

Faculty Senate Minutes
5 March 2025
Student Government Chambers (UC 225)

Senate Leadership in Attendance

Andy Milson, Chair
Rhonda Prisby, Chair Elect
Cindy Plonien, Treasurer
Kathryn Warren, Secretary

Senators in Attendance, followed by the unit they represent
(Department for TT, College or School for APT)

David Arditi	Sociology and Anthropology
Amy Austin	College of Liberal Arts
Alan Bowling	Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Kim Breuer	College of Liberal Arts
Janet Burka	Libraries
Christopher Chambers-Ju	Political Science
Heather Charles	College of Science
Morgan Chivers	Libraries
Manfred Cuntz	Physics
Imre Demhardt	History
Thomas Dombrowsky	College of Nursing and Health Innovation
Ceil Flores	College of Nursing and Health Innovation
Tom Graca	College of Business
Tom Hall	Accounting
Andy Hansz	Finance and Real Estate
Andrew Hunt	Earth and Environmental Sciences
Darlene Hunter	School of Social Work
Joowon Im	Landscape Architecture
Penny Ingram	English
Aimée Israel-Pelletier	Modern Languages
Theresa Jorgensen	Math
Carie Kapellusch	College of Liberal Arts
Vinayak Kaushal	College of Engineering
James Kelsay	Criminology and Criminal Justice
Cynthia Koomey	College of Nursing and Health Innovation
Andrzej Korzeniowski	Math
Laura Kunkel	College of Nursing and Health Innovation
Catherine LaBrenz	Social Work
Joohee Lee	Teacher and Administrator Preparation
Stephen Mattingly	Civil Engineering
Fred MacDonnell	Chemistry
Rachael Mariboho	College of Liberal Arts

Jessica McClean	Libraries
Kaci O'Donnell	College of Liberal Arts
Patti Parker	College of Nursing and Health Innovation
Mark Pellegrino	Biology
Liliana Pérez-Nordtvedt	Management
Alejandro Rodriguez	Public Affairs and Planning
De'An Roper	School of Social Work
Ritesh Saini	Marketing
Phillip Schroeder	Theatre Arts
Eli Shupe	Philosophy
Aaron Smallwood	Economics
Whitney Tholen	College of Science
Dan Trott	Kinesiology
Regina Urban	Undergraduate Nursing
Jack Unzicker	Music
Venu Varanasi	Graduate Nursing
Nilakshi Veerabathina	College of Science
Rachel Voth Schrag	Social Work
Shouyi Wang	Industrial, Manufacturing, and Systems Engineering
Logan Watts	Psychology
Naoko Witzel	Linguistics
Tim Wunder	College of Business
Leaf Zhang	Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Senators Not in Attendance, followed by the unit they represent
(Department for TT, College or School for APT)

Ishfaq Ahmad	Computer Science and Engineering
George Alexandrakis	Bioengineering
Linda Barasch	College of Engineering
Mahmoud Bayat	Architecture
Carlos Donjuan	Art and Art History
Donna Firouzbakht	College of Architecture, Planning, and Public Affairs
Yaowu Hao	Materials Science and Engineering
Muhammad Huda	Physics
Song Jiang	Computer Science Engineering
Aera Leboulluec	College of Engineering
Hyejin Moon	Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Joyce Myers	College of Education
Cheryl Prachyl	College of Business
Don Schuman	School of Social Work
Gregory Turner	College of Engineering
Jingguo Wang	Information Systems and Operations Management
David Wetz	Electrical Engineering
Richie White	College of Liberal Arts

Shelley Wigley	Communication
Xinbao Yu	Civil Engineering

Ex officio Members in Attendance

Jennifer Cowley, UTA President (via Teams)

Tamara Brown, UTA Provost

Guests

Shanna Banda, Division of Faculty Success

Candice Calhoun-Betts, Student Success

Minerva Cordero, Division of Faculty Success

Jackie Fay, COACHE Survey Steering Committee Chair

Lee Pierce, OIT

Ashley Purgason, Student Success

Dane Richardson, Assistant Vice President of Operations

Peggy Semingson, Center for Research on Teaching and Learning Excellence (CRTLE)

Meeting called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Andy Milson at 2:30 pm

February minutes approved by acclamation

Election for Vice Chair and Secretary held; Penny Ingram (ENGL) and Kaci O'Donnell (COLA) elected for the positions, respectively; they were the only candidates and the vote in each case was unanimous

