45 pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle*
may be directed to the Secretary, Mrs. Rose Marie Konet (x6510).
facultysenate@uakron.edu

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 7, 2005

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, April 7, 2005, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:07 pm.

Forty-two of the sixty-two current Faculty Senators were in attendance for the meeting; one additional (new) Senator was introduced from Graduate Student Government (Senator Tomer). Senators Barrett, Brooks, Hansen, John, Lee, Schantz, and Stratton were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Cheung, Hebert, Hixson, Kelly, Kreidler, Lowther, Maringer, Soucek, Stachowiak, Vijayaraman, Vollmer, Wilkinson and Yousey were absent without notice.

I.   Approval of the Agenda – Chair Fenwick welcomed everyone to the meeting and announced that the main item of business that day would be the presentation of the Academic Plan by the Provost.

He first asked for approval of the meeting Agenda, after making one small correction, which was to change the wording to 'consideration of the minutes of the February 3 and 17 meetings' not the March minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the Agenda as corrected. The body responded unanimously to approve it.

II.   Approval of the Minutes – The Chair moved on to approval of minutes from the recent series of meetings. Senator Erickson made a motion to approve the Minutes of the February 3 meeting. Senator Hajjafar seconded the motion. No corrections were indicated and the Senate body approved the February 3 Minutes.

Regarding approval of the February 17 Minutes—the Special Meeting about Senate Bill 24, Senator Norfolk made the motion to approve; it was seconded by Senator Clark. Senator Rich wished to request some corrections to the Minutes, citing what he felt were inaccuracies (misquotes and paraphrased remarks) in some of his comments. He had been in contact with Senate Secretary, Rose Marie Konet, to discuss the issue; she promised to listen to the tape and to correct/amend any inaccuracies in the subsequent week. Senator Rich asked that the Minutes from that meeting not be approved until those corrections had been made, since they would become a matter of record once approved. The Senator then moved to postpone approval of the February 17 Minutes until the next meeting [May 5]. Senator Qammar seconded the motion.

At this point Senator Gerlach offered his observation that according to the rules, it was appropriate to correct Minutes at anytime when errors were found. "So we may postpone it alright, but we didn't have to, we could correct them any time."

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any further discussion of the motion to postpone approval of the February 17 Minutes. Hearing none, he requested that those in favor should say 'aye.' The body responded unanimously to postpone consideration of that set of Minutes until the May meeting **(see Appendix A for proposed changes)**.

III. **Special Announcements** – Chair Fenwick reminded Committee Chairs that they need to meet before the end of the semester, then submit a year-end report summarizing their activities for the academic year. "Provide a written report to the Senate on what activities you've done during the year—even if you have done nothing. And that includes Ad hoc Budget Committee, which I chair."

He then welcomed the newly-elected President of the Graduate Student Government (GSG), Vivek Tomer. Mr. Tomer stood and was recognized by the Senate. The Chair then announced that a handout was available from the GSG outlining their activities and accomplishments during the academic year **(Apprendix B)**.

A copy of the Spring commencement list was also available on the handout table for review. "There is only one copy, so don't abscond with it. This commencement list was distributed via Senate List-Serve on March 31."

Chair Fenwick expressed his hope that everyone would keep their comments brief since the Provost would present the Academic Plan a bit later in the meeting.

"I would be seriously remiss if I did not note the death of Dr. Paul Daum who, as all of you know, passed away on March 4, after a short illness." The Chair went on to mention Dr. Daum's long-standing career at the University of Akron. "He began teaching at the University of Akron in 1964 and, at the time of his death, was the longest-serving active member among our faculty." He further added that the Daum legacy included his tireless work as an undergraduate advisor and graduate student coordinator in the University's Theatre Program. He was involved in over 180 theatre and dance productions at the University of Akron and had lectured widely about the history of theatre in Akron and published numerous articles on stage lighting techniques. His reputation for leadership included work with many local theatre organizations. Dr. Daum was a major benefactor to the Theatre Arts program here at the University, providing several scholarship and endowment funds, not the least of which, the facility that bears his name, the Paul A. Daum Theatre. Dr. Daum was preceeded in death by his brother and his parents. An on-campus memorial was held March 18 in the theatre named for him. The Chair offered condolences to his surviving family and many friends on behalf of the Senate.

Additionally, the Chair mentioned that he had learned earlier that afternoon that Associate Provost Nancy Stokes' mother-in-law had passed away the previous day. "We want to send our condolences to the Stokes family as well." The Senate body rose for a moment of silence in remembrance of the two deceased.

On a happier note, the Chair related a report from Senator Qammar about a team of undergraduate chemical engineering students who took first place in the April regional chemical car competition of the American Institute of Chemical Engineering. The team of freshmen and sophomores defeated schools such as Purdue, Minnesota and Michigan Tech. They took first place in both distance-to-target and poster presentations. The Chair extended congratulations to these students and to their advisor, Dr. Edward Evans. In the fall, the students will compete in a national competition and hope to recapture the national Chem E car award. Chair Fenwick added that, "with the price of gas, I'm excited."

IV. <u>**Remarks of the Chair**</u> – He reported that the tribute [framed resolution document] had been sent to Marilyn Quillin, former administrative assistant to the Senate. A card was sent along, signed by the Senate Executive Committee members, President and Provost. Chair Fenwick shared that he recently received an email from her. Marilyn related to him how she was 'very choked up over this' and had 'never felt more appreciated.' She sent her greetings to the Senate, along with her appreciation. The Chair shared that she misses everyone here. He went on to say how nice it was to hear from an old friend.

He provided a follow-up on the Senate Bill 24 issue. "It is probably going to be in committee until Fall. The Senate Education Committee has gone on to the Education budget. We will keep you apprised. This afternoon we sent out [via email] a copy of the resolution that Bowling Green State University passed."

V. <u>**Reports**</u>

a. Executive Committee – Senator Konet reported that the Executive Committee met twice since the last Faculty Senate meeting, on March 17 and again on March 28 **(see Appendix C)**. The agenda for the March 17 meeting included setting the agenda for the April Senate meeting as well as updates on Senate Bill 24 and the Ohio Faculty Council report. The news from the Ohio Faculty Council was a report on Ohio's Return on Education Investment. The report recommends incremental investments in higher education with the intent of demonstrating incremental returns to Ohio. The Senator expressed her belief that we would likely hear more about that from the President and Provost later.

On March 28, the EC met again to discuss several high-profile topics. The first one was Program Review since there was concern about the time-frame given to complete it and the questions regarding how the data would be reviewed and used. At the joint meeting, the Provost indicated that she planned to respond to department chairs addressing these concerns. Senator Konet said that the Provost had since responded to those concerns. At this point, Provost Stroble confirmed this and stated that a copy of that had also been sent to the Senate Chair.

Senator Konet reported that one recurring issue was the budget, both at the State and University levels. "The news from the State is that it is likely, though not absolute, that the budget will remain flat in the coming year. The President also indicated that the IUC has been making a strong case for higher education investment and that there has been a collaborative effort between the Board of Regents and the two-year colleges to produce an informational pamphlet that would talk about the returns that such an investment would make to the State and the University." There had also been a request for updated information on the University's budget hearing process. The Senator indicated that the Provost would be sending out an email about this. Provost Stroble interjected that there had been two such mailings that week, one in the *Email Digest* and also in *Perspectives from the Provost*. Senator Konet added that these explained where they were in the process and what is yet to be done. She encouraged everyone to read those email messages, if they had not yet had a chance to do so.

In reference to the Decision-Making Task Force report, the Executive Committee decided to move forward by creating a committee to review those recommendations specific to Faculty Senate. Vice Chair Erickson agreed to coordinate that committee; Chair Fenwick would meet with the President and Provost on April 20 to review some of the recommendations.

In terms of the status of the Transfer and Articulation agreements, the Provost shared updated information with the Committee members. "Recently she informed the EC that under House Bill 95, we're now being asked to study the feasibility of establishing articulation agreements with technical schools and proprietary schools. Since this request is raising some concerns, there has been a recommendation that suggests conducting the reviews on a course by course basis and against an established set of standards rather than on a whole curriculum basis." More information on that topic would be forthcoming.

Finally that meeting concluded with discussion regarding updates on the Academic Plan, the serious situation about OhioLink funding, and the creation of a committee to look into University facilities usage.

Chair Fenwick invited questions or comments about the Executive Committee report. Senator Gerlach asked a question about the Senate's resolution in opposition to Senate Bill 24 following the February 17 meeting. He asked if there had been any local newspaper coverage of the resolution in the days following the meeting. The Chair replied that there had been some local television news coverage, from Channel 5. "I can't remember the name of the reporter who got in touch with me, but there was a brief mention that the Faculty Senate here had passed a motion." Senator Gerlach expressed his opinion that, "As usual, the *Beacon Journal* was dumb." President Proenza did relate that the *Beacon Journal* did cover it. The Senator added that "they were covering it on their own, but they did not mention the Senate's action—that's what I thought." There were no other comments.

b. Remarks by the President – President Proenza greeted everyone and commented that for him, this was a "twice to Cleveland day, interestingly enough."

He expressed his deep appreciation for the Senate observing a moment of silence regarding the loss of our good colleague, Paul Daum. "I wanted to inform the Senate that we inducted Professor Daum, posthumously, into the Order of the Phoenix." The award will be displayed either in the College or more likely in the Auditorium of the Theatre bearing Dr. Daum's name. He added that his birthday will be remembered/celebrated as "Paul Daum Day" across campus.

The President went on to thank the Associated Student Government for the leadership exhibited this academic year, resulting in some remarkable accomplishments and great leadership. "Steve [Kushner], to you and all your colleagues here today—and all the others, please extend my 'thank you.'"

He went on to thank Provost Stroble for a tremendous effort this year to move along important initiatives and for doing an exceptional job in establishing very fine communications on a regular basis.

He thanked the body for continued good work. He shared, in addition to the wonderful news about our chemical engineering students, that when he met with the colleagues that morning in Engineering, Dean Haritos had reported to our Board of Trustees the cumulative record of our engineering students in participation in many events such as those reported by the Senate Chair earlier during his announcements. "The fact is, whether in terms of awards or quantitative scoring of those awards, the University of Akron has, quite simply, become 'the team to beat.' When Dean Haritos quantified all of those [awards], it turns out that out of all of the SAE competitions, the University of Akron has won more awards than any other single university in the country, more awards than all other Ohio universities combined. The point base is that it

has scored nearly twice the record of any other institution in the past ten years. As you noted, we beat Purdue, well beat Purdue in areas that we don't have programs in, that *they* do, which I think is astounding. So it is a testament to our students and, indeed, to what we've called the 'enabling competency' of student success here at the University of Akron, so I compliment all of you for dedication to the students."

In terms of achievements, he shared that the College of Business Administration's Entrepreneurship Program was singled out for recognition by *Entrepreneurship Magazine* for the third year in a row. "It has been featured very prominently among the top twenty-five national programs with an emphasis on a number of other things. This year it is identified among the top ten first-tier programs among regional institutions." Additionally, he mentioned that our Industrial Psychology Program rose in the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. It had traditionally ranked among the top ten-in the last few years it has been seventh or eighth, but this year moved to number six.

The President mentioned three dedications, one that happened the previous evening. "Those of you who attended the 40th year anniversary of our C & T College—now Summit College—thank you for being there. It was a very fine evening with a lot of participation from people from the community and, of course, former faculty/retirees and others." The day after the Senate meeting, a dedication ceremony was planned for the new clock that had been installed between Buchtel Hall and the Student Union. He welcomed everyone to attend. Finally, he mentioned that the new academic addition to the Honors' Complex would be dedicated the next afternoon. He invited everyone to stop by. He congratulated Dr. Dale Mugler and the students and said it had been a tremendous success.

