

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 24, 2026
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 04/07/2026

Summary of Discussion

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

FS President Avidor-Reiss: It is 4 o'clock and we are ready to start. The first item like always is Secretary Khanna with roll call.

Senator Khanna: Thank you, Tomer. Good afternoon, Senators.

Roll Call 2025-2026

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

Excused Absence: Brakel, Hamouda, Machalow

Unexcused Absence: Assaly, Kaw, Moussa, Nazzal

Senator Khanna: Give me just a second, President Tomer to determine because we have a lot of absences here today.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: If anyone join online and want to declare his or her arrival, you are welcome.

Senator Mungo: Monita Mungo is present.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you, Monita.

Senator Mungo: Thank you.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: We're waiting on the judgement from Raghav.

FS Past-President Van Hoy: 'The judgement' <laughter>.

Senator Khanna: Just by the hair of our 'chiny chin, chin,' we have a quorum.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Hallelujah. So, the next thing is approving the agenda. It seems quite busy today. So again, we are going to vote by general consent. Are there any motions to change the agenda? In the room, online? Do you see anything in the Chat? Okay, if not, since there are no motions, the agenda stand approved. Agenda Passed.

The next thing are the Minutes. Are there any corrections to the Minutes? In the room and online? Okay, since there are no corrections then the Minutes stand approved.

And the fourth item now is the *Executive Committee report*. So, the bi-weekly Executive Committee meeting and.

1. On February March 13, members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee held a biweekly executive meeting, and we gave a short presentation to the BOT on March 16.

2. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee discussed the following:

- a. We have obtained several nominations for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate president, and we encourage more faculty to consider these roles.
- b. We are following the iClicker license status. If you have any questions, please contact Rob Stevens, who is leading this effort.
- c. We will be discussing reforming the FS meeting minutes and related changes to the FS constitution and bylaws today.

3. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee presented to the BOT:

- a. The BOT asked us to continue updating them on the parking changes suggested by the FS Parking Committee, led by Renee, at the next BOT meeting.
- b. We also reported the challenges in populating all the services needed at UToledo, and the BOT asked for suggestions to resolve the issue.

Last note: Amber Sherick, Accessibility Coordinator, presented at February's Faculty Senate meeting, informed us that GAs can access Acrobat Pro since they are considered 'employees' of UT. Like faculty and staff, they must submit a request for Acrobat Pro through the IT Help Desk to gain access.

Any comments from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee? Any suggestions? Anyone else? Any discussion? Any points online? So, we're going to start with our president, President Holloway.

Dr. Holloway, President of The University of Toledo: Thank you. I'm the other president.

FS Past-President Van Hoy: The University President.

Dr. Holloway, President of The University of Toledo: I agree. So thanks as always for allowing me some time. I want to share a little bit about some of the things that I talked to the Board of Trustees about. Gosh, last week I guess it was, and then a few other items as well. By the way, part of what I want to do in the future is actually show you the presentation that I do for the Board, which I thought of too late today, but I have it here. But actually, I think it is helpful for faculty to see what that 'dude' is saying to the Board <laughter>. Tomer sees it sometimes, but I don't know who actually logged into those. So in future I'll make that one of my regulars to do as well. But some of the things we talked about, shared with ward; I always like to start with some good news. So, one of the things I shared with them was that Dean Rebecca's Zietlow had been inducted into the Toledo Women's Lawyer History Project Wall of Fame. I thought that was a really nice honor for Rebecca. Also, as you know, both the men's and women's basketball teams played in the MAC finals. That's a very unusual event. There were no other men's/women's teams playing that

weekend in the finals. There are a couple of other places where the men's and women's did both play in their finals this year. So, I was hoping to say, 'we were the only ones,' but I'll ask Duke <laughter>.

President-Elect Heberle: Duke?

Dr. Holloway, President of The University of Toledo: Yes, of course it was Duke, right? But in any event, for those I saw few faculty there. You know, I think the students on those teams both played above expectations. They really, really did. They were not expected to be in the finals --either one of them-- and they both were, and they lost by hairs. So, we're really very proud of those students.

I know Grace Bochenek is coming but one of the other things that I talked to the Board about and I've talked to this group about before is the slowdown in federal research. We have some interesting data out of the NIH now. The NIH in a typical year would do 17,000 new proposals. That's the number of new proposals they would fund. This year they are 70 % down from where they would normally be year-to-date. They are 30% of where they normally would be year-to-date. The University of Toledo is 25 % down of where we would normally be year-to-date. So, we are doing better than average, I guess. But it is just kind of some first really hard concrete evidence that this recently came out of, of these slowdown effects. And again, the federal budget contains the research funding. It's mostly there; there have been no significant cuts to these various agencies. They just created all kinds of ways to slow it down getting it out the door. And I don't believe that that is by accident; I think there's some purposeful effort there. One of the other things going on in research that some of you know about is that we formally launched the Northwest Ohio Cancer Research Institute. We launched the kind a soft launch in the fall. We had a launch celebration a couple of weeks ago to really formally get that going. We have some 50-faculty working in areas related to cancer, and so one of the ideas of an institute like this is to bring together those faculty so that they can have a greater impact by working more together than they currently do in all of their separate departments across the institution. One of the things I know Grace is thinking about as our new VPR is what are the other areas where we might want to create similar, you know, kinds of institutes for bringing together faculty across areas of strength in more formal structures. In part as a way to up our efficacy and going after federal funding. So, that's an ongoing thing.

I share [with] every Board of Trustees, I share what I call my UToledo dashboard. We're at version 2.1 of that dashboard. They still don't quite like it, but we'll keep working on it. A report on enrollment, there's nothing new to say there. In terms of fall enrollment, fall enrollment has not changed. It was what it was. However, one piece of data I wanted to share following that is some of the Trustees had asked the question, 'our enrollment's down, but our faculty headcount hasn't changed we hear.' Well, I don't know where they hear that because it isn't true. And so, I showed them faculty headcount over time. But also broken down by non-tenure eligible, tenured track (meaning, ten-year track but not tenured) and then tenured. One of the trends you see there that's very concerning to me is that the number of tenure track (not tenured), that's where we're seeing (in the tenure track ranks), the change. The tenured faculty is actually fairly constant, but the tenure track (not tenured) is shrinking. I'm very concerned about mostly assistant professors, obviously. I'm very concerned about that because that's the future. And so, I wanted to show that to them. I hadn't seen that data myself until I pulled it together a couple of weeks ago. I wanted to show that to the Trustees, both to establish yes, our faculty headcount is going down if you

leave out the clinical faculty and we have this real problem with the number of junior faculty being where most of the shrinking is happening in our research active faculty.

I talked to them about philanthropic production, that's going well for the years so I won't dwell on it. Talk about research expenditures, we just did that. [Let's talk about] research expenditures and awards. The final set of metrics I showed them are about patient care. We have goals for growing our emergency department visits, our inpatient visits, our outpatient work in our clinics and our patient panel for UT physicians -- that's the number of unique patients we treat. We're on a good track on all of those with those increasing. The number of outpatient clinic visits is not increasing as much as our goal, but, you know, it is increasing work that continues there. I wanted to talk to the Trustees about the factors that affect enrollment, so I showed them national survey data of high school students. What do students look at when they think about enrollment, when they think about where to go to college? Those items, largely the number one set of items are all about academics and outcomes, and things like reputation, academic quality, availability of programs, and is it going to get me ready for a job? That's kind of the number one bucket. Number two bucket is cost, real and perceived, what's my financial aid package? That's a factor student very much look at. Next bucket is kind of around student life, student experience, it includes things like student life, athletics, spirit. Interestingly, some students say, "I want my college close to home," and an almost equal number say, "I want a college far from home." So, you can't win on that one. We are where we are, so I don't worry about that one too much. Also, and then facilities, about 66 % of students say they think about facilities when they think about where they want to go to a university. I think within those, and I shared some of this with the Trustees - of those we're delivering on academics. We're delivering on outcomes. We're creating new programs that are excited and interesting. And so, I think, you know, that's a place where in reality we are doing that. Key question is do students perceive it? And so, I shared some data on perception of value in quality, what we see. We've only done these two years, last year and this year. We see increasing perceptions of quality of the institution from parents and prospective students, not students who've come here but students who have thought about coming here from alumni and who was the third group? I can't read it, it's too small. Key points from the people who are, you know, the customers, if you like, the people who are coming here for education, or getting their students educated or who came here for education. Those are all growing. We're seeing increasing belief in the quality of the institution. That's a good thing. How do students learn about us is interesting. The number one-way students learn about us by far is we are the local school. A bunch of us spent some time in four different Toledo public schools this morning, [and it was] very clear, those kids know about us. Our name is on the walls and flags are up, whatever. Half of them, more than half of the students we were talking to were coming here. We're the local school and survey data bears that out - people know about us locally. Second most important way is friends or family tell them about us. That word of mouthpiece is really, really important. That's why alumni frequently ask me what can I do to help enrollment? I tell them, number one, first thing, tell people what a great place we are, what a great time you had here, encourage them to come here because that word of mouth is a key driver. Number three is no surprise, it's Google. It is web search; that's the third most frequent way. College fairs – no, or things like that, no; it is, we are the local school, or somebody told them, somebody friends or family told them about us, or they Googled us. Everything else is small potatoes.

The other thing I did which I won't say a lot about here is I showed the Trustees some conceptual ideas about improving the physical structure of campus, improving some of our spaces. Just as part of, you know, look, 66 % of students say they think about the quality of the facilities as they consider a school.

By the way, our new welcome center is on track to be done, so we should be having an opening for that in August. Last Friday was Match Day, so that was cool if those of you who've seen that event. This is where medical students discover what their residency is going to be and it's all done nationally at noon on that day. One hundred and 64 of our students matched. Sixty-four of those students are staying in Ohio. Twenty-one of them are staying here with us, and twenty-eight of them are in Northwest Ohio. So, the largest single state receiving their students is in fact Ohio. After that, Michigan, Kentucky Florida and a few other places. So that's a good event.

Let me see just a little bit about summer registration. People probably never talk about summer enrollment, but guess what? We have students enrolling in summer. We're up some year-to-date. That's a good thing. We're up in new students for summer, we're up in enrollments for summer, but we're only about halfway there in terms of the total number of students who will enroll this summer. I haven't drawn any particular conclusions yet; I'd rather be up than down so I will work with that. It's very likely that some of this is timing. Students are registering earlier or things like that, and so I don't want to over conclude. I like seeing the new students up. Fun fact, if a student is new in the summer, we count them as new in the fall. That's not our idea. That's the national standard for how you count new students. So, those new students in the summer are kind of important to me so I want to see them here in the fall.

When I look at fall enrollment, probably the most important period of time is over the next couple of weeks. So, this Friday is Choose UToledo, that's our big conversion event. So, from I think 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., we'll have tons of admitted students on campus. This is the chance to try and cement them, lock them in, get them to pay a deposit. And so, this is an important period for those students.

A look at the numbers right now, transfers is up really nicely. New students, direct from high school is about flat compared to what it was last year. I'm not going to draw too much conclusion from that until after the next week or so when the students come to Choose UToledo, and they make their decisions. There are some interesting things going on with other schools as well. So, Ohio State this year enrolled more students early action than they usually do. What that is doing is actually making their later admits, meaning, they're doing fewer later admits, putting more students on their wait list, and they're going to draw less off their waitlists. So, there's a group of students that are still kind of hanging out to figure out Ohio State this year because if they didn't apply early action, then they're in a bit of a holding pattern with Ohio State at the moment. And that, obviously, you know, that's going to matter to us.

We have two searches going on, one for the vice president for marketing communications. That one is active and going on. Our current Vice President, Megan Cunningham will be leaving us in April, April 21st, something like that - don't quote me on the date. She's taken a new position at the University of Michigan. We hope to have that search to the end, hopefully in early May. We'll name an interim for that position very shortly. We're working on the details of that now. The other search going on at the President's Cabinet level is the vice president for athletics and athletics director. Brian Blair will be leaving us also in April and that search is ongoing. We expect to conclude that search hopefully around the end of April, but it'll be done when it's done. We'll try and make that one go pretty fast because that's the nature of searches in that area. I expect to know who our new athletic director will be when the Blade writes a story telling me who my new athletic director is <laughter>. That seems to be the way those things work.

Past-President Van Hoy: And whether or not they agree with it <laughter>.

Dr. Holloway, President of The University of Toledo: I'm happy to take questions at Tomer's pleasure.

Senator Pryor: Sure. It's actually not a question, but just to thank you so much for your response to the onion. It was just masterful. And it was so wonderful that you just seem to have that rise in stability to carry it off. It was just delightful and it really took the sting out of a kind of unpleasant moment for things. Thank you.

Dr. Holloway, President of The University of Toledo: I appreciate that, and for what it's worth, we did check, they've skewered BGSU twice <laughter>.

Unknown Speaker: Yes, good point.

Senator Mungo: May I ask a question about the two program director positions that applications are being requested for? Do you know anything about that?

Dr. Holloway, President of The University of Toledo: Program director?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes, the Provost Office is searching for two faculty program directors, one to help oversee applied learning and the Advantage Toledo initiative, and the other one to help oversee undergraduate research and competitive fellowships. And I believe the applications are due this Friday if I'm not mistaken.

Senator Mungo: Right, I have a quick question about the applied learning program director position.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Sure.

Senator Mungo: Is this person—and I'm glad you mentioned that it was part of the Advantage Toledo—the sole responsible person/office?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: No. In both positions there are staff that are currently working on these initiatives or there soon will be. I think we're finalizing the hire of a staff member in the applied learning position, but what we need is a faculty member to bring the academic perspective and oversight to these positions.

Senator Mungo: Okay. What do you see as the -- so boots on the ground, how many hours do you think it would take to do that job?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: That is a good question, and I'm going to have to get back to you on that one.

Senator Mungo: Okay.

Dr. Holloway, President of The University of Toledo: Provost McKinney will be here at the next one.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes, I'll ask Provost McKinney about his expectations on that.

Senator Mungo: Do you know if any research has been done at other institutions that already have these, like a research center or a community engagement type center to get an idea of the type of time that it takes to create these types of roles?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: I can't address the applied learning, I'm going to have to defer that one to Mitchell. But I will say for the undergraduate research position, we've previously had faculty in this roles, and so this is essentially an established position we are just trying to refill.

Senator Mungo: Okay, but not for the applied learning, that is what I was about?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: No, the applied learning is a new position, so I'll have to ask Mitchell for his expectations about that as well.

Senator Mungo: Okay. I encourage, you know, whoever's handling that, whether it's Mitchell or you to think about talking to other universities that already have these established offices so that we get a real estimate of what it takes as opposed to just thinking what we think it's going to take, because it does take a lot longer than a course release and three additional months---

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Sure.

Senator Mungo cont'd: And so, when I saw that in the position, it just caused me [to] pause, and I wanted to make sure to give you that feedback.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: No, I appreciate that. I also think it will help us from reinventing the wheel.

Senator Mungo: Right.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: So, thank you. I'll pass that along.

Senator Mungo: You're welcome.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Okay, perfect. Thank you. First, thank you to our President for this report, it was great. Next is the VP President for Research, Grace Bochenek. Do we have her online?

Unknown Speaker: I don't see her online.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yeah, okay, it is 4:35 p.m., maybe we can move on and then come back to her. Is that ok? Okay, very good. So, let's move on then to the Faculty Senate on Undergraduate Curriculum Committee report. Rob or Lynne, are you online?

Senator Hamer: I'm right here.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Good.

Senator Hamer: Hello, everyone. We have a shorter report this time and I think we can go on. This is just based off one meeting. We're recommending the approval of the following from last week's meeting:

- MEDT 2010 Intro to Medical Laboratory Techniques
- MEDT 4020 Clinical Hematology I
- MEDT 4025 Clinical Hematology II
- MEDT 4030 Body Fluids
- MEDT 4050 Clinical Microbiology I
- MEDT 4060 Clinical Immunology
- MEDT 4500 Clinical Research and Clinical Correlations

- MEDT 4950 Laboratory Management
- MIME 4790 The Professional Engineer
- CIEC 4550 Methods for Early Childhood Studies
- FILM 2230 Creative Approaches to Cinema
- HEAL 2940 Public Health Internship I
- HEAL 4100 Health Behavior
- HEAL 4940 Public Health Internship II

Senator Hamer cont'd: We are pretty well caught up. We still have some rollbacks from the March 9th meeting. We rolled back about 50% from the March 20th meeting. We are working on two documents which are intended to solidify and capture what we have learned and to communicate it at all levels of the university because we know with these fabulous courses are our very competent colleagues that we shouldn't be given Fs to happen space.

Unknown Speaker: That's right.

Senator Hamer: So, we deal with that, the communication issue. We'll be also offering to work with the Provost Office. I don't know, I think part of it is a little unclear whose responsibility it is to set those standards and so we're grading without giving anyone a rubric. It is exhausting. As we said on both ends, absolutely. So you can expect a report on that for your discussion a little later in the year here. Today I had an email from a pre-cautious department, I would say. They are trying to make sure all of their SLOs in CIM are going to match the SLOs on the short syllabus. We all know if we think about that, that that's not a given in any way. And so, they were asking, you know, a kind of heads up, we're going to be submitting these. I mean that department alone will be about 15 of these. We have cc'd Dr. Heberle, Provost McKinney and Cathy Zimmer, who we know keeps the whole thing going, to ask for some guidance on this because unless things are different, from what I see, this is going to be huge. Scott, we should cc you, too.

Dr, Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes. First of all, thank you for all your work. As for the syllabi, at the last Academic Leadership Team meeting, we spent about 10 minutes going through this with department chairs, associate deans, deans, leadership from faculty senate and grad council, and provost staff. I went through all the resources we provide, and emphasized the point that everyone needs to be looking at these things at the different review levels so we can reduce the number of courses you grade in F. The other issue is with our transition to the Simple Syllabus software. Note that the SLOs that are in CIM are going to be in the syllabus. So, if somebody's PDF version of the syllabus does not match the SLOs in CIM, we will let the department know the SLOs that are on the catalog are the ones that are going to be in the syllabus moving forward.

President-Elect Heberle: So, I have a question or maybe it is a comment. I thought because Jerry and I have been doing SLOs to fill in our missing SLOs or different SLOs from syllabi to catalog in on CIM. And what we did was put our courses in with a comment. We were told, right Jerry to do this?

Past-President Van Hoy: Yes.

President-Elect Heberle: Put our courses in with a comment saying the only thing different here is the SLOs is now matching. And so that---

Senator Heberle: The only thing different here.

President-Elect Heberle: The only thing different in the CIM proposal that would be landing on your workflow desk is the SLOs.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: The only thing change... [Indecipherable]...

President-Elect Heberle: Yes, so they are not there for review. It is a technical issue that maybe Cathy can simply roll up the line, so that it is not going through the full review process because it's only getting SLOs to match. It is not changing anything.

Senator Hamer: Right.

President-Elect Heberle: So, we are trying to not have it go through the entire review, is that right?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes. We asked Cathy Zimmer to save you and your committee a lot of work for catalog pages where the SLOs were missing in the CIM page. If we had a PDF version of the syllabus, we would just copy those SLOs into the CIM page administratively. We assume at some point those SLOs were reviewed and approved when the syllabus was originally submitted, and we're assuming nothing is changing in the course. We just want to make sure that those learning outcomes are available in CIM so that when we go to simple syllabus, there will be learning outcomes there to populate our new syllabus templates.

Senator Hamer: So that's great. Two things. To my knowledge, the only ones that would be missing SLOs in CIM are at least five years old. I've been on the committee that long and Linda [Rouillard] was pretty meticulous in making sure.

Senator Barnes: We, the Core Committee, met on March 11, in Gilham Hall. We usually meet online, but we also meet with the Reimagining the Core Group. We had somehow juggled our meetings, and we've met with them several times, in the Half Day retreat in January, later in January and also in February. So, we've met with them at least four times. You all should have received an email from the facilitators, Deans Ritter and Gregory. I'm going to say more about that in a minute. We had at that time just two courses, so we addressed them first before we started talking about the core. Comm 2600, Public Presentations, we had actually already approved this course a couple of times recently. It's been around. They've been revising their SLOs and we're reviewing it again, probably in relation to the Undergrad Curriculum Committee, so we once again approved it for its spot in the core. And we also entertained a new course, Philosophy 1750, American Philosophy and Civic Thought for submission into the Arts and Humanities core. In the document I sent you, I sent just the course description, but they had also, according to our review, fulfilled all the other requirements. So, we are recommending approval of both of those courses. It puts us to shame when we look at how many courses the other committee [present to Senate], but we've also been busy and I have seen this week, probably four or five more courses come in. So, we're going to have one more meeting to try to pick up that last group, but right now those are the only two that are ready. If you have courses that you want in the core, I will say please check in the CIM system and see where it is in the workflow because there are a couple of spots before us in the workflow. I think the creativity spot is now in the CIM workflow also, and I think folks who are wanting to get their courses through need to make sure they [do]. I don't know when you're meeting again, Ashley, but our last meeting is March 31st, so that'll be it for us at this level and we're kind of the last stop. So hopefully, you're meeting again before that?

Senator Pryor: Yes. We are just starting to get them coming in; we're at the very end of the workflow.

Senator Barnes: Right, sorry, you're before us.

Senator Pryor: Oh, Okay. And so, we're working online so we will be ready to go.

Senator Barnes: Okay, so our last meeting is on the 31st, so as long as you approve it before then, it'll be in our queue. So, I would say for those of you who are working to get your stuff in the core, follow that carefully. I mean, not all courses are going into your workflow, Ashley, correct?

Senator Pryor: Correct.

Senator Barnes: Only the ones that want the creativity spot, so pay attention to that. So, we're recommending approval of these two and before I finish the report, can I get a vote in the room? This is a consent agenda item as well. So, all those who approve please say 'aye.'

Group of Senators: Aye.

Senator Barnes: Any oppose or abstentions? Same online if you would vote. Thank you, I appreciate that. You'll let me know what the vote is?

Quinetta Hubbard, Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary: Yes.

Senator Barnes: *Motion Passed.* Okay, so the other two things just really quick. The Provost Committee, the task force on general ed. as I said, has been meeting. Dean Ritter and Dean Gregory are chairing that committee. You should have received an email from Dean Ritter inviting you to two open forums for faculty, April 1st from 2 pm to 3 pm, that's hybrid. It's going to be in the Business Complex, room 1160 and online on Teams. Also on Thursday, April 2nd from 3 pm to 4 p.m., also in the Business Complex room 1200 A, also hybrid.

The work that we've been doing is principally to attend to the state, the new state requirements, but also according to the provost's request, to look at the Gen Ed. core and get a sense of, whether there are other things that we might want to try to work on, change, implement etc. We did a faculty survey, they did, I shouldn't take any credit for this. They did faculty surveys; they did student surveys. There was a lot of interest, for example, in a different kind of first-year experience. So, we've been talking a lot about that and the President's initiatives too. So, working with best practices in the field and student and faculty feedback; I see my job there really as about ensuring that the things that the faculty have already approved and committed to are still being a part of whatever comes out of those proposals. And I absolutely encourage you to show up and make sure that you are also arguing for the things that you think are important to be a part of the core moving forward. The process has been very collaborative so far; I'm not at all trying to say anybody's 'steamrolling' there. Renee.

President-Elect Heberle: I think, as I understand it from SB96, there's a review process due to the ODHR the ODH, whatever it is, the Ohio Department of Higher Ed., ODHE, on January 31st and the actual revisions are due then later?

Senator Barnes: I think so.

President-Elect Heberle: So now what we're looking at is just a review process that has to be reported by the Board or by us---

Senator Barnes: To the Board.

Senator Heberle: To the Board to the ODHE, is that correct?

Senator Barnes: Yes.

President-Elect Heberle: So, this is like a two-year process theoretically, or not exactly two years but another-year-and-a-half?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: It is one year because---

President-Elect Heberle: I thought---

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: The date is March 2027 to report to the Board and by June 2027, they have to approve any changes.

President-Elect Heberle: So, it's one year from now?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes.

Senator Barnes: I think there's some sentiment that we might want to try to pilot some things to see how they're working, particularly the FYE. The colleges now have quite different models in terms of distribution of credit hours and things like that. So, I think there's some interest in seeing how that works, but we really do need to implement the state-required items. I don't know what the timeline is. Is that also 2027, the civics course?

President-Elect Heberle: Yes, that's already being done for 2026.

Senator Barnes: Yes, and I think that's one of the reasons that approving these courses is important because really, with cohorts of several thousand students, if you have only two courses you're going to be hard pressed to serve that many students. So, that's the reason it's good to see those proposals.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: The civics course requirement does take effect for any student entering the University, fall 2026.

Senator Barnes: So, they're going to need it in their four-year time (let's say four-year time frame), they're going to need to take that course.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes.

Senator Barnes: Okay. So, other questions about the Reimagining the Core work? As time and energy, you know, avail themselves, I definitely encourage you to participate in that. Finally, just quickly, and this is a little longer than I said, sorry Tomer.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: There is a question online.

Senator Barnes: Oh, there's a question? “Hello. This has some details about the timeline” from Dean Ritter. Thanks. Thanks, Dean Ritter for putting that in there. She's definitely been the one “herding the cats,” so thank you for that. The last thing is that last year at this time, well actually before this, we had asked for a subcommittee to work on the diversity SLOs to align them in terms of assessment. Alana Malik especially was just saying we really don't have as good [of] a model for assessment on those diversity courses, and we see that we have different SLOs across the courses. So, we formed a subcommittee, wrote two new sets of SLOs, and I presented them sort of informationally for you at the end of the year last year and said, you know, we'll be doing more this year. And I think really, I, for a lot of reasons, have not moved this forward. So, I wanted to get those diversity SLOs back to you and then ask you to share them with the faculty in your disciplines and your departments, particularly faculty who are teaching in those courses because we really want to get some feedback from the faculty members about how these are going to work in comparison to what they're already doing in those courses before we ask for some kind of official adoption. But we're hoping to do that sooner rather than later. I'm sure there's probably a way to sort out who the people teaching these courses are and send them directly to them. I don't know what that way is, so I really need to hit somebody up with some tech skills to make that happen. But asking you to distribute them, this does not require a vote or discussion unless people want to discuss it now and I knew you did. Please.

Senator Pryor: We had a chance to talk a little bit, and I just want to make this comment in light of the discussions we've already had about renewed scrutiny of our syllabi with this new system. I just want give this information to just context; I'm offering this as someone who used to teach a course, well who continues to teach courses that really value and highlight diversity, and someone who taught a feminist philosophy class that went through many models of sort of pedagogies and frames for thinking about diversity.

Okay, so here's my thing about just looking at, and it's a question. Looking at SLO one on both the US Diversity and the Global, there is a term intersection, and my question to you was, and this is very pragmatic, so I'm just being descriptive. My concern, though, with syllabi going out to the general public now with this new initiative [is] that, that word for some has become a lightning rod, a trigger. So, my question was, is this word really doing work in terms of a theoretical framework or could it be replaced with words such as layers of, or so this is just something that I thought was worth bringing to the floor to discuss and to think about the implications? It is not weighing in in any particular way, but just that's my question.

Senator Barnes: I think to answer for the committee that met a year ago, it would probably be challenging for me to really tell you why. But I think part of it was to recognize that people actually live at those intersections, people have intersectional identities, and they also live and have experiences at the intersections of institutional power. So, I think it was trying to do some actual work, but I don't know that that doesn't mean people wouldn't be willing to consider other alternatives. We actually spent a lot more time discussing the term 'diversity' as a potentially problematic term and we've been talking about it in the Reimagining the Core Committee as well. Particularly because some of the things that the state is asking for look like global citizenship, which fits very 'title-y' with our global diversity requirement. So, I think one of the questions is what our approach is going to be in terms of how much ground we are willing to just give away before we're asked to give away that ground? And so, to me, I think that's where I would land on it. I think that's something that maybe is a conversation we should have as a faculty rather than maybe just a subcommittee of a few people. I have quite strong opinions about it, but I also don't have to "drive the bus" on where we land. So, does anyone else want to weigh in on that?

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Is this something that you want?

Senator Barnes: Or we could talk about it later if you're [in a hurry]. I'm over my five minutes. This is something that the subcommittee that is working on the core could address too. If you have opinions about this topic, that might be a good place to come back and raise your voices there. I can raise your concerns too, Ashley. Thank you so much.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you, Sharon. Next, we have the Program Committee report. Daryl should be online.

Senator Dwyer: This should be relatively quick today. I just looked on CIM a minute or two ago here and saw that after this, we have nothing in the queue, and so we may be done, maybe, for this semester.

Senator Hamer: I got one <laughter>.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Don't bet on it <laughter>.

Senator Dwyer: Now I didn't hear what people were saying, but I bet you, they were happy.

Senator Khanna: They're saying they're going to get something in the queue to get more work.

Senator Dwyer: Oh, okay, I knew I shouldn't have said anything <laughter>. But alright, thank you. But at any rate---

Senator Khanna: I'm just the secretary <laughter>.

Senator Dwyer: Just to go through these things quickly. Thanks. So, if you can see the Excel spreadsheet, the program proposals numbers three through six, we had looked at a little while ago. The committee had voted to accept these, but we were waiting for some courses to be approved by Senate. I think maybe they

were approved previously but it didn't show up in time for me to actually find them. But since we last met with Senate, the courses that you see listed—all communication courses—were approved. And so now we're able to actually put to Senate the request to vote yes for these four concentrations in Communication. So, those four are rather easy. The Bachelor of Education which I spelled wrong, I'm sorry, the Bachelor of Education and Music, we voted yes, the Senate voted yes on that last time we got together. But there is a name change that required that we take another vote to go from the Multi-Age Education, Pre-K through twelve to the name for the program being Bachelor of Education and Music. And so, that's the only thing that we need to vote for on that one. So, we're asking again for a yes vote for the **Bachelor of Education and Music**.

The **Psychology BA** is the new one that we have. I'm learning things. As I keep saying, I'm learning more and more, and maybe by the time I retire in four or five weeks from now, I'll have learned everything just in time to get out of here. But this, the Physiology BA, had a requirement to include two TAG courses. And Mary through Cathy sent me an online website that lists the TAG courses for universities in the state of Ohio. At first, I didn't know where to find those, but that does exist, and so we were able to see that they actually fulfilled that requirement. One of the second thing that I learned and Scott, I hope you don't mind, but I quoted you from the email that you sent me because it is one of the things that I have looked at [always] when there's a pipeline program, is that the proposal includes the one-to-one equivalencies. But Scott, I take it from what you told me, and I did a little quote right there, but it's not a strict requirement that you give the one-to-one as long as the graduate credit hours fulfill requirement at the undergraduate level. We looked at the Psychology BA, and it did not have the one-to-one equivalencies, but the proposal did demonstrate that the graduate credit hours did fulfill undergrad requirements. And so, the committee voted yes on that and we're asking Senate to approve the Psychology BA as well. So we have six items that we can vote on and we're suggesting a yes vote on all six.

- Communication, Digital Comm Conc
- Communication, Interpersonal Comm Conc
- Communication, Media Comm Conc
- Communication, Organizational Strategic Comm Conc
- Bachelor of Education in Music
- Psychology, BA

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Any questions, any discussion before we vote? Okay, Daryl, I think you could call a vote, I don't see anything.

Senator Dwyer: Okay, thank you guys.

Past-President Van Hoy: People are voting.

FS. President Avidor-Reiss: Yes. So, any vote here in the room, yes, no, or abstentions? Online? Excellent. *Motion Passed.* Anything else, Daryl other than that?

Senator Dwyer: No, but thanks for anything new in CIM, I can't wait to see it.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you very much. I think this is an example of faculty that does other elected work until the last moment. Until he retires, he is doing outstanding work for the University of Toledo. So, thank you, Daryl.

Senator Dwyer: You're welcome.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: So I'm going to check one more time, is the VP for President for Research, Grace Bochenek here? No, okay. So next is the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee. Rob Stevens is going to speak about some suggestions. I see Rob.

Senator Steven: Yes, I am here. I'm just going to share my report, or our committee's report.

Senator Lapitsky: Okay.

Senator Steven: Can you see that?

Senator Khanna: Yes, we can.

Senator Steven: It's a little small. Let's see if this makes it any bigger.

Senator Khanna: That's better.

Senator Steven: Alright, okay, so yes, I'm Rob Steven, the Chair of the Committee on Constitution and Rules. It was recently brought to our attention, and we all know this coming forward, that the faculty secretary spends a lot of time working on our minutes. It's a big job in terms of getting that transcript together accurately and there is some concern about that. So, I'm just going to read from the report so I don't miss anything here. There are other related issues as well and so we'll deal with those. There are three different issues, all interconnected.

So, the first issue is the definition and scope of the Faculty Senate Minutes. So, the Faculty Senate governing documents do not define what constitutes the official minutes of a Faculty Senate meeting. But in practice, the minutes have evolved into verbatim transcripts of the meeting. This approach is inconsistent with widely accepted academic governance standards where minutes record actions taken and may summarize the discussion but do not attribute comments to individual speakers.

So, the current practice is creating a significant workload burden. According to our Faculty Senate President, the Senate secretary, and don't want to have any confusion here. I'm referring to the Senate Secretary Quinetta Hubbard, not the Faculty Executive Secretary, which is Raghav. And so, two different individuals, both secretaries, but we're referring here to the Senate secretary who is spending approximately 15 hours per week preparing the minutes, which is half of her total workload, having a work week of 30 hours. Apparently spending 15 hours per week assembling the transcript and circulating the draft transcripts to all of the participants for verification, making sure that that is what they said is written down and revising them accordingly. So, this is a vast amount of work that is being done to produce those minutes that maybe I'm probably 'safe' to say that the majority of us don't even read. So, this time commitment limits the secretary's ability to perform essential duties such as drafting communications, scheduling meetings, assisting with the election administration, working on faculty senate website improvements and helping prepare Faculty Senate meeting agendas. And notably the secretary no longer has sufficient time to attend Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings a responsibility historically associated with the role. So, we have thought about this as a committee and have come up with the following recommendations. These are recommendations only. We can see how it goes if you guys adopt this motion with these recommendations, but yes, we're not recommending any

changes to the bylaws. So, we recommend adopting a standard minutes format without amending the bylaws. The committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt a minutes format that records, in a simple way, these items here: the attendance, approval of previous minutes, the adoption of the agenda whether it was approved or not, a list of reports presented including the report titles and presenter names. And this is the important part, the exact text of every motion made and seconded. Not the discussion, just the motions, and then the action that's taken on that, was it approved or was it rejected? Was it postponed, whatever, and the vote results. And then finally, any assignments that are required or any follow ups required and then the time of adjournment. So that is more in following with the standard procedures when you look up what minutes mean, in terms of parliamentary procedures, senate procedures. This is more in line than what we're doing, which is an exact verbatim transcript which is very, very time consuming to produce, at least at the level that we do it.

So, we propose that the Senate Secretary should assist in producing the minutes under the supervision of the Senate Executive secretary, currently Raghav. So, we have a bylaws article already stating that the Executive Secretary shall (I'm quoting this bylaw) "*Supervise the recording and distribution of the minutes of the regular Senate as well as special meetings of the Senate and the Executive Committee.*" So, adopting this standard format will reduce the time required to prepare the minutes, allow the Secretary to resume essential secretarial duties and make it easier to locate and verify specific faculty senate actions without searching through full meeting transcripts. When I've ever had to look something up, like hey, did we do this already in a previous meeting? We've got this massive transcript and there's not really a good summary of it. Yes, we're getting, more recently, these AI summaries and that's great, but I think it's better to have these formal minutes as we're proposing here. And if we have these formal minutes, boom, hey, these are the motions, these are the votes, these are the actions that have taken place with respect to Senate.

Given that yes, we'll have this new version of the minutes, we still can work with the recordings. These are all automated, like we're working through Webex right now, which generates a recording. We've got that. It also generates a transcript automatically, so we're suggesting that the Faculty Senate meeting recording and the automatically generated WebEx transcript be posted on the Faculty Senate website as soon as the corresponding minutes have been approved. To improve usability yes, we'll ask the Secretary to do a little work on this. The committee recommends that the Senate Secretary mark the transcripts with the starting points of major presentations delivered during Senate meetings. So, you can at least make sense of the transcript, which admittedly is not very good, it's just what are people saying exactly - just transcribed in that way. So, if the secretary could just say, oh, here's the president's presentation starting now so you know the president is talking, and then okay, the provost is talking and then his report. So just headings, not like we've done in the past where 'this is this person speaking,' this is every sentence, what person is speaking what. I don't think it's necessary to go into that level of detail and we will have the recording as well if you do need to go into that level of detail for whatever reason.

And so, two other related issues in terms of the job of the Executive Secretary. These are things that we don't do on a regular basis. According to the bylaws there are some requirements that we should be following and we're not doing that currently, so we're suggesting getting rid of these statements in the bylaws. So, the first issue is the Senate log, the Faculty Senate log. There's an article that's requiring the Executive Secretary to maintain a Faculty Senate log containing item number, title, origin, and date of entry for each proposal. That is any action item that someone is submitting for Faculty Senate to consider. usually it's some kind of email going to the president, or to the Faculty Senate Executive, or to the Senate Secretary Office. It's supposed to be logged and that's never happened.

We've even searched. I've gone with Quinetta and searched for any evidence of a log being maintained in recent years in the Senate Office, but nothing could be found. So, in practice, the email records of the Senate President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee serve as the de facto tracking system. Essentially, we just put any items requiring action directly onto the Senate agenda. So, to get around this with respect to what we have in the bylaws, we propose amending those bylaws to remove references to the Faculty Senate log. The Senate has operated effectively for years without a formal log and eliminating unused structures reduces administrative burden and aligns the bylaws with actual practice. The revised minutes format will provide a clear and accessible record of Senate actions. I'll show you the red-line version below in a second. Just one last issue, it is the same idea. There's this thing called the Calendar of Questions- also, we don't work with it. So, the bylaws require that the calendar of questions on the meeting agenda includes "log item number, title, origin, and committee assignment, due date, and eventual disposition and date of each item." In practice, the agenda only includes a simple list of items of business without these required fields. If the Faculty Senate log is eliminated, the calendar of questions becomes impossible to maintain because it relies on that log for item numbering and tracking. So, we have proposed an amendment that in the bylaws we just replace the Calendar of Questions on our agenda, because that is where we see the calendar of questions, with more standard items that we see if we look at other websites and what they have on their agendas. It is usually old business, new business, which would be new sections for us and yes, this is what is used typically in other faculty senates. This change aligns the agenda with common governance practice and simplifies meeting preparation. Also proposed is the addition of a final category for the agenda, "items from the floor," which already aligns with what we currently do. So simply getting rid of any mention of the Senate Log and the Calendar of Questions, so that's no longer a job of the Executive Senate Secretary, that's Raghav. As mentioned, this article here [referring to the report on the screen] is all about the log and the calendar, scratch that because we never use it. And then finally, the bylaws article on meetings, modify that so we're again getting rid of the Calendar of Questions and replacing it with "Old Business." And instead of "Other Business" at the end, have "New business." It is very common on agendas that I've seen and looked at on other websites for faculty senates, other universities.

It's more common to see old business and new business, but they are not typically used at every meeting. It's usually the reports of different committees that you're using, but maybe yes, you can have, oh, this report or this motion was postponed and so it would come up as "Old business" at some point in the future on an agenda. And then "New Business," if someone wants to make a motion for the first time without having it on the agenda, this would be the spot to do that. Then we already have items from the floor on our current agenda, but it's not in the bylaws so it would be appropriate to add that. So, I'm happy to have any discussion on this, questions?

Senator Lee-Smith: Yes, so I think part of the reason to have the log in the calendar of questions wasn't so much to appear in the agenda, but to ensure that proposals could be given to Faculty Senate and properly assigned by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to the appropriate committee and followed up on. So, the reason for the log was not so that we could do paperwork, but so that things did not fall through the cracks or that if there was an issue, the Faculty Senate should consider that there was some record that it was being considered and working through the structure of Senate to eventually come to the floor. Putting it on the agenda, I think, was more to say yes, it is now at the floor of the Senate and for an

eventual proposal vote or a recommendation to take a vote. So that's my only concern is that this is eliminating a lot of how we know that Senate is open to proposals and items for Senate to consider are being routed to the proper Senate committees.

Senator Steven: I totally agree with your comment there. If I can just follow up with that quickly, we're not losing anything because we're not doing this. In a perfect world, absolutely, this would be great. And even if we have time freed up for the Senate Secretary, maybe she can make an Excel file where every item that comes in by email can be written down. In terms of are we taking care of this properly? That would be something to do instead of having a formal log. Why we're recommending this is because it's absolutely not being done. The job of the Secretary, the job of the Faculty Executive Committee, including the Executive Secretary, are very time-consuming jobs. Nobody is 'oh, oh, oh, I want to be on this committee; I want to do this job.' It's very difficult. We're just trying to make it as easy as possible is the feeling here.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yes and maybe let me just to make a comment. That's what we do, every email that we get gets discussed with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and then routed to the committee or whatever. So, just to let you know that that's the current practice when we get emails.

Senator Steven: Are there any other comments?

Senator Barnes: Yes, I have a question for you. Did your committee talk to Quinetta about problems with doing it this way or potential problems with doing it another way?

Senator Steven: Very briefly, Quinetta sent me an email—which I passed on to our committee—that she is concerned that we will lose something with respect to the ability of people that are interested in reading the minutes to actually see in detail what they need from the meetings themselves. And so, our concern is that it's just not worth the time. And so, we have taken Quinetta's opinion on this into consideration, but the facts are the facts that 15 hours to do this per week is not acceptable when other things that need to be done are not getting done. So, we are recommending this for reason and yes, we understand that it would be great to have the perfect transcript, but, you have got to put some value on this. Is it worth the time it takes to produce that? And in the end, we're saying this is a perfect job for AI or whatever the Webex is using to generate the transcript. We'll have that automatically, and we are recommending that we have minimal editing of that transcript so that yes, you do have something to look at with respect to a transcript, and it will be available on the website if you decide to follow these recommendations. And again, they are recommendations. We can see how this goes. If people are not happy, if they're requesting or looking at the transcript that's online and it's not very good and it's not fitting the needs of faculty members, then we can look at this again.

Past-President Van Hoy: Hi Rob, this is Jerry. So, we get, at least in the past, the Senate office has always gotten a lot of requests for clarification of what happened during meetings. Some of what we're proposing here will improve our ability to respond if it's around a vote or something of that sort, but often it's around the discussion. Under this system, if someone's got to go back and listen to the recording to clarify whose responsibility is that going to be, and should that be specified?

Senator Steven: That's a good question. As it stands here, it would be the responsibility of the person, well they don't even have to make the request. It will be available on the website, the transcript as generated by Webex and minimally edited by the Senate Secretary. It should be clear, oh, this is what the President is saying and those are his words right there, automatically generated by Webex. If it's fuzzy or it's not making sense, that person can then go to the recording, which will also be on the website.

Past-President Van Hoy: Okay, and what about when the recording is really blurred because we have these hybrid meetings and the hybrid meeting recordings really 'suck.' Quinetta goes out and she asks people what they say and she clarifies it for the meetings. [I'm] just thinking about the future, right? When people have questions about what they did in that past Senate that got us to where we are now, how do we resolve those issues because the AI won't fix that unless we ask it to make something up?

Senator Steven: Right, and so it comes to the question of your opinion of the value of time. Is it worth the value of time to do this for every set of, or every single meeting where it takes a lot of time to do this or are you going to just rely on the automated system which does probably almost as good a job where, yeah, sometimes you're going to have to accept that things are missing because we haven't had the chance to ask that particular person, hey, what exactly were you saying in this fuzzy area of the recording? And that's something we have to decide now, are we willing to accept that it's not going to be perfect or do we want to spend the time getting it perfect every time? And the technology is probably going to get better as we go. We can also help ourselves by every time someone speaks, use the microphone if you're in person. I think my voice is going to be perfect with respect to the transcript because it's online, everybody that speaks online it's going to be very, very good. But if you're in-person, use the microphone and every person that speaks should be saying yes, like for me, this is Rob Steven, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics so that you have that information every time someone's speaking. That is historically what we've done in the past, but we've gotten a bit lazy with it and nobody's doing that anymore, so we could just go back to that.

Senator Hamer: Hi, this is Lynn Hamer for the record.

Senator Steven: Thank you.

Senator Hamer: Thank you for your report. My very first two years as a faculty member I was the executive secretary, and it took so long. It should have been a course release, and it was not a good way to start a career. That aside, it's a historical record and I would say if we're going to choose not to do a transcript, we should not make the AI available because no one is going to go back and try to find people years later who probably are dead or gone. So, it's 'mumble jumble.' I think if we were to decide to do away with the transcript, it would be devaluing the work of the Senate because -- and I don't know if any historian will ever look at it. I think that it is an insult to our clerical staff to say that we can replace their careful transcription. A bunch of us, including Jerry and me, are social scientists who do transcription and AI does not. So, we can't pretend that Quinetta's careful work can be taken care of by AI, and to ask the Executive Secretary to look it over is giving them 15 hours of work again, because either you're correcting it or you're not. And if you are told you should look it over and see if it makes sense, you're going to spend 15 hours doing it. So, I'm very much opposed to the idea, even though I think your intention is right on, and it's a huge amount of work. I think we need to hire Quinetta an assistant. We all

know that in the last 25 years, our clerical staff has been cut, I don't know how much, but there's one secretary that I rarely ever pass in a whole building. So, we need to take care of that and actually have it done correctly, and perhaps the Faculty Senate Executive Secretary should get a course release in lieu of, you know, in recognition of that. So, either we value the history and leave it, or we have very skeletal minutes and do not have a transcript.

Senator Steven: Thank you for your comments. I can make a point if you allow me to do so with respect to your comments. You say that you want the transcripts to stand as they are. I just want to emphasize that there is no requirement for that in terms of law or anything like that. We are not required to have a recording or transcript. The most common way that it is done in faculty senate proceedings is as we're presenting it here and as we're recommending it. So, there is no requirement for that. But absolutely, it is valued and again coming down to the final point is, you have to weigh it. Is the benefit or the work that's required justify the benefit that you get out of it? In your opinion yes, in other people's opinion maybe no, and so that's why I think we have to vote on this. And again, these are recommendations that we can see how it goes. If we're getting a lot of feedback that AI can't find who said what, I want to go back to the old way, then we can do that. I think it is worth it, at least the committee thinks it's worth it that we at least try going this route for a little while.

President-Elect Heberle: This is Renee Heberle from Political Science and Law and Social Thought (for the record like Lynne). I have always been puzzled by the transcript for Senate. I've never been in meetings where they've been word-for-word and with a person's names attached in part. I do appreciate completely what Lynn has said about the historical record, but I'm a little skeptical that what we're doing is of historical significance in our meetings. I think it is important to know and to be organized and to know what we've done and how we've done it. I think that the, and I and completely agree that an AI transcript will never replace what Quinetta has done. I was not around when this practice started, but as I understand it though, we used to have another staff person, two staff people in the Faculty Senate Office and with the retrenchment of all other things, the Faculty Senate has lost resources. And Quinetta has been working, you know, working, working, working, working. I think that it's a good option to try this without the transcription. I personally don't see in weighing in the balance. I think there are other things that Senate -- this is a good opportunity to sort of try to start resetting some of the ways in which Senate has operated just because senate has always operated this way. I think that rethinking some of our practices every so often is a really good idea, and that this is one of the practices that I've thought that we should probably rethink given the kinds of time that we have and the resources, the fewer resources that we have. And that's just realistic. We're not going to get an assistant anytime soon. We've established that. We're trying to get resources to give the Faculty Senate President a break, you know, so that work is also included in workload. There are all kinds of things that need to change to make this institution work better. So internally there's just some, this is one of the things we've been discussing on FSEC and with Quinetta about changing.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Rob, if there's no more question, maybe there is a question online.

Senator Wedding: This is Don Wedding, I would like to say something.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Don, go for it.

President-Elect Heberle: I think he is muted.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Don, we don't hear you.

Senator Steven: We've lost Don, I think. I do not see anything in the Chat. Oh, there was one. Sherri Benton wrote, "I apologize if I missed this detail, but how were these issues handled prior to transcript recording being available pre-online hybrid?" Even pre-online hybrid, there was, as far as I can remember a recording. So maybe somebody before my time remembers what happened before we had these types of minutes? Probably Don would be able to answer that.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: I think for the sake of time if we can move on to have the vote if you want to call the vote.

Senator Steven: Sure, if there are no other questions or discussion, please, if you are in favor---

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Just a second, somebody want to read the comment.

Senator Khanna: It's from Monita Mungo. "Is there another option, say hire a part-time grad student, to assist?"

FS President Avidor-Reiss: We can reach out to the Provost Office. But realistically we need to realize what economic situation we are, so we do need to be a little realistic.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: We need to make sure that our colleges have enough grad students to support our undergraduate programs and research labs.

Senator Steven: Can you just repeat that question; we couldn't hear it online?

FS President Avidor-Reiss: The question was, can we get some help in the form of TA or something like that? And the answer is that very unlikely not because we are struggling to get those positions for a students that do other important activities in research and other educational roles. But let's if we can move on to the vote, please.

Senator Steven: Yes, if you are in favor, please write 'yes' in the Chat box. If you're against write 'no' and any abstentions can write abstain. Someone else can take care of that in person.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Can you quickly repeat the proposal? Everybody, they want clarification of the proposal.

Senator Steven: There were three points to it. We're recommending that -- can you still see the screen?

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yes.

Senator Steven: We are recommending that we have the minutes format as follows with these very simple points in terms of what is happening in the meetings, not a verbatim transcript. But aside from that, also have the meeting recording, the actual recording, the sound file being available on the Faculty Senate website, and also the WebEx transcript that is automatically generated alongside that recording; have both of those present on the Faculty Senate website, but just minimal notification on that transcript by the Senate Secretary in terms of okay, the president is speaking here, the provost, and, maybe the reports of the different committees as well. But other than that, not a person-by-person analysis of the transcript, and then just scrapping the log and the calendar of questions. And then finally, adding at the very end of our agenda, modification of old business, new business, and items from the floor. Items from the floor, as I said, is already heading on our agenda---

Senator Allred: Can I ask that we separate out the second one?

Senator Khanna: Can I say one thing here?

Senator Steven: We have another motion, unfortunately we started the vote, but I don't know what we do in mid-vote if someone wants to [speak].

Senator Allred: So, you shouldn't have called to vote when there were still questions on the floor. So that was out of order.

Senator Steven: What was out of order?

Senator Allred: You can't call the vote when there's still questions on the floor, that was out of order.

Unknown Speaker: Tomer called the vote.

Senator Khanna: This is Raghav Khanna. I want to say one thing as a Faculty Senate Executive Secretary. It seems to me that there are a lot of questions about this from various members here. And so I wonder, is it prudent to have these sent out so that everybody can digest them and then we do a vote through roll call, or if we set up an online vote, or something like that to really give people a chance to absorb this and do this in a more organized fashion?

Senator Allred: Yeah, I'm sorry. Can I verify because my question would be like, a lot of these recommendations are pretty non-controversial, and I think we could get an easy vote on those. In addition to whether or not we have a transcript, I am also concerned about whether we also then have the recording online. It seems like there's some discussions there. That part seems very rushed, and I would like to be able to talk to the people I represent, not just myself whether I took a vote on that. So, I'm just wondering since most of this is pretty straightforward, if the items that are straightforward, in other words, getting over to the log, adding the items from the floor onto the agenda is approved today, that makes sense. But I'm hoping that we can table the other one. There are multiple questions there. There's sort of a decision-tree that has to be kind of worked out. And it really feels rushed to take a vote before people even finished talking about that and before people have consulted with the folks they're representing.

Senator Khanna: I agree with that.

Senator Steven: So, let's take it from the official kind of order points of order here. Someone called the vote, so we should follow up with that and have a vote on whether we're going to have the vote. So, are you okay with voting on this right now? Yes or no?

Past-President Van Hoy: Rob, did you call the vote because you are the chair of the committee? You're the only one who can call the vote.

Senator Allred: He did not call a vote, and there were points of order standing and there's been a motion to table that part.

Senator Steven: Well, the vote was called.

Senator Allred: But it was not called by you, and there were questions outstanding.

Senator Steven: I did call the vote, I asked for yes or no. After Tomer said we should call the vote, I said, okay, if you're in favor, say yes. That's calling the vote.

Senator Allred: Did people think they were voting to call the vote, or do people think they were voting on the amendment, or did people know what the amendment was?

FS President-Avidor-Reiss: Rob, let me suggest something. In light of the many discussions here, maybe, let me know if you agree that we will send this information to all the faculty and then bring it back in the next meeting and then we are going to have a short discussion to make sure everything is okay. I think that maybe there is a concern about publishing the recording. I think that's what I see here, what I understand from the last comment. Is it okay if we do that, we just bring it back next time?

Senator Steven: If you guys want to go out of order, that's fine with me.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: I'm not saying this as a Vice Provost, this is just me as a former Faculty Senate member. It appears to me that there are two issues here. First is the amendment to the bylaws which says nothing about minutes or transcripts. What the bylaws amendment does is eliminate the log and calendar of questions. This appears to be an issue in which there is broad agreement and you could vote on. The second issue is what you want to do with the minutes, transcripts, and the recordings. This appears to be a separate issue that requires further discussion. That's just my opinion.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: So Rob, is it okay with you if we bring it next time and then you could present it?

Senator Steven: Yes, absolutely. Especially since it was stalled in mid-vote, that's fine with me. But what we should do is have someone produce a motion, hey, let's postpone this.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay.

Senator Allred: I motion to Table this.

Senator Steven: Ammon is proposing that we postpone the motion until the next meeting, I guess would be reasonable. Do we have a second for that?

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yes, we do.

Past-President Van Hoy: I second.

Senator Steven: Okay, then let's vote on that.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay. All those in favor say 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? ***Motion to Table Passed.*** Thank you. It looks like we have a decision. I think there's a majority supporting to move it to next meeting, so thank you again. Thank you, Rob, for this extremely detailed discussion and maybe we can share this, I think. Quinetta, did you send it to the Faculty Senate today? I think we should send it to all senator and if Rob have any changes that you want to add to that, maybe we could speak with Quinette and then bring it back next time and maybe break it into two votes.

Senator Steven: Absolutely.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you again. I see that our VP for Research is here. We will be happy if you could just introduce yourself.

Grace Bochenek, VP for Research: Thank you, thank you for the opportunity, and glad to be here. I apologize for being late, but I think just making sure that these are on my calendar will be really important as we move forward. But Grace Boheneck, the new Vice President for Research. I look forward to working with the Faculty Senate and all the faculty as we grow and support faculty in in our research agenda. So a pleasure to be here and thank you for the invitation to join this meeting.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you. Anyone have any question to our VP for Research?

President-Elect Heberle: Thank you. This is Renee Heberle. We just – don't go away yet. We invited you; we welcome you and also just to hear about, you know, maybe your first few days on the ground and what your particular interests are, what you've seen so far. Just a little like two to three minutes ... about how are you doing?

Grace Bochenek, VP for Research: Well, thank you.

President-Elect Heberle: We weren't all on the Search Committee so a lot of us don't know you.

Grace Bochenek, VP for Research: Okay, well, I'm really looking forward to meeting everyone and working with the faculty and working with the University. And so, I'll just tell you, you know, my first, you know, now, month, maybe a month and a week has been a wonderful experience of getting to know

the faculty, some of the faculty, meeting with the deans, understanding the strengths of our research and the research agenda. I've been having a lot of conversations about how we scale our research activities. So, I'm very interested in learning more and talking about where our research strengths are. How do we grow those in a way to increase not just the recognition of the research, but also how do we grow our scale of research, the volume of research? So, I have had some conversations and have been thinking through growth strategies, which we'll be able to share in the coming days that I'll be sharing through the Research Council. But looking at opportunities when you think about, you know, at least when I think about scaling research, I think about, how do we bring the interdisciplinary nature together so that we're always stronger when we have multiple research perspectives on very challenging things across either our region or across the nation. So, I'm hoping to help us, you know, grow our research in a way that strengthens us through this interdisciplinary research activities. And I'm sorry I'm a little short because I just ran to try to get on the call. But I would say that just on a personal level, everybody that I've met has been very welcoming, which is wonderful. So it's wonderful to be a part of a very strong community. It's wonderful to be able to have real discussions at all levels about what the challenges are, but what's also working well. And so, when you want to think about, you know, scaling research and strengthening what we're doing, it's important to hear all those different perspectives. For the first month, that's what I've been trying to do, spending time with some faculty. Based on some of the research activities that I've been able to talk to the deans, have conversations one-on-one with the deans, learning a little bit more about the Research Council and the people that are in those positions maybe associate deans for research to hear where they see the future. You know, trying to balance between what are some challenges, how do we remove those barriers in the future, and then how do we unleash the potential that we have here in the University? I hope that helps, but I look forward to, you know, maybe coming back to the next meeting and maybe sharing a little bit more detail and perspective.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yes, thank you. If you find that you have something to share with us, just let us know and we can add you to the agenda.

Grace Bochenek, VP for Research: Okay. Wonderful. Wonderful. Thank you.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you very much and now we are going to move on to the Faculty Senate Budget Committee.

Margaret Hoogland, Chairwoman of the Committee on Budget: I hope you can hear me online. I know I'm not the person you wanted here today. I met with Vice President Schroeder and a couple people from the Office of the Provost last week. Provost McKinney really wanted to make this meeting, but he cannot make it today, so it is rescheduled for April 7th, so please come back. Invite your friends, add lots of questions. We've slated, I think about 45 minutes give or take. Vice President Schroeder wanted it to be 10 minutes and I said, oh, no - expand.

So, the other thing that came up in that meeting, if you look at MyUT, and specifically if you look at the budget information, it is very out of date. So, I will be meeting with Faculty Senate Exec on, I believe Friday, right? Friday morning to discuss what the charges of the committee should be. We did our budget tool in the fall, we got some information. We met twice with Vice President Schroeder, and it became

clear that our committee can either take one of two directions. We can either focus more on faculty affairs related issues and work in connection with the Office of the Provost or we can try to deal with nonacademic things and meet more frequently with Vice President Schroeder. I don't really want to get into details other than to say, if you have questions that are not related to the Provost Office, and that would be most of what our committee has uncovered this year. Please bring those up at the April 7th meeting. So, this could be parking. I gave Vice President Schroeder an update that yes, you will be getting parking questions, right? So parking, health insurance, athletics, you name it. Those are all the things that our committee does not have access to so we couldn't really bring it up. So that's really all I have to say. We do have a committee of five. They've asked me to stay as chair, so you'll get to hear from me a lot next year. We hope not three times, but you know, if you need me to come three times, it will be fine.

President-Elect Heberle: Are you going to share your slides?

Margaret Hoogland, Chairwoman of the Committee on Budget: No, in the interest of time, you don't need to hear anything else. Is that okay? Anything else?

FS. President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you very much. I know this issue can be challenging. The next report is from Karen Green.

Senator Green: Okay, just to update on retention recruiting because, you know, it's enrollment. This is linked with everything, a lot of our roles, right? So, here are our members. All right, next slide please. So a few things we, well first we met quite a bit with Tony Bourn. This is from the February 28th meeting and, you know, there's MarComm coming in. He's hopeful that they'll be able to at least work more together because there have been a lot of disconnects in the past, so we're hopeful that that'll work and everyone's on board with, you know, branding and getting more enrollment up. The last update I had from him was on February 28th. A lot of things have changed with the Lourdes's students coming over and including signing things. So, this was the last number I had, but I'm sure it's different now. A lot of those students are nursing. I went to one of those events where there's a lot of tables and most of the students coming in wanted to talk to the nursing table. There were some students who just started there too, and they said, oh, I just applied here. I was like, you just applied there and they were coming to the event to transfer? And so, one of the odd things, and I told Tony about this, he said, Yeah, they were still admitting students even after they announced it. I don't know how to answer that one.

So, other programs are closing. One of the things I talked to Tony about, like he mentioned one of the enrollment issues, of course, working on adult transfers, community college. We had a 1:15 tour and Terry Beth called me and said there's an accounting student, you know, can you meet with them? And I talked with a student and she said Madani University, which is not too far, they're closing their accounting program, so she was changing here. Now, I let Tony know and the others, you know, maybe we need some strategic marketing. Not to chase those ambulances or anything, but just, you know, put ourselves in a position like, hey, we're here in-state tuition. So, if things you hear about in your in your areas, you have something closing or another program maybe on the verge of that, you know, let them know. Maybe can put some extra billboards or funding like that.

Application numbers, he said there was an increase in the completed number of applications, and at that time financial aid was just announced. He did see an increase from prior year deposits number. Now the big concern is this melt. He said typically you'll see a 12 % melt, so people give their deposit, hey I'm coming, but then they don't. So that's why what's really important is what we do in the coming months to really get them like okay, you gave money, let's keep you interested.

Now this was just, you know, from last December update. But what I wanted to say, when I talked with him, he said, you know, we could make phone calls, post cards, you know, texts and he said this enrollment ask is at the department level. So, I know I made this call in December and then of course, you know, December happens and everyone goes on break including myself and I'm like, oh yeah, I did this slide. So what we did is submit messages to the Enrollment Office and, you know, some Senate members were nicely requested, right? And so, these messages went from text to these students, you know. So if it was accounting major or if they put accounting in there, there was this message from myself that said, hey, there's a Choose UToledo event this Friday, you know. Thank you for coming. I look forward to seeing you. Actually, because I'm going to be at a conference, I put my colleague Keith's name in and said, hey, go find Keith. So that way, you know, they did get this message. And so one thing COBI is doing, and this is from Dean Ritters directive, she had me calling, so I became a telemarketer. I thought, man, in my twenties I'm never doing this again, but here I am. So, I made some phone calls. She had an interesting conversation with someone. One of the students said that they were confused about the enrollment process. So, I think she's looking into some of the barriers now what I did when I heard that I'm like, well, I'm just going to find out myself, so I applied at UT, so I applied as a new student and as a transfer student. So hopefully I get in, right? But I just wanted to see what barriers are they talking about, what are students seeing, and of course, I'll let Tony know to take that number out so it doesn't skew things, right? But we can send those messages and another thing we can do is we can have student or student groups add to these messages. And so, we can create these, give them to the Enrollment Office, and they can use them strategically in the summer to send, whether or not we're going to attend these events or not. So, we could also say, hey, I'm not here, but welcome to UToledo. You know, I'm in this department. The student groups, I'm an advisor for one and they are more than willing to participate in this and even, you know, talk with students or, you know, come to campus in the summer too to help out. So next slide.

So there's a QR code there and will have the slides as well. He's just using research. It's a sign up. So, if you want to participate in these emails, these text messages in the summer for the Campus Crawl, there's a link on there and you can put in what group that you would be interested in sending this to. So, you know, biology or chemical engineering, and then you can put in your message, and I have some examples listed in here about and you can copy it or use something different. And you can, you know, use that one. You can also give them to your student groups if they want to participate in that too. And again, they'll send these out during the summer and whether you can, you know, change your message based on whether or not you'll be on campus.

So these are some examples. The first one is, you know, I'm not on campus, and second one is I'll be here. So chances are you'll probably be here, right? But the top one, you know, most faculty are way in the summer, so if you wanted to do something like this like hey although I'm on summer break, welcome to campus crawl, please come see me. Just that sense of belongingness a lot of research shows, especially

this generation that they really gravitate towards that. So, and those examples are on the survey as well, just fill out. These are if you want to contact your campus coordinator that does a lot of these recruiting events.

And so last part of the survey, so in the survey there's text message, text message from your student group. If you want to do that, you can always leave things blank, you don't have to answer everything. And then I'm also doing it because, you know, you're going to send things out. I'm doing a student survey where I'm asking our students, why are you here? What brought you here? What are the things you brag about to your friends? What are things that we're missing? What would you say to your friends? And then Tony asked me to put this one in. Did you get what you thought you were going to get? Did we oversell, undersell? You know, did we do some false advertising just so he can get an idea on that one? And, and I want to know what our current students think. The incoming class wants to hear. Because I know, you know, you do all these surveys with different groups and sometimes, just from my research, you see people that want to tell you what they think you want to hear, but you know these kids, you know, our students are not going to do that. But, if you want to participate, you know, there's a sign up for that. Just put your name and email there. If you want to do bonus points for your class, just put what class number you have, and then that way I can sort them by your class section and send you the names. That way you can, you know, just merge it with blackboard be a little easier. If you want to do it. If not, if you just want to do the messages, you don't have to answer all these things, you can just leave it blank.

I think that's it. Yes, that's it. So, these slides will be provided through faculty center so you can have the QR code if you want to sign up for those things. Cool. I'm sorry. I did 10 minutes. I'm sorry. I tried.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, thank you for this opportunity. I just want to let you know, I did submit my message, so hopefully I will see somebody in biology. But the last item is do we have any item, any new item from the floor? Oh, I just want to let you know that the Faculty Senate election started today, somewhere around noon, right?

Past-President Van Hoy: One o'clock.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you. So, if there are no more new items and there is no objection, we are adjourned.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 5:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dr. Raghav Khanna
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary