# the university of akron
# Chronicle

2005 - 2006, No. 3

a report to the faculty of
the university of akron

October 6, 2005

27 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 October 6, 2005

T he regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, October 6, 2005, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm.

Forty-one of the fifty-seven current senators were in attendance at this meeting. Senators Broadway, Cheung, Gandee, Garn-Nunn, Gerlach, Linc, Londraville, Ofobike, Schantz, and Stachowiak were absent with notice. Senators Gamble, Jeantet, Kelly, Mann, Riley, Taylor, and Vijayaraman were absent without notice.

**I. <u>Approval of the Agenda</u>** – The chair welcomed everyone to the October session of Faculty Senate. Before starting the meeting he made several brief announcements. He asked that Senators sit in the first four rows near the microphones and that visitors sit behind the first four rows. He also reminded Senators to use their name tags so that they can easily be identified when called upon to speak, and to address the Chair when speaking to the Senate. He reminded everyone that the microphones are very sensitive and pick up all noise and conversation, so to please refrain from mumbling or talking loudly.
The Chair then moved to the first order of business, approval of the agenda. He asked for a motion to amend the Agenda to place the Executive Committee report after the remarks of the President and the Provost. The motion was made by Senator Steiner, seconded by Senator Rich and unanimously approved by the body.

**II. <u>Approval of the Minutes</u>** – Chair Fenwick presented the next order of business, consideration of the Minutes from the September meetings. He announced that approval of these minutes would be postponed to the November meeting.

**III. <u>Special Announcements</u>** – The Chair offered a few additional announcements. He reminded everyone of the Senate Orientation program scheduled for Thursday, October 20, from 3:00 until 5:00 p.m. and asked that if Senators planned to attend to please email Linda with an RSVP. An agenda for that Orientation would be sent out shortly.

He then introduced the visitors attending the meeting; two classes from Higher Education Administration taught by Professor Sandra Coyner. Chair Fenwick asked the students to please rise for recognition as they were welcomed by the Senate body.

The Chair announced that he had received a call earlier in the day from Harvey Sterns, Chair of the Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee. He wanted to report that the classroom survey conducted in Spring 2005 was ready and needed to be reviewed and discussed by the Ad hoc Facilities Committee, which needed members, and which the Executive Committee would appoint later in the month. He asked that if anyone wanted to serve on this committee, to let the Executive Committee know.

The Chair stated that several announcements from The Ohio Faculty Council had been sent out on the list serve earlier in the week. The first was the IUC [Inter-University Council] resolution with the State

Legislature on State [Senate] Bill 24, the so-called Academic Bill of Rights, would not go to a vote with the House and Senate. "You have seen the agreement, which I believe the IUC will sign next Tuesday, October 11. The Ohio Faculty Council and the Faculty Senate will monitor what happens afterwards. My understanding from looking at the resolution is that it will be left to the universities, through grievance procedures, to address those issues. Related to that, the Ohio Faculty Council will have its first meeting Friday, October 14, in Columbus, when we will be addressed by Mark Smith, Director of Government Relations at the National AAUP. He will talk about the Academic Bill of Rights movement and Senate Bill 24 and what it means to us."

The Chair stated that he believed that Jim McCollum, an executive of the IUC was on National Public Radio talking about this; however he was not able to hear it and wondered if perhaps the President had heard it. The President had not, but said, "It's nice that we're being featured as having, in effect, taken a proactive stance rather than being forced to do something that would be inappropriate to be forced to do." Chair Fenwick stated that they would continue to monitor that and continue to have faculty input on that issue.

In a related area, an article from the *Columbus Dispatch* was sent out earlier in the week citing Speaker of the House Husted's comments regarding working toward consolidation of duplicative programs at state institutions of higher education. At the end of the article was a comment by Jim McCollum welcoming and encouraging the idea of participants or groups to come to the table with an open mind regarding the consolidation of duplicative programs. "We're expecting this to include faculty as well, that the faculty will be at this table and we will certainly have open minds."

One other point to which the Chair drew everyone's attention was a resolution coming from the Executive Committee of the Senate regarding the implementation of the Academic Plan. "This was the document that was forwarded to me by the Provost on Tuesday and I sent it out to the EC and to the Faculty Senate erroneously. I apologize; I thought it was the final draft of the Academic Plan…It is the process by which the Plan will be implemented. The responses are due back in the Provost's office by Monday at 10:00 a.m."

He continued saying, "The resolution encourages that the Plan and the implementation process be brought to the Senate for our consideration and vote, that such procedures are in the University Bylaws, and also we found a precedent. On April 23, 1998, the Faculty Senate formally approved the 1998 Academic Plan, so there is precedent in the University of Akron history for Senate approval of such a plan." He explained that the goal of the resolution and the goal of the discussion is to work with the Administration in the implementation process of this Academic Plan according to established University procedures. Such process and the use of such process encourages buy-in by all constituents of the Faculty Senate. "I think of the analogy that the Provost made at the Convocation, of the Academic Plan being "a strong house"—that we are constructing a house and that the implementation process is kind of the blue-prints of how we go about constructing this house—that the Faculty Senate wants to build "a strong house" and that we want to build it *together*."

"Last week I was at a meeting where Abraham Lincoln was cited quite a bit and some of his speeches were quoted. One speech that was *not* quoted was his first inaugural address. Right after the secession of

South Carolina, he became President and his famous quote from that speech is that "a house divided against itself shall not stand." And we don't want that; we want to build a strong, united house. That's the spirit in which this resolution is coming to the Faculty Senate." With the conclusion of these remarks, the Chair turned the meeting over to the Provost to accommodate her schedule.


IV.  **Reports**

**a.  Remarks by the Provost** – The Provost began her remarks by expressing her appreciation for adjusting the schedule so that she could leave at 4:00. "I gave you a one-pager about topics that I feel are important to talk about **(Appendix A)**. The first one being that three of us on this campus are participating in a state-wide effort to do some consultation about what's called 'Shorthand SSI—State-share of Instruction Shorthand Subsidy. There are different kinds of terms that are used for this, but every two years typically the Regents convene a group that does a consultation about how those formulas are devised, whether there ought to be alterations in those formulas. This year it truly is a more open process in that they are inviting feedback and input about very different ways to look at that formula, partly because of House Bill 66.