President Proenza mentioned the current issue of *The Buchtelite* and the article it carried with "wonderful news about the Spicer Village Project." He explained that this was the first major project catalyzed by the Knight Foundation Grant to the University and the University Park Alliance. "It's a $40 million investment in some new commercial developments, apartment developments and about 120 to 130 new town homes that will be built there in various price ranges. We have solicited some private donations and have identified some monies—discretionary monies—from those sources to provide an ownership incentive program to staff, faculty and/or students of the University of Akron that wish to purchase one of those homes." He stated that more details would be made available and expressed his belief that Summa Health Systems would likely make a similar plan available. He invited everyone to visit the website for more information at: http://www.upakron.com/

He continued with an update of information out of Columbus. He related that it had been an interesting year, one in which we might yet come out better than we might have anticipated. "Suffice it to say that when we got to the legislative session, there was nothing short of rancor and hostility being voiced in Columbus for higher education. Their words were, literally, hostile, quite damaging in most regards and virtually impervious to any sort of basis of reason or, certainly, *fact*." He explained that over the past few months, beginning in January with an historic meeting—between the Chairman of the Board of Regents, the Chancellor of the Board of Regents, a two-year university president, Dr. Zimpher, President of the University of Cincinnati, and he—they began work to form a coalition between the Board of Regents, the two-year colleges and four-year universities. The result was the R.O.E.I. proposal, which will provide the Legislature with an opportunity to make modest but incremental investments in higher education and to recognize the significant returns on that investment. He explained that informational materials would soon

be distributed that would summarize the initiative. "It's being talked about widely. Regrettably, I don't think it will have the impact of getting the investment started, at least not so far from the signals we get from the House. The House is in the midst of finalizing the budget." The President went on to reiterate that in terms of funding, the numbers would be fundamentally flat. He added that there is currently a controversial proposal—in the second year of the biennium—where all line items would be lumped into a single line with an appointed commission charged with sorting out how the money would be divvied up. "Hopefully they will reverse it even before the House releases it, but if not, we have reasonable assurances that the Senate would reverse it, because last November, the IUC—under my signature—sent a letter to the Board of Regents initiating a process of completely reviewing how higher education is funded in Ohio. In short, we had anticipated that this was something that is needed." In summary, he expressed the hope that the House would acknowledge that in their own language rather than introducing a second version of the same process legislatively." I trust that this will be the case, if not, we do believe that it can be reversed in Senate."

He went on to report that the new coalition members spent a number of days collectively in testimony across a two-week period. "I can tell you that most of us were pleasantly surprised because we had anticipated, again, hostility, which had been present at the beginning of the session. Instead, we found moderation and quite reasonable questions ninety-eight percent of the time. Those questions that were *not* reasonable were simply ill-informed yet the person asking remained receptive to the information." He commented that the myths continue about inefficiencies, excessive duplication and too many graduate programs in higher education, so there is still a long way to go for understanding. "To that end, the IUC together with the Board of Regents and the two-year colleges and, hopefully, the private universities as well—hope to form a truly comprehensive higher educational alliance and have begun to discuss the opportunity to engage in a significant marketing, public relations, public information campaign over the next several years." He went on to state that we must recognize that Ohio is, to put it simply, very far behind other states regarding a tax base. "Ohio has such a long way to go and Ohio has had such a legacy of people thinking that the jobs that they had on the farm or the jobs that they had in the factories were going to be good enough for their children, their grandchildren, and their great grandchildren, that it is not as a State participating as well in higher education as other states and that has been the reason for the decline in per capita income over time." The President mentioned that we have joined with the American Council of Education, which is interested in doing this on a national basis, and Ohio is likely, therefore, to be one of the first pilot states to engage with the American Council of Education. He promised to keep everyone posted on this, since the coalition is still in its beginning stages. "At the heart of it is getting Ohioans to recognize the importance of lifelong learning, the importance of higher education for the jobs that are being created today." He added that it intended to formulate a new means for the State government and Legislature, supported by the people of Ohio, to have a sense of the public responsibility for higher education and public education in general. He concluded his remarks by inviting questions. None were forthcoming, so the Chair thanked him for his remarks.

c. Remarks by the Provost – Provost Stroble explained that she had assembled just a few items on her handout **(Appendix D)**. She highlighted some upcoming events, such as the fourth annual event to celebrate Teaching and Learning, to take place on April 15. She encouraged those that still needed to RSVP, to do so. "It promises to be a great luncheon event and there are a number of presentations during the day by faculty, staff and students. It's always a great opportunity for us to celebrate as a college community what works so well here in the nature of teaching and learning."

The second forum for the proposed Academic Plan was scheduled for May 11, an email had been sent out with the date and session times. The Provost explained that the morning would provide two sessions so that people could come to one or the other since they would be virtual repeats. The sessions would provide opportunities to focus on what would, by then, be the fourth or fifth draft of the Academic Plan. She went on to explain that the third version would be presented later in this meeting, including the feedback from earlier sessions that day. "We are going college to college, office to office, division to division. We'll make revisions and, at that forum, really focus on what this document means for us in terms of implementation."

The Provost provided information of impending visits by finalists for two dean's positions:

· Dean of Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences; she anticipated that they would be in during the week of April 18.
· Two finalists for the Dean of University Libraries; she was unsure about how quickly those candidates would be on campus.

She added that information would be distributed in the next week with agenda details, sent particularly to the faculty of those two colleges.

Provost Stroble said she would provide a lengthier written year-in-review report at the next Faculty Senate meeting. She explained that she provided such a report to the Board of Trustees and President, so she would provide a similar type of report for the Senate as well.

In response to Senator's Qammar's question about fees, here's the best I can do *this* month **(ref Appendix D)**. "I think if there are more questions about this—follow-up questions—I'll just need to hear those and I'll try to gain more information. In response of what I can share with you today, I thought it would be useful for you to see the sources of fees for the various colleges, first of all." She outlined four different types of categories of fees:

1 Course fees: These are recommended by the deans and the department chairs and the faculty of the various programs, then approved through the Board of Trustees. Then they are collected based on enrollment in those various courses and what the established fees are. A list of what has been distributed to the colleges through April 1 of this year in course fees has been included in the handout.

2) Technology fees: That is what has been distributed to the colleges so far and there will be another $762,887 that will be distributed to the colleges before the end of the spring semester.

3) Other categories:
Infrastructure fee in Engineering;
Developmental course fee in University College;
University Libraries receives a library fee; you can see that the amount is exceeding what we projected for this year. I think what was projected was in the neighborhood of $800,000;

these fees generally go to purchase of books. That was approved a number of years ago to offset the drain on the University library budget that was being created by ever-escalating subscription costs and try to dedicate some fee income to book purchases.

4) Sales category: I thought this would be interesting to you as well. Various colleges have revenue-producing streams—services that they provide to the general public that cause a revenue-stream to be created for the colleges.

She explained that these were the types of fees received by the colleges from course fees, technology fees, other fees and sales. She continued, "If your question, then, is 'what do the colleges do with the fees?' that's a question that's got to go to the deans, because that generally is not micromanaged from the Provost's Office level; that's handled at the deans and administrative levels and department chairs within colleges. So if that's your next level of questioning, that will require a little more information. If you want that, I can ask."

Related to the question of 'how much income comes in from Career Advantage fee?,' she explained that this was the available information for the 2004–2005 academic year. She thought perhaps everyone would find it interesting as she had that sixty-nine percent of the dollars actually support salary and fringe benefits for individuals employed by the Center for Career Management. "Of those employees, three individuals were actually transferred from the College of Business Administration budget to the Center for Career Management budget." She reiterated that this is the information she has been able to discover, to date. She also emphasized that she would be happy to answer questions about that as well as gather more information, if necessary.

On the topic of Articulation and Transfer, the Provost explained that data had been submitted to the Ohio Board of Regents to show them how transfer and articulation works at every State institution. "We had done that kind of information gathering as a prelude to our recent revision of our policies. We discovered that every single state institution requires that the transfer credit be from a regionally accredited institution. So we shared that with the Ohio Board of Regents staff that had asked us how we treat the transfer credit; we said, 'here is how we treat it and, by the way, here is how every other state institution treats it.' So as I learn more about what they intend to do to move on with the mandate from House Bill 95, I will share that in upcoming meetings."

Chair Fenwick thanked her for her comments and invited questions/comments. Senator Clark asked for clarification about the meaning of 'technology and proprietary programs' that were mentioned. The Chair responded that they were institutions such as ITT Tech, Bryan and Stratton; the Provost added that there was a list of about ten or fifteen institutions they were particularly interested in—not State institutions. She added that she did not know their source of funding, but that these programs were highly focused, technical institutions that prepared a very small set of programs and were not necessarily associated with a two-year college or a university. She said that the list could be forwarded.

Senator Qammar thanked the Provost for putting together the fee information. She then commented that Engineering received no money back for tech fees, although their students paid the same tech fees as anyone around campus. She added that, when the tech fees were first established at the university level,

Engineering already had another category in place. "Years ago I had asked the [then]Vice President, whether or not Engineering students would actually receive any direct benefit from the fees that they pay as the other students on campus did, and he said that since the year before they instituted this, we had paid zero percent, we would get zero percent. So it's now four or five years later and we're still getting zero percent. That appears to be an ongoing philosophy." Senator Qammar added that similar things happened with the Career Service fee, "although thirty percent of it goes for things beyond personnel. We're still the remaining unit on campus, because we have the fourth oldest engineering co-op in the country; we maintain our co-op internally within our college. Then again our students pay this fee and it seems as though thirty percent of their fee, at least, ought to come back for direct use for them through this Career Advantage fee." Provost Stroble responded that she was unsure of remembering all of that, so the Senator promised to send her the information in an email.

The Provost replied that she only remembered what has happened since she has been Provost. She then asked Associate Provost Nancy Stokes to assist with the percentages if she had them wrong, adding that there had been a change in how technology fees were distributed to colleges, where originally when they were instituted there was this agreed upon 35 percent/65 percent split—35 percent to colleges and 65 percent to Information Technology. "In the year 2000, I think, it was frozen for the colleges at what 35 percent was that year. So even though Information Technology fee income continued to go up, colleges were frozen at what that 35 percent figure was that year for a number of years. That has changed this year. The colleges now, this year, get the true 35 percent of what the entire technology fee income is. So, we've expanded what comes to the colleges. I see that as a positive move—to go back to what the original agreement was."

Provost Stroble addressed the second part of the Senator's question about why Engineering did not have an opportunity to share in the fees. "What I'm doing is a first step. And, truly what I've been told—I never heard that part that you paid zero—that's new information to me. What I had been told was that there was an agreement that, in exchange for Engineering keeping its own dedicated fee, they were not going to get a share of the technology fee. I can't tell you whether that's accurate or not, that's just what I've been told. What I'm doing this time, I gave out an assessment of technology fees to the Colleges in the Fall; that's what is reflected here. In this second assessment of technology fees, I sent out to every dean a request asking, 'what would you really need to use technology fees for?' and I included Engineering in the request. So this time, rather than the fees going out just on a *per capita* basis, I'm giving them out according to the need that the deans identify. There's more money to give out this time than we've had in a number of years and I'm making it possible for Engineering to be competitive. I'm sure not everybody will think that's a good idea, but it's my attempt to try to meet a need."

