

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 13, 2018**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

**Summary of Discussion**

Approved @ FS on 4/10/2018

**Provost Andrew Hsu, Dr. Connie Shriner and President Thompson--Intersession**

**Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.**

**President Thompson called the meeting to order; Executive Secretary, Fred Williams called the roll.**

**I. Roll Call: 2017-2018 Senators**

**Present:** Atwood, Bjorkman, Brakel, Bruce, Compura, Chattopadhyay, Duggan, Edgington, Ferris, Frank, Gilchrist, Giovannucci, Gruden, Hall, Haughton, Hottell (substitute for S. Barnes), Humphrys, Jaume, Keith, Kippenhan, Kistner, Krantz, Leady, Lecka-Czernik, Lee, Maloney, Menezes, Modyanov, Niamat, Nigem, Oberlander, Ohlinger, Rouillard, Sheldon, Steven, A. Thompson, Van Hoy, Weck-Schwarz, Wedding (substitute for S. Ariss), Weldy, White, Williams, Woolford, Xie

**Excused absences:** Hammersley, Hefzy, Randolph, Wittmer

**Unexcused absences:** Bouillon, Dinnebeil, Emonds, Gray, Hoy, Kovach, Lundquist, McLoughlin, Monsos, Ortiz, Relue, Said, Schneider, Schroder, Patrick, G. Thompson, Willey

**President Thompson:** Welcome to the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the academic year. Hopefully, you had an enjoyable and restful Spring Break. Now that we are back, it is time to roll up our sleeves and finish the semester strong. From a Faculty Senate perspective, we have several items we will be focusing on for the last four meetings of the 2017-2018 Academic Year.

Our annual Faculty Senate elections is one of the items that we devote significant time and effort to. Yesterday, you should have received an email with your college nomination ballots for the Faculty Senate, and if your college is eligible, University Sabbatical Committee and UCAP ballots. Each college ballot was sent to its Elections Committee representative for approval prior to being sent to all eligible faculty. Senators Dan Compura and Sibylle Weck-Schwarz, co-chairs of the Elections Committee, will provide an update of the elections' process as well as a timeline.

Another task we will be focusing on is ensuring all of our curricular and program proposals are processed by the completion of the April 10<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting. As a reminder, please let

your colleagues know that the deadline to have any college level approved proposals to the respective Faculty Senate committee chairs is Friday, March 16.

The timely processing of proposed policies has been a goal of our Faculty Senate this year. We wanted to update you on one of the major policies that we will be asked to vote on yet this year, a university-wide research misconduct policy. Last week, Senator Kristen Keith, Chair of Academic Regulations, met with Provost Hsu to discuss her committee's comments and suggested edits to the current policy. Once her committee approves the current draft, it will be brought to the floor of Faculty Senate for possible endorsement yet this semester.

One other task that we will complete this semester is the creation of a new Deans' and Provost Evaluation Survey. I have asked President-Elect Linda Rouillard to update us today on the progress of this Ad-hoc committee. We also will have the data collected by this Friday, March 16 from all of the Ohio Faculty Senate presidents regarding their administrative evaluation process. This data will be provided to the Ad-hoc committee co-chaired by Past Presidents Mary Humphrys and Kristen Keith so that the committee can issue recommendations on the procedures used to conduct the evaluations of the Deans and Provost in the next academic year. I have asked that these recommendations be presented at the March 27 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Speaking of surveys, one other initiative we are launching this week is a faculty evaluation of the university bookstore. This is in alignment with one of our major goals this year of improving the faculty experience with the bookstore and improving textbook affordability and accessibility. Special thanks to Senator Tom Atwood for leading this work. He will be updating us at today's meeting on this. Please encourage your colleagues to fill this survey out as their input is very valuable to improving the services provided by the bookstore.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee recently announced our annual tenure and promotion workshops on both campuses. As a reminder, the Health Science Campus training will be March 29 from 1:00-3:00 p.m in Collier 1200. The Main Campus training will be on March 30 from 1-3 p.m. (room is TBA).

On April 2, from 1:00-3:00 p.m., in the Student Union Room 2591, the Faculty Senate, in collaboration with the Office of Government Affairs, will be hosting an Advocacy Training Workshop. The goal of this workshop is to train faculty on various ways to effectively advocate on policy issues and how to use their expertise to create awareness or seek out possible funding. The Faculty Senate hopes you and your colleagues will take advantage of this important program.

For today's meeting, we have invited Dr. Connie Shriner, Vice-Provost for Assessment and Faculty Development, to present data collected from the pilot intersession term earlier this year. When this pilot program was initiated, it was agreed upon by the Provost that before full implementation of a future intersession term that pilot data must be presented to the Faculty Senate and that there must be a vote of endorsement. Dr. Shriner will discuss the success of this

pilot program, and we have been asked by the Provost to introduce a resolution in support of a regular intersession term that will be voted on at today's meeting.

Lastly, as many of you know, gun violence continues to be a major issue and concern at schools and universities across the country. Two weeks ago, another MAC University, Central Michigan University, went on lockdown as a student fatally shot and killed his parents. In response to these acts of violence, this Wednesday, March 14, at 10:00 a.m. there is a "National School Walk Out Day". This event is scheduled to last for 17 minutes in memory of the 17 people shot at the Stoneman Douglass High School. While there is no formal directive at UT providing guidance on this issue to faculty, please be aware that you may have students wanting to participate in this national demonstration. It may be helpful to have a discussion with your students in advance of this event in terms of how this will be handled in your respective classes that are being taught during this time period.

This concludes my report. Are there any questions?

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Yes, I have a point of order on the Constitution Committee. We met this morning or this afternoon before this. Mark Templin is not here, but he called a meeting. And we presented to the Executive Committee a new Constitution revised about several weeks ago. And we've heard through the rumor mill that some people on the Senate Executive Committee they want to stop it, want to hold it up. And maybe put it into next year. There's been a lot of time invested in this, and I think that it should come to the Senate this year.

I know that you don't have it on your list of priorities. And I do know that you do have on there the Research Misconduct Policy, which is also being looked at by others other than Kristen Keith's committee. But that's another issue, and you seem to be rushing that. But the Constitution was submitted to the Executive Committee, and we have not heard anything back. And I think it should be coming before this body so that it can go on to the faculty at large. That's my feeling on that. I don't understand why it has not...why it's pigeon holed, so to speak.

**President Thompson:** Sure, thank you. I'd love to respond to that.

First of all, those of you that are on the Constitution and Rules Committee, I really appreciate your work. I know that this has been a very large undertaking. And Mark Templin has done a great job with this. As you know, that committee was charged right in the beginning of the fall to actually start working on those documents. Only until recently have we received the current version, which would be right before Spring Break. We've been working as an Executive Committee along with the drafts of the revisions that we've gotten, and the Executive Committee has provided consistent feedback.

Right before Spring Break, we got a version of the document that was significantly changed compared to what we had seen from our template. There were at least four to five areas that were completely different than we had seen moving forward. And so when I talked to Mark, I asked him for a redlined version, because anything that would come to Senate, we would want to see what changes have been made. And part of the issue with the documents, just so you know...this has been a major overhaul versus a minor revision of these documents.