I have been representing the University; I went to the first meeting and Sabrina Andrews joined me the second time; I believe that Chand Midha will serve on one of the sub-committees as will Sabrina Andrews, so little by little we continue to advance our role in being at the table so that as decisions are made we are at least aware of what the topics of the conversations are."

"Typically in the past, the representation at the SSI consultation was largely Chief Financial Officers because it was seen as a financial undertaking. This year there are many more Chief Academic Officers included in the consultation with an understanding that, with the way the subsidy works, it has an impact on academic entities and that it's more than a financial calculation. It really amounts to how the priorities of the institution work in concert with the funding formula that's established by the State." The Provost indicated that she was learning a great deal in these conversations because they have been largely confined to Chief Financial Officers as the parties that understood how the formulas work. If there is something specific to report the Provost stated that she would be glad to share that through the Faculty Senate list serve so that everyone can know the kind of specifics that are being proposed.

The Provost announced that the NOCHE Celebration of Teaching was happening on campus the next day. "I think this is the fourth time NOCHE institutions have recognized faculty from the various member institutions. We have four members who are being recognized this time. It's been on the website for the University of Akron and there actually is an article in today's *Buchtelite*. We always, out of this institution, nominate because this is what the NOCHE criteria call for. We're proud that this is the first time that the University of Akron has actually hosted the celebration, that we have four faculty who will be recognized, and Dr. Tom Price, one of those who will be recognized, is also appearing in a panel and being part of the actual program at the celebration. So, it's kind of a triple win for Akron this year."

She then announced that on October 24, there would be a groundbreaking at the site of the University of Akron/Medina County University Center. The Center has been multiple years in the making. No University funds are being used to build this particular construction; it has all been raised through federal

and state appropriations and through private donations. "With the Provost's Office taking the lead, along with John LaGuardia's office and development officers in actually writing the earmarks, doing the legislative work and also seeking donors. So it's a real accomplishment to find the money for a 30,000 square foot entity that I think will serve Medina County and give us an opportunity to serve the residents of Medina County in a much more intentional way than we are able to now."

The Provost then announced that the University is participating in a self-study this year called the Foundations of Excellence Project, about how the university undertakes the first-year experience for new students. Surveys have been sent to 1,115 individuals, including full-time, part-time and teaching assistants who taught first- or second-year students last year. The survey went out electronically from an entity called EBI—Educational Benchmarks Institute, and the Provost asked that if anyone in the Senate had been sent the survey that a response would be appreciated.

"Finally, I want to thank Dr. Fenwick for alerting me to the reaction and the fact that EC would bring a resolution today. I've prepared some comments about that regarding the Academic Plan:

*I'm pleased to have an opportunity to speak to you today about this very important document for our future as an academic community—the Academic Plan.*

*The process that carried the Plan to its current form is one of engagement from all segments of this campus community, multiple opportunities for feedback and numerous revisions. This has been and will continue to be a truly inclusive and collaborative process. Faculty, staff, contract professionals, students, both part-time and full-time, have contributed to the design, the writing, and review of the plan at all stages of the process, beginning with three all-campus forums.*

*And, as appropriate, faculty members have served a central role in all stages of this process. We have built the house together up to this point. These faculty members who have been involved have offered invaluable input into the initial stages of development; they continue their participation through the focus groups, the writing process, participation in departmental meetings, and in development of the design principles. The Provost expressed her pleasure with the number of faculty members that were involved with the Academic Plan process, many of whom are members of the Faculty Senate. She elaborated that the summer focus groups where the design principles were established included 71 participants representing 12 colleges and 28 administrative units. Of those 71 participants, 41 percent were faculty, 44 percent were contract professionals, 8 percent were staff, and 7 percent were students. Forty-two percent of the teaching faculty that participated (19 people) are members of the Faculty Senate. And overall, between 2004 and 2005, 48 members of the Faculty Senate have participated in the Academic Plan process. That kind of buy-in is needed and appreciated. In asking your thoughtful review of the Academic Plan, I direct your attention to the hard and valuable work of your faculty colleagues in developing this plan. Support for the Academic Plan is truly support for the diligent work and valuable contributions of all involved, including, of course, faculty, but also students, staff, contract professionals, and alums.*

*The Academic Plan has to this point certainly been an inclusive process. And in this final, crucial phase of implementation, it's imperative that we continue with valuable input from the entire campus community and especially faculty. During this phase we will identify university initiatives that best represent the clusters of excellence and incorporate the design principles. We will also develop plans to incorporate more fully the design principles in every single program on this campus.*

*At this most crucial phase of this process, it is essential to continue to fully dialogue as a campus community and I am very grateful to the Faculty Senate for this opportunity for formal Faculty Senate engagement in determining our collective priorities. I conclude by saying that in consultation with Dr. Fenwick and your leadership in the form of Executive Committee, I support the initiative to engage this formal body of the faculty to validate the previous work of your peers and the rest of the campus community and to support and endorse the important next steps which need to be accomplished. I pledge that I will continue to work with Faculty Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick in this regard.*

The Chair thanked the Provost and asked if there were any questions. Senator Lillie commented that from his perspective there certainly had been a lot of involvement over the past year and a lot of activity trying to include a variety of viewpoints. He expressed his hope that as we looked forward that we could take the same spirit of inclusion and input and look forward to an implementation that will fulfill the requirements of the "well-built house." Provost Stroble thanked Senator Lillie for his comments and stated that they were in agreement.

Senator Riley requested clarification, "Are you suggesting that the resolution that's coming forward is supportive of how you see the Academic Plan 'rolling out'?" The Provost confirmed this.

Senator Erickson commented that the implementation plan seemed to be on a tighter schedule and asked if the Provost could provide the reasoning behind this schedule. Provost Stroble indicated that she expected feedback; that is why the "Next Steps" document was a draft **(see Appendix B)**. She explained that she had met with the Executive Committee twice, discussed the "Next Steps" process, and that the Committee expressed a desire to discuss it further. She stated that she had already incorporated some of the EC's feedback, but that she also understood that EC needed the opportunity to provide feedback once it was in written form. She asked Chair Fenwick to please share with the Executive Committee now and, based on that feedback, would figure out what to do next.

In answer to Senator Erickson's question, the Provost explained that since we are heading into another cycle of budget hearings, it seemed like the optimal time for colleges to incorporate those priorities that they had established in the Academic Plan process. However, if it is not possible to finish this process before January, "then that just causes us to look at the planning and budgeting process in a different way." The Chair thanked the Provost.

