on that path so that they can complete those programs in a timely fashion. Shannon, do you want to add anything to that?

Shannon Newman: No.

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay, that works.

Senator Coulter-Harris: As to the success coaches, if you remember, every success coach had more than 350 students, and then they were causing some problems for faculty.

Interim Provost Molitor: Well, I don't want to say they were causing a lot of problems. They did some great work in a lot of students were very upset because they lost a part of their support system. I want to make sure our students have that support. But as you point out, it can't be a limited set of students. It has to be for the students who need it.

Past-President Rouillard: Quick question. Do we know which major students tend to switch out of the most and to which majors they switch into?

Dr. Angela Paprocki: No. That is part of the process which is digging into all of this data more. So just to speak to that, when we met with NIST, we had this preliminary data set and then that created a number of other questions that we want to dig deeper into that will be part of this process.

Interim Provost Molitor: The question was, are there tendencies for students in a certain major to switch to other majors? And I'm almost positive the answer to that is yes. I think that's something that they talk about in our first-year programs, so can we design our programs to be more meta major focused at least in the first year so that students who end up having a tendency to change from one major to another don't lose, you know, credits, don't extend their time to degree? And I think that's certainly something we're going to want to look at. Gina?

Gina, Unknown Last Name: I understand the logic behind it. You want to give basically more like an evenly distributed workload to everyone and not have them doing so much administrative things. So, it's supportive for the students. I posted it on a Facebook group for student affairs, you know, what their experience was for centralized advising. And actually, there was a lot of positive feedback. The advisors felt like they were more supportive. They had a wider range of resources, so that was good. But my question is, is, has there been thought to titles, salary changes, and the worry of people leaving because of maybe those changes?

Interim Provost Molitor: So, I think the question is, let me go back up to the front here. So, the comment was, as you've seen from colleagues at other institutions positive feedback on centralized, but

are we worried that potentially people may leave because of the changes we're making? Yes, that is something I'm certainly worried about. I hope we can minimize it by having these kinds of conversations and making sure everybody understands what we're doing and what we're trying to do. But, in the end, we want to make sure we give our students the best support we can.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: I just want to comment. It's about our students, but it's also about the advisors, which we are keeping paramount to this process, right?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes.

Dr. Angela Paprocki cont'd: The support to them is, we have learned over the last year meeting with SSDs that there is not really a community anymore for advisors. There's an online community, but there's no on the ground community. So, while trying to do the best for our students, we also want to improve the structure for advisors.

President Van Hoy: I appreciate that.

Interim Provost Molitor: Did everybody hear it online?

Senator Avidor-Reiss: I want to express my concern. I think the main problem at UT, at least from my point of view, is seeing our advisor, our advisor in NSM works very hard. I don't know the idea that they have an overload. They are very good. There are just not enough of them. So, I would suggest—and I am not opposing what you are suggesting that we need to centralize—but we need more of them. We need more of them so they can do the great job that they are doing. It looks to me the University of Toledo is, I think Matt mentioned last time, we are spread thin. We are spread so thin that we cannot do our job. There's no need to centralize and do all the activities that makes everybody more anxious, other than let the people do their job and do not interfere.

Interim Provost Molitor: So, I think the comment there if you didn't hear it was, we maybe don't need to centralize, we just need more advisors. Boy, that would be wonderful! And if you find me that 'bucket of money,' I'll do it. And that's the problem. We are very resource constrained. We have to be as efficient and thoughtful with the resources we have, vs. the resources we want or need.

Senator Avidor-Reiss: The other half of the comment was that by doing all those things, you're actually doing damage. You're not doing good.

Interim Provost Molitor: I disagree. We're going to find out.

President Van Hoy: Provost Molitor, just to follow-up on that -quickly -. The rumor going around has been that centralization will lead to a reduction in advisors. Would you please address that?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes, I have zero plans to get rid of any advisors. We don't have enough. You heard it from me.

Senator Lapitsky: Will we replace advisors if people quit?

Interim Provost Molitor: Will we replace advisors if people quit? I will absolutely approve those requests. Now, will I be provost forever to do that? No. But if I'm in the position to make that decision, absolutely. And we have, by the way. Yes, Dr. Coulter-Harris?

Senator Coulter-Harris: There are lots of comments in the Chat.

Interim Provost Molitor: ‘Holy cow.’ Okay, way at the top there. Dr. Kumar wrote, “Why are faculty whose work speaks to issues of DEI and community engagement not included in this committee?”