So, before, we had a Constitution and Appendices. Now, we're breaking it out to three separate documents. We have rules. We have bylaws, which is a good thing. And we have a Constitution. And so in terms of what's going on at what point we are right now—I sent an email to Mark I believe last week and asked him for a redlined version, which he provided. He was able to go in and, at least on the Constitution, be able to show us where the changes have been made. And that in addition, as an Executive Committee, we had a meeting on this, Don. And we asked to have a written justification for why these major changes had been proposed to the Constitution, which he did provide us.

So, our intent, which we've already talked about in the Executive Committee, because we've just literally gotten this newest version within the last I would say two and a half weeks. We have an Executive Committee meeting. We are spending a large portion of that meeting going through what he has sent us with the redline and with the justification. Our plan based on that meeting is to probably have a follow-up meeting with the committee, which would be appropriate. Any time we bring a major issue to Faculty Senate, we always have that individual or group come to the Executive Committee.

That's a practice that we do. And make sure that all of our questions and concerns have at least been heard. Then depending on that meeting, we would move forward with that. So, although I will tell you, Don, speaking to your point, revision of the Constitution is something I personally have been pushing very hard with Mark.

And in fact, having meetings with Mark saying, "Where are we at with this?" But when we got a document that was very significantly different than what we have seen in the past, honestly, it takes some time to process and to make sure that whatever comes to the floor of Senate is something that's ready. So, that was our process. There's no intent to derail, you know, whatever you've heard...to derail anything. It's more to make sure that by the time it comes to you that it's in a good form that we wouldn't have to spend the rest of every meeting second that we have debating this on the floor of senate.

**Senator Gilchrist:** So, the committee recognizes the challenges that we've presented, because we have three new documents – the Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules. And it's pretty hefty. And so in our meeting today, what we thought of as an alternative process that I think makes more sense so that we don't lose the effort we put in this year would be to consider the Constitution first.

The Constitution is only three pages long. It's 11 articles. And so I would like to move that we make the consideration of the Constitution as approved by the Constitution Committee our sole agenda item at the next meeting. That will allow us to read the Constitution as required, consider those 11 amendments, and vote on them, thus not losing the work that we put in.

**Senator Van Hoy:** I second the motion.

**President Thompson:** So, there's been a motion and a second. We need to have discussion on it, correct?

**Past-President Humphrys:** I want to clear-up a couple of things, because I think that from a professional courtesy standpoint, we shouldn't be doing Senate business by referencing rumors. First, I sit on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and I have not seen, or noticed, or heard of anyone trying to prevent the Constitution from being brought to the floor of Senate.

Second, the Executive Committee did address the document that came to us. We met the Friday before Spring Break and discussed the document we received. As President Thompson said, we asked that we be given a redlined version because Senators requested they would like that when we talked about the revised Constitution in the Fall.

And we also requested to have an explanation in writing from the committee to explain why they were proposing the changes that they made. So, unlike what has been suggested—we did respond—and in a very timely manner. We did that the Friday before Spring Break. As President Thompson mentioned, the Committee sent the information we requested in a very timely manner, but it was during Spring Break so the Executive Committee was not meeting. So, I want to make sure that the facts are out there, that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is not trying to hold back on anything.

This is a very, very important document, as we all know. And it's going to be changed very drastically, which I think is what we want. But it's not something that can just be done by, "Let's all look at this." It's going to take some time. I'm not saying that there might not be the time for it this year.

We really appreciate the work that the committee has done. It's been extensive and time consuming.

And as far as coming forward with the Constitution alone, the concern that I would have is that when people will see the current Constitution and see the redlined version, they'll realize that much of what is contained within the current Constitution has been taken out, which is fine. I'm not sure I would be willing to just consider the Constitution without knowing that some of the important parts that have been deleted would actually end up in the final version of the bylaws or rules. That would be my only objection of approving just the Constitution.

**Senator Gilchrist:** Thanks, Mary. And I should just clarify. I don't think our committee meant to impugn the Executive Committee's work at all. In fact, the work you've put into this is all so incredible and the fact that you turned this around over Spring Break, we all appreciate. So, I don't want to leave that impression. I think Mary's concern is a good one, though. And it is correct that much of what the substance that was in the Constitution is now in different documents. I don't think that changes my motion. We can present all three documents to alleviate that concern and address only the Constitution. For those who haven't been on the committee, the process that we need here at some point is for the Faculty Senate to approve the articles of the Constitution. Those then get forwarded to the university faculty as a whole for a super majority vote.

**President Thompson.** Which then eventually would go to the Board of Trustees for their approval.

**Senator Hall:** How close are those other documents to coming to the Senate?

**Senator Gilchrist:** From our view, they are ready to come to the Senate. The problem that we've identified is we don't think there's time in the remaining meetings to address what's 28 pages of substance. The Constitution is 3 pages. So, the Constitution is fairly simple. And I think we can get through that without great difficulty. The challenge will be if we try to do everything, that might be impossible. But to present them, to show everyone what we intend to do—that can be done.

**Senator Hall:** But it seems to me a little bit—to agree with other statements which were made—that it seems like a package deal in that there are things that are coming out of the old Constitution that we need. It's difficult to approve the Constitution without knowing that they're going some place else and will be there.

**Senator Gilchrist:** Well, they're approved by the Constitution Committee. So, from our perspective, it's done. All three are ready for presenting to the Faculty Senate as a whole. It's a question of whether the Faculty Senate as a whole wants to consider all parts of it.

**Senator Hall:** I don't see why, personally. But...

**Senator Keith:** I'd like to speak to a different issue. And I appreciate your motion. And I think that we certainly need to bring something to Faculty Senate before the end of the year, as soon as possible. But we have an agenda in play for the next meeting, which includes items from Academic Regulations. We've got an issue with the TOEFL score that needs to be settled before the end of the year.

**President Thompson:** Melissa Gregory is coming to present the tenure and promotion guidelines document.

**Senator Keith:** And given the major changes that have been inserted into this latest draft, I'm not sure there would be time during the meeting for us to do all the work that we need to do that we've already set aside for that meeting as well as then having a good overview of what's in this Constitution. So, perhaps it could be at a later meeting.

**President Thompson:** Okay. Other discussion?

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** What is your position on taking this up this semester and not losing all this work going to next year? What's the position of the Executive committee on this?

**President Thompson:** So, that's a great question. I think that's the intent of our meeting on Friday. I don't want to speak myself when I represent a body of the Executive Committee. So, the whole intent—because literally, we just got the redlined version over Spring Break—is to meet on Friday, look at the changes, look at the justifications, and then decide what is the next

point. We need to try to quickly schedule a meeting with the committee. You know, I think we're very open to that, right? But we haven't even had a chance to really review all these new recent changes. And that's the standard protocol for the Faculty Senate. I mean, that's something we usually do is vet things before they come to you. Right? Any other discussion? Because there is a motion and a second, so we will need to vote on the motion. Any discussion? I'm sorry, did you have something?

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** What is the motion again?

**Senator Gilchrist:** The motion is to present the Constitution, and bylaws, and the rules at the next Senate meeting, and present the Constitution, 11 articles, for consideration by the Senate.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** So, they will be considering the Constitution, three pages, but they will have the next two documents before them at the same time. If they wanna vote on it, they can vote on them all.

**Senator Keith:** I just want to speak against that motion again, because I don't think there is time. It will take an entire meeting solely dedicated to the Constitution, and the rules, and the bylaws. I don't think we have time at the next meeting to take on that business.

**Senator Wedding:** How about the next meeting?

**Senator Gilchrist:** I would be willing to amend the motion to the second meeting out.

**President Thompson:** Which would be the last true meeting that we would have any business done, which would be April 10.

**Senator Gilchrist:** This is our concern. We don't have any meetings left, so that's...

**President Thompson:** I hear your concern. I hear your concern. But again, from an Executive Committee standpoint—our commitment is to review the document on Friday, go through it, ask for a meeting of your committee with the Executive Committee if that's deemed needed. We can do that right away and then choose to see what the next step is. I mean, I can't foresee because there is some major discussion on some of the changes that have been made that need to be addressed. So, you know, I guess, I think we're asking as an Executive Committee to allow some wisdom of us to work with your committee to try to look at some of those issues and make sure we have an understanding that the document is clean and ready to come to the floor. I hear what you're saying. Alright? But it's usually a process that we do with every single thing. Trust me, I told you, I've been trying to push this all the way through. Mark will tell you, I've been pressuring him on it. But we want to make sure that it's to the point where it should be.

**Senator Van Hoy:** It seems like two meetings out gives the Executive Committee that time to do that.

**President Thompson:** Sure. And I mean, I think that's the goal, right? But, I mean, we want to see how the meeting would go with your committee and the Executive Committee.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Would you agree that with two meetings out? He's given us a month.

**President Thompson:** Do you want amend your motion?

**Senator Gilchrist:** I would like to amend to my motion. Yes, two meetings out.

**President Thompson:** Okay, April 10. Do I have a second?

**Senator Van Hoy:** Second.

**President Thompson:** Okay. Any other discussion having it two meetings out?

**Senator White:** Is this like other documentation? Will we be able to see these actually the three documents prior to that meeting?

**President Thompson:** You would have to, yes. Absolutely.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** You cannot have this at the last minute as some documents do reach us.

**Past-President Humphrys:** The thing is, as a Faculty Senate, it is unprecedented to have the agenda set by a motion brought forth by a committee. Even a committee that has done exemplary work like this one. I'm not saying that it won't come forward at the next meeting or the meeting after that. But I believe that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee needs to set the meeting agendas. The EC has an overall view of the amount of work that needs to be accomplished before the end of this academic year. That is why—while acknowledging the important work of the Constitution Committee—I would like to table this motion. I know we have to have a vote on that.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** You don't think four weeks is enough for the Executive Committee to assess this? They've already had it for...

**Past-President Humphrys:** I think if it was the only thing we had to do, I think four weeks is more than enough time. But there is a significant amount of other important things we are working on. As you know, there's this major research misconduct policy. There are several other things that President Thompson mentioned in her Executive Report.

One of those items is the deans' evaluation. And we're making decisions on whether the written comments should be published as they were before, in what format, and distributed to whom. I think that's what the issue is—that there are so many other things that the Executive Committee is looking at, that it may not leave the amount of time necessary to thoroughly review something as important as the Constitution. Also, I don't believe there will be an issue with the committee's work going to waste; it just may be a timing thing between this year and next year.



And the thing that we have to remember is that the next Board of Trustees meeting is April 16 and that we can't get it passed by Senate, passed by the faculty as a whole, and to the Board by that date. Do they have a June meeting? Okay. So, that's just why I would like to table this, because I would like the Executive Committee to have the ability to prioritize things based on what needs to be done before the end of the academic year.

**President Thompson:** Okay. There's a motion to table.

**Senator:** Second.

**President Thompson:** Any discussion on tabling?

**Senator Van Hoy:** Just a question to ask real quick? So, if the agenda was so full, why was the committee pushed so hard to get it done this academic year?

**President Thompson:** So, I'll answer that. My goal was to get this done, right? But the documents we've been getting all along were consistent with a minor revision. These are major revisions. There's language in these documents that are significant. There's language that remove, for example, associate deans from serving on Faculty Senate. These are major, major revisions of evaluation of the vice provost. These are things that we need to take some time and make sure we understand the justifications for why these were suggested. I mean, we have a number of associate deans on Senate, for example. So, these are very significant ramifications for pushing through something that we want to make sure is relevant for our body. And when you think about it, it's taken the entire semester for the committee to get up to this point. So, I think asking the Executive Committee to vet this and have ample to be able to do that is fair.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** But, it's not the Executive Committee that's going to evaluate and vote on this, it's the Senate body. And it seems to me that by getting these documents to the Senate body, they can evaluate for themselves what's been changed. Now, I was told today because we asked this question to Mark who is not here. It's estimated that 80% of this is the same. There's probably been about 15 or 20% change. And it's not wholesale, as you say. There have been some separation out. But... And there's been some wordage. And we can certainly provide redline documents as...for everybody. That's not a problem, doing the redline. Once we know it's going to the Senate it'd be emailed out to the entire Senate. And it will be redlined. And the Senate can decide for itself. I don't see where the Executive Committee...what they have to add to this that they have to stop and evaluate it. You know, are you the wall between the committees and the Senate? Is that your function?

**President Thompson:** There is no wall. No, there's no wall. I mean, if anything, we're trying to make sure that it's in a condition that's right, it's clear, that the language is clear. Because we do that for any policy. For example, with Kristen's policy committee, before it comes to the floor of Senate, all of the policies that they've passed through her committee actually comes up to our Executive Committee to look at to make sure that this is appropriate, right? And going back to the redline comment, Don, for example, I'd asked Mark right away, "Could we have a redline version?" And he said, "I can't even give you a redline version of this because the information is now so dispersed." And so he worked over Spring Break and just got us the redline. That's all

I'm saying—we just want to make sure that we're proceeding in a way that is appropriate and that the language is clear and if there are things that we can help or add to make sure that this is a very concise process.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Senate can decide that for itself if this material is sent out to them within the next couple of weeks. And they will then be able to decide these issues. They're gonna have to vote on it.

**President Thompson:** Sure, absolutely. We just wanted ample time to be able to address some of those issues.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** I don't know when you say we've gotta have ample time to address it, Mary is already saying what she wants to do. They wanna table this until next year, which is what I said at the...at the very top of all this. I think that the Executive Committee...

**Past President Humphrys:** I don't think I said that.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Then what are you...what are you saying if we're not going to...? We're out of time is what you're saying.

**Past-President Humphrys:** I'm not saying that. I'm saying that the Executive Committee's responsibility is to look at all the issues in front of the Senate and to try to put it into some sort of order that allows the Senate to thoroughly address the maximum number of issues within its given timeframe. And so I'm not saying that this won't come forward, I'm just saying that this is the job of the Executive Committee and it always has been. There are many items that are time sensitive; and if we don't look at them, they won't go into effect in the fall. So, I'm just saying that the Executive Committee is not trying to hold this back. Why would we not want the Constitution to come forward?

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Because you're opposing certain portions of it. And we can certainly get into that, but that's not...

**President Thompson:** A vote has been called. Is there a second?

**Senator:** Second.

**President Thompson:** Okay, so there is a motion on the floor to table the Constitution and bylaws pending that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee can review the materials.

**Past-President Humphrys:** I'd like to table the motion that requires the Constitution to come forward two meetings from now. It may come forward at the next meeting or the meeting after that, but what I'm tabling is mandating that it must come forward two meetings from now.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Wait, wait, wait, what are we tabling? We're down to four weeks, I thought.

**President Thompson:** Alright. All those in favor of tabling the motion that was proposed to force the issue...

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** For two weeks?

**President Thompson:** For two meetings.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Two weeks or two meetings?

**President Thompson:** Two meetings.

**Senator Williams:** The issue is not forcing it to come forward, Don. The motion was forcing it to come forward.

**President Thompson:** So, we're voting on tabling forcing it to come to the floor in two meetings. That's what we're voting on. So, if you vote yes, that means we're tabling that motion, and it's not being forced to come to the floor.

Okay. All those in favor of tabling the motion that was on the floor, please raise your hand. Okay. All those opposed, please raise your hand. We're going to have to do a vote count. Okay. All those in favor, please raise your hand. Mary, can you count.

**Past-President Humphrys:** I'd better not.

[Laughter]

**President Thompson:** I shouldn't count, right? Kristin, can you count this please. Only senators are voting, correct?

**Senator Keith:** I had 21.

**Senator:** I had 22.

**President Thompson:** Okay, 22. All those opposed, raise your hand.

**Senator Keith:** I counted 20.

**President Thompson:** Alright, so your move to table the issue passes, Mary. Thank you for offering that. So, here is the last word, if possible. We give you our word that we will have this meeting on Friday. We will be looking at the redlined version of the documents. We'll go through the justification. Right after that meeting, if we have any additional concerns, we'll set up a meeting next week with the committee and have any addressed to hopefully move this forward as quickly as we can. Okay? Any other questions?

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Yes. Do you consider it the function of the Executive Committee to challenge or try to get changes made in the committee's work? In other words, if you disagree

with the committee's work on a particular article or section of the Constitution, do you consider that a basis for you preventing it from coming forward?

**President Thompson:** Absolutely not.

**Substitute Senator Wedding:** Alright, thank you.

**President Thompson:** Sure. Of course. Thank you for your input on this. I appreciate it. This is something that's very important. We obviously want to get it right for Faculty Senate. Alright, Provost Hsu with the academic update, please.

**Provost Hsu:** Thank you, Amy. Well, welcome back from the Spring Break. I hope you had a relaxing week and that this morning's blizzard is a good welcome back for all of us. So, a few items I want to report to the Senate. One is an update on Transfer Assurance Guidelines or know as TAGs. The state has been developing these transfer modules where they ask all the universities to approve and then participate. Last year, we actually invited ODHE here, and we invited Faculty Senate.

We invited the provost's office staff. We wanted to make sure that everybody is on the same page. So, at the time, the state's complaint was that we were the outliers. So, our compliance grade was 45%, and the average compliance grade in the state was 75%. So, I think we've collectively decided that we want to be in compliance. And so I'm happy to report that with the your help, we're now at a 60% compliance rate. So, we're moving towards where our peers in the state are. And we will continue to work with you. And we really do appreciate all the department chairs, all of the faculty who have been working on this.

So, the Ohio Department of Higher Education has also released a number of guarantee transfer pathway programs. These are the so-called "2 plus 2" programs. And the first one that went live is the business pathway. That has been implemented. So, students who go to community colleges for two years will have an opportunity to be admitted into four-year programs in business and then get their B.B.A. within another two years. And there are several more that have been proposed and have been sent to the relevant department on our campus for our approval. And we are just the middle man in that they send information. We don't receive the feedback.

The feedback will be sent back directly to the state, and then the state will determine which one is approved and which one is not. The newly proposed pathways are six in social sciences and seven in humanities. So, those are currently being reviewed by our departments. So, I would encourage those of you who are department chairs to go back, if you have a program that you have to review, to review and give your feedback and the faculty in the department please go back and talk to your department chairs and make sure that we provide them feedback. So, when I first came about two years ago, when we discussed these TAGs, I think the major concern was that these people decided these things, and it's not suitable for us.

And if we don't give them feedback, then it's never gonna be the right pathways for us. So, we need to make sure that we participate in the discussion and give them our input so that these

pathways will be acceptable. Once they're approved by the state, then we don't have any leverage in proposing changes.

So, another item I want to give you an update on is that the state in their revised code—I can't remember the number—but required all state universities to participate in the regional compact.

So, then ODHE took that revised code, and then put together a requirement saying that we're going to divide the state into six regions, and then all four-year and two-year universities have to belong to a regional compact. And they also required that the universities all sign a regional compact agreement. So, the things that the state legislature required all institutions to do include to look into program implementation, workforce preparation courses, and program sharing, assets sharing, reducing operational and administrative costs, sharing of resources, to expand capacity or research and development in other areas. So, there's a long list of things that we're required to do. Which means that if it's something, for example, research—the community colleges are probably exempt from that.

So, you have to do something on the list, you don't have to do all the things on the list. So, our region is the northwest Ohio region and includes UT, BGSU, Owens, Terra State, Northwest State, and Rhodes State. So, six institutions. Dr. Gaber invited the provosts and the presidents from these institutions to our campus in January, was it? And then we agreed that we're going to form a steering committee. So, a steering committee was formed. They drafted an agreement, and they met at Owens two weeks ago. And then that agreement was sent to all of the provosts and presidents for their review and approval. So, by now, the agreement was revised.

And basically, the agreement just says we're gonna work together. And a signing ceremony is schedule for the 20<sup>th</sup> at ODHE with the participation of all the university presidents from our region. We're sort of the leader in the state to have this signed.

The third information item I have for you is—some of you may already have seen this—in our Strategic Plan, if you remember, we said we wanted to develop opportunities for our faculty and staff, and we want people to be happy to have a work/life balance. And the way that we would measure whether faculty and staff are happy with UT, with how we're doing and to find ways to improve is through a nationally normed survey. So, we said that in our Strategic Plan.

And we have identified a nationally normed survey which is the Great Colleges to Work For survey by *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. And so we decided to start that survey this year as a benchmark, so we will have a score that we know where we start, and we will try to improve in the next five years. Hopefully, at the end of this period, we will be one of the great colleges to work for in the U.S.. So, it's really important that you participate. It's not that the survey was not sent to everyone. They randomized it. And 2,000 faculty and staff will receive that. So, if you received an email message, you are one of the lucky ones. And we really need everybody's participation just so that the survey is a fair, reliable survey. The survey is completely voluntarily. Nobody will force you to participate. And it's completely confidential. It's anonymous so nobody will know that you said the provost was the worst provost you have ever seen. I would not be able to retaliate for that statement. So, I would encourage you to go back to your faculty and make sure people understand. The message is going to come from an account

that's called "Chronicle Great Colleges." Okay, so normally when you see something that came from a place like that, your first inclination is to hit the delete button. So, please don't delete that message.

I'd be happy to answer any questions if you've got any.

**Senator Kippenhan:** I'm really liking the idea of these six schools working together to share resources and benefits. Is that something that's going to crossover into our employee benefits such as tuition? Or is that going to stay only on the UT campus.

**Provost Hsu:** I don't think we have discussed what we're actually going to do in each area. So, the agreement--the regional compact--says we want to work together, And those things are exactly what the Revised Code says we should be. And things that we know we're doing are for example foreign language collaboration and software implementation--we're doing collaborations. And so those are the type of things we know we're doing. But, for instance, collaboration with Owens on the transfer program and stuff. But things that we could potentially be doing I'd be happy to receive an email message from you saying this is something we should do. And I'll certainly bring it to the other provosts.

**President Thompson:** Okay, thank you Provost Hsu. Alright, Dr. Cappelletty and curricular proposals.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Thank you. So, the Undergraduate Curricular Committee has two new course proposals. One in Kinesiology and one in Pharmacy Practice, College of Pharmacy. Both had elements that fulfilled all of the requirements within the syllabus and didn't seem to duplicate anything. And the committee is recommending approval of those two new proposals. We have six course modifications. Three out of Anthropology, and one each from Art, Psychology, and Sociology. All of them appropriate and approved by the committee and the deans recommended for approval as well. Any questions or discussion?

**President-Elect Rouillard:** Just a comment about the Pharmacy Practice course, the 4770. The syllabus for the 4770 didn't show up on curriculum tracking, but I did look at the 5770 syllabus that did show up. It might be useful since this type of conversation has occurred elsewhere that when courses are slashed like this that syllabi be filed completely separately so that there will be a separate syllabus for 4770 and a separate one for 5770.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Our committee has had the same types of conversation. And we would prefer that as well. The question is can I make that a statement moving forward with proposals that come in. So, 5770, I can say because I know this course, it already exists on the books. An undergraduate course is being created for students within the Cosmetic Science and Pharmaceutics programs to take as elective coursework. And so the 4770 is the new course that's coming forward. They did in their syllabus differentiate what would happen for undergraduates and graduates. I think part of what they did was just not re-label the 5770 syllabus.

**President-elect Rouillard:** And there was nothing available for 4770 in curricular tracking, so it would be helpful to insist that people do that.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Right. So, that's always been a question that we've had that when these dual courses come through, we don't ever see the graduate course to see that they've clearly differentiated between the two. Would it be appropriate to say that we would like to see both the undergrad and the grad syllabus differentiate the differences between them?

**Senator Van Hoy:** And by the way, Graduate Council does that already. We require both syllabi.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** You require to see both?

**Senator Van Hoy:** Yes.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Do we want to move with that potentially in the future and have both the undergrad and the grad syllabi attached to the undergrad form?

**President-elect Rouillard:** I don't think the grad needs to be attached to the undergrad form, but when these courses are slashed, I think we need to have separate syllabi, and they need to be posted in the system.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Because I know that there are many courses that do use a combined syllabus but differentiate within that syllabus what undergrads will do and what grads would do.

**President-elect Rouillard:** Well, what you do in the classroom is your business. If you want to distribute a dual syllabus. But for purposes of curriculum, I think you need to post separate syllabi.

**Substitute Senator Hottell:** I'm on the GCCC, Graduate College Curriculum Committee. And we've had a lot of discussions about this as well. And I think it's pretty clear to me that the graduate syllabus at least what I would call the policy page where you have the announcements, the policy, the student learning outcomes, those are very different from undergraduate to graduate. They're also, I think, very different from 6000 to 7000, to 8000. And that's a conversation we've had there, too. And I think they all should be separated. One way to study this or to make sure that this happens—I don't know how we do this through Constitution or Rules—is to look at what councils have done. So, in other words, for us, the council of Arts and Letters does look at the difference. And theoretically, they look at we're still doing that on all accounts this year. There are two different syllabi. Or at least policy pages. And I would think we should be able to require that and ask to look at it here.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** I think as we move into the new system that will track curriculum and it changes, I think it's potentially completely appropriate to say that both an undergraduate and a graduate syllabus for dual-listed courses should be provided to both committees up front so that if both are there, then the committees know clearly where the separations are between the two courses at that undergrad and grad level. And they can post as many attachments in even the current system—as they like. So, I would say that I'll make it apart of what undergrad curriculum does is that we request that both syllabi be attached.

**Senator Weldy:** On the first proposal for I believe sports medicine. I talked to Sarah Long today and asked if she would be amenable to changing the title to something more like healthcare rather than sports medicine, which implies medical school and those types of things. And she said she would talk to the faculty, so I'm not sure where that leaves us. But I would like to see it changed in the title because of the implications of the present title.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Well, I know that this particular course started out early last semester, and I was told to put it on hold because there were issues within the college that needed be worked through. And it was about two weeks ago that Tom McLoughlin indicated that they were ready to move forward with this course for approval. So, I would prefer, I think, to approve it as it is and then have a course modification come through so that they're not delayed further in this process.

**Senator Weldy:** Will that be listed in the handbook as sports medicine?

**Dr. Cappelletty:** My understanding is they're working on changing even all of the alpha codes around within the college. And I don't know where they're at on that whole process yet either. But they were looking to do some major changes to the whole Sports Medicine and Kinesiology programming.

**Senator McLoughlin:** I'd be happy to address that. So, Tom McLoughlin. I'm the Exercise Science and program director for the Exercise Science faculty. So, yeah, this is a Foundation in Sports Medicine course that's going to be taught really exclusively to students because the undergraduate athletic training program is no longer in existence. It moved to a graduate program now. So, it's part of our restricting, so now it's really a pre-athletic training. So, it's really dedicated to students who are interested in the graduate pursuit.

**Senator Weldy:** The program and the course sounds great. I'm concerned about the use of sports medicine at the undergraduate level, especially in an introductory course. Because it makes implications about medical care and the practice of medicine. And I think we need to be a little more careful about how we term those things and the implications that they have.

**Senator McLoughlin:** I hear what you're saying. Yeah.

**Senator Weldy:** I wouldn't be opposed to going ahead with this and then making some modifications.

**Senator McLoughlin:** Yeah, it's going to be dedicated to students who are pursuing athletic training, so maybe Foundations in Athletic Training.

**Senator Weldy:** Or healthcare is what said.

**Senator McLoughlin:** Okay. I'm totally amenable to that. It's really a great comment, so thank you.



**Dr. Cappelletty:** Any other comment? All in favor of approving these eight approvals, say aye.

**Group:** Aye.

Opposed?

Abstain?

**President Thompson:** Great work. You've done a nice job keeping up with all those proposals for sure.

**Dr. Cappelletty:** Well, I hear we're about to get slammed.

[Laughter]

**President Thompson:** You'll go out strong, I'm sure. Alright, next up is our elections update with Dan and Sibylle. They've been working really hard on getting those nomination ballots out, so special thanks to them for all their good work and their committee as well.

**Senator Weck-Schwarz:** Okay, we have 989 faculty who are eligible to vote. The number of seats for each college remains the same as last year. In total, 19 new senators will be elected. Each college except for Law will have vacancies for Faculty Senate. And we have two vacancies each on UCAP and the Sabbatical Committee, so those are the elections that are coming up or rather that have started this Monday. The deadline for voting is next week, Friday.

And then we will have about somewhere between one and two weeks—hopefully closer to one week than to two weeks—for finding people who are willing to actually run for the elections. And then the final elections will be about the 4<sup>th</sup> of April to the 17<sup>th</sup> of April is what we figured would be the latest that we can do the elections. So, that's the timeline there. Thank you to all of the members of the Elections Committee for going through all the rosters during Spring Break. Even for some people who were out of town. Actually, out of the Country, in regions where they were having difficulties with email. But eventually, everything got approved. Any questions or comments.

**Senator Compora:** Well, all I wanted to say I was not thrilled in asking committee members to work over Spring Break. I felt bad. But this year with the shorter semester the timeline—there just wasn't a lot of time. The timeline was really dictated by the Constitution, which says that you have to start these five weeks before the end of the term. But that's just simply not enough time. You really need six to seven. And so the shorter semester really kind of forced the timeline this year. We really didn't have any get. So, I do apologize for those few bad suckered in... I mean...

[Laughter]

...recruited to...to do work over break. It was certainly was not ideal.

**Senator Keith:** Can you tell us which colleges have elections for sabbatical committee and for UCAP?

**Senator Weck-Schwarz:** Yes. Law and Pharmacy have elections for UCAP and Law and Education have elections for the Sabbatical Committee.

**President Thompson:** This has been a ton of work, and you're actually ahead of schedule, I think, somewhat. Right? Compared to last year, so that's...

**Senator Weck-Schwarz:** One other issue, which maybe I should address, is that election notices were sent out to all faculty, so there might be faculty who are definitely not eligible to vote in any of the elections that got the notice. And I just got alerted to the fact that there are some people who are eligible to vote who are not on the list, so that list has not been updated quite as much as my own list. So, we will make sure that everybody gets a couple of reminders. But if you know of someone who did not get the election notice, the email you were sent does not contain a personal link or any personal ID or anything in them. It's just been linked to the website. So, feel free to forward it to your colleagues, if you know of anyone who should be getting it and didn't. I'm perfectly willing to do the same. But it just helps the procedure if you do that. So the identification really happens on the website. If you are a voter, your UTAD ID will make you eligible to vote. That's where your own identification comes in.

**President Thompson:** And, if you have any problems with the link, please make sure you email one of us to make sure that, you can get in, and process your voting. So, any other questions for that? Thank you, again, for your work. I really appreciate it.

[Applause]

**President Thompson:** All right, Dr. Shriner you're up, with our intersession update.

**Dr. Shriner:** Thank you, Amy. It's good to be back with you again. I can't believe that a year has passed since we first started talking about this. For a bit of background, those of you that, maybe, don't remember, or were not part of Faculty Senate last fall, but, Dr. Hsu announced that we were going to pilot an intersession term. And, as Amy alluded to in her opening remarks, the term ran from December 18 through January 13. We had a call-out for proposals for faculty who were interested in adding a course, teaching a course, during that new term; and those proposals were due in our office by September 1. We received a total of 13 applications, both undergraduate and graduate; and I'll give you more detail about that later. And then, we reviewed them, and we really paid special attention to the time. The credit, the credit hour guidelines dictate that, for every hour of credit, a faculty member would need to engage with the students for 750 minutes. That doesn't mean just putting videos out for students to watch or sending them to some site, but actual interaction with faculty and students. And then in addition, they require another 1,500 minutes of out-of-class student work. So, we were very concerned about making sure that courses offered in this very abbreviated term were appropriate for that timeframe, that the amount of credit being offered associated with the course, was appropriate, and basically, that faculty and students both were putting in the time the course required to award the credit that they were requesting.

So, we reviewed 13 applications. There was some back and forth with faculty about what they were doing, and what they were planning to do. Two faculty withdrew their proposals, and one faculty member, we could not get over the hurdle. It was a 3 credit hour course, which is really a stretch for that very abbreviated time, and we could not come to an agreement on what would be an appropriate blend of instructional activity and student work, so that one proposal was denied for this initial intersession. We ended up with ten that went forward and were published in the catalog for that winter term. Six of them were undergraduate courses and four were graduate courses. It was pretty much up to the faculty to try to promote those courses in their colleges, and in their programs. Four of those ten were cancelled due to low enrollment. Brenda Grant can respond to the issue of how required minimum enrollment is determined. I don't really know the calculations; but we told faculty that enrollment needed to cover the cost of instruction. So, enough students had to enroll that would take care of paying for the faculty salary during that term. And, different colleges had different payment structures, at least that's my understanding, and Dr. Hsu will tell me if I misspeak, here.

So, we only ended up with six courses running during that winter term. Two undergraduate courses were offered, and four graduate courses went forward. All of those were either, well, they were totally online, or they were a higher ed. A couple faculty, really, it was kind of a very creative approach, but they put materials out for students to do some self-study work, and did the online portion interacting with students at the beginning of the term, and then, when we were back on campus after the new year, actually met. They had face-to-face sessions that ran for multiple hours a day. So, actually only ended up with six. And, here's kind of a breakdown of the number of students—a total of 37 students participated in the courses.

For none of the courses did the enrollment exceed ten. Along with the proposal, we decided that, because we were asking faculty to do some new work, course revision, and what I was really interested in was what the evaluation of it at the end. We also offered an intersession course award, and basically that was an additional amount of compensation for faculty who would submit an evaluation to my office at the end of the winter term. And, I was looking for three things. I wanted them to comment on student achievement; student feedback, compared to the same course when they taught it either in the summer or in a regular term; and then also, their own comments and reflections about the winter intersession. You know, what did you think? What was it like for you as a faculty member?

The results of this I want to share with you today. I did have one faculty member opt out of this, and it probably was okay. It was a study abroad experience, and so, it would not, it was a little bit, a unique experience without the same kinds of grading. So, for the first course, it was an undergraduate course. Faculty interpreted my instructions differently, so I have a little bit different data display for each course, but I think it's enough to give you an overview. This faculty member compared the intersession to a summer course that was offered last year. You can see the average final grades were comparable. This faculty member noted a huge improvement and increase in participation. They used discussion boards, and Echo has a system where students can have questions that they answer while they're going through a lecture, a PowerPoint lecture, and the participation jumped from 29% to 94%. So, students were much more engaged in that shorter term. Their average Blackboard quiz scores, 80 versus 82, and then

this faculty member did have the students do a course evaluation, and their mean rating score, 4-7 versus 4-9 for the intersession. The second course was also undergraduate enrollment, 18 versus 3. A very small sample, I mean, that is a huge limitation to everything I'm sharing with you today. Mean scores are very similar, and the distribution of grades, smaller cohort, but during the intersession, the grades all were in the A and B range. The graduate course, this faculty member submitted comparison to two earlier terms. Four students were enrolled. The faculty member did say they used the same exams, the same assignments. They really didn't lessen the amount of work that they asked of students because of the shorter term, but the grades for the intersession are not inconsistent with what they were. There was a paper, this...this one, the .84, where they had to do a paper that the faculty member said that, due to the short term, it was not possible to review a draft of the paper, give that feedback back, and then get a final version. So, she felt that was an impact on the score, that was a score on the initial submission, without a rewrite. Okay, the next one. Another graduate course. Six students in this course. All the students ended up with an A, and there was really, they were unable to do any evaluation with the students, and I'm not sure why, but that data was not submitted. And then, the last one, course six, was also a graduate course. This faculty member provided comparison data on all of the assignments and quizzes. I opted to only give you the tasks that were identified as major assignments in the course. And, again, the numbers are very similar. The distribution of grades heavily weighted on A's for these grad students, as it was during the spring.

Also, I had asked them for their reflections, their thoughts, their comments, and there was the good and the bad. One faculty felt the course was successful, pleasant to teach. Several mentioned the high level of interaction. You know, you get a class of four students, or six students, or even nine students, when you're used to teaching 25 or 30, and they felt that there was a greater connection with the students. The small class size was a benefit of teaching during that term. You know, there was so much intense time on task. Grading was not difficult in the review, because of the low number of students involved. One faculty member commented that, because the students were together for several hours every day, that you could introduce a concept, introduce a project, complete it, and debrief, all in that same class period, instead of having the students leave, and come back next week, and then they have lost some of what they had discussed the first time. So, that was considered a benefit. And then, one of the instructors for the graduate class was surprised at how much graduate students could actually do in a small amount of time; and maybe the implication was that he wasn't being demanding enough of them during the term, because they really stepped up, and they really mastered the content. On the negative side, faculty said that it was draining. You need to be available to your students all the time, and if you're doing an online course, you still have to connect with them, you know, providing them feedback on discussion boards, answering their questions. It would be impossible to do it for a large class. The small numbers are what made it manageable for faculty. A couple comments mentioned, missing a class. If the student became ill, or a faculty member became ill, the time was so tight, that if you missed one class, it really threw everything off. It would not be possible to make up that content in the next class period, because you had so much to cover every class. One colleague mentioned that, there was no time over break to focus on research, and he felt that, personally, it was a choice he made, but that really, it impacted what he was able to do in his own scholarly work over that break. And also, that you don't get a true break, that as faculty, we're used to those breaks in the year, and teaching in that intersession took that away. One faculty member commented on why the numbers might be so low, and that students had a

lot of questions about financial aid and scholarships, that they weren't really sure how those systems were going to run, and so, they dropped the class, or they chose not to enroll. That's good feedback for us to share, I think we, you know, at the Registrar, that if this were to be offered again, there needs to be more communication up front with our students, so they know what's coming.

So, those were the results. Very small sample, which really limits the ability to say anything with much confidence; but as I looked at the comments for the overall, it was a very self-selected group of faculty. You know, they chose to do this, and it, and they made it a good experience. The students, obviously, were self-selected, as well. They chose to participate. They worked hard; and if just looking at the grades tells you anything, it was successful. But again, it was a very small sample; and I always want more data. [Laughs] You know, because you really couldn't do it. You couldn't. You just couldn't do anything with the numbers, but nothing jumped out as meaning, this, "Oh, this was wonderful," or, "Oh, this was horrible." So, with that, I'm turning it back over to Amy.

**Senator:** So, what was the ultimate answer about financial aid? Because that, I don't feel like I ever got that answer...

**Dr. Shriner:** I don't, I honestly don't know. Do you know?

**Senator:** Did they pay for this separate of their spring semester or do they pay it as part of their bill for their spring semester? I just don't know how that turned out.

**Provost Hsu:** So, if it's a, it's part of the spring semester, but a term, got its separate bill. So, if a student has financial aid, he or she can use that for winter intersession. However, that's going to lower his availability for spring. So, it's part of the spring, part of the spring semester.

**Dr. Shriner:** Okay. Other questions that either I can answer or hand off to Dr. Hsu? Yes.

**Senator Van Hoy:** Are you going to bring this conversation to graduate council, as well, since four of the classes were graduate level?

**Dr. Shriner:** Again, I haven't been invited, but the PowerPoint's done. I'll be happy to come.

**Senator Van Hoy:** I think it's important, too.

**Dr. Shriner:** Yes, yeah, please, you know, feel free to send an invite for a time that works for you.

**Senator:** So, did all of the classes cover the faculty members' salary; and did this generate any revenue for the university, especially when considering the administrative burdens?

**Provost Hsu:** If it did, it probably generated \$50.

[Laughter]

But, so, all we did was, we looked at all the courses, and make sure that tuition minus scholarship would cover the cost. I don't think any of these classes made money. Then, again, this is because students are not used to this, faculty are not used to this; but the number of students and the number of courses are very small. And, other universities who are more successful, and can have longer experience with this, And anecdotally at least, it, will generally generate profit, but as a pilot program...

**Senator:** Can I follow-up just briefly? Because, I didn't get from the presentation if he's moving forward with this. Would the goal be to, like, modestly increase enrollment in classes, or how? How do we turn this into, based on what we have, a profitable program? Is it just more classes, all with small class enrollment?

**Dr. Shriner:** Yeah, I think it has to be. It has to be optional, I mean, at least, at this point, faculty have to choose to do this, because this is intense.

**Provost Hsu:** So, our number one goal is to help students pull through and be successful, and graduate. And so, if we didn't make any money, a few students were able to take a course that they failed in the fall or they have prerequisites that they needed, so that in the spring semester, they can take certain courses, then I would call it a success. If sometime in the future, we have enough scale, and can generate some revenue, I mean, all that would be optimal. A success, it doesn't have to be a financial success.

**Dr. Shriner:** And, if I could add, there was one of the faculty members, in the student comments, that was a point that they made. There was a student who took the course in the winter intersession. It was not going to be offered again, and it was going to allow that student to finish and graduate. So, at least intersession made a difference for at least one student.

**Senator Keith:** My question is kind of along the same lines. Were any of the courses that were offered, with this enrollment that you had during the intersession, did it impact enrollment in the spring, so that they became a low-enrolled course that potentially got canceled?

**Dr. Shriner:** We haven't looked at that, but we certainly could.

**Provost Hsu:** Yeah, so, moving into the future, I think that's the important question to answer. If you are going to offer the same course in the spring semester, and if normally that course, is not filled to the cap, then maybe you shouldn't offer that same course during intersession. But, because this is sort of our first pilot, and we were just happy there were any courses that we were offering, we didn't really look into that much.

**Substitute Senator Hottell:** Could I ask you to repeat, briefly, study abroad? You said that there was one course involving study abroad. Did I understand that properly?

**Dr. Shriner:** Yes. All the rest were either a hybrid or a DL course. Correct.

**Substitute Senator Hottell:** Because that's a perfect opportunity for students who don't have time for a semester or can't get away from work for even a month in the summer. That's who also want to go with someone they know, that, that's been our experience in the department in the past, too, so.

**Dr. Shriner:** Yeah, I agree, and we had two. Two of the courses that were withdrawn; there were other studies abroad, but they were withdrawn for reasons of arranging travel. They were small one credit hour classes, I believe, is all they were asking, and they certainly would've achieved that.

**Substitute Senator Hottell:** We spoke about that in the department, but there just wasn't enough time. It takes more time to figure out the specifics. So, we look forward to participating in the future.

**Dr. Shriner:** That course had either seven or nine students. I'm not sure, but it was a nice group that went.

**Provost Hsu:** So, you know, Miami's one that had a much longer experience with this, and their primary use of the winter intersession is for study abroad. So, they have a much bigger student population. And when we talk to Bowling Green—and by the way, Bowling Green is also going to change to a 15-week schedule—and they said they want to try a winter intersession.

So, perhaps, eventually, once everybody figures out how this works, it could be that students will become familiar with the concept and be more interested in taking these intersession courses.

**Senator Krantz:** Just to add, what Provost Hsu just said, would it be possible to develop a cooperation between Bowling Green and UT, to enhance the number of students in study abroad, or...?

**Provost Hsu:** That's a great suggestion, and, you know, we can certainly cross-list.

**Senator Krantz:** Once you do the logistics, it all falls into place, and you just need more students.

**Senator Kippenhan:** So, based on what you were saying, about credit hours, it's going to be very difficult to offer a 3 or a 4 credit hour course. But, if we have who need to do, for lack of a better word, remediation so they can continue on to the next course, you would have to create a new course. It would be 1 or 2 credit hours, but you would allow it to be a hybrid, then, where it could be recitation style, very intense personal interactions. But then, that is something that we can...

**Dr. Shriner:** I think that's a very good... I think, personally, that would be a very good use of this time. You know, it's just that it would be hard for them to take a 3 credit hour course start to finish, but a remediation class, certainly. Yes.

**Senator:** But, if you do have the remedial class, would that justify the faculty's, salary?

**Dr. Shriner:** So, there's a balance there. Anything else? Well, thank you very much, and let me know about Graduate Council. You know, I'll be there.

[Applause]

**President Thompson:** Provost Hsu before we move into a possible passage of our resolution, did you have anything else you wanted to add, in terms of the intersession?

**Provost Hsu:** So, I just wanted to say that our initial goal is to have a pilot, to have enough data to help us decide whether it's a good idea or not. At this point, I just feel that we probably need to do some more. So, but because, if you're willing to approve, I will be very happy to continue with this experiment.

**President Thompson:** Okay, very good. So, in the spirit of shared governance, working with Provost Hsu, the Executive Committee has developed a resolution for your discussion. The resolution reads:

**Whereas,** an intersession term is an academic term offered outside of the traditional fall and spring semesters and provides an opportunity for students to take additional credits towards their degree completion;

**Whereas,** an intersession term is in common practice at many other universities in Ohio such as Kent State University and Miami University;

**Whereas,** between the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters, the University of Toledo implemented an optional pilot intersession term that was successfully received by faculty, staff and students;

**Whereas,** data from the pilot intersession term was collected by the Provost's Office and deemed favorable to proceed with full implementation with consultation by an appointed committee with Faculty Senate representation;

**Whereas,** participation in a fully implemented intersession term is optional and at the discretion of the faculty member, chair and dean of the respective college;

**Whereas,** the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, at the request of the Provost, has approved an intersession term to be held on an ongoing and regular basis;

**Therefore, be it resolved,** on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of March 2018, the Faculty Senate, endorses the implementation of the intersession term beginning with the 2018-2019 academic year.

**Senator Ferris:** I may have misunderstood, but I thought I understood the provost to suggest that it would be appropriate to do it as a pilot rather than to approve this on an ongoing, continuing basis. Did I misunderstand?



**President Thompson:** Well, I think this is part of this discussion. I think, ideally, we start out saying, if the Senate is comfortable fully implementing it, if your recommendation...

**Provost Hsu:** Let me amend my statement.

[Laughter]

If the Faculty Senate feels comfortable, we'll move forward with your endorsement. If not, we'd be happy continuing as an experiment.

**President Thompson:** Thank you, Provost Hsu. The whole premise behind this resolution is that there would be a special committee put together with Faculty Senate, making sure that there is a protocol and procedures in place for, you know, what would be the date? How would this run? And, having full Faculty Senate and faculty feedback for that process.

**Senator Ferris:** I have another question about faculty compensation and workload, and how the intersession fits in, would fit in on an ongoing basis.

**President Thompson:** Do you want to answer that? Because, currently, it's \$2,250, right? That's what they were compensated.

**Provost Hsu:** So, apparently the faculty are compensated based on overload. It's \$2,250 for some and then, I think that's probably the model that would work well, because if you said, "I need 10% of my salary," then you will need 30 students to be profitable.

**Substitute Senator Hottell:** I hate to be a pain, but I have a friendly amendment. After therefore, there should be a comma, and have that little blue line there. It's wanting a comma.

**President Thompson:** Other discussion before we vote.

**Senator Gilchrist:** I guess I'm confused. Is it, is the choice between full implementation by voting yes for this, or continuing, what's the word? Experimentation and evaluation by voting against this? Is that?

**President Thompson:** I think it's open to an amendment, if that's what your idea is.

**Senator Gilchrist:** I just don't, I'm confused by, I guess, the last line, "full and ongoing implementation." Full implementation seems like something more than what we did this year, ongoing seems like continuing what we did this year, and I just don't know what, what's going on.

**President Thompson:** So, the idea moving forward is that this would become regular term, based on this resolution. So, if you'd like to offer a change to the language.

**Senator Gilchrist:** I would offer a comment. If it's full implementation, then some of the brass-tacks issues, like compensation and workload, probably ought to be specified in the resolution.

**President-elect Rouillard:** As long as it's voluntary, the fully-implemented intersession is in fact going to be like an ongoing pilot session. And, there is no workload associated with this, because it is strictly voluntary and strictly paid on a part-time compensation model.

**Senator Ohlinger:** I think, just to re-emphasize that the paragraph that mentions it's optional and at the discretion of the faculty member, chair and dean of the respective college, and that's where workload gets decided anyway.

**Senator Giovannucci:** Just, maybe, clarifying in that last paragraph, with a couple comments it just endorses the implementation of the intersession.

**Senator Gilchrist:** One other suggestion, then. In the optional paragraph, maybe change "should be" to "is".

**President Thompson:** Is? Okay. Other comments or discussion, before we would vote on this? Are we ready to vote? Yeah? Okay.

All those in favor of the amended resolution in support of implementing intersession, please say, "Aye."

Opposed?

Abstained?

We have a passed resolution. I appreciate your vote on that. All right, moving forward. Our next item on the agenda is discussion of the dean's evaluation. Am I right? Yep. Linda, if you could come up and give us a update.

**President-elect Rouillard:** I can do it from here. So, we have a final draft that is circulating among committee members for the dean's evaluation. We have a first draft that's an adaptation of the dean's evaluation survey or the provost's evaluation that is circulating. Once the dean's final draft is signed off on by the committee, we'll send it to deans, so that they know what they're being evaluated on; and we'll have a meeting. The committee is meeting on the 21st to work on a second draft of the provost evaluation instrument. So, we should be done by the end of the semester.

**President Thompson:** That's great. Thanks for your work on this, and, I know that you really updated the instrument, and I look forward to seeing how that kind of goes in with Mary and Kristen's committee.

**President-elect Rouillard:** And, I forwarded the final draft of the dean evaluation to their committee.

**President Thompson:** So, the intent is that, this will be used in the next academic year, for the evaluation process.

**President-elect Rouillard:** Correct.

**President Thompson:** Thank you very much. I appreciate that. All right! Last on the agenda. As I mentioned in my executive report, one of our goals was to kind of evaluate the bookstore, and hopefully enhance the relationship with faculty. Tom, would you mind updating us on the evaluation?

**Senator Atwood:** Sure. So, tomorrow, I'm going to send out a really, really brief survey on a bookstore evaluation for faculty. It probably takes just a few minutes to complete. We've really tried to make really good progress this semester, on bookstore relations. And just to gauge and see what current faculty perceptions are, what you see as the strengths of the bookstore, or potential weaknesses, or areas of improvement. I'm also working on putting together a panel on inclusive access and textbook affordability across campus. If you'd like to be a part of that, I'm going to send out a request. You've seen some of the news this past week, Ohio has come out with affordability and inclusive access models across the state. So, these are conversations we need to start having. There are a handful of courses that currently are using inclusive access. That's probably going to expand over the course of the next couple of years. And finally, I'm sort of working in very, very draft form right now, of putting together a textbook selection policy across campus, and I will keep you up-to-date as that progresses.

**President Thompson:** Thank you very much. I'm looking forward to that information, and then the goal is to share this with Faculty Senate, so that you can see how faculty are perceiving the bookstore. One of the last questions I actually asked you to give ideas on how we can improve the efficiency and the affordability of textbooks; so, this is really important that you give your input, and fill out this survey. Thank you. All right, so, any other items from the floor that you'd like to bring out today, before we adjourn? Any announcements, good news, anything you want to bring up?

**Senator Kippenhan:** I will be traveling with a group of eight students to New Orleans this weekend to pick up a national outstanding award and a great chemistry award for the University of Toledo.

Good for you!

[Applause]

That's terrific. Any other good news or announcements? Anything else happening?

**Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.**