**b. Remarks by the President** – President Proenza began his remarks by thanking everyone who had participated in the planning process and a sincere hope that this would continue since it was very important to have that participation and input.

The President moved on to a discussion about the challenges facing higher education. "Colleagues, at Convocation I made some remarks indicating where we were and also noting for you that I thought it was my responsibility to highlight for our campus community some of the challenges that I saw emerging for both higher education in general—at the national level and the statewide level—and how we might want to consider some of those challenges and explore how best to strengthen our institution."

"You may recall that I highlighted that those challenges consisted primarily of a marked diminution and, in fact, an erosion of public trust, financial disinvestment in public higher education throughout the country if not the world and considerable challenges towards our performance, our accountability and, in short, our credibility throughout the nation in particular."

He reminded the Senate of the report the Chair referenced from *The Columbus Dispatch,* where the Speaker of the House followed up on an earlier letter that he had sent throughout the State challenging higher education to help address these issues. "Let's not be naïve. He is responding to a political climate in Ohio and in the nation that is very critical of higher education. He is saying, if you read between the lines, "fix it or we will." The President identified several of these potential "fixes"; a Mumper-type bill; consolidation of programs and/or their requirements, closing of institutions. It is clear at the present time that the Legislature has wanted to cut, not add any more money, limit further spending and *assume* that Ohio is already well-placed nationally when that is totally contrary to the fact.

The *Dispatch* article further reflects the assumption that higher education is wantonly wasteful, inefficient and harbingers of too much duplication. "As I've said to you, they are willing to say with all sincerity—or at least certainly political conviction—'why does every University have to teach English?' Which is why, you may recall, I have asked 'why does every city of some size need more than one high school?' or for that matter, 'why does every house need an electrical supply or water supply? Why not just go next door and shower with your neighbor?' All joking aside, these are serious matters."

"Nationally, as I mentioned to you at Convocation, the American Council of Education is calling for a national initiative to try to restore public trust and public support. Fortunately, it is just beginning; unfortunately, it is in my judgment, naively conceived. It is extremely idealistic. I support it, don't misunderstand me, but it is naively conceived because they believe at this point that they can have a national campaign for $400,000. You cannot have a state-wide campaign for $400,000 never mind a national campaign. Nevertheless, we have invited David Ward and his predecessor, Stan Eickenberry, to come to Ohio. They have visited and we have pledged to join with the American Council of Education and, indeed, the national associations in advancing any aspect of a campaign to restore public trust and begin to cement a new compact between the people of our nation and public higher education."

"In addition and somewhat more pragmatically, the Council on Competitiveness is probably going to initiate a focus—national innovation component initiative—focused on higher education." The President encouraged everyone to read the survey that recently appeared in *The Economist* magazine. Available at www.economist.com/surveys, it provides an overview of what is happening world-wide. "While it very candidly says that American higher education is the best in the world because "there is no system," unfortunately most politicians believe that the only way "to fix an ailment" is to reorganize the deckchairs, to restructure the system, to provide more authority centrally, never mind what the facts show."

"So, what is happening, what are we going to do, what do we need to do institutionally?" The President cited the continued evolution and implementation of recommendations from the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy. A Business Alliance for Higher Education has been established reflecting that there is general acceptance of a need to convince Ohioans of the importance of higher education. The governor has also established a leadership council for P-16 education.

"Unfortunately, as was reflected for us by Steve Portch, the major consultant to the Commission who visited Cleveland last week and spoke to NOCHE, the Northeast Ohio Council for Higher Education, Ohio is moving in the right direction, but it's moving glacially slow compared to every other state in the nation. So, folks, we somehow or other need to galvanize our state, we need to galvanize ourselves." The President urged the Chair to galvanize the Ohio Faculty Council to start moving on some of the broader issues saying that "if we don't fix it ourselves, believe me, we're not going to like the solution that's imposed on us."

"Steve Portch also, in his remarks to us last week, highlighted some of the kinds of challenges that he sees more broadly for higher education. I invited Dr. Portch to visit with us hopefully yet this year if not early next year because he was quite bold and really striking in the things that he said." The President cited four of them:

1) The United States should abandon what he considers an industrial model of higher education that settles for counting credits towards a degree rather than assessing actual competency. In short, he said—and he uttered these exact words—"our academic model is bankrupt." That's why we're thinking of design principles for *ours* and we need your input.
2) He went on to say that 44 of our 50 states now have structural budget deficits and the customary economic model that supports higher education will therefore not be sustainable in the future and therefore the economic model for higher education is also bankrupt. His words, not mine.
3) Thirdly, he noted as I have to you, that regrettably the United States is losing ground. Where once we led the world in educational achievement at both secondary and tertiary levels, we now trail 22 countries—in fact, maybe more, because when I last reported to you I said that we trailed three countries in higher education; Dr. Portch indicated that we trail 15 countries. I had not seen that data, but it does not surprise me. That is of concern.
4) Finally, he simply indicated that it is time for us to really look very carefully at ourselves. He paraphrased: 'We've met the enemy and—guess what?—it is us.'

The President referred the Senate members to an article published about ten years ago in *Science Magazine*, called, "Electronics and the Dim Future of the University" by Eli Noam. "'Dim,' not meaning abysmal, but poorly seen at the time. It's a striking article about some of the challenges that *he* saw even 10 or more years ago."

The President concluded his remarks with a few comments about the Higher Education Leadership Council. "As I reported to this body some months ago, early this year with the leadership of Ed Adams, the Chairman of the Board of Regents; Roderick Chu, the Chancellor; Nancy Zimpher, the President of the University of Cincinnati; Roy Church, the President of Lorain Community College, and myself, we came

together and agreed that it was time that higher education started talking with *one voice* not—however many there are when you count all of the public institutions of Ohio and *not* in four separate organizational voices—the Board of Regents saying one thing, the two-year colleges saying one thing, the four-year universities saying something else, and the independents still something else. We proposed a bold idea for Ohio, called the "Return on Educational Investment" or ROEI that picked up from the recommendations of the Commission on the Higher Education and the Economy. They called for increased participation *and* completion of college by a significant number of Ohioans and we pledged, with the appropriate investment, to service those additional students, we would deliver on that challenge and that requirement for Ohio."

"For the first time in history, those four constituencies—Board of Regents, the two-years, the four-years, and the independents—spoke together, went to the legislative meetings together, testified together, brought in business people, students and alumni together, and held forth in a message that was heard. As the end result, rather than our receiving either flat funding or a significant decrease, we got $30 million in additional funds. We've decided to formalize the group somewhat—it's still very much in an *ad hoc* fashion. Regent Adams and myself are serving as conveners of the group. We've met three times now and we'll be meeting at the end of October."

The group felt it was very important to start a dialogue with the Business Alliance for Higher Education in the Economy, the formal body that the Commission on Higher Education in the Economy suggested was necessary to interface with the Governor, the Legislature, and state agencies, in order to help them recognize that higher education is extremely valuable to the economic future, the business future, of Ohio. "We've met with them and here is what they have at least tentatively agreed to do."

He felt that one of the biggest problems we have is the myths that are perpetuated: 'you are wantonly wasteful and inefficient,' 'you have too much duplication.' "Where's the data? There's no data to support that. I've told you over and over, we are at the national average for costs. Why is tuition so high? Because state support is down here; if state support is down here, who makes up the difference? Tuition! For you who are students here, of Higher Education Administration or student government, it's not that your university wants to charge you more money. It's that your State has failed on its promise! If our costs are below or at the national average, we're not wantonly wasteful or inefficient. I'd be the first to go down there and apologize if we were at the top of the list in costs, but we are at the middle of the list and often below that list, but with state support at the bottom, tuition has to be very high as a consequence and that's is too bad. But it is not as high as it is in Vermont or Pennsylvania, so at least count some blessings."

Since the State does not seem to believe the data, the committee asked the Business Alliance to hire an independent accounting firm, as Illinois did some years ago, to come into Ohio and tell the Legislature the truth. The productivity report that the Board of Regents presented to the Legislature and the commission report contained all of that data, but did not convince the Legislators. The committee hoped that the Legislators would listen to an independent consulting firm, hired by business people not by higher education.

Secondly, the Higher Education Leadership Council met and agreed upon three things in a preliminary way. "First, that we will develop an aggressive vision and plan for higher education in Ohio. Nancy Zimpher has been given that responsibility and at first blush, we would propose to do a regional plan that

focuses on what is needed in different regions according to the demographics of population and economic distribution of industrial clusters there.  Secondly, we've agreed that whatever plan is devised, we will need a way to articulate and communicate it; we've asked Roy Church to work with Nancy Zimpher and the group to do that. Finally, we've asked Regent Adams to work with the Department of Education to explore ways in which—at their request actually since they've come to us—we can further strengthen the preparation of students in the K-12 system so that when they get a high school diploma, *all of them* who have a high school diploma are ready for college."

"I do need for you to think very carefully about those strong words that Steve Portch shared with us when he met with NOCHE.  And, by the way, in case you do not know who Steve Portch is, other than the leading consultant to the Commission, he was the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the University of Wisconsin system; he then went on to a very distinguished tenure as the Chancellor of the University of Georgia system.  He has since retired, but is, of course, very active nationally and, indeed, proved to be the most valuable person that all of them recognized working with the Commission."  The President thanked everyone for their attention and encouraged everyone to participate in solving the challenge.

The Chair thanked the president and asked if there were any comments or questions for the President. Hearing none, he moved on to the Executive Committee report.

**c. Executive Committee Report -** Senator Konet announced that the Executive Committee met several times since the last Senate meeting.  The first was on September 21 to prepare two agendas, one for the October Senate (today's meeting) and one for the meeting that was later held with the President and Provost.

The Committee discussed issues regarding the current activities of the Ohio Faculty Council, the outcome of Senate Bill 24, the Academic Bill of Rights, and how universities would interpret the agreement that was made through the Inter-University Council in regard to that legislation.

On September 28 committee members met with the President and Provost and were updated on several fronts. The first was the Hurricane [Katrina] relief effort and what our University was doing in support of that effort. Details of that effort can be found on the web site listed in the report. **(see Appendix C)**  David Witt is the representative from Faculty Senate on that particular committee, so any questions or ideas should be addressed to David.

Following this was a discussion about the next steps needed in developing the Academic Plan, in particular, the process that might be used to find and select programs considered to be exemplar models of the design principles included in the plan.  The group then moved to discussion about Senate Bill 24 and what policies the University of Akron already had in place to address student concerns regarding treatment in class. The agreement made with the IUC may require that we review University of Akron policies and perhaps make some modifications to them. Although it appeared that there was resolution and conclusion to this issue, there is a sense that this is not the end of the discussion; hence this item will continue to be an agenda item for Ohio Faculty Council.

The question of the Well-being Committee in the health benefits discussion was raised again. As has been expressed previously, there is a strong desire to have representatives from all constituencies on campus participate in substantive discussions about the direction and the future of our health plan.

There was also a discussion of the campus visitor policy. The Executive Committee was informed that recommendations are being formulated, however they were not yet complete.

Finally, the EC met again to discuss drafting a resolution regarding implementation of the Academic Plan.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Resolution regarding "Implementing the Academic Plan":

**WHEREAS:** The Faculty Senate is "the legislative body of the faculty regarding its academic mission" (University of Akron Bylaw 3359-10-02 (B)); and

**WHEREAS:** It is empowered by the Board of Trustees to "Formulate suitable rules, requirements, and procedures for the admission, government, management, and control of students, courses of study, granting of degrees and certificates, and other internal affairs of the institution necessary to meet the objectives of the university …" (B) (1); and

**WHEREAS:** It is further empowered to "Review and offer recommendations concerning proposals for the creation, abolition, or rearrangement of colleges, departments, schools, or divisions of instruction…" (B) (2); and

**WHEREAS:** The Academic Plan is intended to define the academic mission of the University and specify the process by which that mission is to be accomplished, it is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to review and approve the Academic Plan.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Plan and the strategy for its implementation be brought to the Faculty Senate through the procedures established by the University of Akron bylaws for its consideration and vote; and that to ensure that adequate time is given, the Provost meet with the Executive Committee to establish an appropriate schedule.

The Chair indicated that since the resolution came from committee, no second was needed. He then asked for discussion on the resolution. Senator Riley requested an explanation for the phrase 'adequate time/appropriate schedule.'

Senator Erickson replied to this, and stated that, as the Provost had said, the general academic plan had been going through lots of groups and lots of discussions through the summer with a very *ad hoc* group—essentially those people who were available at the time. The Senator said that the EC assumed that the document would be presented for discussion. "EC is waiting for this to occur, but then on Tuesday, when the document was received, there was a concern about the short implementation schedule and the lack of input from elected representatives, students or departments."

She continued that there was a concern because of the notion of process. "As we approach the end of the process we have an expectation that the process is going to go one way, and then suddenly there is a proposal from the Administration with a very tight schedule leaving no time for real discussion. All these inputs have to be in by Monday. How can we possibly get them all in by Monday when you are talking about the process of how we are going to get to, what is in essence, a real plan? If you want to talk about a *house,* I guess the central parts that keep the house up—it is indeed important to have the Academic Plan in general terms, but it is the specifics of that plan, the programs that are going to be identified and the way that we, in the units, are going to work with these things that are really the essential Academic Plan."

Senator Erickson referenced the last Academic Plan that included specifics about scholars, under-graduate excellence and the Carnegie Academy and the fact that it was voted on by the Senate. She indicated that these are important issues relating to the academic mission of the University requiring time and input from the elected body. There was a concern that this body was going to be bypassed in this very important part of the plan. The intent of this motion was to say that this body and its committee should have input into the second part of this process, the implementation.

The Chair asked if this response clarified the intent and if there was further discussion? Senator Riley said that she was thinking about the contact people that are responsible for getting the paperwork done. "I don't have an issue with people that have been enlisted; the timeframe is very ambitious, but I don't have a problem with the timeframe or the contact people that have been enlisted to carry out the paperwork with, I assume, input from their—and I guess that's the issue—assumed input from their [constituents]."

Senator Lillie reminded the body that he stood up earlier to point out that he felt there was a lot of input over the past year and though he does not normally stand up to praise administrators, he did feel that some positive things had occurred. But now we were getting to the area of concern that he had regarding implementing the Academic Plan. Referencing the draft document he said, "It's not the Academic Plan itself, it's the implementing of it. I am looking, in particular, at the process, 'to establish a list of exemplary programs, operations, services' and so forth. That's on the third page going into the fourth page. The third page, which has the actual nomination process, appears to 'look for nominations from a wide variety of places.' The problem, for me, then comes when you move to the next page, you've got the nominations, and you're trying to figure out how those nominations are going to be ranked, and the criteria by which they are going to be judged. All of a sudden, the implementation for that moves away from something that does actually include constituents of the Senate which, remember include not only faculty, but students, staff, contract professionals, and retirees, so that [accounts for] Senator Erickson's comment about this being a constituent body."

"All of a sudden, then—and this may be what the Provost was referring to in terms of feedback—it appears to say that the nominations will be reviewed by—and this is all I can find in this document—UA Vice Presidents and Deans for their recommendations to President Proenza and Provost Stroble, who with the Board of Trustees will make the final decision." The implication was that those who made the final cut would receive focused attention in terms of marketing, appropriations requests, academic investment funds, investments of new dollars as well as reallocated funds. "It appears to be a situation in which there would be nomination from a wide variety of people, then all of a sudden there appears to be a 'finalist,' but who is going to decide? Part of what I'm concerned about, and I would like to see the Senate involved

with, would be a little bit more of a formal 'inclusion' in this aspect of the implementation of the Academic Plan. As far as the timeline goes, I would agree that it's extremely ambitious. If it could be met, that would be fine. I'm not sure that it can, but I certainly wouldn't want to stand in its way. However, I do think it is important for us, as a Senate, to be substantively involved in these kinds of issues and the discussion of these issues."

The Chair pointed out that, in the past, the Administration had been very good about bringing various versions of the Academic Plan before the Senate. He thought that what wasn't noted in the document received Tuesday was that there were processes and procedures referenced in the resolution and established in the Bylaws that this document should be brought to Senate, and that the timeframe was tight. He concluded by saying, "The EC and the Provost need to meet to establish an efficient, effective and speedy timeline, but with enough time to give us adequate consideration so that we can make an informed judgment and decision. Again, we're supportive of this idea but we want to give it our best shot."

The Chair asked if anyone objected to Associate Provost Stokes speaking? (*No objections were indicated.*) Associate Provost Stokes stated, "While I know that the Provost certainly will support input from the Faculty Senate as a body, I would like to draw your attention to the last paragraph on the bottom of page three. It talks about, during November the Deans and Vice Presidents will conduct forums within their units to review and discuss these nominations and to prioritize the nominations to ensure that they meet criteria. So I do think an attempt was made to include all faculty, staff and contract professionals in meetings within their own units for discussion."

Senator Lillie pointed out that this was correct but that it did not include the Senate. Associate Provost Stokes understood.

Senator Erickson felt that "forum" was a very vague term and asked, "What is a 'forum'? I have no idea. If it's a case to be specified by particular units then it becomes a matter of one Vice President might interpret it one way and another, another way. Again, I think when you want 'buy-in,' you make this as inclusive as possible and you also include the elected bodies." She felt that the elected bodies should come up with some suggested procedures.

Senator Erickson then compared this process to the program review process. "Having gone through program review and rewriting *a lot* for program review, we knew that the reason we could do so is that we had spent 18 months on program review and, therefore, we were just summarizing it. If we were just starting from scratch you couldn't do it. The same thing goes here."

"This is trying to get the University organized in a particular set of criteria that, at this point, we don't necessarily know or, if we have, we haven't accepted because it hasn't come to the Senate. By the time we get started on this it will be middle-October. You've got until December and by the end of November it's [time for] exams. Program review was almost impossible because the way that faculty have to allocate their time was not taken into account." Senator Erickson felt that this was a serious document that we wanted to spend time working on and felt that the timing and input needed to be more specific. "The timing needs to be longer and the input needs to be more specific to include all our constituents, including elected members."

Senator Qammar asked an overarching question. "Always, my issue with the Academic Plan is that so much of what faculty on the academic side *do* is, what I call, "slog through" courses. We spend a great deal of time preparing for courses, getting students to be encouraged and motivated in courses, grading all the stuff, assessing what students do. That just takes a huge volume of our time in addition to everything else we have to do. So one of the things that I would wonder is, in generating these design principles, and in generating this initiative to look for exemplary programs, are we certain that, because of the size of a program, because of the size of the initiative that a program may have brought forward—given the amount of money, resources, faculty time or anything to be able to generate this—are you sure that all of these lists of criteria that we have won't miss the "little guy" and instead continue to reallocate resources to something that has been given the resources to put together a "smash-bam" initiative in the first place?"