Interim Provost Molitor: I don’t know what committee that is, but Dr. Kumar, if you want to reach out to me directly, I would be happy to make sure I connect you appropriately. Dr. O’Connell wrote, “Can I get copies of the org. chart?” Yes, when it is finalized, we will make sure we publish that.

Senator Barnes: I think the committee---

Interim Provost Molitor: Oh, Community Engagement and Strategic Partnerships? Oh, okay, that is not a committee, that is an office. Thank you.

Senator Kumar: Dr. Molitor, thank you for answering my question. I was just wondering why we have so much expertise in our colleges, and we are not using it as much as we should. That was the only reason.

Interim Provost Molitor: So, Dr. Kumar, you’re saying, why are we not utilizing the expertise of our faculty who are experts in these areas? Is that what you’re suggesting? I didn’t quite hear that.

Senator Kumar: Yes.

Interim Provost Molitor: Send me an email and I will. I would be happy to. In fact, I’ve started requesting meetings with individuals to get their thoughts on this overall organization and how we can integrate these things into our overall student success plan. So I’d be happy to talk to you.

Senator Kumar: Thank you.

Interim Provost Molitor: Back over here [to the Chat box]. Dr. Sun wrote, “The student major change can take place within the department, within the college or across colleges, what’s the percentage of each type?” Yes, that is a good question, Dr. Sun. And again, that is the information we talked about, you know, digging in deeper to find those patterns of major changes.

Okay, so Dr. Javaid wrote, “To point #1 – Most advisors are “experts” in the programs they serve. By centralizing, aren’t we increasing their workload more by making them become “experts” in all programs offered at UToledo?” Again, we’re not going to make them experts in all programs, although I will say this. If we have well mapped out plans of study for each student, it will be easier for advisors to make those decisions. And also, if we have kind of this system of data sharing and data entry that will allow advisors access to these issues, we don’t necessarily have to be experts within a particular discipline and knowing all the nuances, but they can be 90 to 95 % of the way there.

Next, Dr. Sun wrote, “Instead of moving from pure distributed advising model to a pure centralized model, can we have a hybrid model by maintaining the majority of ‘distributed’ advisors and adding ‘thin’ central advising unit by pulling a few advisors from each college?” The answer to that is yes, I don’t think we’re going to have a pure centralized model. It’s going to be something more in between. I don’t know if you... I’m getting a nodding of heads for my colleagues that yes, that’s the intent here.

A guest speaker wrote, “We make personal referrals to Rocket Career Center and to individual academic advisors in programs(s) of interest. This was an issue for some engineering students this past summer.”

Yes, I think I can still foresee a model or at least you'll be able to, you know, point somebody to a college office. But again, this idea of, okay, I'm going to appoint a student to this particular advisor and that advisor is on vacation or, you know, taking a leave of absence or something like that. These are the things that we're trying to address and prevent. And then, yes, that was an issue for some engineering students this past summer. Let me give you my personal experience for my department. We actually had three different times in my time as undergraduate program director where we were in between advisors that they went on to other positions in the university or left for other universities. So, my chair and I were there at Rocket Launch signing up students for their classes. And in those years, we had lower retention rates because, to Dr. Lapitsky's point about the connections between advisors and the programs not having those personnel available, was a handicap to those students. And so, if we had a more distributed model where somebody could have stepped in at that point vs. this ultra-special advisor, we probably would not have had those issues.

Senator Semaan: I think the issue was about the cancelation of classes in the summer and delaying students, not advisors.

Interim Provost Molitor: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. The next comment in the Chat states, "Courses may be required." Yes, we understand that we have issues with resources and again, having more information on this data like Dr. Semaan's point about engineering students needing courses over the summer, that is something we need to have a better handle on and have that information. And again, if students have specific plans of study to enter, and I believe, if I'm not mistaken, in Banner, in the degree audit system, we have a way to indicate what semester students are supposed to be taking which courses.

President Van Hoy: The catalog as well.

Interim Provost Molitor: And the catalog as well. We can utilize that information to make sure we are offering courses that are needed when they are needed. A question from the Chat states, "What is the focus of a first year program experience?" We're actually working on that now and that will be part of the overall plan, so stay tuned on that. We're talking about how to implement that. And yes, transparency in the process is welcomed.

Another question from the Chat, "Are the deans okay with advising responsibilities potentially changing within the college?" I think I could safely answer that to say no, they're not okay with it. I'm getting more pushback from the deans than I am from you guys. Another comment, "A suggestion to reach out to BGSU to see how they've changed." Yes, Dr. Lipscomb, we did do that. We did reach out to BGSU to see how they have structured their centralized advising. And my understanding is that they've settled down a model where students have a centralized advisors in their first two years, and then engage with either specialized or faculty advisors during their last two. Another comment, "Does this mean no faculty will be acting as advisors anymore?" No I anticipate not only will we continue having faculty advisors, but hopefully, we will be able to engage more faculty in this process.

Again, something that came to the Bowling Green model, where once the students are well settled into their majors and are following specific plans of studies, then the advising becomes more, you know, career goals, [such as] what I do after graduation, things I want to consider for electives, which I think is probably more appropriate for faculty. But again, this is obviously a workload and resource issue that we have to address as well. Great question. "What if this plan fails? How long will we test this approach to see if it works or not?" That is a great question. Obviously, this is a big change that won't be incorporated

overnight, nor can it be unwound overnight. But I believe the approach is to kind of phase this in. We're not going to be just diving in headfirst. We're going to be phasing in certain aspects of it. And then yes, we have data on retention rates, graduation rates, which unfortunately only occur on an annual basis, so we're going to have to look at potentially other metrics as well.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: We will also be implementing a student survey. So after the advisors have contact with the students, it will be like, 'how did I do' type survey so that we can collect that type of data as well, right?

Past-President Rouillard: How many advisors do we currently have and what's the average number of student visits that they have? Do you have that information?

Interim Provost Molitor: I don't know about the student visits. In fact, that is one thing we need to record. We need every advisor when they have a student there saying, I'm talking to the student about X, Y, and Z.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: But one issue with that is we don't have every group or every college using the same system. If we did, we would be able to get that. So, that's one of our first goals is to implement across the board the same system.

Interim Provost Molitor: But how many advisors do we have overall today?

Dr. Angela Paprocki: There's 31 or 32. I can clarify that [later].

Senator Heberle: I just had a little red flag go up when you talked about faculty advisors and I think that question like put a point on my main concern, and that is that faculty advisors, major advisors who are faculty know the classes that students may or may not be involved with. There's no way that a centralized advisor can create a plan of study through the major for a student, the same way a faculty could. So, I just want you to clarify that you weren't saying that they're not going to get to us until they already have their four years mapped out. That a plan of study is not sort of put into place for them where they just go ahead and register without knowing that they need to talk to us as their major advisors because that to me, is one of the main problems is the gap between students and their faculty major advisors. You know, we used to have orientation classes where they were required to come and talk to their faculty major advisor. And that was awesome because a lot of students don't know that they need advisors. So, I really want to push back if that's what you meant, that we're just good for professional and career advising, I really want to push back against that because that is not what we do. I mean we do, but not---

Interim Provost Molitor: That comment was that faculty are needed not just for career and professional advising, but also to help students work out plans of study. And I'm relaying my experience and I apologize from engineering where a number of our professional programs, the curriculum is pretty well laid out for the students. I understand in your college that is not necessarily the case. And that is absolutely a valid point and something we need to consider that we need, if the students aren't working directly with the faculty, then at least the advisors need to be working directly with the faculty to say, hey. Alright, thank you. We will note that in our plan.

Senator Semaan: Do we have a ratio of advisors to students based on the ratio that we have---

Interim Provost Molitor: So, if we're talking 30-some with 11,000 undergrad---

Senator Semaan: No, we have 75 based on the numbers they have just mentioned; it would be that ratio, 31 advisors, assuming we have 12,000 students.

Interim Provost Molitor: There you go, 400 to 1.

Senator Heberle: It is like the success coaches.

Senator Semaan: Do we have the ratio target? Are we going to assign 200 per person or 300, or are we going to give it---

Interim Provost Molitor: Well, again, this is an issue of not all populations are equal.

Senator Semaan: True.

Interim Provost Molitor: So we have some populations that are going to need more help and it is going to take more advising workload to work student per student. Then we have other populations that may not necessarily need all that help. That was, you know, I think one of the issues with the success coach program. When it was implemented, there were two approaches we could take, which was to target those success coaches to the students that needed the most or assign every student a success coach. And we ended up going with the latter on that. And so obviously every student needs an advisor, but not every student needs to spend the same amount of time with an advisor. So that's something we need to address.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: We also want to leverage technology to help sort that for advisors as well, who are the students who are at risk of not registering next semester? So, leveraging technology to help them identify who on their caseloads is in the most need when during the semester as well.

Interim Provost Molitor: We're also engaging with, and you guys probably won't want to hear this, but we are thinking about a chat box that students can engage with to help answer, you know, common questions or questions at three in the morning when we're all tucked away in bed. So that's going to be technology we also hope to leverage, but that technology will require, again, this kind of information sharing and access in order to be successful. All right, I am coming up on five of 6 o'clock.

Past-President Rouillard: Could I change the topic to ask one quick question?

Interim Provost Molitor: Sure.

Past-President Rouillard: It actually relates to a topic that came up earlier in the meeting, and that was related to a question to Constitution and Rules Committee about changes of apportionment. Can you give us the list of the new faculty hires so that we can accurately prepare our lists for apportionment? We need to know who was hired as tenured track, who was hired as lecturer, who was hired as visiting so we don't inappropriately count people.

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes.

Past-President Rouillard: Thank you.

Interim Provost Molitor: Can you send me an email and I will make sure I get that to you as soon as possible? All right, well, President Van Hoy, what would you like me to do?

President Van Hoy: Well, one last question. We got a late question that wasn't on your list---

Interim Provost Molitor: Okay.

President Van Hoy cont'd: About the changes to DEI. The question essentially asked, you know, there are DEI needs outside of the Provost Office. So, is there a way in which that is being managed at this time?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes. So at this point, again, oh, Malaika left. Malaika will still work with HR, for example and at the Health Science Campus regarding initiatives for employees, for faculty and staff. But again, we want to bring her expertise into the student side as well to make sure as we're making these changes that we incorporate and think about that to have more widespread distribution. Same thing with community engagement. They do a lot outside of academic affairs. We want to make sure they're still managing. And obviously, it's going to be a workload issue. So, are we going to be able to continue everything we were doing outside of Academic Affairs? The answer is probably not. We're going to have to look at, and prioritize, and figure out what the most important and high impact programs are and work that they're doing.

President Van Hoy: And then in the last few minutes that you have, you know on that list there were also quite a few questions about prioritization?

Interim Provost Molitor: Yes. Since I am about to 'fall over,' can I request that maybe you invite me to the next meeting because I do have some things that I want to share with you. But it might be better if I spend a little forming that up and to have more specific information for you.

President Van Hoy: Sure, but I don't know if it would be the next meeting.

Interim Provost Molitor: An upcoming meeting, I apologize.

President Van Hoy: Yes.

Interim Provost Molitor: Happy to do that. Well, thank you all. I do appreciate all the feedback. This is how we make good decisions.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: One more thing. We have sent out email today to schedule stakeholder meetings, so we will be meeting with deans and colleges independently to discuss the issues and concerns that they have so we can address them appropriately. And lastly, I just want to announce, Adam Hintz has accepted the role of the academic advising administrator position, so he will be leading this charge along with us.

President Van Hoy: And for all of you who did not have your question addressed, we will have Provost Molitor back. We will cycle him back through. Okay, one quick announcement before we adjourn the meeting. So, Banned Book Week is September 22 to 28, and please look for the announcements all over campus for the Banned Books Week Vigil. Also, they are looking for help with this event and they are looking for donations. So, if you can help, please contact – help me, I'm blanking on names.

Past-President Rouillard: Paulette Kilmer.

President Van Hoy: Yes, Paulette Kilmer. Thank you. She's still doing it. All right, any questions from the floor or online?

Senator McInnis: [*Indecipherable*]...

President Van Hoy: So, Senator McInnis is asking if Faculty Senate Exec. has considered inviting the CFO to come talk about university financials. You and I emailed about that. The Executive Committee hasn't met yet. We will meet this Friday and talk about where that fits in the timeline. But I suspect everyone agrees that this semester and next semester might be good. Right? Thank you.

Senator Heberle: I just want to thank you for compiling the questions and everybody for sending their questions in advance because I think that makes this whole process much smoother. Maybe we can also do that for the CFO.

President Van Hoy: Absolutely. Renee Heberle has thanked everyone for sending in their questions both for Matt two weeks ago and Scott today. She suggests that when the- CFO comes that we also collect your questions.

Interim Provost Molitor: Very helpful, I agree.

President Van Hoy: All right, I don't see any more items. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Past-President Rouillard: So moved.

Senator Avidor-Reiss: Second.

President Van Hoy: Good night, everyone. Thank you so much. See you in two weeks.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Coulter-Harris
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary