

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 27, 2026
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 02/10/2026

Summary of Discussion

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

President Avidor-Reiss: Do you hear us online?

Senator Pryor: Yes, we do.

Senator Padilla: Yes, we can hear you clearly.

President Avidor-Reiss: Very good. So, good afternoon. We are going to start with our first item on agenda. Dr. Raghav Khanna, our new Faculty Senate Executive Secretary, will do the roll call.

Senator Khanna: Hello everybody. I hope you can hear me. My name is Raghav Khanna and I'm going to be taking roll. I hope I don't 'butcher' anybody's name, but if I do, please feel free to 'butcher' mine right back <laughter>. Feel free to send me a note or something and we can talk about pronouncing it correctly. For those who are replacing somebody, your name might come out of alphabetical order, so please listen out for your name because it might not come in alphabetical order. With that, I am going to take roll.

Roll Call 2025-2026

Present: Allred, Avidor-Reiss, Balthus, Barnes, Bellizzi, Benton, Bigioni, Bornak, Cheng, Cochrane, Duggan, Dwyer, Eichner, Elgafy, Fresenko, Gibbon, Gilstrap, Giovannucci, Glassman, Haller, Hamer, Harnych (proxy for. B. Bamber), Heberle, Kalinowski, Khanna, Kistner, Krantz, Krishnamurthy (proxy for. W. Taylor), Kumar, Lapitsky, Lawrence, Lee-Smith, Martin, McLoughlin, Miner, Mungo, Padilla, Pryor, Reinert, Sahloff, Smith, Song-Tao (proxy for M. Diakonova) Steven, Stoltz, Van Hoy, Wedding, Willey, Yonker

Excused Absence: Brakel, Green, Hamouda, Machalow, Javaid, Sheng

Unexcused Absence: Assaly, Cooper, Ekwenna, Kaw, Moussa, Nazzal, Osman, Semaan

President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, so we are waiting for the count. It will be a second.

Senator Khanna: Yes, we have a quorum.

President Avidor-Reiss: So, the second item is to vote for the agenda. We are going to do it by general consent. And I do want to let you know that compared to what we sent you, we have added the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee's report recently. Are there any motions to change the agenda? Since there are no motions, the agenda stand approved. *Agenda Approved.*

The next item is to approve the Minutes. Again, we are going to vote by general consent. Are there any corrections to the Minutes? Okay, if there are no corrections then the Minutes stand approved. *Minutes Passed.*

The next item is the *Faculty Senate Executive Committee report*, and I am going to read it: Over the past month, Faculty Senate Executive Committee members have met with President Holloway and Provost McKinney and held a biweekly executive meeting.

1. Renee and I met President Holloway and discussed the following:
 - a. Renee updated the president on the parking committee's early discussions and will provide one to the Faculty Senate today.
 - b. We discussed the need to make the university budget more transparent and easier for faculty to understand.
 - c. We discussed the need to enhance the research office for undergrad students.
 - i. In this regard, we want to make you aware of the Undergraduate Research Poster Symposium, which will take place February 23-27 in the Carlson Library. This is an excellent opportunity for undergraduate students from across the University to present their research. Abstracts are due January 30. The Faculty Senate sent a document with a QR code for submission. Chessa Oetjens is coordinating the event.
2. Renee and I met Provost McKinney and discussed the following:
 - a. The provost requested that a small group of senators consult him on the implementation of SB1 and HB96. Renee volunteered to be part of this group, and we are consulting the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to identify two other faculty members who can provide insight, either through their knowledge of faculty senate opportunities or other expertise. We appreciate the provost reaching out to collaborate with faculty.
 - b. We discussed the administration's proposal to eliminate course cross-listing, and the provost informed us that he favors maintaining cross-listing and addressing the bureaucratic challenges it creates. We appreciate his stance on this issue.
 - c. We discussed the need to provide faculty with an opportunity to train when the University changes faculty activities. For example, the email announcement sent to all faculty about annual review training was unclear, causing confusion.
3. Regarding the most recent biweekly Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting:
 - a. We discussed a request from the provost's office to streamline the process of removing inactive elective courses from catalogs. The provost's office staff asks that they make administrative adjustments "to administratively remove references to inactive courses from catalog pages that delineate program requirements." We are concerned that department chairs and program directors are not fully aware of the consequences. We understand and support the need to streamline the process and believe the best way to do so is for each department to review the courses and be aware of the changes.

- b. We discussed inviting new administrators to be introduced to FS, such as the VP of research and the general counsel.
 - c. We discussed the new and ongoing training and support for department chairs — a great initiative by our provost.
 - d. We discussed a preliminary parking committee meeting with Claire Dow — more about this today from Renee.
 - e. We set up a listening session with WittKieffer to discuss the search for our next VP of MARCOM, which will be on Wednesday at 11 am. An email with the link was sent to you by the Faculty Senate office.
4. As in the past, to enhance communication with faculty, the Executive Committee reports and the PowerPoints from our meetings will be emailed to all faculty following Senate meetings.

President Avidor-Reiss cont'd: Are there any comments or statements from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members? Anything else from senators? Yes, Sharon?

Senator Barnes: Can you say what the small committee implementing SB1 and House Bill 96, what part of that are they working on? Is that separate from the Faculty Senate Core Committee and Provost's "Reimagining the Core" work?

President-Elect Heberle: Yes.

Senator Barnes: Is that a little different?

President-Elect Herbele: Yes.

Senator Barnes: I was thinking about that.

Provost McKinney: I'm going to speak to that in my provost's report.

President Avidor-Reiss: Good, the provost will speak about it, that is great. Any other questions?

Senator Willey: Yes, this is Jim Willey from College of Medicine. Can you hear me, okay?

President Avidor-Reiss: Yes.

Senator Willey: Regarding the transparency of the budget, are you able to share the particular requests that you're putting to the president for transparency? I have a particular interest in knowing about the allocations to the different colleges based on revenue and so on. That's an important question. So, transparency can mean a lot of different things and so I just wanted to comment---

President Avidor-Reiss: What I suggest is you reach out to the chair of the Budget Committee because they are in communication. If you have specific questions or requests, please contact Margaret Hoogland and specify exactly what you're looking for.

Senator Willey: Alright, fair enough. Thank you.

President Avidor-Reiss: This is their job. They are communicating right now with the Budget people to make sure everything is needed in the way that is clear to everybody. So, if we have nothing more, let's move to our Provost report.

Provost McKinney: Thank you, Tomer. As I was thinking about updates and things that are happening this week, next week. I was looking at the calendar, and I wanted to start by thanking many folks for participating in activities of last week. On Friday morning, I started with a welcome, a charge to our core curriculum general education task force. This was an all day work retreat. And in that room, I'd say dozens, numerous of our faculty, our chairs, deans, our two deans chairing that task force, and so I thank them for keeping up that initiative and the work they were doing there.

I remember this vividly because it was a cold Friday and we walked across from the Student Union over to Rocket Hall, and there we had a large group of probably 50 or 60 faculty and others for the kickoff of the workforce education, the non-credit course development work that Barb Kopp-Miller and her team have initiated. So, I'm excited about the work that's happening there. I just came away from that thinking of sort of the investment, the energy, the work that's going across both of those areas.

So, what's coming up this week? I liked the slide that was up when I came in. I agree with Tomer, you said it was the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or officers in terms of our need to support, and enhance, and build-up the Office of Undergraduate Research. You saw the deadline that's coming up. The deadline is this Friday, January 30th at 5 pm. So, please, please, please, work with your undergraduates and encourage them to submit their abstracts so they can participate next month, February 23rd through 27th in the Undergraduate Research Creative Activity Exhibition. I also went to the website of Office of Undergraduate Research, and I asked the personnel and I said, okay, I know what's coming up after the submission of abstracts for the Research Exhibition next month. There will be the call for proposals for our summer research creative activities program. This is the funding of our undergraduates working with faculty members through the summer on research projects. I found the description in terms of the stipends for our undergraduates. Typically, it says it ranges \$3,000 for summer recertification. I went back and I said now, what's our level of funding? Are we able to cover everyone who submits? Then I heard that most recently we had a cut from that funding, and we were not able to. I said okay, well, then let's restore that funding for this summer. So, faculty working with your undergraduates submitting proposals for summer research activity and the call and the link to undergraduate research page portal will go active February 1st for those submissions. By the way, we are putting in the Chat Box links to all this information. Also putting in the Chat Box and I encourage you, nominations are due for our outstanding teachers and advisors' recognition awards. Those nominations must be submitted by 5pm. on Monday, February 9th (that is a week from this coming up Monday). Nominations for outstanding faculty teachers, six full-time faculty members will receive an award of \$1500 cash stipend or certificate. Two recipients for the outstanding advisor award, each receiving cash stipend, \$1500 and certificate. And here, students,

alumni, and faculty and staff are all encouraged to make nominations for those two awards coming up, February 9th. The link will be in the Chat. Also coming up is the next Office of Research Mixer. And Scott, you all are bringing in Joshua?

Past-President Van Hoy: It's going to be remote.

Provost McKinney: Remote?

Past-President Van Hoy: He is from California.

Provost McKinney: Okay.

Unknown Speaker: We are going to gather together to listen to the presentation.

Provost McKinney: He's at UC Santa Barbara and so he will be there remote on scientific writing this Thursday from 4 to 5:30pm. I would encourage your participation there. Also, there's a call for faculty who are interested in being involved in our experiential learning. I think, Angela, the last time we talked about this I said, well, we have another task force or working group. So, I'll call it a working group that is working with Angela and her team as we begin to build up how we are addressing Toledo Advantage. This is the goal: beginning this coming fall, all undergraduates will participate in at least one form of experiential learning activity during their time with us. Angela has called for faculty volunteers who would like to be a part of this effort. So if you've got an interest, in experiential learning and you would like to be part of how we're building the infrastructure that will implement our experiential learning in Toledo Advantage. We certainly want full faculty involvement. I don't think we have a link, so I would say please send an email to Angela for your participation there.

Dr. Angela Paprocki: Yes, that is fine.

Provost McKinney: Let me circle back to what Tomer reported, and I met with Tomer and Renee sometime last week. I was probably calling it SB1 or HB 96. Since then, we have received reports from the latest filings in Columbus in terms of upcoming legislation, more legislation. We will likely have more House bills or Senate bills.

President-Elect Heberle: Just move out of state <laughter>.

Provost McKinney: I'm hesitant to name a SB 1 group or HB 96 group because it likely will be something else, but I guess because I was tied to these notes. It is an academic policy and procedures advisory group. So Sharon, to your question, this is not a group. This will not be matters that are developing new policy or approving courses. All of those things go through the normal channels, but then when it comes to the Provost Office of implementing of how do we do this? For example, one of the connections coming down the pike is the syllabus requirement. Now, that's a policy. It's approved. We have guidelines. But then there's a number of matters of, well, what is the process? And what is the timeline? And how do we do this? We've got other matters that I shared with leadership of sharing curriculum that is approved by Faculty Senate that then will be shared with the Board. So, I'm thinking

through what's the process? How do we do these things? I immediately said, "Well, I invite and need faculty input and advice on process and procedures." And as I shared with Renee and Tomer, rather than me developing, coming to you then reporting and then the reaction is, well, this is the first we're hearing or why the decision was made. So, I think what we decided is rather than a one committee because these are rather broad; they are not developing policies. It is implementing various things that the leadership will identify committee chairs to work or other folks on Faculty Senate to work with Renee to form this group of three or four that will then assist me in the advisory group. As I say this, I in fact envision a monthly meeting or every two-week meeting or so to get the advising that I need from the Faculty Senate representative. So, I'm looking forward to having that guidance that I think is important.

Now, everyone, please take out your pens or keyboard and mark this important day, Friday, January 30th. It is "national have fun at work day" Yes, and I'm serious about this.

President-Elect Heberle: Well, that's every day.

Provost McKinney: Well, I'm looking forward to seeing how you will implement that this Friday. I've already had several of my ideas 'poo-phooed' by the staff. My first one was, oh, we can go outside and challenge the President's Office to a snowball fight. And then someone said, well, this is fluffy snow; it doesn't pack very well. So then they 'poo-phooed' that idea. And I said, well, I will come up with some other ideas. So, I look forward to sharing with you how we are going to have our fun workday on Friday, and I look forward to hearing from and seeing you, Friday, January 30th. So, those are the updates.

President Avidor-Reiss: Any questions? Okay, thank you. Oh, David [Krantz], do you want to speak out?

Senator Krantz: Yes. Can you hear me?

President Avidor-Reiss: Yes.

Senator Krantz: This is a comment coming from the Curriculum Committee in Natural Science and Mathematics. Associate Provost Molitor has been trying to track down very specific information about new guidelines from the Ohio Department of Higher Ed., and I thank him for that effort. I would encourage the Office of the Provost broadly to get very clear guidelines that those of us who deal with a program review, that we can implement these because it's going to be coming up to the Faculty Senate also from the colleges. Thank you.

Provost McKinney: David, thank you. We might have this topic addressed a bit later in this meeting in terms of guidelines for program review on the specific question. And then I would just say on the broad question, very clear guidelines from ODHE. Renee is laughing. That is almost a daily task that we are sending queries and trying to get guidelines on a number of fronts. But I appreciate the question. Hopefully, we will have addressed the program review guidelines in a report later in this meeting.

Senator Krantz: Very good. My concern is that literally, at the college level, we are running out of time to be able to get things program modifications approved, forwarded to the Faculty Senate, and having them approve them as well.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Hello, David. This is Scott. I think what you are referring to is what we can count towards major hours and concentration hours. And yes, I did send an email to the ODHE at end of last week and have not heard back. I will probably be following up soon, if not sending a phone call. My recommendation is to go ahead and forward your curriculum through the curricular approval processes, so we don't hold things up. Hopefully in anticipation of an answer that what you're proposing will be acceptable, and then if it's not, we will have to circle back and figure out how to proceed, okay?

Senator Krantz: Yes, very good. Scott, I've been watching in the background as all of this has been going on within NSM, so thank you very much for your efforts.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: No worries. Thank you, David. I appreciate it.

President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, so next is Renee. Do you want to come here?

President-Elect Heberle: No, I just have a brief report. The Parking Committee did meet again and I can't even remember if it was before or after our last meeting, but I did want to update people that things are moving along. We are figuring out as we go who needs to be at the table essentially. So, our current effort is to get folks at the Port Authority to the table. So now we have finance at UT, the Port Authority, UPark Toledo, anyone else the President thinks from the cabinet should be involved and the faculty committee who are going to be working on making some of the changes that we are proposing as a faculty about parking. The three things are mostly trying to extend the hours that they do not ticket overnight, figuring out a way to either subsidize, or make more available parking for events and volunteers coming to campus. So, we really are focusing on opening our campus through our front door parking. We have momentum and we will continue to get all these people to the table to try to work out some new policies for parking.

President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, thank you.

President-Elect Heberle: Also, I've been working on getting volunteers for the committee that Provost McKinney mentioned about consulting on SB1 and HB 96 and all the rest that's going to come down the pike. We have three volunteers so far, really excellent representatives. If maybe one or two more folks would step up to do that, that would be great. I can't give you a real solid job description yet, but we'll work it out and I trust that Provost McKinney understands our workload already. But if you're interested in being involved, please email me. We just need one or two more people. It's not a representative committee, the person doesn't have to be a senator, but it will be a senate sponsored sort of committee to work with the provost on these implementation issues.

President Avidor-Reiss: All right, thank you, Renee. Let me stop sharing. Rob is going to take over.

Senator Padilla: You guys have the PowerPoint, right? Would you guys like to put it up?

President Avidor-Reiss: That is a good question. Yes, we can.

Senator Padilla: Alright, this is our undergraduate report following our first [2026] meeting last week. All the courses are bioengineering courses. I'll go through and tell you what we are generally doing with each one. All of these were submitted to kind of update the student learning objectives and course learning objectives in each of the courses and to update their syllabi. I'll just read so that we're all on the same page. I'll read the first page and then the second page. Then I'll ask if Faculty Senate wants to approve them. But I'm not going to give you the reasons for each individual course because they're all the same; it's all course syllabi updates and SLO and CLO updates. All right:

BIOE 1000 (Orientation and Introduction to Bioengineering Computing)

BIOE 1010 (Professional Development)

BIOE 1200 (Introduction to Bioengineering Applications)

BIOE 1410 (Freshman Design Innovation I)

BIOE 2100 (Bioengineering Thermodynamics)

BIOE 2300 (Biomedical Quality Control)

BIOE 3110 (Introduction to Biomechanics)

BIOE 3400 (Biotransport Phenomena)

BIOE 3500 (Bioprocessing Laboratory)

BIOE 4410 (Bioengineering Design Project I)

Senator Padilla cont'd: Each of these courses, I think except one, was a course that we had sent back, and they had done a wonderful job in addressing all the issues we had. And so, we would like to ask Faculty Senate if they will approve these ten courses so that we can push them forward to the Provost Office. Are there any objections?

President Avidor-Reiss: Do you see any online?

Senator Padilla: No, it doesn't look like there are objections online.

Past-President Van Hoy: No objections in the room.

Senator Padilla: I'm sorry?

Past-President Van Hoy: No objections in the room.

Senator Padilla: Okay. So, can we send them forward to the Provost Office?

Past-President Van Hoy: If it is a consent agenda, yes. The answer is yes.

Senator Padilla: All right, thank you guys. I appreciate it. *Motion Passed.*

President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, excellent. So now we are moving to the next item, Alana Malik. She will be discussing assessments, accreditation and program review updates. Let me share here.

Dr. Alana Malik: Alright, well hi everyone. For those of you who don't know me, my name's Alana Malik and I work on assessment accreditation, and program review. So Tomer asked me to give an update to everyone, and so that's what I will be doing. I've got Angela and Scott in the room, so they're going to keep me honest and let me know if I make any mistakes. So, there's a few things I wanted to talk about. Again, this is mostly just an update from what we've been doing for the last year. We're still working on Ohio Transfer 36. We have a new project called Simple Syllabus, which hopefully you've already heard about, but if not, I'll give a brief update on what's going on with that. We've got curriculum mapping and happening in our CIM system. I'm going to give a brief update on program review. And, I'm going to apologize in advance Dave, that I don't have all of the details that you were asking for, but I can get them to you, and I'll get them to everybody actually because I didn't include them today, but, I will definitely be able to get them to you. And then the HLC insurance argument, a little update on that. And then I have preliminary results from our 2024-2025 assessment cycle. So, for those of you who are on the University Assessment and Program Review Committee, and I know there's some of you that are online, this is a sneak peek of what we're going to be talking about next week.

So, jumping right into Ohio Transfer 36, I can't remember what percentage we were at last time I talked to all of you, but we are getting much better. We are at 77% of the courses that have been submitted and approved (so that's great), or they have been inactivated by the department, and that also counts as 'check done.' I've received five courses submitted already for this spring review process. The deadline for all the rest of the outstanding courses (of which I know it says 21 up there, but it's actually 20) is coming up on February 1st. So, if folks could get me those last 20 courses, we will do our best to get them in the system and hopefully get them approved this semester. Unfortunately, for us the state is now asking to expire courses if they're not approved. That means that any course that isn't approved is at risk of being expired by the state, which just means it's not going to be a part of the Ohio Transfer 36. But, it is still important that we get those in. One of the reasons why I want us to get it in and be done with this process is because they've actually made it a process that's never going to end. They initially started this recertification process back in 2022. Prior to that, it used to just be hey, tell us what course you have and what's its number and we'll just trust you that it's equivalent of the Ohio State course, at the same number and the same name. And so, they're now asking us to recertify and re-submit courses on a five-year cycle. When we started in 2022, all the courses that were approved in 2022 are now coming up for re-review in 2027. It's 2026 people. I need you to get the other stuff done so that when the 2027 recertification of the recertification starts, I don't lose my mind, and we all don't lose our mind. And then of course, the years after 2023 correspond to 2028 and so on and so forth. So, again, it's in our best interest to get those last courses in so that we can get on with the rest of the process and get ready for the rhythm that's going to continue.

President Avidor-Reiss: Just to clarify, for 2027, when do you want to get it done? By the end of 2026?

Dr. Alana Malik: Well, in order for us to be ready to go for 2027, all of our courses have to be approved in 2026. Or at least like to be done and be just getting into the regular review process.

President Avidor-Reiss: So, spring 2027 or earlier?

Dr. Alana Malik: Well, I asked for them in December, and I got five and so now I'm asking again. They've got till February 1st to get the rest of them in. They've known about it for quite a while. In fact, in some cases, for three years. So, this is me not losing my patience but being very adamant that we get these in because we're starting to get behind the ball.

Alright, another project that we're working on is Simple Syllabus. This is our chosen implementation strategy for the SB 1 requirements related to syllabi, all being hosted on a website for all to see. Jean Krissina and I are on Provost McKinney's implementation team like he talked about. We are planning to have the system built. We are working on that right now with the vendor and we have to be able to train folks on it as early as we can in the spring as soon as they get it up and running for us. Our initial timeline was pushing it out to probably the end of April, but I'm hoping that we can move faster and get it done sooner than that so that we have more time at the end of the semester to help folks look at it, and see what it looks like, and see how to set it up. It's going to make your life a lot easier though. Like, you're never going to have to remember what your CRN is for your course because it's already going to be in the system for you. It's going to use Blackboard as its interface. So, a lot of you that are already using Blackboard, it shouldn't be too unfamiliar then. I am not technical at all, like I'm a technical logical idiot. And so, even for me when I look at it, I'm like, okay, this is pretty intuitive. The keyword there is 'simple,' and so if it works as well as they said it will, I think a lot of us will be in good shape.

In keeping with that though, there's a comment there about learning outcomes. I appreciate that the bioengineering folks said they were updating their syllabi and they were updating their course learning outcomes because that's what I need all of you to do if you have a course in CIM that does not have the course learning outcomes in CIM. When Simple Syllabus gets implemented, they're going to be pulling data from Banner and from CIM; the part that they're pulling from CIM is our course learning outcomes. So, if they're not in there, they won't be in your course template for you. So, we need those in CIM to make it work for everybody.

President Avidor-Reiss: So, what will happen then? Will the faculty be able to edit?

Dr. Alana Malik: No, because the course outcomes are at the course level and faculty are at a section level, right? So, if you've got five different people teaching the same course, you want all five of those people to end up with the same outcome or the same outcomes because it's the same course, right? How they get there can be different, but the outcomes need to be the same. So, that's why we're pulling them from CIM, and that's why in CIM it only asks you for one set of outcomes.

Past-President Van Hoy: Has the list been generated so that we might know which courses?

Dr. Alana Malik: Yes, I sent the list out to the University Assessment and Program Review Committee members, which are a lot of the associate deans. And right now, we have a little over 800 courses that don't have--- but there's thousands of them in there. So, to say there's only 800 left is not insurmountable, I don't think.

Past-President Van Hoy: And these are trickling to the departments that faculty then need to change?

Dr. Alana Malik: Hopefully, that's the plan. I can send them. I can look up any of the LTC ones and send them to you.

Past-President Van Hoy: I haven't heard anything anywhere, so I am concerned.

Dr. Alana Malik: Yes, that's concerning because we've been asking for this for the last couple of years.

President Avidor-Reiss: I do want to emphasize that we noticed that there is a big barrier with administration to faculty at the mid-level. So, if there is a way for you to communicate directly with faculty because you know that they are just sending, please do.

Dr. Alana Malik: I will go back and look at that list of 800. My problem is, I don't always know which course goes to which department, so I'll try and get help figuring that out and hopefully someone will be able to help do that for me. So, yeah, there's 800 courses that are missing their course learning outcomes in CIM. I will say this to you, if it's a course (because I run into this sometimes) that hasn't been taught in a few years, and they look at the old outcomes and they're like, those aren't really what we want to teach anymore or those aren't written very well so we don't want to use those. But then they're like, but we're not teaching the course, so we don't really want to spend time creating new ones because I have other things to do, right? Well, then that gets me in a catch 22 of why we have 800 courses, right? Like if the course isn't being taught, take it out of CIM, inactivate it in CIM, and then we know that we don't have to worry about it anymore. Because right now some of these are probably a part of this 800 that we're not teaching.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: And let me add, if you inactivate a course in CIM, it's easy to reactivate it if you want to offer it again. So, it is not permanent.

President Avidor-Reiss: I think the concern is that there are courses that we teach once in two years or three years, not necessarily every year, and that maybe full of this category.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: I would expect that you would have outcomes that are relatively up to date if you've taught it two years ago or even three years ago, to be honest. We are more concerned about the courses that we have no real plans to offer in the foreseeable future.

Past-President Van Hoy: What are the syllabi expectations for independent study and internship courses that don't necessarily have syllabi, but we use contracts for?

Dr. Alana Malik: That is a good question.

Dr. Anagela Paprocki: They did. It is on the Teaching Center's website.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: But it still should have learning outcomes. It should have expectations on how courses are going to be graded.

Past-President Van Hoy: Well, the contracts don't have all of that in, right.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Right, so you are just going to put it in the form of a syllabus.

Past-President Van Hoy: Okay.

Dr. F. Scott Hall: For us, the syllabus is the contract. So the syllabus doesn't change, but all the individual stuff goes into the contract.

Dr. Alana Malik: Right. It is almost like you could write a master syllabus for your independent study and then just change out the things that are important to that student, right? Okay, any other questions about Simple Syllabus?

Alright, so the next thing I wanted to talk about is the curriculum mapping that's happening in CIM. This is also a project that we started. The Assessment Committee started asking folks to do curriculum maps back in 2020. We had a big room full of people right before the pandemic happened and it was a really good conversation. Everybody understood what curriculum maps were. We were all going to work on them. We all got them done on Excel, which was fantastic, at the program level. Now we're asking for groups to go back and actually align course learning outcomes with their program learning outcomes. So this is again why it's important to have those course learning outcomes in CIM. That was actually our initial reason for wanting them in, aside from it's just good practice to have them in one place. So, if you're an approver for a program and you see a map up there like the one in the left-hand corner at the top, and it's empty. That means that the folks haven't gone ahead and converted their Excel curriculum map into CIM so that you as approvers can see it at one glance, right? Once they get these in here, you won't have to go through and open that Excel file in the approval process. Did you know there's an Excel file in the approval process?

Dr. F. Scott Hall: Yes.

Dr. Alana Malik: Okay, good. It makes me wonder if people actually open it. The curriculum maps should be in here, but if they're blank, just send them back to me and say, hey, Alana can help you do that? So, send them to me. I'm happy to help them get started on how to do it. CIM actually makes it really easy. If all your course learning outcomes are in there, you click on that little pencil mark, and it pops open. It tells you what course it is, and it tells you your program learning outcomes, and then it lists all of your course outcomes under that. You can click the box of which one you want to align with your program outcome. It's a beautiful thing to help you kind of make all these puzzle pieces fit together. So again, if it's blank, send them to me. If it looks like this other one that I have blacked out the names of the courses to protect the group that I stole this from, this one is done, but it's done over robustly and it's not done correctly. Does anybody know why it would not be done correctly? Is there a reason?

Past-President VanHoy: Every box is marked.

Dr. Alana Malik: Yes, every box is marked. Why is that a problem when you do a curriculum map?

President-Elect Heberle: Because they don't all map onto everything.

Dr. Alana Malik: Yes, if you map everything to everything, it's a headache and it's a nightmare and it becomes meaningless. Right. So, in this case, I would have you all as the reviewers say, hey, Angela, you need to talk to Alana because you didn't do this the way we expected to see it - so why don't you go talk to Alana and we'll figure this out? Because yes, they've got all sorts of problems with this one. That first class is a 2000 level class, and they've got four all the way listed at the end. That means all of those program learning outcomes, a four means that I've mastered that outcome at the graduation level and undergrad level, right? Like that's not happening in a 2000 level course or if it is, there's a problem with the curriculum and we need to go back and figure that out, right? I'm so glad you all knew the answers to that. Do you know that that's progress? Because if we had talked about this ten years ago, you all would have been like, what are you talking about Alana? So again, this is my short review on program review. So, David Krantz, I'm so sorry. I will get you all the other stuff you want. So, we are piloting a new program review template with the Department of Communication and the Department of Mathematics. They have their self-studies that they've had since probably October. They've had the template. They've had data from IR. We actually were able to embed their data within their template, so they just look at it all in one big document. We are hoping to have their self-studies come in at the end of this week and then we will have external reviewers come [that review] taking place later in the spring. And I also have worked with a group of faculty members to draft program review policies that are somewhere in the approval process. And the other thing that we did was, we told the groups, Communication and Math, if you're looking at data and it is not that interesting and the story is just not that important to you, skip that question. Go on to the next one. Find the things in this template that are really important to you and that are really speaking to you. So, we gave them some flexibility in the template as well. I promise I'll get them to you David Krantz. Any questions about program review? Yes, Renee?

President-Elect Heberle: I just want to make sure I'm clear on this. Many years ago... and a lot had to do with strengths and weaknesses, etc. etc. So, there was a cycle at the University that every program was supposed to go through every five years. And part of it was to help the university understand what the program needed. Does this have anything to do with that or is it just HLC saying---?

Dr. Alana Malik: Yes, we are still doing that same level of closing the loop with the provost. So, that part of the process didn't change.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: And resources a program needs are still a part of this process. The current process was missing an evaluation of the curriculum and student outcomes. I should point out that this is not only for HLC. The Chancellor's Council and Graduate Studies requires us to do regular program review on all of our graduate programs as well, and I have a report on that every September.

Past-President Van Hoy: So, you are saying that program reviews are being dictated more or less by HLC expectations, so this was a change from the previous. But a lot of the programs have outside accreditation and so the program has to include a lot of other things that are not required for unaccredited programs.

Dr. Alana Malik: Right. You're going to like this answer. Program review, the internal process is for programs that don't have an external accreditor. The externally accredited programs, we want you to just

follow what your accreditor wants you to do. Then we have this set up for the groups that don't have it. And we'll certainly help if people need help with their accreditation. Sharon?

Senator Barnes: So is there nothing in the program review outside of curriculum?

Dr. Alana Malik: Say that again?

Senator Barnes: Is there nothing in this review that exists outside of curriculum?

Dr. Alana Malik: I would say that the topics that are listed in the template are all curriculum related or curriculum adjacent.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: No, we have questions on the resources and several other topics.

Dr. Alana Malik: It talks about like faculty workload and service. It's a lot of the things that---

President-Elect Heberle: You would need more stuff on curriculum.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes, we added more emphasis on curriculum.

Dr. Alana Malik: I will send you the template so you can look at it because it's not a secret. Y

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: That would be great. In fact, we've been asking Math and Communication to provide feedback on the template as they go through the process to evaluate the recent changes. I think it would be great for Senate to look at it and provide your feedback as well. That would be fantastic.

Dr. Alana Malik: Yeah, we can do that.

President-Elect Heberle: Thanks.

Dr. Alana Malik: No problem. Anytime. Okay, so now we've been talking about the Higher Learning Commission. For those of you who don't know what it is, HLC is our accreditor for the entire institution, so it's like ABET on steroids cause it's for all of us. It's on my mind a lot, just on a regular day. But it's on my mind a lot this year because we're at the midpoint of our cycle. They were here in 2021 in the middle of the pandemic and we were recredited for ten years, so we're accredited through 2031. But HLC got smart and they decided that maybe when they have accreditation last ten years rather than have people just sort of slack off for eight years and then panic for two and then slack off for eight and then panic for two, that they would do a mid-cycle kind of a midpoint update. And so, that's what we have that is due coming up in March. But we had a group of people come together from across campus that helped us write our draft and it was complete. Right now, it's with our editor. Once we get that back from her, I'm sure we'll send it out to folks to read and look at for us. We'll be adding evidence from the spring, anything that needs to be updated, like, this PowerPoint will probably get added in just because I think it's good. And then also, because HLC has a closed system, there's a way we have to format it. So we're going

to be working on that for the rest of the time before it's due in March. But we're in good shape. Honestly, I said this when we started the process. I said, maybe I'm the only one that actually likes accreditation because I think it's a great way to spotlight what we do really well, and I don't think UT does a great job of highlighting what we do well and telling people what we do well. And so, by the process of doing part of this draft writing, I have been blown away by what you all do with your students and how much you care. It's just been amazing.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Alana's statement here carries extra weight because Alana herself is also an HLC program reviewer.

Dr. Alana Malik: Oh yeah, I do that on the side. Actually, I do it so that it can help us when we have to write ours. How am I doing on time?

President Avidor-Reiss: You are okay.

Dr. Alana Malik: Okay, good. So, the last thing I wanted to talk about is, and how am I doing on time? Okay. I want to talk about what we found in our assessment, the strengths and challenges. This is preliminary data because I haven't gone through everything yet. But what I did for you is look at the evaluation reports, which are the summary reports that are written by the liaisons. They look at all the programmer reports that come in. They usually have a committee that they work with and that committee usually looks at them with them and then gives feedback back to the programs. And then the liaison looks at all of the data that came in and writes a summary at the college level – and so, that is what I looked at for you all to look at. And then I did it by HLC accreditation because of their criteria, again, just because HLC is on my brain, so hopefully this makes sense. So those were the colleges that participated in the cocurricular service units. Law isn't here because they have only one program. We don't make them write a report on a summary of a report. I need you to write a summary report when you have ten different programs and we want a summary, right? So, there's a, there's a little bit of data that's missing here. The first HLC criteria is about mission. Like I said, you all are doing so many great, wonderful things. There's been strong integration of experiential learning and applied learning across programs that came out in the, in the reports. The academic support services, that's Tia Tucker's area over in the Learning Enhancement Center. They actually pull data and look at and are making strides in keeping students here with persistence and then also completion. They look at their grades and persistence, so that's fantastic. And then they also talked a lot about how our learning outcomes are really geared towards helping students see, not just, you know, in theory what it could look like in the classroom, but how it relates to the real world. So, I just thought those were really great examples of where we're living our mission in our classes. Now some challenges related to mission: In COBI, they found out that they haven't reviewed associate degrees in a while, and so we want to do that to make sure that we're maintaining our connection with the workforce development that we say we're going to be doing in the region. They had some DFW rates and this was an issue in the exploratory studies, which is part of U College. So, and that's going to be impacting persistence and retention and the sense of belonging, and so that was something that they had noted. And then a couple other things. The program eliminations that happened, they were done well. We as a committee opted to not have faculty do reports on programs that were being taught out because we wanted them to focus their time and energy on the programs that are saying. And I say that not because the programs that are leaving aren't important or aren't worthy, but you'll see later,

one of our other weaknesses or one of our other challenges is bandwidth, and so making sure that, that we align our energy with things that are going to matter down the road. Strengths, the second HLC category is about integrity and ethical and responsible conduct. Again, one of the things that I appreciate having done this job for as long as I've done it now is that we actually are at a point where it's okay to not be perfect. When we first started this, people thought, oh, I have to tell Alana that everything's going great because if I don't do that, they'll come after me and they'll, they'll close me down or they'll let me go. No one has lost their job because of assessment. No program has closed because of assessment unless the program decided it wanted to close based on its own assessment. But, if folks can't report, they report why they can't report and they've all been pretty legit reasons, right? Our enrollment's too low, it's a brand-new program, we're making major revisions to our curriculum etc. You know, those are legitimate reasons why you wouldn't report and it's been clearly documented and it's been great to know that that's what's happening. There's more transparent communication between faculty, and liaisons, and the program directors. I appreciate again this idea of people doing assessment because they want to make their programs better, not because they need to check a box. When I first started it, it was Alana, what do you need me to do so you can check your box? Alana, tell me what I need to do for you? And I'm like, please don't do it for me, do it for yourself. So I think we're finally turning a corner and getting to a place where it's not about me and what I need, it's about you all making sure that you're getting done what you need to get done, which is great. Some challenges that came up. We did have some FERPA fowls that happened, but they were identified quickly and the data was cleaned up, and so those students/identifiers were taken off. That's something that we wanted to make sure that we keep reminding people about that just to make sure you don't have any unique student ID data in there. I didn't talk about it in the last one, but the merger between HHS and Nursing has allowed them for the opportunity to change their governance structure which is going to impact assessment. So, they've been talking about that. It's not necessarily a strength or a challenge; it's just something that they need to do. So, it got dropped into the challenges.

And then teaching and learning, again, this was the section that I co-wrote. This one is the meat of our assurance argument. It's basically all about what we do to support students, the learning environment that we create, the educational programs that we offer, the support services that we have, and are those programs effective? So once again, we have lots of good alignments between program learning outcomes and assessment measures and curriculum maps. We've got direct embedded assessments that link to assignments. That's really fantastic. I love that there was one in here about a strong emphasis on experiential learning with a hundred percent student participation and practice-based learning in many programs. So, I know that experiential learning is a 'buzzword' this year because of the president's initiative to get everyone a hundred percent of our students doing experiential learning, but I would argue that we're already doing it and we're already doing it super awesomely well. And so, this was just a nice, you know, pat on the shoulder to say, good job UT.

Challenges related to it: For as many programs as we have that are getting really good at aligning their program and learning outcomes and their assessments and their curriculum maps and getting it all done correctly. We still have some that use course grades or GPAs for their measures, which is not the best. So, if you see that, send them my way and I will help you figure out a better way to do it. And sometimes our program learning outcomes are even our course learning outcomes are written in such a way that they're too broad and they're not measurable or written, so I can help with that too. We've had some programs

showing kind of inconsistent performance across assessment cycles, and they're talking about using the process.