Senator Rich cautioned, "There is a danger here of losing track of exactly what's before us at this point. I think we might be on the verge of that. We also might be on the verge of—at least appearing—not to be taking 'yes' as an answer. The Executive Committee received the document that you have, that lays out some procedures for adopting and implementing the plan. The Executive Committee was asked to provide any input that it might have on this document by Monday and the Executive Committee thought it was not enough time for this body and/or any of its committees to seriously consider the document. So what the Executive Committee arrived at was a recommendation to this body, that is, this resolution that we're presumably going to vote on at some point. The resolution says in effect that Faculty Senate should have a role in determining both the process by which the Academic Plan is adopted and implemented and, presumably, when and if we do have a say about that, we might say that the Faculty Senate should have a role in the actual adoption and implementation."

"At this point, what we're talking about is the first message, which is that the Faculty Senate should have a chance to take a look at what the proposed process is for adopting this and suggest any changes that it may deem appropriate, including perhaps the inclusion of the Faculty Senate in that process. We just heard the Provost say, as I understand it, that she embraces and supports this resolution and so what I suggest is that we take "yes" for an answer and pass the resolution and get on with it."

Senator Stratton stood to support the motion. "I notice on the second page of the implementation there is a discussion for the establishment of academic scorecard baseline data and target goals for the institution, but nowhere do I see a role for the formal Faculty Senate to participate in the finalization of what those data are. To my knowledge we have yet to be consulted as a body on what the actual scorecard measures will be and what we will use as a baseline in our targets. I don't know about you, but as an economist, those are where the incentives lie. And forget about a lot of what else is said, if those targets are not done well, we will have incentives to do things that may be counterproductive to the institution. From my perspective, that's a key part of the program on which we have yet to be consulted."

The Chair asked if there was further discussion on the resolution? Hearing none, he called for a vote. (*The body responded unanimously in favor of the resolution.*) The Chair ruled that it passed unanimously.

**d. Academic Policies Committee –** Associate Provost Stokes brought forward two motions from the Academic Policies Committee. The first was the recommended change to the undergraduate admissions

rule to include home-schooled students **(Appendix E)**. Senate passed a change to the undergraduate admissions rule last Spring, but the committee failed to remember the home-schooled students, so language was added to include home-schooled students:

> *Home-schooled students should indicate "home-schooled" in the section of the admissions application for name of high school.  An admission committee will review each home-schooled student application.*

This was proposed would become effective in Fall 2006.

Chair Fenwick stated that since this motion came from committee, it did not need a second. He asked if there was any discussion on the motion?  Hearing none, the Chair called for a vote.  The body responded unanimously in favor of the motion coming from APC regarding home-schooled students. The motion carried.

Associate Provost Stokes presented the second motion dealing with foreign languages, but asked to make a slight modification **(Appendix F)**.  Chris Eustis from the Department of Modern Languages called and requested that the word *foreign* be inserted after the first word, so that the motion reads, "All *foreign* languages…" not "all languages."  Associate Provost Stokes indicated that the Committee was happy to add that word, and asked that the body also add it to the motion.

Senator Lillie rose to say that he was going to congratulate the committee for including ASL, but American Sign Language was not a foreign language.  Associate Provost Stokes responded by saying that they realized this but could not think of a better word.  Senator Lillie then proposed that maybe the wording was better in the original motion. He did think that it was a very important, positive sign that ASL was included.  Associate Provost Stokes suggested that perhaps the language could be changed to say 'all languages including both American Sign Language and all foreign languages.'  Senator Moritz suggested 'all foreign languages *and* American Sign Language.' Associate Provost Stokes accepted this change.

Full text of the revised motion:

> *All foreign languages and American Sign Language, can fulfill the foreign language requirement for those programs that have a foreign language requirement. Certain majors may specify specific language requirements where appropriate.*

Chair Fenwick stated that since this motion came from committee, it did not need a second. He asked if there was any further discussion on the motion?  Hearing none, the Chair called for a vote. The body voted unanimously in favor of the motion regarding foreign language and American Sign Language. The motion passed.

Associate Provost Stokes thanked the Senate and the Chair for allowing the second motion to come forward after the agenda had gone out.

**VII. New Business –** Chair Fenwick introduced one item of new business, to amend Senate Bylaw 7(E)(5) on unexcused Senate absences. The details of the motion could be found on the back of the agenda **(see Appendix G)**, however, Senator Gerlach who made the motion was not present.

Senator Lillie moved to postpone consideration of this until the next meeting of the Senate. This was seconded by Senator Steiner. The Chair confirmed that the motion was to postpone.

Senator Lillie explained that he made the motion because Senator Gerlach, who was the prime mover, was not present. He thought that Senator Gerlach might be able to provide the Senate with his rationale. Senator John spoke against the motion feeling that it was very obvious and straightforward as to the intent. He did not know what more Senator Gerlach could add, unless it was to discuss the number of unexcused absences.

Senator Lillie felt that it seemed straightforward until you asked the question: what constitutes 'unexcused' absence? He felt that perhaps there needed to be further discussion.

Senator Siebert requested clarification. "Is it unexcused absences per Senate year or per term?"
Chair Fenwick answered that it was not defined in the motion. Senator Siebert felt this needed to be clarified. The Chair agreed, however, he reminded everyone that the motion on the floor is to postpone and asked if there was any further discussion on the motion to postpone? Hearing none, the Chair called for a vote. The motion passed in favor of postponement.

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any other new business to come before this body. (*None indicated.*) He then asked if there was anything for the Good of the Order. (*None indicated.*) Hearing neither, the Chair called for adjournment. The meeting adjourned at: 4:15 p.m.

***Transcript prepared by Linda Bussey and Rose Marie Konet***

# APPENDICES TO MINUTES


# FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF OCTOBER 6, 2005

## APPENDIX A

**REPORT OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST**
**Dr. Beth Stroble**

**Faculty Senate**

**October 6, 2005**

- SSI Consultation Participation

- NOCHE Celebration of Teaching
  October 7th

- Ground Breaking:  University of Akron Medina County University Center  October 24th

- Survey: Foundations of Excellence in the First Year of College

- Next Steps for Academic Plan: Need for Participation and Feedback

## APPENDIX B

**(hard copy distributed at October 6, 2005, Faculty Senate meeting)**

# DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

# 10/3/05

# NEXT STEPS

## Implementing the Academic Plan

The design principles of our Academic Plan and the metrics of the Academic Scorecard are the operational tools by which we now continue to implement the vision and strategic intent that we first set forth in Charting the Course.