Senator Qammar sought further clarification about one particular year where the campus community had the tech fee and, because the Engineering College already had its own in place, students did not pay double that year. "That's when you had the thirty-five percent of that Tech fee distributed across the units." The Senator felt that due to miscommunication the Engineering College students were unexpectedly assessed a tech fee, the name of the initial Engineering fee had to be changed, and now those students pay *double*. The Senator added, "That year our students experienced over a twenty percent increase in tuition and fees. Because we received no Tech fees from the year before, because our students did not paid that, we have continuously gotten *zero* from that point on, all due to thirty-five percent of that magic number the

students paid one particular year." The Provost responded that she understood the logic of that and went on to explain that what she had done was to take a 'baby step' toward figuring out how the technology fees could be increased *en masse*. "So there's much more money in tech fees coming to colleges this year than there has been in years. I'm also trying to figure out how some way to make some small part of it available to College of Engineering."

She pointed out that, in regard to the Career Advantage fee, the College of Engineering was not the only college that had its own in-house internships. "You're probably one of four or five colleges that provide it and the other colleges provide it for *every* single student. I just want to say that this is a widespread problem on this campus and I appreciate Engineering's issues around this and for raising it. It's also an issue for Nursing, for Education, for Social Work, for Speech Pathology, for a whole host of programs around campus. In various colleges, we have worked effectively because some services could be delivered for them that complement their own services and in other colleges, that's not the case." She went on to explain that she had met with Dr. Johnson and her staff to find ways to make this work better. The Provost emphasized that if the students perceive that fees are collected without receiving benefit of them, "this is not a good place to be." She reiterated that she started the conversation, but that it was not yet finished.

Senator Erickson asked for clarification about the tech fee. It was her understanding that only part of the tech fee went to *colleges* and that another part went *centrally* to the budget; she asked if that was correct. The Provost replied that it goes to Information Technology and is largely dedicated to PeopleSoft conversion expenses, as the Operations Advisory Committee discovered in their audit about a year ago. Senator Erickson pointed out that that particular information was not on the list that the Provost had provided, just the percentage for this year. She then asked about course fees, to which the Provost replied that no course fees go to feed those units, adding that "course fees are purely a college vehicle." Senator Erickson asked to confirm that when a student pays a course fee, it goes directly to the college. Provost Stroble replied that it does. The Senator asked if that went for the sales item on the report as well. The Provost confirmed this.

Senator Erickson then raised the issue of *why* there was a 35/65 split in the fees and if it was officially written somewhere. The Provost responded that, "yes, when it was approved, that's how it was approved." The Senator asked about the *why*, the reason or the criterion used to determine that split. The Provost said that this was before she came to the Provost's Office but that she could try to surface those documents and share them with the Senate, but that she had not been a part of that decision. The Senator again emphasized that there must have been a set of criteria under which funds were allocated. "If it's not going straight back to the department or to the college, then it would seem to me that there would [need to] be a set of criteria." Provost Stroble replied that, "I believe that those will have to be created; I don't think that we will find them." Senator Erickson commented that she remembered that in 2000 the money went into the laptop program. Provost Stroble clarified that it was the technology fund—a separate fund—and not the tech fees. Senator Erickson expressed her opinion that this was why it was so confusing. The Provost remarked that if she was asked a question, she would get an answer, but that she believed she had answered Senator Qammar's question. Senator Erickson replied that she understood, but was just asking—without provocation—if there was no criteria for this. The Provost answered, "No, I'm not saying there are no criteria. You asked me 'is there was a document that spells out the criteria?' I said I would be glad to do the research to see if there is." Senator Erickson thanked her.

Senator Witt expressed his interest in the whole question of fees in the interest of the students and what they get for their money. He further expressed that the conversation needed to continue, but that he was unsure about whether the deans were in a position to research that and explain. "What I would hate to happen is for a student to pay the fees and have it misused somehow—either in error or because it is an extra bunch of money. That's a lot of money on this page and when it's sitting around and we have needs, I would like for the money to be appropriately used. One way we could begin, I think, is to look at policies for use for fees. Let's begin with an admonition that course fees have to be used for specific purposes, for example, our technology fees." Senator Witt thought that if the students could see, in material terms, what their fees pay for—he suggested posting signs stating that the computer lab had been paid for with technology fees. "So when they walk in, they don't just expect that to be there because it is the University's. I think there's probably not a lot of malfeasance going on, but right now we are open to the charge."

Provost Stroble replied that she had been sensitive to the requests she gets, since course fee information came through her office this time of year. "When they come to me and people are requesting an increase in this or an increase in that, and I will say 'no' to people when it seems to me that *what* they're asking for the fee to support seems farfetched for a course fee to support. I am sensitive to the fact that, from our viewpoint, when we experience 'charge-backs' we kind of rail against that. But I think it could be the case sometimes for a student, that they perceive the fee as our ability to give them a charge-back. So I think you are absolutely right that it is incumbent upon us that the service that is delivered in exchange for the fee is a valued one and that it's clear what is being offered. So what I will be glad to do is to do a bit more research about any language that we have in place about how tech fees—course fees, at the time they are proposed, a rationale is provided for how the fee is going to be allocated, so that we have it in documented form." She gave an example of the Library fee's documented form and how it was allocated according to that. She emphasized that we probably do have more guidelines in place than we realize. "But you're right—this is a large sum of money."

Senator Witt reiterated that he would like for everyone involved in the collection of fees—at the department and faculty level—to be reminded of the policies and what the fees are for. He felt it was important to have a document or rule number to reference. The Provost thought more research was in order for this and stated that she knew providing the fee collection figures would cause more questions, but emphasized that since information was requested by the Senate, she sought to provide it. "I never feel defensive about your questions, although I may sometimes want to clarify and make sure that you understand what I am saying and what I'm not saying and I think that's appropriate. But I'm glad to have your questions because I see that it does all of us good to get more clarity. I will follow up next time, if I can."

Senator Witt added that, if anyone was interested in the *history* of the technology fee, he and former fellow committee members (Senators Norfolk, Cheung, Garn-Nunn) had worked on it and could provide info since they had worked together on it.

At this point Senator Konet asked the Provost to clarify the different between the technology *fee* and technology *fund*. "What is the difference? Obviously, the technology fees come from the students. Where do the technology funds come from?" Provost Stroble said she would have to look into it. Senator Konet said that they sound interchangeable, but suspected that they were not. Senator Norfolk commented that he was sure they were not. Provost Stroble replied, "I know part of the difference gets at what Senator Erickson asked me, which was about how laptops were funded. There was this one fund at one point that

was like $500 per full-time faculty member. I'm not sure that this is the "tech fund," but I will get some clarity about this. It was two different sources." Senator Konet asked if, then, there might not even be a "tech fund"? The Provost responded, "I think they hardly exist, because now we just kind of funded that through other means."

Senator Gerlach raised the issue and his puzzlement about the column listed as "Sales" and asked for some examples. The Provost offered a couple of examples: Fine and Applied Arts administers a clinic that provides hearing-aid dispensary and services to clients as a 'sales and service' item for that college. Then Senator Steiner added that the department of Statistics operates a Center for Statistical Consulting that had off-campus clients that were charged a nominal fee for that. Senator Siebert explained that the Department of Geography and Planning had a lab for cartography and spatial analysis; they do cartography work for departments on campus and for off-campus clients. Provost Stroble further explained that generally it is professional services for clients outside the campus and so, for a particularly enterprising department that had a marketable service to offer, that could obviously generate some income.

Senator Londraville had some comments about Senator Witt's concern over student fees. "I'm sympathetic with what Senator Witt was saying in the sense of telling our students what their fees are being used for. Part of what we can teach our students is how much it costs to do what we do. When you are leading a lab or a class, you can hold something up and say, 'this costs $500' and this is why we charge this much for your class. I led a lab this semester that cost $3,000 to buy the stuff for that one lab." He had explained to his students that this [the lab expense] was why fees were collected from them. "In fact we don't collect enough money to cover it, unless it is covered by our budget—which doesn't cover it either. But I think that is part of what we can tell our students: 'this is what it costs to do this."

Since there were no other questions or comments raised, the Chair thanked the Provost for her remarks.

e. Academic Policies Committee – Associate Provost Nancy Stokes presented a proposal from the APC. She explained that, over the years, the Academic Policies Committee had received requests for creation of centers and/or institutes across campus in many of the colleges. These requests had come in varying forms, with varying amounts of information, sometimes with volumes of narrative, sometimes only a paragraph or two. Recently there had been three such requests. In light of this, the Academic Policies Committee determined that in order to more effectively review and make reasonable recommendations about the creation of these centers/institutes, they needed to develop a template to standardize the format of the requests. This template would aid the committee in receiving and reviewing the information expeditiously. The APC brought these recommendations and proposed template **(Appendix E-1 and E-2)** before the Senate in the form of a motion, to be used for future proposals for centers and institutes, not ones that were currently being considered.

Chair Fenwick confirmed that this motion came from committee and so needed no second. He invited discussion of the motion. Senator Lillie observed that, on the surface, this seemed to be a good idea. He requested clarification about the exact motion. "For instance, does the motion include this proposed template or just the notion that somebody somewhere will design a template?" The Associate Provost replied that the motion was stated in the email, 'All proposals for new university centers or institutes shall prepare

their requests on the approved template for proposed centers or institutes.' The Senator then asked if this was the 'approved template.' The Associate Provost replied that this was the template the APC was asking approval for. The Senator replied that he just wanted to make sure that this template was the one they were asked to approve. No other questions or discussion were raised, so the Chair instructed all of those in favor of the APC motion to say, 'aye.' The motion passed unanimously.

g. Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee – The Senate gave its permission for Dr. Harvey Sterns to present a short report from the Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee. Dr. Sterns announced that the upcoming UA *Email Digest* would contain a request to complete the online classroom survey. He explained that distribution through the *Digest* was the only way to get this out to the entire faculty and encouraged everyone to respond to the survey as soon as possible.

VI. New Business – The Chair announced that the next item on the Agenda was 'New Business' and consisted of a presentation of the Academic Plan by Provost Stroble. The Provost commented that 'presentation' was more formal than she certainly had intended to be, but thanked him. She expressed her hope that everyone had had an opportunity to read version three, available on the website **(see Appendix F)**. "We're taking this out to anybody that will give us some time on their agendas to have the conversation because truly the first draft, which you saw just before the previous forum—which was probably the fifth or sixth draft at that point, but it was the first one we were willing to go public with—really reflected our best understanding of what had surfaced in previous forums in this community, including one last spring—looking at University planning documents, going to back to 1998 and looking at a lot of college documents. So, indeed, we're trying to reflect what the University community seems to be about and what the future directions and opportunities could be for us as well as to take advantage of looking at what's going on in the country in comparable institutions—metropolitan institutions—that are very connected to their communities and want to be leaders for their communities. What are they thinking are the important things to pay attention to? How can we be crafters of our future in some important ways and say what it is we're going to try to honor in terms of principles." She explained that from the first versions to the most recent, some major changes were made, such as the concept of 'three spheres of the map' to 'six design principles.' She stated that they had tried to create a new graphic that better demonstrated how these relate and added language that would get at what it was they cared about in each of those principle areas. "It's tricky to write this kind of document and strike a balance between being general enough, visionary enough, and global enough that everybody can find a home for themselves in the future of the Academic Plan, but also be specific enough to realize that not *everything* that we might imagine for ourselves might fit the plan, but that some things would fit better than others." She explained that she tried to avoid becoming overly prescriptive in the document to avoid a dull list of "'who's in' and 'who's out' because I really don't think that's what the plan ought to do." She sought to give enough directions, though, to get at "what do we want this institution to be in the next three to five years, how do we look at our programs, and how do we redesign or reinvent ourselves, fine tune this, or do this better, or reshape this aspect of our design." The Provost hoped to outline the direction that defines—to ourselves and those outside—what we are about.

She stated that, as it was now, the plan was imperfect. "It's hard enough when you write a manuscript to go to your writer's group and say to four or five other people 'read my manuscript and give me good feedback so that I can send this off for publication.'" She expressed that it was much tougher to do that on

a website or face-to-face with lots of people staring at you, asking them to "please pick apart my document and tell me what needs to be improved about it." However, she emphasized that this was the only way to get an academic plan that we all could feel positive about.

Provost Stroble explained that they had already met with ASG once and I think we're scheduled to come again and that most of the colleges had been scheduled. "We've already met with some VP units, so this is really your opportunity to tell me what advice you would give me as we take version three and move it into version four. What do you think needs to be strengthened, what would you give less focus, what would you do differently in the formatting? It's all fair game from my viewpoint, because this document really has to be our document, not mine. I'm just the author that puts it out there for people to respond to that we can get to a good place with it."

Chair Fenwick asked the Senators to speak out if they had questions for the Provost about the document. Senator Witt was in favor of more clarity in the document, stating "my poor old 'west Texas brain' is buzzing from all these terms, I think it would be really nice in the next iteration that we can specifically show constituencies out there in the community exactly where they fit rather than trying to 'imagine yourself' being there." The Provost asked him what that would look like and for his help in knowing how to do that. He promised to send some suggested language to her. "I think also somewhere along the line that this is a blueprint that *assumes* that we're all interested the same future in many ways—diversity." He explained that some areas of the document were troublesome and seemed to rely on marketing kinds of orientations. "I could read this one way and see that what I need to be doing is training students vocationally. I'm not sure how that makes us any different from the two-year community colleges that are doing exactly that." He expressed his belief that perhaps the value of a liberal arts education should be stated up front.

Speaking from a faculty point of view, the Senator stated that he would like for the faculty to understand *why* they need to buy into the plan. "Right now—they haven't, largely. I asked about a third of my department and not one person had read any of the versions yet, but that's not because they are not interested…it's because they are working on Program Assessment and those kinds of other things, so you are a victim of your workload." He suggested that the Provost should 'make it plain that this is good for you.' He stated that, "It's not an article of faith that it has to be; you can really show me where it's good for me. I think we might be running a little short of faith here and there." The Provost replied that she sensed that in every conversation she had and so understood and appreciated his advice. She also reiterated that if he had specific language, she would welcome it. Senator Witt agreed to work on it.

Senator Clark inquired if the Provost could provide specifics examples of how the various drafts changed or shifted in focus. "I don't know if we can talk in such broad holistic ways in a specific concrete way, but it would just be interesting because I'm guessing that you started out somewhere and it shifted in some broad ways. Just maybe discuss some of the various steps of the various drafts as they got public." The Provost explained that she began after reading many documents, mostly University of Akron documents, that had been provided by the deans, the VPs—the Balanced Scorecards things. "I immersed myself in what the University of Akron has been saying about itself since 1998." She went on to explain that she even asked the deans and VPs to go back to those 1998 documents and to ask themselves: 'if you had to give me an update about what you said about yourself in 1998 and where you think you are now, where do you think that is?'

The Provost then did some concept mapping by rereading those documents. On small pieces of paper, she wrote down every main idea or concept that popped up as she reviewed them. "Then I put them out on my living room floor and started taking the pieces of paper and clustering them and grouping them by what concepts seemed alike; that's how I came up with those first three: campus and community engagement, assessment for accountability, and innovation." After the first forum and the great feedback received that day she realized that three concepts were not enough and that not everything had been captured. The President gave his feedback, then she looked at a document from the University of Cincinnati as well as a document from Arizona State, both created in the past year. "They had identified some things that weren't in our document that I thought were really important to think about. So, that's partly the change that you've seen. But most of the change from the last time was a result of a little more reading and all of the feedback that came in." She expressed her opinion that the document is getting richer and more complex, although not as clear anymore. "I think that you're right—the language sometimes borders on jargon and it would be better if we could use more down-to-earth language. I'm getting that feedback enough that I believe that."

Senator Sugarman offered an editorial comment that, on page 14, it stated 'Wayne Campus and the newly-developed Summit College with *guaranteed employment*.' The Provost replied that they had no idea how the phrase got there; most likely it was the result of cutting and pasting text. She explained that Jess Hays pointed out the error to them earlier in the day and wondered how it escaped their attention with multiple readings of the text. She said it had just been introduced with the current version, but would be fixed.

Senator Clark asked another kind of 'broad-stroke' question related to the process of creating the Academic Plan while under huge budget pressure. She wanted to know how, if at all, the Provost linked the two. The Provost responded by saying, "I guess it's my approach to life…I think you can laugh or you can cry. And so when circumstances are tough, I'll choose to laugh almost every time rather than cry. And I really believe that you've got to see things as opportunities, not crises, so what better time for us to be clear about what's important to us than in a time of restrained resources. When resources aren't tight, you can kind of afford to do everything and not have to be so focused." She explained that the situation called for us to remain focused. She went on to add, "I still want to dream, even in times when it looks like it would be challenging to do that. I think for us to keep our spirit alive it is absolutely essential."

Senator Covrig pointed out, in the spirit of editorial comment, that he did not like the word 'differentiate' used in the document, but preferred instead, 'distinguish' in that we should 'seek to distinguish ourselves.' The Provost said that was nice and that she liked that. The Senator went on to explain that "Criminals 'differentiate' themselves. 'Distinguish' seems to be a positive side of differentiation." The Senator added that Alfred North Whitehead once said there are three stages of conceptualizing. One was the 'simpleton stage'—clear but uninformed. Next came the 'complex stage,' where it was informed and it's all there, then you get to the 'wise and simple stage.' The Provost stated that they were not yet to that last stage. Senator Covrig continued that he believed we were at the 'complex stage,' which is probably where we needed to go. "I keep coming back to the words that keep surviving in these documents, such as 'academic primacy,' and 'operational excellence.' Those seem to be the two grounding elements, then the three that you developed, I thought were useful—I still like them—community engagement, innovation and accountability." The Senator thought maybe it was manageable, but clarifying the fundamentals "somehow has to get back into this." He recommended maintaining those two strong strands: 'academic primacy' and 'operational excellence.'

The Provost agreed with Senator Covrig, adding, "anytime you do this kind of writing, to use a phrase that rhetoricians use, this middle version has to 'problematize' things. It started out pretty clean and simple—that's a rhetorician's word—and so you 'problematize' the thing, but now we've got to get to the point that it actually communicates. We're not there yet, but I'm counting on the feedback that we get helping me figure out how to wander back to a simpler document."

Senator Lillie thanked the Provost and also encouraged the development of the document while including more specifics to provide a sense of what the expectations were for faculty and for students after the Academic Plan was actually in place and implemented. The Senator cited two places in the document—picked arbitrarily—that were problematic. One was on page five (5), in the discussion of the primary missions of the University of Akron. The phrase mentioned 'teaching for learn;' the Senator's question was, "what other kind is there?" The Provost responded that she had received some alternative language and thanked him. Senator Lillie pointed out the words 'academic plan,' located in the next-to-last paragraph, which read: 'established the next steps in establishing our strategic vision and intent, that of being recognized as the public research university for Northern Ohio.' He wanted to know if that would be in every single area or if it was the intent of the academic plan to distinguish one particular area of excellence in research from some other. "In other words, are there colleges that might have more of a mission in, let's say, teaching than in research? If so, what are they and why?" He thought this would be helpful to know.

The next clause he mentioned was: 'A place of access and excellence and a place of discovery and innovation for the betterment of students in our community.' The Senator added that, again, that's wonderful language and that he really liked it and believed that we all would want to do that. "However, it would be helpful to me, I think, and especially for the future, to get an idea, perhaps some examples or samples. Maybe they don't have to be part of the final version of the plan, but some way to help crystallize what it means—in my mind and perhaps of others."

On page 12, he gave another, brief example. "Under the 'designs for the future and inclusive excellence' rubric—about two-thirds of the way down the page—'inclusive excellence includes university protocols and policies for the admission and *graduation* of diverse students from varied geographical areas and social backgrounds.'" He mentioned that this was just another instance where it would be helpful to know what is meant, the direction it was going and who would help to prepare protocols and policies. "What are some of the variables that it might be important for us to think about if we're talking about 'admission' as opposed to 'graduation' of diverse students? I'm sure that this will have to be implemented later."

Regarding the 'hiring and retention of faculty, administrators and staff with diverse perspectives'— again Senator Lillie thought it would be helpful to have some explication of what those things meant. He expressed his belief that he thought he was sharing similar concerns expressed by others that the academic plan seems to be extremely generalized. "It's difficult to get a specific notion about what it's going to mean when we're actually living out the implications of that plan." The Provost thanked him for the specific examples.

Senator Gerlach addressed the Senate Chair, "After thirty-some years at this University and reading this kind of stuff, I really do congratulate the Provost on a nice, general work of composition, free largely of jargon and dreadful words like 'input.'" He had a couple of questions aimed at clarification and speci-

ficity. "On page 5, in the middle of the page, it's very interesting—I see the part, to a degree, of why you refer there to 'new knowledge being created and applied.' I have a notion that we ought to say something about—not 'new knowledge'—but just 'knowledge,' how knowledge is created or discovered and *preserved* as well as applied, because one of our great purposes is to pass things on—to preserve things. So I think that would be a good thing. Then, on pages 19 and 20, I'm not certain I understand what 'inclusive excellence' refers to. Does this need to be explained?" The Provost thought so, explaining that she had included language that had been given to her by a faculty group who is working on the topic of inclusive excellence. "In the spirit of getting a draft out, I used the language they had given me. My guess is that we'll get enough feedback that I'll need to go back to them and say that we need a little more explication. There truly are other things that they've written that do that, I just looked at this part and plugged it in and I think it needs more work." Senator Gerlach thanked her for hearing his observations. She expressed her appreciation for this kind of feedback "because it helps us get better."

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any other comments or questions for the Provost. None were otherwise indicated, so he offered an observation. "Last Fall, Nancy Stokes sent me the 1998–1999 Master Academic Plan. I looked at it then, put it down and then looked at it again this morning after I read this. What I like about the 1998 plan is that—and I'm not sure this is the direction its going because I didn't really look at the substantive differences—was just that it has, for every focus area and every strategic direction, it has a list of strategies and the operation of how units come to get there. It does this for every unit." He believed this was perhaps something that should be considered, especially in light of comments he had heard from the faculty in his department and around the campus. We want to know: how do we, as faculty, get there? He also observed that at the end of that document, there was a kind of 'balanced scorecard' argument presented. The Provost agreed, "Exactly. So you can see that's where we need to get."

The Provost commented that they would probably not get there by May 11, but that she thought it was part of the implementation and that she understood what the feedback was. "If this document can guide us a bit more in getting to that specific problematic strategy, people would feel safer buying in. So, I need to do that part. But truly it's going to have to devolve to program faculty to figure out what the specific strategies are, but I need to get enough guidance that it's not as general as it is now. I understand that. I think it's going to be tricky, but I'll take it on and try to figure out how we get there."

The Chair asked if the documents from Arizona State and Cincinnati were available on the Provost's website. She said that, no, they were not yet, but would see to it that they would be posted. She mentioned that she thought he would find the documents interesting.

Senator Witt asked if the idea was, ultimately, in the year or so to come, that all of the projects—budget review, program assessment and balanced scorecard—would sort of be in one place. The Provost said that was exactly the idea. "I've said here before that it would have been nice to have had an academic plan already done, then move forward on all the other pieces as sort of the 'roll-out' of that, but that hasn't been possible." The Senator asked if people should be sending recommendations about the metrics/measurements that are on the balanced scorecard since they were pretty important as well. The Provost replied that they would soon put together a little group to begin reviewing those. She mentioned that Sabrina Andrews, the new Institutional Research Director, has been going around, college to college,

meeting with people about their data needs, correcting and clarifying data where inaccurate. The Provost gave her the Balanced Scorecard indicators to review. Since Ms. Andrews is familiar with the Balanced Scorecard, she recommended that although some of the language in it was okay, it was not very measurable. The Provost has enlisted her help with this. As a result, they planned to invite some groups to meet with Ms. Andrews to attempt to figure out how they can somehow be refined then implemented. "Let her talk with you a bit about what's measurable and what isn't and let us see if we can agree on some new language." The Provost will plan to bring together some of the deans and the Faculty Senate, but suggested waiting a bit until after feedback had been received from the next version of the Academic Plan, "because right now we're not ready for that." Senator Witt wished to clarify her message, "So the message to the faculty is that you shouldn't panic quite yet about anything, because there's nothing really to measure too much. You're not going to give us a measure then next week?" The Provost replied that she thought it was coming along, adding, "with the kinds of questions I've had about program review and in Provost's Advisory Committee—we had a luncheon meeting today…we 'brown-bag' it and I provide cookies and pop—we had a meeting today and Program Review was one of the topics. An individual said—and I've heard this a couple of times—"well, we're just worried that there's something in your head that is going to be the 'gotcha' for whether we say the right thing in our program review or not." I said that I really try not to function that way, but if you're trying to guess what's in my head, Academic Plan is as close as you're going to get right now. That's my best expression right now, rough hewn as it is about what's important to pay attention to.

It obviously needs to get to the next level of specificity, and we'll do that together. I'll do part of it and I'll count on you helping to take it the rest of the way. But I'm really about making decisions happen *where* they need to happen. So if this Academic Plan is just about me, you won't have gotten your role in the decision-making process in the way that I want you to have it."

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any additional comments or suggestions? None were indicated, so he thanked her for coming to present this, stating that the discussion had been very useful. He further commented that one other issue on his mind was on page six (6) where it spoke about the 'dual purposes of being committed to open access for students, an open access University and premier research institution.' He wondered if perhaps City College had an academic plan, because it is a premier research institute that has, for a century, had open access to students from all over the world. The Provost said that they would look and thanked the Chair for time on the agenda for the diligence in reading the documents and giving feedback on it. "It's not too late. The website is still open and so if you think of things that you would like to send—a written commentary—log on and do that."

The Chair announced that this concluded the New Business of the Senate meeting and asked if there was anything for the Good of the Order (*none indicated*). Is there anything else that needs to come before this body? (*None indicated*.)

The motion to adjourn was made by Senator Gerlach and seconded by Senator Norfolk.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Linda Bussey

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FOR
APRIL 7, 2005

APPENDIX A

Corrections from February 17, 2005, issue of *The Chronicle*

The following corrections were requested for the Feburary 17, 2005, issue of *The Chronicle*. (Amended text is shown in **bold**; replaced text [in brackets].)

p. 5 – **Executive Committee Report:**

(in paragraph 2): Corrected sentence should read: *Senator Rich expressed his support for the proposed amendment **but said** [saying] that he was actually going to make the point that Senator Gerlach just made, that it was a misleading characterization of that provision and that we needed to be careful not to be guilty of the same sort of thing that we're criticizing here.*

p. 8 – (paragraph 3): Due to discrepancies between the verbatim transcript and final paraphrased version, we are printing the entire paragraph, as follows. Word in **bold** were added for clarity and accuracy at the request of the speaker.

As much as I like concision, I think as it is written it is rather long-winded and that is unfortunate. I'm afraid that just saying this is already covered is not quite enough because the obvious response to that is: **then** what's the harm of adding this to the law?   There are responses to that, but there are, in fact, some other problems with this. I agree that this is a cleverly-constructed bill, but **I don't think we should say,** I don't think it's true—**that** apart that it has an enforcement mechanism—it's just fine. That's not quite true. What troubles me about it, actually, is that it **doesn't** attempt to require a balance of viewpoints in individual reading lists if given. That is often present, but we individually make decisions about how to construct reading lists. I, for example, am sort of fond of teaching against the text, so I often include an imbalance of viewpoints that favors viewpoints opposed to my own. I think we all need to make those kinds of judgments on the basis of our professional expertise and pedagogical theories. There are a few other things in here that are similarly problematic even though it is clever enough to put us in a position **of** seeming to argue against things that nobody should argue against. For these reasons I can't agree to eliminating all of the 'WHEREAS' clauses except for the one that would be left by this amendment, though I would be receptive to something that would pare it down.

<u>APPENDIX B</u>

Graduate Student Government
April 7, 2005

Drafted by Stacey L. Buckshaw, MPA

Accomplishments:
1. Set up GSG website and WebCT
2. Re-drafted theConstitution
3. Developed means of recruiting Senators from each academic department.
4. Held training for Department Senators.
5. Introduced the idea of a UA research conference to Dr. Newkome
6. Co-sponsored Conference for Undergraduate and Graduate Student Research with the McNair Scholars Program
7. Held monthly meetings for the Executive Board Officers and Senators
8. Held voting position on Graduate Faculty Council and all affiliated sub-committees.
9. Began taking steps to take part in EAF application evaluation.
10. Participated in focus group to decide use of green space following the knocking down of Carroll Hall.
11. Participated on the selection committee to appoint student members to the Board of Trustees.
12. Collaborated with Keith Hunt to update the graduate student list-serve.
13. Worked with Anthony Serpette to hold online GSG Presidential Elections.

Goals for next year:
1. Hold an academic orientation for all graduate students.
   a. Library and campus tours.
   b. Online registration, parking, grade posting, etc.
2. Maintain involvement in CUGSR.
3. Work with Dr. Sharon Johnson to develop improved health insurance for graduate students.
4. Continue participation on Graduate Faculty Council, the Graduate Faculty Senate, and become involved with Faculty Senate.
5. Establish annual fundraising efforts.
6. Work with the Office of Leadership and Development on the EAF evaluations.
7. Participate/collaborate with graduate departments and student organizations as needed.

APPENDIX C

Executive Committee Report
April 7, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Executive Committee met twice since the March 3rd Senate meeting; March 17 and 28.

The agenda for the March 17 meeting included setting the agenda for the April 7 meeting, discussing updates on Senate Bill 24 and the Ohio Faculty Council report.

In response to the resolution passed at the February 17 meeting in opposition to Senate Bill 24, faculty Senate has received responses from several State Senators. The Senators were appreciative of the professional and polite manner in which the resolution was stated and indicated that they were pleased that we did not "storm" the capital. Further, we were informed that the State Senate has tabled SB 24 for the time being and has moved on to budget issues. If SB 24 is raised again, it will be sometime in the summer or fall.

The Chair then shared the news from the Ohio Faculty Council regarding Ohio's Return on Education Investment, a report that recommends incremental investments in higher education with the intent of demonstrating incremental returns to Ohio.

On March 28, the Executive Committee met again to discuss several high profile topics. The first was Program Review; the time frame given to complete it and questions regarding how the data would be reviewed and used. The Provost indicated that she planned to respond to Department Chairs, addressing these concerns and other questions in her response. She has since sent a response.

Another recurring issue is the budget, both at the state and university levels. The news from the state is that it is likely (though not absolute) that the budget will remain flat in the coming year. The President also indicated that the IUC has been making a strong case for higher education and that there has been a collaborative effort between the Board of Regents and the Two year colleges to produce a pamphlet intended for wide distribution that discusses the return that can be expected by investing in higher education.

Closer to home, there was a request for an update on the university's budget hearing process. The Provost stated that she would be sending out an e-mail (April 4 edition of Perspectives from the Provost) explaining where we were in the process and what is yet to be done. There was also another follow-up to this message on April 6, Special Edition of E-Mail Digest.

The Decision Making Task Force Report has also been a topic in several meetings and the Executive Committee has decided to move forward with creating a committee to review the recommendations made in the report specific to Faculty Senate. Vice Chair Erickson has agreed to coordinate the committee. Chair Fenwick will be meeting with the President and Provost on April 20 to go over some of the recommendations.

Executive Committee Report (continued)

Several months ago, the Provost shared with the Senate, the status of the Transfer and Articulation agreements. Recently, she informed EC that under HB 95, we are now being asked to study the feasibility of establishing articulation plans with Technical Schools and Proprietary Schools. Since this request is raising some concerns, a recommendation has been made to conduct the reviews on a course by course basis against an established set of standards.

The meeting with the President and Provost concluded with brief discussions regarding updates on the Academic Plan, the serious situation with OhioLink funding, and the creation of a committee to look into University Facilities usage.

Report submitted by Rose Marie Konet
Secretary, Faculty Senate

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST
FACULTY SENATE
April 7, 2005

Upcoming Events

April 15th: Celebration of Teaching and Learning
May 11th: Academic Plan Forum

Campus visits by finalists for: Dean of Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and Dean of University Libraries

Next Faculty Senate
Year in review report

Follow-Up about Fees
Fee Distribution Year to Date as of 4/1/05

	Course Fees	Tech Fees	Other	Sales
Arts and Sciences	372,338	336,437		570,187
Engineering	88,148		245,070	10,362
Education	181,259	153,566		298,139
CBA	90,170	137,532		318,954
Fine and Applied Arts	492,021	141,867		439,590
Nursing	288,745	34,829		5,500
Law	345,540	55,523		272
Polymer		30,020		251,541
Summit	159,737	89,666		323,175
University College			131,150	160,635
University Libraries			979,705	4.338

$762,887 in additional technology fees will be distributed to colleges before end of spring 05 semester.

Career Advantage Fee

4-05 $523,345

Total salary dollars and percentage used for staffing of Center for Career Management: $358,788/ 69%

(Three (3) individuals transferred from CBA budget to CCM budget in 2002-03 with salaries totaling $99,249)

APPENDIX E-1

Motion to Faculty Senate re Proposed Template
for the Creation of New Centers or Institutes

All proposals for new university Centers or Institutes shall prepare their request on the approved template for proposed Centers or Institutes.

Rationale:

Faculty Senate By-laws state that Senate shall "Review and offer recommendations concerning proposals for the creation, abolition, or rearrangement of colleges, departments, schools, or divisions of instruction…" The creation of Centers and Institutes are considered to be a creation within a college. Academic Policies Committee reviews proposals for the creation of Centers or Institutes. We have found that the information needed to make an informed recommendation is sometimes missing and often obscured in the narrative of the request. Consequently, it takes considerable time to address these requests. To streamline the process, APC recommends the use of the proposed template for all requests for new Centers or Institutes.

The use of the template will provide consistency; will facilitate the process for both writer and reader; will allow for complete information to be presented; will clarify all information needed for decision-making purposes; will emphasize the need for the proposed Center or Institute to align with the mission of the University.

Roles and Responsibilities Chart		
Role	**Responsibility**	**Qualifications**
Director	Supervises the entire center activities. Has executive decision powers. Developes new constitutive laws for societal interaction.	Ph.D.; proven leadership; 5 years experience; written and oral communciation skills
Associate Director		
Financial Director		
Administrative Asst.		
Tech Group Leader		
Members		
Technician		
Staff		
Advisory Board		
Membership Chart		
Member	**Task**	**Duration**

APPENDIX E-2

PROPOSED TEMPLATE FOR A
PROPOSED UNIVERSITY CENTER/INSTITUTE OF EXCELLENCE

Executive summary

This section should contain:
    Identification of discipline, artistic field, goals, timeline
    Relation to the University mission and goals
    Statement to address all sections of the document

This section should not be longer than one page. The entire document (excluding the executive summary and any appendices) should not exceed ten pages, single spaced, no less than 11 point font.

Section 1: Mission

A. Provide a statement of mission
        Purpose – What
        Constituents – For whom
        Reason - Why

B. Provide a rationale with supporting documentation.
        What is the benefit of using a Center or Institute structure
        What are the other existing programs – nationally; internationally
        What is the potential in terms of $$ and intellectual property

C. Describe how the mission of the Center aligns with the mission of The University of Akron.

Section 2: Organizational Structure and Membership

A.   Provide a description of the activities required to fulfill the mission of the Center. Connect this description with a proposed organizational chart along with the responsibilities and qualifications of the personnel. Append organizational chart, roles and responsibilities chart, and membership chart; examples are provided in Appendix A.

B.   Describe how are personnel identified and included, any required qualifications, how personnel are aligned with the goals of the Center, and what method will be employed to allow for personnel movement and changes.

C. Identify any collaborating institutions and the nature of the collaboration.

Section 3: Physical Facilities

A. Provide a description of the facilities required to fulfill the mission of the Center.

B. Consider existing facilities and address present and future facility needs for:
    • Space – new and/or existing
    • Equipment
    • Infrastructure – including utilities
    • Maintenance
    • Safety and environmental requirements

- ADA compliance
- Special needs

C. Include a statement of how you will fund future needs? (this should be a line item in the budget)

Section 4: Budget and Funding Sources

A. Provide a description of the budget and funding sources required to fulfill the mission of the Center. Project when the Center will become financially self-sufficient.

B. Initial (Founding) Budget. Specify if the funding comes from outside or inside the University. If funding comes from grants, how will the indirect costs be distributed? Where pertinent, address the following categories:

- Personnel
- Facilities
- Supplies and services
- Communications
- Technology – hardware and software
- Copyright and publishing
- Conferences
- Legal
- Travel
- Advertisement
- Lobbying
- Other

C. Forward Looking Budget (Estimate). Project the sources of income beyond the initial funding. Project continuing funding needs.

Section 5: Implementation

A. Create a timeline for implementation of the Center.

B. Identify and provide a brief description of stages or phases of implementation, if applicable.

Section 6: Expected Outcomes

A. Describe your expected outcomes:
    Accomplishments
    Products/Results
- Job creation
- Patents
- Publications
- Spin-offs
- Created works

B. Describe how the outcomes will benefit The University of Akron.

C. Describe your plans for assessment.

D. Describe how the Center will impact your discipline.

APPENDIX F

ACADEMIC PLAN
PROLOGUE
3/22/05 Draft
(Presented to the Faculty Senate by Provost Stroble on April 7, 2005)

The academic plan is a narrative of the vision statement and statement of strategic destination captured in "Charting the Course." As a vision narrative, it is the story that describes what we will do, why we will do it, and the results we anticipate for The University of Akron as we engage the community of northern Ohio and beyond. The paragraphs of this vision narrative reflect a design for our future as we honor the historic legacy of this institution. As put forth in our strategic destination, we seek to differentiate ourselves as the public research university for northern Ohio, the University dedicated to the education and success of its students and to the production, integration, and dissemination of knowledge for the public good. This academic plan will guide our strategic thinking and decision-making for the next three to five years.

The University of Akron mission statement clearly expresses its commitment to the fundamental role of higher education in society: teaching or
learning, research, and service. Further, it recognizes the centrality of the pursuit of excellence and the benefit of focused distinction.

> The University of Akron, a publicly assisted metropolitan institution, strives to develop enlightened members of society. It offers comprehensive programs of instruction from associate through doctoral levels, pursues a vigorous agenda of research in the arts, sciences and professions, and provides service to the community. The University pursues excellence in undergraduate and graduate education and distinction in selected areas of graduate instruction, inquiry and creative activity.

Charting the Course is the strategic vision of The University of Akron.
Charting the Course represents our strategy for attaining greater excellence -- requiring collaboration, continuing reliance on factual information, sharing information openly and candidly, and demonstrating the utmost professionalism in all that we do – all disciplined by high standards and aspirations. It establishes the foundation for shared leadership.

This vision narrative is linked to the Balanced Scorecard, the methodology by which we have established institutional and unit goals and metrics that will provide assessment for the purposes of improvement and accountability. As such, it not only tells the story of our collective future, but establishes the benchmarks by which we will chart our progress. As all members of the campus community commit themselves to continuous quality improvement in all areas of the University, every unit will engage in data collection for the purposes of making comparisons with standards of leading practices, identifying necessary improvements, celebrating objectively measured accomplishments, and using resources in the most strategic way.

The academic plan is designed to address these questions:

• What innovations strengthen the differentiating, unique capacities of The University of Akron and capitalize on them?

• How will we honor our mission, vision, and strategic intent statements as we confront challenging fiscal times and demographic changes for

institutions of higher education, in Ohio and the nation, coupled with an increasing need to provide quality postsecondary education to Ohio's

citizens?

• How will we simultaneously engage with the local community to enable civic and cultural transformation while also recognizing our place as

citizens of the globe, with a responsibility for the international impact of our actions?

• How will we continue to engage ourselves and our community in activity that enhances community well-being, enriches the culture, fosters

discovery and innovation, and provides leadership for developing the economy of northern Ohio and beyond?

• What are the most strategic priorities for our actions and investments, in all aspects of our enterprise—academic programs and services,

administrative operations, programs of research, enrollment management, development campaigns, governmental relations, information technology, and master plans for capital facilities and planning?

• How will we assess our progress toward achieving our strategic destination in a time of increased accountability?

BACKGROUND

On May 3, 1870, Buchtel College, the predecessor of The University of Akron, was founded as a sectarian liberal arts college associated with the Ohio Universalist Convention and named for its benefactor, Akron industrialist John R. Buchtel. In 1913, in the midst of the rubber boom, the assets of Buchtel College were transferred to the city of Akron, and the institution became the non-sectarian Municipal University of Akron. In 1967, the transition was made from a municipal to a state university.

Today, as a mature, metropolitan, comprehensive, doctoral-granting institution, The University of Akron serves over 20,000 students, operates on a budget of over $332 million and offers more than 350 degree programs from the associate to the doctoral level. The University includes thirteen academic units.

In their Fall 2004 Convocation addresses to the campus community, the President and Provost celebrated the work already completed by The University of Akron to achieve three fundamental goals established by the Board of Trustees in 1998: first, to complete a master plan for the University and to begin the physical transformation of our campus into "A New Landscape for Learning;" a second, to gain recognition for our teaching excellence by achieving the designation of a Carnegie Teaching Academy; and third, to gain national recognition for our research programs by achieving classification as a "Research II" university. That each of these goals and much more has been accomplished at least two years ahead of the anticipated 2006 completion date is a testament to the capacity of this University and its community to achieve greatly.

In 2004, the University completed the $300 million "New Landscape for Learning" comprised of 9 new buildings, major expansions or renovations of 14 other structures, the closing of two streets through campus and the addition of 30 acres of green space to transform the physical appearance and usefulness of the University. In a similar initiative to reshape the environment surrounding the campus and to create an extended opportunity for positive engagement with the communities beyond our campus, the University Park Alliance has launched the "New Landscape for Living," a community development project to create a vibrant 40-block, mixed use neighborhood surrounding The University of Akron.

The three primary missions of The University of Akron—teaching for learning, research, and service— are integrated around a common focus student success under a new metaphor of "New Mindscapes for Learning." Specifically, what we strive to do within the twenty-first century knowledge economy is to enable students to know how new knowledge is created and applied. The "New Mindscapes for Learning" initiative includes the creation of a comprehensive student activities environment that complements the classroom and empowers learning outside the classroom.

This academic plan establishes the next steps in achieving our strategic vision and intent—that of being recognized as the public research university for northern Ohio, a place of access and excellence, and a place of discovery and innovation for the betterment of students and our community.

We are grateful for our Founders, mindful of our traditions, and enthusiastic about our future. We recognize that we create our future as a
collaborative enterprise based upon a common framework of understanding and direction. Charting the Course is that framework. The academic plan provides the map.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE

The Academic Plan for The University of Akron 2005

A May 2004 all-campus retreat engaged many members of the campus community in building the foundation of this academic plan. From that event we clarified the guiding legacy that has nurtured and preserved this institution for more than 130 years. That legacy has two, equally vital components: to provide students with access to high-quality, postsecondary education, while at the same time partnering in research necessary for the industrial and economic growth of the region.

The retreat posed this question: how does the University serve the dual purposes of being committed to open-access for students, while also pursuing our destiny as the premier research institution in this region? What emerged is the realization that these two missions are not mutually exclusive. One retreat participant pointed out that many of the students in our research programs and in the University Honors Program are themselves first-generation students. In fact, many University employees are the first in their families to complete associate, baccalaureate, masters, or doctoral programs. The twin pillars of our legacy—open-access, high quality education and research leadership—do share a common foundation: student academic success.

It is academic primacy, supported by operational excellence, which will ensure the success of the University, by first achieving student academic success. For that reason, the two themes of academic primacy and operational excellence form the foundation of this academic plan.

Academic primacy results from high-quality experiences, both in the classroom and outside of it. To deliver those high-quality experiences, we must achieve operational excellence—that synergy of service delivered to our students, as well as to each other, that ensures the integrity of our operation and supports the quality of the academic enterprise. We must achieve benchmarked standards of excellence in service, communication, infrastructure, shared leadership for decision-making, and business processes that provide integrity for the academic enterprise.

First, we must clearly identify this University's unique capacity to provide high-quality experiences because identifying those components will guide our investments in ways that ensure we build academic success for every student as we simultaneously specialize in development, protection, marketing, and commercialization of new technologies.

As primacy of the academic mission depends upon excellence in operations, it is most useful to design for a future linking these two themes

through six design principles: campus engagement with local and global communities, innovation for success, inclusive excellence, leadership for economic growth and development, civic and cultural transformation, and assessment for improvement and accountability.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE: ENGAGEMENT OF CAMPUS WITH LOCAL AND GLOBAL COMMUNITIES

The four clusters of excellence found in Charting the Course:
• Discovery and innovation
• Cultural enrichment
• Community well-being
• Economic development

challenge us to engage with and among ourselves and with the larger community. For the purposes of academic primacy and operational excellence, student success plus community engagement defines the Akron Advantage.

The University of Akron has already developed significant capacity to engage our students in leadership roles and in their learning both in and out of the classroom. Engagement is easily demonstrated by the active involvement of many units on campus with local, regional, national, and international entities. Engagement entails sustained attention; commitment; and dedication of time, talent, and resources for common purpose and mutual benefit. Engagement brings about mutual transformation of individuals and institutions through the joining of intellectual, cultural, economic, social, political, and physical resources.

The community we must engage begins with ourselves—faculty, staff, and students with one another to create opportunities for our success. Students' successful engagement with us is linked to levels of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning opportunities, student-faculty interactions, enriching educational experiences, and their perceptions of a supportive campus environment. Our commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning serves as engagement of teaching for learning. Carnegie Cluster leadership in development of our students' critical thinking and civic learning are intellectual and physical elements of engagement. As we collaborate across campus units, we create interdisciplinary programs that

sustain mutual benefits for members of different knowledge communities engaged in providing sophisti-cated solutions for complex problems. When academic and administrative units collaborate to serve cam-pus constituencies, they engage each other in the design of activities, ongoing programs, and facilities as examples. The rich experience of inclusive excellence engages diverse campus and community cultures to create robust and equitable strategies in service of excellence and access. Internationalization engages us with the global community, an engagement necessary for the success of our students who are not only citizens of Akron and northern Ohio but of the world. As we review our study-abroad programs, our recruitment of international students, our faculty exchange arrangements, and our research opportunities for U.S.-based students abroad we will seek the most strategic ways to strengthen international programs and our awareness of the need for global competencies in all aspects of our work. We will continue to invest in academic programs and services and administrative operations that engage the campus with the community—locally and globally.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE: INNOVATION FOR SUCCESS

The Council on Competitiveness boldly resolves, "Innovation will be the single most important factor in determining America's success through the 21st century." Over the next quarter century, we must opti-mize our entire society for innovation. Our record of innovation is strong; it must endure and grow if we are to succeed.

Innovation has been defined as the ability to generate creative ideas, products, services, or processes paired with the ability to transform and

implement them successfully. Innovating for success requires a continuous development and imple-mentation process built on the creativity, imagination, and hard work of the people of an organization. To succeed, we must work in a culture and structure that supports innovation and provides the processes and technology to implement our innovations.

Although our dual legacies of a mission of excellence and access in teaching and research have been challenged as being mutually exclusive, our commitment to and current successes in this pairing of excel-lence and access are fundamental elements of our innovation as an institution. We can innovate in many ways:
  • Groundbreaking design and delivery of curriculum, services, and facilities
  • Transformative interdisciplinary and inter-unit collaborations
  • Cutting edge development of and uses of technologies
  • Stellar services for specific populations of students that marry excellence
  and access in ways unique to this institution
  • Enterprising collaborations of campus and community members
  • Entrepreneurial developments of new knowledge and new products
  • Value-added assessments for purposes of improvement and accountability.

The kinds of activities which we will nurture in this climate of innovation will engage the campus and community, differentiate the unique capacities of The University of Akron, and will demonstrate measur-able results because without appropriate benchmarks what we perceive as innovative may truly only be new to us.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE: INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE

Inclusive excellence encompasses the processes within The University of Akron that purposefully value differences for the ultimate purpose of promoting the learning, critical thinking, and personal enrichment of students. It aims to build "a welcoming campus community" for all its students.

Inclusive excellence recognizes diversity in thought, learning, and personal characteristics that can be tapped and understood in the working, living, and learning environments of the University. Inclusive excellence enables us to engage in civil conversation with those who hold views that differ from our own; to enjoy meals with individuals who prefer different foods; to engage in civil debate on key issues with others who hold different rational views and positions; and to socialize with persons who have had differing lived experiences. Also in class, clinical and field experience settings, inclusive excellence is addressed through ample opportunities to learn about diverse cultures locally and globally. Inclusive excellence includes university protocols and policies for the admission and graduation of diverse students from varied geographical areas and social backgrounds, and for the hiring and retention of faculty, administrators and staff with diverse experiences and perspectives.

Through inclusive excellence experiences students can develop knowledge and personal abilities that may enhance their critical thinking and learning, and better enable them to meaningfully contribute to society as graduates of The University of Akron. As we design for inclusive excellence, we will implement this principle in:

- Student success initiatives
- Content and instruction in academic programs
- Student organization activities
- Recruitment of students and employees
- University and community events
- Leadership initiatives.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE: LEADERSHIP FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Our location in the center of the dynamic regional economy of Northeast Ohio is a significant competitive advantage for our students. Community engagement and our long history of mutually beneficial involvement with area businesses are at the core of our portfolio of opportunities.

The University of Akron is a world leader in creating new materials for the new economy; a national leader in the development, protection, management and commercialization of intellectual property; and a regional leader in information technology initiatives. Akron is the only university in Ohio to have a science and engineering program ranked in the top five nationally. We continue to develop new degrees and certificates in such areas as computer engineering, intellectual property law, e-commerce, homeland security, and international business. Research into biomaterials, nanotechnology and other emerging sciences offers hope for astounding medical and technological breakthroughs.

We have formed partnerships with area business and industry to support their libraries and to create industrial assistantships for graduate students. Our design for economic growth and development includes such innovative programs as the Career Advantage Network and the activities of the Wayne campus and the newly-developed Summit College where students can complete programs in applied and technical areas with guaranteed employment upon completion of associate and baccalaureate programs. Our work with areabusiness and industry, government, agencies, and economic development offices enables a presence at the Summit County One Stop shop, extensive contract work and non-degree offerings for workforce development, the growing capital investment in our community as a result of the University Park Alliance, and the rapidly developing presence in Medina County where ground will soon break for a University building linked to the county's high tech business park.

We will continue to invest in the kinds of activities that prepare our students and incumbent workers for knowledge industry employment while also partnering to grow the economy of northeast Ohio through robust programs of research and technology transfer.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE: CIVIC AND CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION

The University of Akron is in, of, and for Akron. We continue to shape the greater Akron area - by providing exciting cultural opportunities and much-needed community services, by driving economic development, by educating thousands of people to become valued professionals and effective citizens . . . and by working with our neighbors to reshape our surrounding environment and create an extended opportunity for positive engagement with the communities beyond our campus. A $2.5 million grant from The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation is helping to launch a community development project to create a vibrant 40-block, mixed-use neighborhood surrounding The University of Akron.

We will continue to build the kinds of partnerships between academic and administrative units and neighborhood groups, area businesses, agencies, and city government that resulted in the Campus Compact recognition for exemplary campus-community partnerships.

We will seek to create innovative activities in the arts and in community service to define and enhance the quality of life for those in the region and beyond. An estimated _____ individuals attended campus events in the past year; new opportunities should build synergies around these events that span unit boundaries. The University provides innovative leadership in partnership with the City of Akron and area arts groups for campus venues such as E. J. Thomas and the downtown Civic Theatre and Lock 3. As charter sponsors for the Akron 2025 project, we will develop new strategic partnerships to continue transforming Akron as a strategic destination for education, the arts, and entertainment-important components of the Greater Akron Chamber's drive to make Akron a "cool" community for young professionals.

All that we do revolves around our mission to make life better for individuals and society. We accomplish our mission by providing students with excellent educational experiences that enrich their lives both personally and professionally. As active civic partners, we seek to transform citizens' understandings of the federal budget process through technology tools like the Exercise in Hard Choices; we acquaint our students with careers in local, state, and federal government through funded internships; and we provide expertise on topics of global importance such as homeland security. Through direct service provided to clients through clinics, centers, and institutes, we connect with our community through civic engagement that improves the mental and physical health of area citizens.

We will continue to find ways to grow in service to others that transform us and the civic and cultural fabric of our communities.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE: ASSESSMENT FOR IMPROVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Successful institutions are defined by a culture of assessment and accountability. Such a culture is the foundation for engagement and innovation.

A culture that values the purposes and processes of assessment will support excellence in programs, services, and operations because the orientation toward use of data, self-refection, peer review, and shared leadership in meeting accountability expectations will ensure continuous improvement. Continuous improvement will result from the use of internal and externally benchmarked data to establish meaningful goals and targets for each of our units captured in the institutional Balanced Scorecard and unit strategy maps.

At The University of Akron, assessment processes enable a commitment to student success through collecting and analyzing data, identifying necessary improvements, celebrating objectively measured accomplishments and using resources in the most strategic ways to ensure successful outcomes in a continuous quality improvement cycle. For The University of Akron, assessment fulfills four purposes:

- To establish that the quality of programs, services, and operations meet established stan dards for continued approval by external agencies such as the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, professional accreditors, the Ohio Board of Regents, the NCAA, and various governmental and funding agencies
- To support our own continuous improvement processes for programs, services, and operations to enhance the effectiveness of achieving the goals of the institution; responding to needs of community, students, faculty, and staff; and differentiating The University of Akron
- To provide the basis for alignment and strategic allocation of resources in accord with our institutional mission, goals, and priorities that have been benchmarked against federal, state, and local policies and leading practices in higher education.
- To build a culture that values the use of data, self-reflection, peer review, and shared leadership in meeting accountability expectations, continuously improving, and aligning resources with our strategic priorities.

Assessments will measure productivity in a number of areas with explicit focus on enrollment and retention, and research growth. The academic plan rests on a number of internal institutional assessment processes which will require continued investment of time and resources:

- Program review for academic and administrative programs
- Annual budget and planning cycle
- Personnel performance reviews
- Assessments of student learning
- Standardized evaluations of courses
- Surveys of service satisfaction and other elements of operational excellence.

These processes, and others which may be created to assess components of the academic plan, are accompanied by a variety of external assessment processes which demand our time and resources to meet the growing demands for accountability for delivering value for the investments made.

External assessment processes include:

- Accreditation self-studies and site visits
- Audits
- Benchmarking studies for all programs, services, and operations
- Reviews by external agencies.
- Regional and national recognitions

As a result of these assessment processes, the University community will build on its capacity through the use of data to make the most strategic use of resources and to create new opportunities. Examples of assessment and accountability are programs and/or services that demonstrate excellence as compared to external benchmarks and will result in accomplishing the goals of the Balanced Scorecard.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE: VISIONARY IDEAS AND PRIORITIZATIONS

While not all programs, services, and operations at The University of Akron will honor every design principle with equal strength, we should strive to continuously improve in ways that stretch our current designs to engage the campus with local and global communities, to innovate for success, to exhibit inclusive excellence, to provide leadership for economic growth and development, to support civic and cultural transformation, and to assess for improvement and accountability.

A culture of assessment defines and differentiates a university that is committed to achieving ambitious goals through engagement and innovation. It also supports the data-driven decisions that must be made to ensure the primacy of the academic mission and supporting levels of operational excellence. Those programs, services, and operations most aligned with externally benchmarked standards of leading practices established through rigorous assessment processes are those which will most merit our continued investment.

The process for establishing priorities will include a review of information presented in the budget presentations this year and program review snapshots to be compiled in the Spring. We will focus on indicators of our twin legacies: success for students in terms of enrollment, retention, completion of degree, and successful transition to career and future employment as well as productivity in research and economic development. Over time, the data collected and aggregated from assessments of student learning will be added to data sets about programs' productivity. Programs, services, and operations - academic and administrative – that integrate the design principles will warrant continued, and when possible, increased emphasis and support. As emerging programs, services, and operations identify and demonstrate how they will incorporate these design principles, they, too, will receive a higher priority. Those activities that embrace engagement, innovation, inclusive excellence, economic growth and development, civic and cultural transformation, and assessment and accountability, those programs that confirm our commitment to academic primacy and operational excellence will establish the priorities of the University.

APPENDIX G

Report from Academic Policies Committee
(In response to concerns raised at March 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting)

The issue of the Coordinating Committees for Summit and Wayne Colleges interaction with the Main Campus was raised at March Faculty Senate. APC discussed the concerns and made recommendation to the Council of Deans. APC recommended that the Deans of the affected colleges shall create a written agreement addressing how these coordinating committees will be established and implements. This agreement shall be completed before the end of Spring semester 2005. The agreement(s) shall be made available to the Senate and to the campus.

The Council of Deans agreed to the recommendation. APC believes that the Deans are addressing the concern expressed by Senate and there is no further need for discussion at this time.

Submitted by Nancy Stokes
Associate Provost

APPENDIX H-1

Proposals Approved By Provost
New Programs To Faculty Senate March 2005 and Board of Trustees April 2005

College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-05-29	Political Science	Undergraduate certificate in Racial Conflict
AS-05-30	Political Science	Graduate certificate in Racial Conflict
AS-05-32	Political Science	Graduate certificate in Gender Conflict
AS-05-61	Political Science	Joint J.D./Master of Applied Politics

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-05-18	Curric. & Instr'l Studies	Masters in Secondary Ed. w/ Life Science licensure
ED-05-19	Curric. & Instr'l Studies	Masters in Secondary Ed. w/ Earth Science licensure
ED-05-21	Curric. & Instr'l Studies	Masters in Secondary Ed. w/ Physics licensure

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
SC-05-29	Public Srvcs Technology	AAS in Emergency Srvcs Technology: Fire/Medic option

APPENDIX H-2

Proposals Approved By Provost
To Faculty Senate April 2005

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-05-03	Philosophy	Change pre-req 3600:426/526
AS-05-04	Philosophy	Change pre-req 3600:424/524
AS-05-08	Psychology	Change pre-req from 3750:240 to 3750:380
AS-05-09	Biology	Increase credit hours for 3100:365 to 4 credits
AS-05-11	Biology	Increase credit hours for 3100:428/528 to 3 credits
AS-05-12	Biology	New course 3100:685 Advance Cell Physiology
AS-05-18	Mathematics	Increase variable credits for 3450:591 from 3 to 4
AS-05-19	Mathematics	Increase repeatable credits for 3450:489/589 to 12
AS-05-20	Mathematics	Change pre-req 3450:627
AS-05-21	Mathematics	Change pre-req 3450:628
AS-05-22	Mathematics	Create pre-req for 3450:307
AS-05-26	English	New course 3300:531 Victorian Fiction
AS-05-28	English	New course 3300:592 Internship in English
AS-05-34	Sociology	Increase variable credit for 3850:697 from 3 to 9
AS-05-35	Sociology	Increase variable credit for 3850:753 from 3 to 9
AS-05-36	Sociology	Increase variable credit for 3850:767 from 3 to 9
AS-05-37	Sociology	Increase variable credit for 3850:797 and 798 from 3 to 9
AS-05-38	Biology	Blanket statement added to non-major courses: Not available for credit toward a degree in biology."
AS-05-40	Modern Languages	Accelerated Beginning Spanish I
AS-05-41	Modern Languages	Revise bulletin description for MA Spanish
AS-05-45	Modern Languages	Rename 3580:432/532; Delete 3580:433/533
AS-05-47	Canadian Studies	Delete Canadian Studies Certificate Program
AS-05-55	Geography	New course 3350:497/597 Regional Field Studies
AS-05-58	Geography	Delete 3350:428/528 Industrial and Commercial Site Locations
AS-05-59	Geography	Delete 3350:436/536 Urban Land Use Analysis
AS-05-60	Geography	Delete 3350:471/571 Medical Geography
AS-05-62	Chemistry	New course 3150:199 Introductory Seminar in Chemistry
AS-05-63	Chemistry	Addition of two courses to electives list for BA Chemistry
AS-05-64	Chemistry	Addition of two courses to elective list for BS Chemistry
AS-05-66	PAUS	Change in pre-req for 3980:615
AS-05-70	Computer Science	Course title change 3460:465/565
AS-05-72	Computer Science	Increase variable credits for 3460:699 to 15 credits
AS-05-73	Computer Science	New course 3460:445/555 Intro to Bioinformatics
AS-05-74	Computer Science	New course 3460:676 Data Mining
AS-05-76	Economics	Initiate pre-req check for 3250:201

AS-05-78	ELI	5 new courses: 3030:051-054
AS-05-79	ELI	Increase variable credit for 3030:096 from 4 to 5
AS-05-80	ELI	Increase variable credit for 3030:099 from 4 to 5
AS-05-84	CSAA	Create bulletin header for 3370:101-120 Case Studies in Archeology
AS-05-85	CSAA	New course 3370:102 Age of Arthur
AS-05-86	CSAA	New course 3370:103 Kings of the North Sea
AS-05-87	CSAA	New course 3370:104 Crypts, Castles, and Cathedrals
AS-05-88	CSAA	New course 3370:363 Women in Ancient Greece and Rome
AS-05-89	CSAA	Revise bulletin description 3240:313
AS-05-90	CSAA	Revise bulletin description 2340:314
AS-05-91	CSAA	Revise bulletin description 3240:400/500
AS-05-95	CSAA	Revise bulletin description 3240:410/510
AS-05-96	CSAA	Revise bulletin description 3240:420/520
AS-05-97	CSAA	Revise bulletin description 3240:440/540
AS-05-98	CSAA	Add pre-req to 3240:450/550
AS-05-99	CSAA	Revise bulletin description 3240:472
AS-05-100	Physics	New course 3650:401/501 Everyday Physics
AS-05-106	Geography	Change pre-reqs for 15 courses
AS-05-110	Mathematics	Increase variable credits and change to CR/NCR 3450:491

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
BA-05-20	General Business	Delete 6100:100
BA-05-21	General Business	Change in requirements Business Admin program
BA-05-22	Accounting	Change in requirements Accounting
BA-05-23	Accounting	Change in requirements Accounting Information Systems
BA-05-24	Finance	Change in requirements Financial Services
BA-05-25	Finance	Change in requirements Corporate Financial Planning
BA-05-26	Finance	Change in requirements Real Estate
BA-05-27	Finance	Change in requirements Financial Planning
BA-05-28	Management	Change in requirements Industrial Accounting
BA-05-29	Management	Change in requirements Materials Management
BA-05-30	Management	Change in requirements Information Systems Management
BA-05-31	Management	Change in requirements Human Resources Management
BA-05-32	Management	Change in requirements Production Management
BA-05-33	Management	Change in requirements E-Business Technology
BA-05-34	Management	Change in requirements Supply Chain Management
BA-05-35	Marketing	Change in requirements E-Marketing and Advertising
BA-05-36	Marketing	Change in requirements Marketing Management
BA-05-37	Marketing	Change in requirements Sales Management
BA-05-38	Marketing	Change in requirements International Global Business Interdisciplinary
BA-05-39	Marketing	Change in requirements International Business Foreign Language
BA-05-40	Management	Change in requirements Supply Chain/Operations Management

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-05-03	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change in pre-reqs 5500:605
ED-05-04	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Additional pre-req for 5200:325
ED-05-05	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change admission requirements for student teaching in Special Education Masters licensure program
ED-05-06	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change pre-req and co-req in 5610 Special Ed program
ED-05-11	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Course title change 5610:540
ED-05-12	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Course title change 5610:547
ED-05-13	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Course title change 5610:548
ED-05-16	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Delete 5500:620
ED-05-17	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Course title change 5500:625
ED-05-22	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change admission requirements for student teaching in Secondary Masters licensure program
ED-05-23	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Suspend Superintendency Masters program and institute licensure-only program
ED-05-24	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Course title change 5170:704
ED-05-25	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Change in requirements for Principalship Masters degree; course number change 5170:720 to 5170:615; two new courses 5170:695 and 5170:696
ED-05-26	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Course title change 5170:610
ED-05-27	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Course title change 5170:601
ED-05-28	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Course title change 5170:613
ED-05-29	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Course title change 5170:620
ED-05-36	Physical Ed & Health Ed.	Complete program revision to meet CAAHEP accreditation; addition of 10 new courses; pre-req and co-req changes to 5 courses
ED-05-37	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change minimum grade requirement for students admitted to Family and Consumer Science program for all professional education courses to be eligible to teach and graduate from the College of Education
ED-05-38	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change minimum grade requirement for students admitted to P-12 Drama/Theatre program for all professional education courses to be eligible to teach and graduate from the College of Education
ED-05-39	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change minimum grade requirement for students admitted to P-12 Music program for all professional education courses to be eligible to teach and graduate from the College of Education
ED-05-40	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Change minimum grade requirement for students admitted to P-12 Visual Arts program for all professional education courses to be eligible to teach and graduate from the College of Education
ED-05-45	Curric. & Instr. Studies	Delete 3 hour elective from AYA Math and add 3450:420/520 as requirement
ED-05-48	Ed Foundations & Ldrshp	Remove pre-req for 5100:614

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
EN-05-11	EngPhD	Decrease minimum variable credits 4100:600 from 6 to 3
EN-05-41	Electrical	Restoration of math co-reqs
EN-05-42	Electrical	Revise bulletin description 4400:332 to require a C- for passing 4400:321
EN-05-44	Electrical	New course 4400:490 Intro to Sensors and Actuators
EN-05-46	Electrical	New course 4400:666 Simulation of Nanoscale and Molecular-Scale Systems
EN-05-50	Electrical	Restructuring of BS Computer Engineering
EN-05-52	Electrical	Change in program description BS Computer Engineering
EN-05-81	Biomedical	2020:222 can substitute for 3300:112 in Biomechanics track
EN-05-82	Biomedical	2020:222 can substitute for 3300:112 in Instrumentation, Signals and Imaging track

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-05-16	Music	New course 7500:121 Theory and Musicianship I; changes to description 7500:141 and 7500:151
FAA-05-17	Music	New course 7500:122 Theory and Musicianship II; changes to description 7500:142 and 7500:152
FAA-05-18	Music	New course 7500:221 Theory and Musicianship III; changes to description 7500:241 and 7500:251
FAA-05-19	Music	New course 7500:222 Theory and Musicianship IV; changes to description 7500:242 and 7500:252
FAA-05-25	SLPA	Allow 7700:741 and 7700:742 to be repeatable
FAA-05-28	SLPA	Allow 7700:745 and 7700:746 to be repeatable
FAA-05-34	Music	Revision of music core curriculum and changes in bulletin description of program

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
PS-05-01	Polymer Engineering	Removal of math requirement from MS Polymer Engineering

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
SC-05-06	Eng & Sci Technology	Restructuring of AAS Geographic and Land Information Systems; new course 2985:205 Building Geodatabases; changes to 2985:201, 2985:210 , 2985:227 , 2985:280; bulletin description change
SC-05-08	Public Service Tech	Increase credits for 2260:210 from 2 to 3
SC-05-34	Eng & Sci Technology	Remove pre-req and change co-req 2940:170
SC-05-37	Eng & Sci Technology	New course 2860:290
SC-05-38	Eng & Sci Technology	New course 2860:490
SC-05-29	Eng & Sci Technology	New course 2920:498
SC-05-48	Developmental Programs	Course department number change from 1020 and 1021 to 2010

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
WC-05-06	Wayne	3 new courses 2530: 242, 2530: 284; 2530:290; title change 2530:241; update curriculum Health Care Office Management
WC-05-07	Wayne	update the curriculum for the Office Technology - Health Care Administrative Assistant Option
WC-05-08	Wayne	Update curriculum Medical Billing Certificate
WC-05-09	Wayne	Update curriculum Medical Transcription Certificate