Remarks from President Cowley (via Teams)

- Higher ed oversight bill not yet out; could be early next week (expected by March 14)
- Higher education chair issued a memo saying that all funding for higher ed is going to be frozen until they can confirm that SB 17 is being complied with; the state has completed its first round of audits for compliance; Shelby Boseman has met with chief legal officers from across UT System to review our compliance plan and look at areas for risk where further action might be necessary
- President went to DC to meet with our legislative delegation; was there with 20 other college presidents advocating for community engagement-related funding activities (e.g., AmeriCorps, work study), some of which are facing reductions of up to 50%
- Met with legislative delegation to ask what's going on, to convey how many people at UTA are impacted, and help getting things get back on track
- Related to executive orders: one executive order that impacts us, the one around affirmative action; it was established by executive order and can be rescinded by it; impacts reporting requirements but it doesn't significantly impact the way we operate
- Executive orders around DEI, NIH, and gender identity—those have temporary injunctions; no court decisions, but a stay of action before those orders can be implemented
- Grants: additional termination notifications have been received at UTA (still pretty minimal). Last week Trump issued an executive order saying that all grants and contracts

have to be reviewed within next 30 days for consistency with priorities; anticipating an increase in cancelation and stop-work order activity. Higher ed said to be prioritized first.

- Beginning to see grants being issued (new grant activity)
- The “Dear Colleague” letter (from 2/14/25) expands the application of the Supreme Court’s 2023 decision in *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*; broad in its scope; last Friday UTA received an additional guidance letter from the Department of Education; the additional guidance letter is more typical of “Dear Colleague” letters because it provides legal grounding and tells the areas that are and are not of concern. Those align closely with what we’ve already done under SB 17. There are a few areas at the boundary that need more investigation (residential learning communities, graduation celebrations, employee resource groups); Shelby Boseman is meeting with key stakeholders to see what might need to change. An injunction has been filed related to the Dear Colleague letter, but no action has been taken so far.
- Budget overview
 - At federal level, next week is consideration of the continuing resolution that will keep the government going; not clear whether it will or won’t pass. There could be a government shutdown.
 - Budget reconciliation process—concerning. A week and a half ago both the House and the Senate passed a budget resolution that outlined targets and budget goals. We get \$60 million in funding from various federal agencies.
 - Two bills that passed: House Bill, Senate Bill. Senate side: dealing with tax cuts separately from immigration and other items; House Bill is everything all in one, setting targets across the board (favored solution by Trump).
 - In early summer or late spring, there will be a reconciliation process and both House and Senate will need to agree on what budget will be.
 - House Resolution (includes everything)
 - \$4.5 trillion in tax cuts over next 10 years (\$4 trillion of that issued under prior Trump administration)
 - Increase debt ceiling by \$2.8 trillion
 - \$300 billion in new spending related to border security and immigration
 - \$2 trillion in spending cuts; targets been set across various committees
 - What might this mean for higher education?
 - Energy and Commerce Committee: almost \$25 trillion budget over 10 years; vast majority is Medicare and Medicaid; NIH and Department of Energy matter for us for research; no way to cut the required \$880 billion without touching Medicare and Medicaid; how much of the non-Medicare and Medicaid bucket will get cut in order to achieve the required cuts?
 - Education and Workforce Committee: \$722 billion; \$330 billion cut proposed; budget goes mostly to child nutrition and student financial aid, which is where we can expect to see significant changes; the College Cost Recovery Act will put a tax on universities for missed interest payments on student loans; student loan reform; cuts in federal work study all on the table, as well as endowment taxes on wealthiest endowed institutions (UT System doesn’t fall in that group; would not be subject to a proposed tax).

- Agriculture Committee: USDA, \$230 billion proposed cut to things like SNAP benefits/food stamps
- Another \$.5 trillion that needs to be cut; \$10 billion targeted from Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (numbers unclear); paying close attention
- Too early to know how much any committee is going to recommend and where those recommendations are going to come, but realistic to expect we can expect substantial reductions to funds for research and development
 - Advocacy work: we have a consultant in Washington, DC, who does outreach and engagement to help keeping us tuned to latest developments. Expect a memo from the President's office in the next day or so that outlines that we're not preparing for budget reductions this year, but given the uncertainty, the budget process will take longer this fiscal year, and we need to be prepared for significant cuts.

Senator: Clarification about SB 17: that is coming from Texas, not the federal government. But because of SB 17 compliance, we can't access the grants?

President: SB 17 and the federal Dear Colleague letter overlap in areas of commentary, so when we implemented the SB 17 plan, we had some items that might be on the edge, so now we're getting more clarity both from the state and the federal government. The state has put a freeze on state funding until we issue a letter from the board saying that we're in compliance with SB 17. On the federal side, there's no immediate risk of loss of funds related to the Dear Colleague letter, but there is a threat of loss of funds for non-compliance. Columbia is losing \$50 million in grant funding related to an antisemitism issue; we know this will be used as a tool (funding in relation to compliance).

Senator: From a colleague: what should we do with private scholarships (e.g., scholarships from donors who want to support, for example, Black students). Can we accept that?

President: We don't accept that now, nor have we in the past. Our development office works with the donor to structure those scholarships in a way that we can award them. E.g., a scholarship that would support members of the Society of Black Accountants.

Senator: Every time we hear something about these legislative actions there's always some issue with a graduation ceremony, and this is a very small thing to be concerned with.

President: There's a perception it's been creating segregation on campus.

Shelby Boseman: UTA is the only UT institution that still hosts these ceremonies, and our doing so is drawing attention to what else we might be doing that isn't in compliance with SB 17. We want to have these events, but we don't want it to become a catalyst for looking at everything we do. The ceremonies are open to everyone, of course. We are speaking with stakeholders and trying to find ways we can still have celebrations like these, ways for students to get the stoles.

One idea is having third-party donors and organizers having the same events. The students will participate in the same experience.

Senator: We can have celebrations for specific groups, not based on race, language, or nationality, right? For instance, or EMBA's bring in a lot of money, and we have special events for them.

Provost: That's fine.

Senator: Maybe they don't realize that these are not competing graduations; they are celebrations that feed into the regular graduation.

President: Some people think these events are propagating an environment that is divisive on campuses.

Senator: I've been hearing that there's a discussion about shredding the Americans with Disabilities Act, and I'm concerned that we're going to have to wipe out wheelchair access, for example. Have you heard anything about that?

President: Not specifically to the ADA, but I have observed the word "disability" moving into discussions of DEI by adding an "A" to the acronym, but it's not clear what that means or what the policy implications are. I suspect there might be something to do with Department of Education and funding for K-12 schools for accessibility.

Shelby Boseman: There have been four DEI executive orders passed, and one of them, "Wasteful Government DEIA Program Preferencing and Destroying Merit Based Opportunity," uses that acronym, with "A" for accessibility. It's talking about programs that give a preference that's unlawful to people with disabilities. But the ADA is federal law. To change it would take Congressional action.

Senator: I've noticed there's been fewer resources available for ASL interpreters to attend meetings outside of official large events. Is that related to this state funding, or what's been the impetus for that?

Provost: I've been having conversations with TCE about that question and how we can have a structured approach and what that approach would be to providing the support you're referring to. No, there's not a connection. It's just serendipitous timing, because we want to make sure we're being consistent as well across the institution.

Senator: I wanted to follow up on the ASL question. I am the faculty advisor for the English Graduate Student Association. They have a conference every year, and this year the keynote speaker is someone who needs an ASL interpreter, but she was told she could not have one. I think I understand you're saying we want accommodations for disabilities to be equitably distributed across the campus, but it seems strange to me that a faculty member would be denied an interpreter for an official event. Can you provide a bit more clarity around the ASL issue specifically?

Provost: What I'm hearing is inconsistencies of just that sort, and then where do you go? How do you address that? We don't have guidance about that. We need a structure so that these kinds of decisions are clear, and we're working to put that in place.

President: The SAR Center has the ASL interpreters; that's funded by a student fee for students, for student accommodations. That's straightforward. The challenge becomes when we have other people who want to engage with ASL interpreters, and that falls under TCE as a reasonable accommodation in the workplace. There's a dissonance between what we provide to students and what we provide to others, and that's the issue that needs to be sorted out between the various offices. There's not a dedicated budget line item in TCE for ASL interpreters.

Senator: What is the goal of all this? Is DEI being used as a way to make budget cuts? Are they trying to end higher education altogether? What is the angle?

President: There are different pieces. There's a viewpoint that ideologically, higher ed sits on a different end of the spectrum than those who are in leadership today and that this difference in ideology needs to be course corrected, so we need to remove things that are causing those differences (e.g., banning certain concepts). There are other ways of thinking of this. If you look at the Project 2025 website, there's the view that to fix the system, then the best way to do that is to tear things down and start over. That's not practical. So what you're observing is a mix of strategies. The big question mark is where is Congress and the judiciary going to weigh in. What's the research strategy for innovation for the country if funds get taken away from higher ed? What is the outcome we're trying to achieve, and what comes next after you break it?

Senator: Thank you for the advocacy you have been doing. I understand guidance is changing. I am curious about proposals that are going out now. To give one example, in a recent proposal I worked on, three of the criteria they're giving points for are about ensuring racial and ethnic diversity in our sample. Our pre-award office had told us we couldn't use certain words (that AI would screen for them), but we won't get scored on those criteria if we don't use them; then if we do use them, and the grant is awarded, if the executive orders persist we might get a cease and desist order. How can we continue to do our work and try to go forward . . . I'd appreciate any guidance in that process or when we're doing things like creating new courses.

President: The program officers at the funding agencies are just as frustrated as you are because they're awaiting guidance. Yours sounds like a high-risk grant that might get revoked. I would respond to the criteria as carefully as you can, but I can't assure you there would be a positive outcome at the end. I think we have to try to have patience for the amazing federal workers who are trying to navigate the changing landscape. My hope is because of the EO last week, we'll get all the stop-order grants finalized this month, so then we'd have some certainty about what is or is not acceptable from the federal agencies' perspective. So far we've only had a handful of projects get canceled, but they're all for different reasons. We'll issue more advice as soon as we can.

Senator: I've been thinking about messages or suggestions we could use in our endeavors. In the last twenty years, big pharma, med tech, oil, and natural gas don't have a lot of patents right

now; the industry survives on academic research. If it's possible, if we can have a representative here that we can talk to about our issues, like Senator Cornyn or a Congressperson who represents us. It might help us to convey our message.

President: The good news is we have a process called “unite” that we launched as part of our innovation strategies. That's intended to deepen R &D relationships and fundraising. If we can make this work from ten companies, we can replicate that. We have an incredible region with incredible industry. But the question becomes whose role is it to engage in that research. As for engagement with our legislators, of course we can. Chris Turner represents us at the local level. At the federal level, I met with Roger Williams yesterday. He's a very conservative member but he wants to be supportive of UTA. He wants to know what the impact will be on our campus. Jake Ellzey represents a portion of Arlington; we might have more luck with him. We're going to use every angle we can to find out who's on what committee. We can have Jeff work with us to host something.

Chair Elect: Has there been any communication from UT System regarding the Dear Colleague letter?

Shelby Boseman: Because we've complied with SB 17, the Dear Colleague letter isn't catching us off guard. We believe we're already fully compliant with the Dear Colleague letter. We're compliant with federal law. A temporary restraining order has been filed against the letter; there's a possibility it will be enjoined at some point. That doesn't mean the Texas legislature believes we're in compliance, though. So we are looking to make sure that we don't lose any state or federal funding.

** (Teams call ends)

Research Office Update, Dane Richardson, Assistant Vice President of Operations

- We recognize that many federal agencies are interpreting the EOs to provide guidance. We've been having regular, repeated, continued dialogue to make sure we're on top of what needs to happen to ensure that we're as compliant as possible.
- Please keep working with our grants/contracts teams.
- You'll have seen instructions going out to campus with regards to temporary funding; there have been suspensions and termination of grants. We expect that when more guidance comes out, we'll have to lean on temporary funding situations. Our team has been working closely with those PIs.
- There is a delay as to how some of this happens. Discussions around F&A. Where there is advocacy and the implications of the campus, we're working on that.
- We want to double down on UTA 2030. The campus has done its own work to determine its path to success; despite these challenges, we think it's important to focus on what we've set as important goals. Taking a deep, hard look at what we want to achieve and keep our eye on that. But we have to understand the landscape has changed.
- We want to make sure we're looking at internal efficiencies. There is greater opportunity for dialogue. We can eliminate repetition.
- We want to minimize any under-recovery.

- Proposal development – most colleges have proposal development specialists anchored in the colleges working with the associate deans of research. A place for deeper understanding of the work that's happening and how that can be leveraged for federal, state, or philanthropic funds. We want to be more forward-facing, so proposal development is going to be a core part of how we're going to weather this storm.
- We also want to look at core facilities for STEM researchers especially.
- We recognize that there are some gaps: fragmented, limited sustainability, faculty having to go externally for some resources; we've been consolidating where appropriate and necessary. Examining facilities to make sure they're on par. Adding greater visibility and accountability to these services will minimize the costs and bring greater impact and utilization.
- Restructuring the team that supports the core facilities.
- Working with John Hall's team on space. Under the current system, only wet labs are categorized as research space. People who carry on research in other space are essentially invisible, given how space is categorized. But it's important if we want to recognize ourselves as an R1 and talk about scholarly activity across our campus, we need to know where you are and what you're doing. Working with facilities in that realm to make improvements to how we categorize space.
- There are several institutes on campus that have never gone on review. We want to work with colleges to ensure we have greater visibility, accountability; if we have successful, active centers, we want to celebrate that.
- New initiatives, e.g., the National Center for Therapeutics Manufacturing, a partnership with Texas A&M; investments around construction for the Maverick Autonomous Vehicle Research Center that opens in the fall.
- Communication is another important need. Investments internally. Core Facilities Steering Committee. Idea is to have the input of faculty and researchers.
- Moving forward with creating a research committee. Will be made up of all disciplines across campus.
- Speaking with the community. Want to be focused on celebrating work all faculty are doing.
- We recognize that internally we aren't communicating with faculty very well. Making changes so that researchers can get information they need.
- Reimagined magazine.
- More intentional around faculty recognition and support. We have three categories of awards that the research office supports (Academy of Distinguished Scholars, Distinguished Record, and Outstanding Research Achievement/Creative Accomplishment); want to keep making sure those are fully supported. We are about to announce IRPs and REPs for 2025
- Working on the last couple of months in response to a criticism with respect to the ADS policy: that it didn't emphasize a wide range of scholarly activity across disciplines. We recognized we needed a change of policy to better represent the campus.
- Working with Faculty Success around creating a database for awards and providing mentorship to faculty so they can apply for various awards.

Chair Elect: For the F&A (facilities and administrative costs), the federal government was going to make the decision about individual grants and whether or not the IDC (indirect costs) would be cut. Do you know when the exact date is for them to make that decision?

Dane Richardson: No. We're trying to find out. We anticipate there will be some sort of cut. What we want to therefore do is 1) Make sure that cut is more informed, because there's misunderstanding around what it is. 2) We are discussing maybe changing our ideology around how we are more direct with charging. For example, a national lab covers the entire cost of research. They don't have an IDC because they are paying for that cost fully. That's not atypical for federal funding. Some organizations directly bill the federal government for any costs they incur. The federal government has benefited from us subsidizing their costs. There might be an opportunity for thinking about how we bill the federal government. There's still more we need to learn. These discussions are in their early stages.

Chair Elect: Do you know which agency is reviewing this issue?

Dane Richardson: I can't give you a specific answer. I defer to Jeremy. We're looking specifically at NIH.

Senator: The VPRI really wants to see us successful with publications and student involvement. She's been actively sending out media for the students. I didn't see any carve-outs for support for travel for students funded on research projects, though. I recommend that.

Dane Richardson: That's one thing we're looking at specifically. If we're looking at AAU for where we want to go, books and other citations are important elements for recognizing scholarly activity. We want to be able to say that we invested in it. Having to go to multiple places for funding becomes a burden for researchers.

Student Success Update, Ashley Purgason, Vice Provost of Student Success and Candice Calhoun-Betts, Assistant Vice Provost of Student Success

- Meeting monthly with Faculty Senate student success subcommittee (Nila Veerabathina chairing) and working closely with Shanna Banda in Faculty Success
- Have had Civitas tools on campus for a while—will be rebranded (MavPlanner, MavScheduler) and marketed to students as enhanced
- Taking comprehensive approach to all the tools they have and ramping up adoption
- Technology tools not a silver bullet for student success, but can help us leverage data and technology to intervene with students earlier and have a more enterprise-wide approach to student success.
- MavInspire: advisor-facing. Leverage predictive analytics to start intervening with the right students earlier, and students will use it to make advising appointments.
- Faculty-facing tool: Inspire for Faculty. Will continue as is. It allows faculty to identify students based on engagement scores in the LMS; how are students doing compared to their peers? That tool allows faculty to communicate with students easily. Can easily send messages to students and identify them based on their behavior. Can see how active they are in their online classroom.
- Brand new: the early alert system. Will allow faculty to send an alert on a student based on predefined criteria. Tiers developed, so that if Tier 1 doesn't support the student they way they need it, can progress to Tier 2. Not just risk factors; way to communicate good things too. Commendations are available.

- When faculty reach out to students, we see a lift in their persistence. We've seen gains of 8-9% when faculty reach out, 5-6% when advisors reach out, 14-18% gains when we double up.

Senator: You say that if both the teacher and the advisor reach out, it changes it from 8 to 14%-- how many students is that overall?

Candice Calhoun-Betts: That's data we garnered from our Civitas partners across several institutions. We're talking about 2000-3000 students across many institutions.

Peggy Semingson: If you can send us onboarding resources, we can put that on our websites.

Shanna Banda: We ran a training on February 25 with about 40 faculty. We'll do an encore session April 16. This is a really quick, easy system to raise an alert and actually get responses back because it goes to human beings.

Senator: When is this going live, the early alert portion? The 2/25 training was fun and good.

Candice Calhoun-Betts: If you log into Canvas, you'll see Inspire for Faculty listed there. Just one or two slots down you'll see "course alerts." We are training academic advisors to make sure they know best practices. We'd like you to go live at the end of the month.

Ashley Purgason: This won't be the last innovation we make with these tools. We're pushing for a "student-raised alert" in the MyUTA app. It will say something like "I need help." If we can normalize a culture of asking for help, we're hoping that will help transform the student success culture and make it easier for us to help them sooner.

Senator: I've used Inspire for Faculty. It's based on student engagement with stuff on Canvas. But how about the difficulty I had in the past was, let's say a student is clicking on all that stuff but failing the exam. The system was not able to recognize poor grades as an alert. The system will still show that student as highly engaged. So I couldn't email the student through the system; I emailed them separately.

Candice Calhoun-Betts: Civitas has thousands of data points they're pulling in, and it's not necessarily based on grades. Engagement is one area, but you can raise the high alert if a student is failing. We've revised the model twice so far, and we can continue to look at it. I'll take that feedback. But that's why we have the high alert for you to send as soon as possible. There are some best practices that Shanna will go over in the training.

Ashley Purgason: We're starting conversations with the Registrar. To this point, we have tons of data that show that on the aggregate, if students are failing when you enter their four-week grades, they usually fail the course. We could push the vendor to read the grades.

Shanna Banda: The model has been improved over the years, and it will tell you more data points (it will show you GPA). With the early alerts, it has an engagement factor for your section

of the course. It will tell you how many times the student has logged in in comparison to other students in your section. There are a lot of enhancements.

Senator: I use this a lot. I teach a lot of asynchronous online grad courses. I look at engagement, and then I also track time in Canvas, and there's a direct correlation. You have to use those two tools together.

Candice Calhoun-Betts: Advisors are on hand to help contact students if faculty raise an alert.

Senator: In Social Work, we're using it as an all hands on deck approach. Faculty, advisors, chair all reach out. Faculty can include the advisor, who get the message to follow up.

Jackie Fay, COACHE Survey Steering Committee Chair and Leaf Zhang, CoEd

- Have been getting questions about confidentiality
- COACHE data anonymity is protected at all three levels: personal information removed (email address, names, anything else); open-ended response questions, same process. If you mention your colleagues' names, your department, your college, that information is removed as well. Strict rules about groups of 5 individuals or fewer—no way to identify those small groups.
- At UTA level, once we receive the data, university analytics serves as the owner and gatekeeper of the data.
- Very thorough process to protect data use.
- A little over four weeks left.
- Response rate is currently 37.9%; completion rate is 31.2%
- Completion rates across colleges show COLA in the lead with 45.5% completion rate
- Helps when we have a faculty advocate to put a face in the survey for those units.

Senator: The completion rate in a cohort, is that at this current moment, or is it the finalized completion rate?

Jackie Fay: It's the completion rate right now. If you're talking to faculty, it can be helpful to point out how the survey includes questions about areas of concern to them.

Peggy Semingson, Interim Director of CRTLE

- Special edition newsletter with free resources on AI coming
- A book coming out in collaboration with the Library with faculty vignettes and lesson plans and ideas for ways to teach with AI; free, OER. Can access via MavOpen Press on library website, and we'll send information out about it.

Senate entered Faculty Forum (held in executive session) at 4:30.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 pm

Next meeting: April 2, 2025