Together, these three documents and the actions that flow from them illustrate how our collective work over the past year, as we sought to define operational excellence and academic primacy, has come together and continues to build momentum for our continued success as a university.

**The Academic Plan,** *Access & Excellence: A Plan for Student Success***, helps us**

- Innovate to strengthen the differentiating, unique capacities of The University of Akron
- 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
- 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
- Build a welcoming community that engages all of of its diversity in the service of student and organizational learning
- Enlarge the leadership capacity of The University of Akron by developing leadership among our people and programs
- Assess our progress toward achieving our strategic destination in a time of increased accountability.

As an institution, we must pursue the most strategic 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

Not only should we collectively consider the implications of *Access & Excellence* for The University of Akron, but each of us should now use the plan we have created to at every level of the institution—within programs, departments, and units.

These are the necessary next steps:

- Make final revisions in the text of the plan
- Finalize graphic representation of the plan
- Establish academic scorecard baseline data and target goals for the institution and for each unit
- Use the design principles to focus ongoing improvements, enhancements, and redesigns of current programs, operations, and services
- Establish a list of exemplary initiatives among our programs, operations, and services
- Incorporate the design principles and academic scorecard metrics in planning and budgeting, grant applications, appropriation requests, program review, and marketing, and take other steps as necessary.

## FINAL REVISION IN THE TEXT OF THE PLAN

Before the end of fall semester 2005, the Office of the Provost will lead the process of making final revisions in the text of the plan submitted by the Summer 2005 design workgroups.  We will use feedback from constituency groups to guide these revisions.

## FINALIZE GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF THE PLAN

Before the end of fall semester 2005, the Office of the Provost will collaborate with Institutional Marketing and members of the Myers School of Art faculty and students in Design X Nine to consider additional elements of the draft graphic, with attention to its use for multiple audiences and feedback gained from the Convocation audience.  Feedback on additional elements will be sought from the campus community through website postings and surveys.

## ESTABLISH ACADEMIC SCORECARD BASELINE DATA AND TARGET GOALS FOR THE INSTITUTION AND FOR EACH UNIT

Before the end of fall semester 2005, the Office of the Provost will collaborate with Institutional Research to refine the baseline data as well as target goals for a limited number of indicators at the institutional level. During January and February, the Office of the Provost will meet with leadership in every college and vice presidential unit to establish the target goals for each indicator at unit levels.  These documents will be posted for campus use and will be condensed in a dashboard approach for quick reviews of progress toward institutional and unit goals.

## USE THE DESIGN PRINCIPLES TO FOCUS ONGOING IMPROVEMENTS, ENHANCEMENTS, AND REDESIGNS OF CURRENT PROGRAMS,OPERATIONS, AND SERVICES

Before the end of fall semester 2005, each vice president and dean will submit a document which describes the unit's response to the design principles of the academic plan.  This 5-10 page document will describe specific plans for implementing the design principles to focus ongoing improvements, enhancements, and redesigns of current programs, operations, and services in the unit in ways that support institutional success in alignment with the design principles.  The document will detail plans for the next three years, including timelines and parties responsible for implementing each plan component.

**ESTABLISH A LIST OF EXEMPLARY INITIATIVES AMONG OUR PROGRAMS, OPERATIONS, AND SERVICES**

As a means of establishing unit and institutional exemplars among our programs, operations, and services, the Office of the Provost issues a request for nominations of those programs, operations, and services that best utilize the plan's design principles and represent at least one of the Clusters of Excellence in Charting the Course.

The resulting list of exemplars will function as a beginning list which we will revisit in fall of 2008 for the purpose of assessing their continued status as exemplars and to consider additional exemplars as more programs show evidence of singular incorporation of the design principles.

This request for nominations is issued to initiate the process by which members of the campus community—faculty, staff, contract professionals, students, administrators submit specific programs, operations, and services for consideration in the priority listing in Access & Excellence, the academic plan for The University of Akron.

Nominations must be received in the Office of the Provost via electronic submission by October 28, 2005, to receive full review.   During November, deans and vice presidents will conduct forums within their units to review and discuss the nominations of programs, operations, and services within their units for the purposes of prioritizing the nominations from their units and ensuring that nominations meet required criteria.

Associated Student Government will also be asked to conduct a forum for review by students.

All nominations will then be reviewed by UA vice presidents and deans for their recommendation to President Proenza and Provost Stroble , who with the Board of Trustees will make the final decision about the list of exemplary initiatives. We  intend to complete this activity by the end of the fall semester 2005.

The resulting exemplary initiatives list of programs, services, and operations will receive focused attention in terms of marketing, appropriations requests, academic investment funds, and investments of available new dollars as well as reallocated funds to support personnel and operating expenses.

Because the resulting exemplary initiatives list is designed to link the design principles of *Access & Excellence*, the clusters of excellence from Charting the Course, and the measures and indicators from the Academic Scorecard, those who wish to make nominations should review those draft documents at the links provided below.

Self-nominations are permitted.

The rationales for nominations must address each of these criteria:

- Consistency with specific aspects of the five design principles: hyperlink to academic plan
- Coherence with at least one cluster of excellence: hyperlink to Charting the Course
- Current productivity, viability, and quality as evidenced by program review snapshot results: Hyperlink to program review template
- Contribution to specific goals of Academic Scorecard: Hyperlink to Scorecard site
- Uniqueness of program, service, and operation in Northeast Ohio (and beyond in applicable) using benchmark data
- Connection to UA Mission
- Potential for growth and differentiation
- Potential for synergy with other programs, services, and operations of UA

- Broadness of focus—ability to build across UA units
- Relation to documented demographic trends in region and Ohio and beyond: Evidence of ability to attract students, partnerships, external dollars
- Documented job potential for students as result of program, service, operation.

Nominators should complete the attached electronic template and submit to Associate Provost Stokes by end of day October 28, 2005.   Receipt will be acknowledged.

Template:  to be developed  (will have page limit—5 pages approximately)

**INCORPORATE DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND ACADEMIC SCORECARD METRICS IN PLANNING AND BUDGETING, GRANT APPLICATIONS, APPROPRIATION REQUESTS, PROGRAM REVIEW, AND MARKETING**

Because these documents are designed to focus our strategies for achieving Access and Excellence, they will guide our actions and investments in many ways in the coming years.

For example, it will be expected that units will frame their budget requests and make allocations within their own units in ways that are consistent with their priority nominations as well as their plans for increasing incorporation of the design principles in every program, operation, and service.  Academic investment funds will be allocated according to these priorities.

As the institution and units prepare grant applications and appropriation requests, and prepare for the upcoming comprehensive campaign, the plans established within units should guide our strategies for diversifying and enhancing revenue sources.

The program review process will increasingly focus on programs' alignment with the design principles and accomplishment of targets of the Academic Scorecard as measures of program quality, viability, and productivity.

And as marketing focuses on the strength of specific programs, operations, and services, exemplars of the design principles will become a strong part of the story we tell to the community we serve.

<u>**APPENDIX C**</u>

**Executive Committee Report**
**October 6, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

The Executive Committee met on September 21 to prepare two agendas, one for the October Senate meeting and one for the meeting with the President and Provost. The committee then moved to discussions regarding the current activities of the Ohio Faculty Council, the outcome of Senate Bill 24 – the Academic Bill of Rights, and how universities will be interpreting the agreement that was made with the Inter-University Council in regard to the legislation.

On September 28, committee members met with the President and Provost and were updated on several fronts. The first was the Hurricane Relief effort and what our university is doing in support of that effort. The details of efforts and activities can be found on the web at http://www.uakron.edu/info/

Following this was a discussion about the next steps needed in developing the Academic Plan. In particular, the process that may be used to find and select programs considered to be exemplary models of the design principles included in the plan.

The group then moved to a discussion about Senate Bill 24 and what policies the University of Akron already has in place to address students concerns regarding treatment in class. The agreement made with IUC may require that we review the U of A policies and perhaps make some modifications to them. Although it appeared that there was resolution and conclusion to this issue, there is a sense that this was not the end of the discussion, hence this topic will continue to be an agenda item for Ohio Faculty Council.

The question regarding the involvement of the Well Being Committee in the Health Benefits discussions was also raised again. As has been expressed previously, there is a strong desire to have representatives from all constituencies on campus participate in substantive discussions about the direction and future of our health plans.

Finally, a question regarding the status of the campus visitor policy was asked. The Executive committee was informed that recommendations are being formulated; however, they are not yet complete.

*Report submitted by Rose Marie Konet*
*Secretary, Faculty Senate*

## APPENDIX D

## Faculty Senate Executive Committee Resolution regarding "Implementing the Academic Plan" presented at October 6, 2005, meeting

*The text as read to the Senate body:*

**WHEREAS:** The Faculty Senate is "the legislative body of the faculty regarding its academic mission" (University of Akron Bylaw 3359-10-02 (B)); and

**WHEREAS:** It is empowered by the Board of Trustees to "Formulate suitable rules, requirements, and procedures for the admission, government, management, and control of students, courses of study, granting of degrees and certificates, and other internal affairs of the institution necessary to meet the objectives of the university …" (B) (1); and

**WHEREAS:** It is further empowered to "Review and offer recommendations concerning proposals for the creation, abolition, or rearrangement of colleges, departments, schools, or divisions of instruction…" (B) (2); and

**WHEREAS:** The Academic Plan is intended to define the academic mission of the University and specify the process by which that mission is to be accomplished, it is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to review and approve the Academic Plan.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Plan and the strategy for its implementation be brought to the Faculty Senate through the procedures established by the University of Akron bylaws for its consideration and vote; and that to ensure that adequate time is given, the Provost meet with the Executive Committee to establish an appropriate schedule.

# Academic Policies Committee regarding Undergraduate Admissions
## Motion presented October 6, 2005
## Meeting of the Faculty Senate

**Motion:**

APC recommends the following change to rule 3359-60-2-B-2-b  Undergraduate Admissions.

All students**, except home-schooled,** must submit an official high school transcript or G.E.D. scores. This official record must be received and evaluated before admission action can be taken.   If, due to extenuating circumstances, official records cannot be obtained, the student may petition the Director of Admission for consideration.

***Home-schooled students should indicate "home-schooled" in the section of the admissions application for name of high school.  An admission committee will review each home-schooled student application.***

**Rationale:**

In May 2005, Faculty Senate approved a change in the Admission policy to require high school transcripts or G.E.D. scores for all incoming students. This recommendation was approved by the President and forwarded to the Rules Committee of the Board of Trustees.  The Rules Committee questioned how the issue of home-schooled students would be addressed – home-schooled students have neither a high school transcript nor G.E.D. scores.  The Rules Committee proposed additional language to the rule change.

Academic Policies Committee has considered the additional language (in bold above) and recommends its inclusion.

## APPENDIX F

## Motion from the Academic Policies Committee
## regarding Undergraduate Foreign Language Requirements
## for presentation at the
## October 6, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate

Academic Policy Committee responded to a question concerning foreign language requirements – "Will all of the languages offered on campus fulfill the two year foreign language requirement?"

**RATIONALE:**
This issue is not addressed in the Undergraduate Bulletin. To provide future guidance for all colleges and departments, APC voted unanimously to make the following motion:

**MOTION:**
All foreign languages and American Sign Language, can fulfill the foreign language requirement for those programs that have a foreign language requirement. Certain majors may specify specific language requirements where appropriate.

APC recommends that this policy statement appear in Section 3 of the Undergraduate Bulletin as a sub-heading under Procedures and Requirements.

## APPENDIX G

# Proposed Amendment to Senate By-law 7(E)(5)

This amendment was recommended by Senator Gerlach at the September 15, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate and laid over for a vote until the October 6 meeting of the Senate.

Below is the current By-law; following is the recommended amendment, with the new text shown in **bold text**.

**By-law 7(E)(5) currently reads:**

> *Should a member of the Senate be unable to discharge the duties of the office, the Senate may declare that seat vacant.*

The amended text, if approved would read:

> *Should a member of the Senate be unable to discharge the duties of the office* ***or should a member have four or more unexcused absences,*** *the Senate may declare that seat vacant.*