The last area that HLC looks at is about sustainability, and institutional effectiveness, resources and planning. Again, we have a very established systematic assessment process that we've been using now for several years. Everybody knows when things are due. We kind of have a nice rhythm for the year. We have documentation of faculty committees using their results to create accurate plans and prove their curriculum. So, we're doing a lot of great things really, really well. And I think kudos also to Institutional Research. They've been reaching out and helping, especially with Tia Tucker's area that now has a dashboard that helps them see their persistence and grades between the groups that use the Learning Enhancement Center and those that don't. So, Institution Research has been really, really helpful in our process and programs process with assessment. And then of course we've also had consistent success with our accredited programs as well and so that's important to note.

Challenges: Again, that governance came up again that we need to create a new assessment process for the for the upcoming year. That's something that HHS is working on. This goes back to what I said about working on teaching out programs because we're over extended as we are anyways. So, that comes up pretty much every year that we have limited resources.

So, I think that is it. Let me see. Yes, that is it. Any questions? Yes, Scott?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Just two comments. First, one of the things that you didn't see here were comments on the specific programs or the learning outcomes. And there's good reason for that. That's not what we are interested in at the institutional level. That's what the faculty and your individual programs should be interested in. When you are reporting data on learning outcomes, and your students seem to be doing well in some areas and not so well in other areas, these data are for your use to determine what if any changes are needed. Unless there's an issue that requires facilities or resources to improve student performance, this is for your internal to determine what you as faculty do in your programs to ensure your moving forward and improving student outcomes. So, again, these details are not the focus of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The HLC wants us to demonstrate that we have processes in place that focus on the continuous improvement of student outcomes within our programs.

Another comment regarding experiential learning, which Alana also mentioned. Experiential learning is wonderful not only for the experience students receive, but it's wonderful for assessment of student performance with respect to student learning outcomes. When I was a program director in Engineering, one of my best sources of information for assessment was what the co-op employers said about our students that were participating in our co-op program. And it turned out that not only were they providing information with regards to how our students were performing with respect to our learning outcomes, sometimes they identified student learning outcomes that we should consider adding, which led to changes in our courses and program requirements. So, I would highly encourage you to keep this in mind as we implement the President's goals regards to Advantage Toledo program and expand our experiential learning opportunities.

Dr. Alana Malik: Any other questions? Yes, Sharon?

Senator Barnes: Thanks a lot for all your support and making this possible.

Dr. Alana Malik: Thanks. You know I love it.

President Avidor-Reiss: Let me find my PowerPoint here again. Any items from the floor? Any discussion points? Barbara?

Senator Miner: Department of Art

The Department of Art faculty have routinely underspent, or zeroed out, both the Operating Budget and the Lab Fee budgets. The inability to create a “savings” account, or a “roll-forward” account, prevents the department from purchasing/stockpiling when materials are on sale, or from saving for a big-ticket item of technology or tool/equipment repair or replacement. In fact, faculty scrounge for sales on materials to offset and supplement the increased cost of basic fine arts materials and supplies. Faculty have even raided their own stashes of supplies and donated those supplies when students are unable to pay for their own materials.

The cost of materials has skyrocketed over the last ten years and the university’s continued “taxes” on student Lab Fees continues to take a toll on both student and faculty moral.

Impacting Lab Fees associated with Studio courses, a combination of increased supplies and materials costs, and the university’s “taxes” on student Lab Fees, makes the delivery of nationally accredited programs increasingly difficult. As students struggle with the rising cost of a higher education degree and fewer students are actually choosing college as a career path, the current model of taxing Lab Fees is unsustainable.

Taxes on Lab Fees are collected based on course enrollment two years prior to the current fiscal year. Therefore, prior high enrollment years negatively impacts current lower enrollment, and current students are paying a higher percentage of their lab fees than were students in the previous two years.

Aside from the “taxes” levied on the Lab Fees, research into how the ODHE defines the rules guiding disbursement of certain fees is codified on their website.

As far as I can understand, “Taxes” assessed on lab fees actually amount to a tuition increase without transparency or accountability.

I was told that the assessed taxes are an “Administrative Charge” that goes to Central Processing to pay for oversight. However, Central Processing has no direct responsibility for ordering paper, charcoal, welding gas, ceramic glaze materials, wood for building painting frames, or photographic papers. Research about materials and ordering of those materials is handled directly by full-time faculty using PCards. Part-time instructor’s supplies are ordered by the department secretary using a PCard. All receipts are submitted via Concur and the secretary and department chair approve all charges before they are reviewed by the college’s Business Manager. Perhaps there is another layer of administration that I am not aware of, so it would be helpful to have some clarity about how Central Processing uses student Lab Fees from say, a Drawing class.

I think that the institution is at a long-awaited crossroads. A new era of transparency and honesty about the institution’s finances and the ways in which that transparency truly matters and impacts everyone,

even down to the purchasing of pencils for Drawing classes, is deeply desired. I appreciate your time and the information I am certain will be

President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, thank you Babara. I think this issue of tech fee taxes and lab fee taxes are an important issue that negatively affect what we do in our classes. Hopefully, we will reach out to the Provost probably in the future to see what can be done about that.

Senator Miner: Thank you.

President Avidor-Reiss: Any additional concerns or comments? Okay, so if we have no other suggestions and if there are no objections, then this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dr. Raghav Khanna
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary