



45 pages

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Faculty Senate Membership .....	2
Faculty Senate Executive Committee .....	3
Faculty Senate Committees .....	3
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held September 1, 2005 .....	7
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of September 1, 2005 .....	29
A. Press Release regarding assistance to Students affected by Hurricane Katrina .....	30
B. Executive Committee Report presented on September 1, 2005 .....	31
C. Report from the Well-being Committee .....	32
D. Academic Policies Committee: Student Success Policies .....	34
E-1. Gerlach Motion re: Changes to Nomenclature of Honors Program .....	35
E-2. Titles for Administrators in Honors Colleges at MAC Schools .....	35
E-3. Response from UA Honors College re: Suggested Changes to Nomenclature ...	36
F. Presentation of Academic Plan/Balanced Scorecard Overview .....	37
G. Ad hoc Committee lists .....	40
H. Senate Committee Lists by term .....	41

---

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](mailto:facultysenate@uakron.edu)**

## Faculty Senate Membership 2005–2006

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Arts &amp; Sciences (16)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Linda Barrett – 2007  Stephen Brooks – 2007  Cheryl Elman – 2008  Elizabeth Erickson – 2006  Rudy Fenwick – 2007  Ali Hajjafar – 2007  Robert Jeantet – 2006  R. Londraville – 2006  William Lyons - 2008  Tim Norfolk – 2007  Wolfgang Pelz – 2006  Loren Siebert – 2006  Richard Steiner – 2006  Richard Stratton – 2006  <b>(2 - TBA)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Summit College (5)</b>  <i>(formerly Community &amp; Technical College)</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">John Boal – 2007  Russ Davis – 2007  Paul John – 2007  Jeffry Schantz – 2007  Sherry Gamble – 2008</p>	
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Education (4)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Francis Broadway – 2008  S. Kushner Benson – 2007  Susan Clark – 2008  Tim Lillie – 2007</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Engineering (4)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mike Cheung – 2007  Nathan Ida – 2008  Bruce Taylor – 2008  Helen Qammar - 2007</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Fine &amp; Applied Arts (8)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kathleen Clark – 2007  Pamela Garn-Nunn – 2006  Robert Huff – 2006  James Lenavitt – 2006  James Slowiak – 2006  Brooks Toliver – 2008  John Vollmer – 2007  Victor Wilburn – 2008</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Business Administration (4)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Ray Gehani – 2008  Pamela Keltyska – 2008  Emeka Ofobike – 2008  B. Vijayaraman – 2007</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>University Libraries (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Frank Bove – 2008  Diana Chlebek – 2007</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Polymer Science/Engineering (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Gary Hamed – 2008  Erol Sancaktar – 2008</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assoc of UA Retirees (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Robert Gandee – 2008  Don R. Gerlach – 2008</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Nursing (3)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Maryhelen Kreidler – 2007  Linda Linc – 2007  Tracy Riley – 2008</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Wayne College (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Tim Vierheller – 2008  Nick Zingale – 2008</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Students (3)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kyle Bohland (ASG) – 2006  D. Kingsbury (ASG) – 2006  Jesse Mann (GSG) – 2006</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Contract Professionals (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Anne Jorgensen – 2006  Rose Marie Konet – 2006</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Part-Time Faculty (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(2 – TBA)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SEAC (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sarah Kelly – 2006  Jim Shuster – 2008  Robert Stachowiak – 2007</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>School of Law (2)</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">E. Steward Moritz – 2008  William Rich – 2006</p>	
<p><b>Note: Term expires in year listed.</b></p>		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Total members: 60 (64 seats)</b></p>

## The University of Akron Senate Committees 2004–2005

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

**Rudy Fenwick\*** – Chair  
 Elizabeth Erickson\* – Vice Chair  
 Rose Marie Konet\* – Secretary  
 Mr. Robert Huff\*  
 Dr. Tim Lillie\*  
 Mr. William Rich\*  
 Dr. Richard Steiner\*

#### Senate Committees

\*designates Senator

**Boldface** indicates Chairperson.

Term expires in year listed.

### ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

Amanda Aller – 2007\*

Jack Braun – 2005\*

Leslie Gordon – 2008

Gwen Jones – 2008

Meredith Kalapich – 2007

Susan Kushner Benson – 2008\*

William Lyons – 2008\*

Brenda Marina – 2007

Charles Monroe – 2008

Emeka Ofobike – 2008\*

Helen Qammar – 2007\*

Peggy Richards – 2007

James Slowiak – 2006\*

**Senior VP and Provost, ex-officio, non-voting member, or Nancy Stokes, designee as Chair**

### CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Sabrina Andrews – 2008

Stephen Brooks – 2008\*

Kathleen Clark – 2007\*

Enoch Damson – 2008

Ali Hajjafar – 2007\*

Pamela Keltzka – 2008\*

Don Laconi – 2006

Tim Lillie – 2006\*

Craig Menzemer – 2007

Charles Monroe – 2006

Richard Steiner – 2006\*

Evangeline Varonis – 2006

Richard Yoder – 2006

**Ex-officio member, Dr. Elizabeth Stroble, Senior VP & Provost, or Nancy Stokes, designee as Chair  
Ex-officio member, University Registrar**

## ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

Francis Broadway – 2005  
 Irina Chernikova – 2008  
 Cheryl Elman – 2008\*  
 James Frampton – 2005  
 Robert Gandee – 2008\*  
 Marylu Gribshaw – 2008  
 Kevin Klotz – 2008  
 Loren Siebert – 2006  
**Anne Jorgensen** – 2006\*  
 Diana Kingsbury – 2007\*  
 Alan Kornspan – 2008

Anthony LaSalvia – 2008  
 Tim Lillie – 2008\*  
 Patricia Millhoff – 2008  
 Vicky Rostedt – 2007  
 John Sahl – 2006  
 Dan Sheffer – 2006

**Ex-officio members, Mr. J. Dean Carro,  
 NCAA Faculty Representative  
 Mr. Michael J. Thomas, Athletic Director  
 or designee**

## UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE

Linda Barrett – 2007\*  
 Lindgren Chyi – 2008  
 Diana Chlebek – 2006\*  
 Kevin Concannon – 2006  
 Pamela Garn-Nunn – 2006\*  
 Virginia Gunn – 2008  
 Robert Huff – 2006\*  
 Diana Kingsbury – 2006\*  
 Rose Marie Konet – 2005\*  
 Hillary Nunn – 2008

Jeffry Schantz – 2007\*  
 Larry Shubat – 2008  
**Eric Sotnak – 2008**  
 Brooks Toliver – 2008\*  
 Janice Yoder – 2006

**Ex-officio members, Dean of University Libraries  
 or designee  
 Mr. Paul Richert, Law Librarian  
 Ex-officio, non-voting member, Director of  
 Information Services**

## REFERENCE COMMITTEE

Mike Cheung – 2007\*  
 Don Gerlach – 2008\*  
 Paul John – 2007\*  
**Gwen Jones** – 2008\*  
 Linda Linc – 2007\*  
 Frederic Marich – 2008  
 William Rich – 2007\*

John Vollmer – 2007\*  
 John Welch – 2006

**Ex-Officio member, Secretary – Faculty Senate  
 Ex-officio, non-voting member, Mike  
 Sermersheim, Deputy General Counsel**

### STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Colleen Curry – 2008  
Carolyn Embree – 2006  
Dianna Ford – 2008  
Sherry Gamble – 2008\*  
**Deborah Gwin – 2006**  
Nathan Ida – 2008\*  
Tucker Jolly – 2005  
Sarah Kelly – 2006\*  
Jesse Mann – 2006\*

Tim Vierheller – 2008\*  
John Vollmer – 2007\*  
LaVerne Yousey – 2006\*

**Ex-Officio members, Mr. Doug McNutt,  
Director – Student Financial Aid  
Dr. Sharon Johnson, VP Student Affairs  
Dr. Karla Mugler, Dean – University College**

### COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES

Roland Arter – 2008\*  
John Boal – 2008\*  
Frank Bove – 2008\*  
Russell Davis – 2007\*  
Lori Fielding – 2008  
James Grover – 2006  
Mary Hardin – 2008  
Phil Hoffman – 2008  
Robert Jeantet – 2007\*  
Michael Johanyak – 2008  
Eric Kreider – 2008  
James Lenavitt – 2006\*

Richard Londrville – 2006\*  
Herb Matheny – 2008  
Peggy McCann – 2007  
Stewart Moritz – 2008\*  
**Tim Norfolk** – 2007\*  
Wolfgang Pelz – 2006\*  
Richard Steiner – 2006\*  
Richard Stratton – 2006\*  
Bruce Taylor – 2008\*

**Ex-Officio member, Director - NetworkServices  
or designee**

**Please note that membership lists of the Ad Hoc Committees  
for the Faculty Senate may be found in the Appendices (Appendix ??).**

**Committee listings, shown in order of the term, may also be found in the Appendices  
(Appendix ??).**

### FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Maria Adamowicz-Hariasz – 2008  
 Christopher Banks – 2008  
 Sandra Buckland – 2006  
 Kyonsuku Min Cakmak – 2006  
 Andre Christie-Mizell – 2008  
 R. Ray Gehani – 2008\*  
 Laura Gelfand – 2008  
 Michael Graham – 2007  
**Kevin Kreider** – 2006  
 Sharon Kruse – 2008  
 Mary Myers – 2006  
 Pizhong Qiao – 2006

Yu Qiao – 2008  
 Tracy Riley – 2008\*  
 Julia Spiker – 2008  
 David Steer – 2008  
 Bindiganavales Vijayaraman – 2007\*  
 Ping Wang – 2006  
 Victor Wilburn – 2008\*  
 Nick Zingale – 2008\*

**Ex-Officio member, Associate Provost  
 for Research or designee**

### FACULTY RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**Lloyd Anderson** – 2007  
 Gary Bays – 2008  
 Ann Bolek – 2007  
 William Brittain – 2007  
 Susan Clark – 2006\*

Elizabeth Erickson – 2007\*  
 Michael D'Amico – 2007  
 Maryhelen Kreidler – 2006\*  
 D. Dane Quinn – 2007

### UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE

Joan Carletta – 2008  
 Cinda Chima – 2008  
 Russell Davis – 2007\*  
 Lori Fielding – 2006  
**Elizabeth Erickson** – 2007\*  
 Hal Foster – 2007

Pamela Hoover – 2007  
 Al Lieberman – 2006  
 Nola Lowther – 2007  
 C. Alan Newman – 2006  
 Colleen Teague – 2008

### OHIO FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE

David Witt – Faculty Senate Representative\*

## Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 1, 2005

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, September 1, 2005, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

Forty-nine of the fifty-seven current senators were in attendance at this meeting. Senators Broadway, Brooks, Jeantet, Kreidler, and Riley were absent with notice. Senators Cheung, Kelly, and Londraville were absent without notice.

**I. Approval of the Agenda** – The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2005–2006 academic year. Senator Erickson made a motion to approve the Agenda for the meeting; Senator Mann seconded it. No issues were raised about the Agenda and it was approved unanimously.

**II. Approval of the Minutes** – Chair Fenwick presented the next order of business: approval of the Minutes of the May 5 meeting. Senator Gerlach made the motion to approve; Senator Erickson seconded the motion. No discussion was indicated and the body voted unanimously to approve the May meeting Minutes. The motion carried.

**III. Special Announcements** – The Chair made a few “standard announcements” that are made every year. First he asked all Senators to sit in the first four rows and to use their nameplates to be recognized. Guests were instructed to sit in the rows behind the senators. He reminded everyone about the sensitive microphone that would pick up all conversations. “So unless you are addressing the Senate, try to keep it to a dull roar.

He announced that the Senate was still in need of a parliamentarian, relating that William Harpine, who served as our Parliamentarian last year, had left the University. Last month’s appeal to fill the position went unanswered. He again extended the invitation to any of the Senate’s colleagues who might want to volunteer the first Thursday of the month from 3:00 until 5:00. “Otherwise, I will have to rule on my own actions, which I don’t want to do. So unless we have a parliamentarian, Senator Gerlach, Senator Lillie or Senator Rich can advise me, but I hope this is not a permanent situation. In other words, please give me a parliamentarian!”

The Chair expressed his hope that everyone had a productive yet relaxing summer. He again welcomed everyone to the Faculty Senate of the University of Akron and extended a special welcome to all of the new senators and those who were reelected to the Senate. He read through the list of new/reelected Senators:

Amanda Aller	Frank Bove	Francis Broadway
Cheryl Elman	Sherry Gamble	Robert Gandee
Ray Gehani	Don Gerlach	Nathan Ida
Jesse Mann	Steward Moritz	Emeka Ofobike
Tracy Riley	James Shuster	Robert Stachowiak
Bruce Taylor	Brooks Toliver	Tim Vierheller
Victor Wilburn	Nick Zingale	

The Senate body welcomed these senators with a round of applause.

**IV. Remarks of the Chair** – The Chair reminded everyone that items to be announced should be sent to Linda Bussey, the Administrative Assistant of the Faculty Senate. “Over the summer we received no notice of deaths, or births, or anything else. I would like to assume that nobody died over the summer, although I understand that this is not true.” Senator Gerlach offered a brief summary of four people he knew who had passed away. They were: Boris Blick (History), Cathryn Taliaferro (English Department), Bernard Esporite (Education) and Frank Bradshaw (Music). The Senator added that, “I didn’t put these in because I thought someone else was keeping track. That’s the habit of an oldster, reading the obituaries.” In addition, Senator Stachowiak reported that Tom Gallagher, who had served as Assistant Director of the Physical Plant for many years, had recently passed away.

The Chair asked the Senate body to observe a moment of silence in memory of our colleagues as well as those who have died and others still suffering in the Gulf Coast region in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. “Many of those people are family members of colleagues of ours and certainly we sympathize and empathize with them. (*The Senate body stood to observe a moment of silence.*)

Chair Fenwick continued his remarks by addressing the issue of Hurricane Katrina, “I hope everyone had a chance to pick up the handout announcement from the President’s Office regarding assistance to students who have been dislocated, whether they intended to enroll or were enrolled in universities and colleges in that area (**Appendix A**). We are providing assistance to them, as are other colleges and universities around the country. We are offering admissions assistance and counseling.” He related that, according to the Provost’s Office, three or four students had been already enrolled and received assistance, but expected that number to increase. “We expect up to twenty students who may be enrolling late and needing assistance; if the number goes beyond that the Senate will be consulted and we will work together to form a policy of how to deal with the students. Certainly, I think I can speak for the faculty and for the Senate, we will assist in any way we can in this national emergency.”

Chair Fenwick related how this tragedy and its complications reminded him of the lyrics of one of John Lennon’s last songs: “Life is what happens when you’re busy making other plans.” The Chair related that this was certainly the case with the victims of Hurricane Katrina and in a much lesser way it’s true of individuals and institutions in general.



With the beginning of the new semester, the Chair spoke of plans for this upcoming year and for years to come. He added that later in this session, the Provost would offer a brief overview of the current draft of the Academic Plan.

He also stated that the Senate had been involved in long-term planning to make the governance process at the University of Akron more inclusive of all constituencies and more effective. The Chair related how life often interferes with these long-term plans, at least in the immediate future and how issues arise that need our immediate attention. Such was the case regarding current healthcare insurance proposals being discussed and whether or not the Well-being Committee had adequate input into that process. “After talking to the Well-being Committee and the EC, we have decided that instead of the Senate Orientation meeting to be held on September 15, there will be a special session of the Senate, as a whole, to discuss this issue.” Details of this would be presented in Senator Konet’s Executive Committee report and in Senator Erickson’s Well-being Committee report.

The Chair reiterated his welcome to everyone in the Faculty Senate and expressed his belief that by working together, we would have a productive year.

## **V. REPORTS**

**a. Executive Committee** – Senator Konet reported that the Executive Committee met frequently during the summer: ten times as a group and four times with the President and Provost (**Appendix B**). Meetings were conducted to certify the elections of new senators and to complete their committee assignments. She added that if anyone not received a committee assignment or unsure of what it was, to let her know so she could clarify that.

The Executive Committee met also to propose some new initiatives for the coming year and to discuss other pertinent issues. In particular, they discussed the condition of the state budget and the university’s budget; thus far, the University budget appeared to be flat as anticipated.

Enrollment increased in a number of areas including the Honors College, direct admits, the College of Nursing and at Wayne Campus. Senator Konet reported that, overall, the headcount and credit hours were down slightly, but final figures would not be available for several weeks yet, so there was no way to know if that was accurate. She related that one of their conversations focused on enrollment management, retention issues and some of the recommendations included in the Henderson report.

The Senator reported that the Provost regularly shared updates regarding various search processes and also presented an overview of the Academic Plan, stating that meetings had been conducted over the summer in order to continue developing the plan. However, there would be more work to be done.

Related to concerns about theft and safety on campus, the committee had requested more information on the University’s visitor policy. A committee, convened by the Provost, collected existing policies and would draft a recommendation for a new policy.

As mentioned by the Senate Chair, several new initiatives were proposed by the Executive Committee, some of which would be implemented during the current academic year. The first proposal was implementation of an Orientation program for new senators. The program would provide an overview of the Senate, its purpose, its goals and its accomplishments. There would be an introduction of each of the Senate committees, the purpose of each of those committees and encouragement for Senators to actively participate in one or two of their choosing.

Due to an unexpected development, however, the Orientation session originally scheduled for September 15 had been rescheduled for October 20.

The Senator reported that in the spirit of communication and information sharing, a newsletter would be launched this year. This newsletter will highlight key points and action items completed during the Senate meetings to be distributed soon after the meeting. It is hoped that the newsletter will provide the members of the University community with another ready source of information so that they would have opportunity to react and respond to items on the list.

Senator Konet informed the Senators that the Ad-hoc Committee on Decision-Making had developed and proposed possible shared-governance structures that would be more inclusive of all constituents on campus and the University community. "One of the key underlying principles of that committee is that, of all of the proposals that they recommend, the election of its representatives is critical, that people on this committee must be represented by election." The Ad-hoc Committee was still working on the details but hoped to have a proposal prepared to present to the Senate later in the fall.

Most recently, the Executive Committee was informed of some proposed changes to the healthcare plan for 2006. She added that, "At issue and of grave concern to the Committee is the process being used to report these changes." Because of the lateness of that announcement, the Executive Committee felt that a special Senate meeting should be held in lieu of the Orientation. The special session of the Senate (on September 15) would present a forum to discuss the challenges to shared governance that seem to be embodied in the way the healthcare changes were proposed. This concluded the Executive Committee report.

The Chair asked if there were any questions about Senator Konet's report. Senator Gerlach inquired about the status of the Executive Committee proposal/plan (as reported in the May 2005 issue of *The Chronicle*) to develop a template over the summer for the purpose of Administrator review process; the issue had reported that this would be offered for Senate consideration in the fall. The Chair replied that this proposal was still under consideration.

**b. Remarks by the President** – President Proenza began his remarks and offered his own personal welcome to everyone for the new academic year and to the new Senators. "Thank you for your service and we're looking forward to this new academic year."

He mentioned events related to Hurricane Katrina. "I think you know we have on campus the only accredited program in Emergency Response Management, under the tutelage of Professor David Hoover. David and his colleagues are in the midst of plans to send, at regular intervals, teams of students and experienced faculty to support the relief efforts." The President understood that the

plan would send teams of three to six individuals for each of two weeks over a period of time. From the perspective of emergency response forces, these teams had much-needed expertise. At the same time, the students would have an opportunity to test what they have learned in the field and to be of service to those in a great time of need. The President went on to mention the healthcare issues and expressed his regret—“for reasons that I think you can understand, but if you can’t please ask Mr. Mallo who is in the back”—at not being able to discuss some of those issues. Yet he expressed his delight that the Senate chose to have a special session to discuss the issue.

President Proenza mentioned that last spring saw the emergence of a new framework to deal with the Legislature. He reported that an unprecedented alliance—a coalition—was created between the Board of Regents, the four-year universities, the two-year colleges and the private and independent colleges. The platform for that coalition went under the term of ‘Return on Educational Investment’ or ROEI and offered two unprecedented measures. First was that these four communities came together to provide testimony on the same topic repeatedly. He added that they were joined, not only by members of each other’s groups—those four that he had previously mentioned—but also by members of the private sector as well as students who had completed their studies at each of these institutions and were prepared to talk about how higher education had benefited them in their career. “As a result of that unprecedented success, for the first time ever I am somewhat optimistic mainly because this has never been tried before as best we can tell in Ohio’s history.” He commented that for many years Ohio has been used to pit one group against the other. Yet the effort to bring everyone to the table to sort things out before going to the Legislature or to the public was a first for all of these. “I think we all know that the tendency is to simply revert *in all ways* of doing things, to fight with each other instead of finding ways to propose solutions and collaborative opportunities to go forward.”

The President reiterated that, while it remained a fragile coalition, he felt that there were two significant points to be noted. First, because meetings were held for the duration of the spring and early summer, the Legislature voted an additional \$30 million appropriation for higher education. He mentioned that the language that they used, although not called “ROEI,” contained all the other terms that have been used to describe the Return on Education Investment concept. He felt that this showed progress and the message was delivered. He mentioned Representative Shawn Webster’s presence on campus, commenting that he is being very candid and of his hope that this would continue.

Secondly, in addition to the appropriation, that group informally banded together under the rubric of “Higher Education Leadership Council” (HELCC). Representatives from each of those four groups planned to meet again on September 6 with Regent Ed Adams, Chairman of the Board of Regents, and President Proenza, to serve as co-conveners of the group. The President was pleased to be joined by such strong leadership from the two-year colleges as well as significant participation from the independent and private institutions, including the University of Cincinnati.

He shared that the newly-created Business Alliance for Higher Education planned to meet September 12. He reminded the Senate that this business alliance was initially recommended by the Governor’s Commission on Higher Education and the Economy. Although it took some time, it had

been officially launched in the early part of the summer, met a couple of times already and had invited the HELC group to meet with them, specifically two presidents from each type of institution, plus Regent Adams and the Chancellor on behalf of the Board of Regents. “I’ve had several conversations with members of that business alliance and I am optimistic that—again because this has never been done before—we will start to gain some additional traction and move forward. So I will keep you informed and I hope that those of you who are participating in the Ohio Faculty Council will keep that in mind and will help us bring together that coalition at all levels.”

The President mentioned the recent installation of the Chihuly sculpture in front of the Polymer Building, expressing his belief that this was a marvelous addition to the campus. “As some of you may know, Dale Chihuly is the world’s foremost recognized glass artist and that he came to the University of Akron to learn how to do ‘polymer glass,’ a wonderful marriage between our expertise and that of our Polymer Science Department and School of Art.” Dr. Frank Kelley, Dean of the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering together with and Ms. Christina DePaul, then-Director of our Mary Schiller-Myers School of Art, met with Dale Chihuly to convince him to create such a sculpture and donate it to the University. (The materials for the sculpture were purchased through private gifts from corporations and individuals.) In addition, soon the area around the sculpture will be landscaped. He called attention to the Chihuly sculpture, not just because it is new and has now appeared in all major newspapers in Ohio, but for the attention it brings to the campus at-large, as evidenced by being featured in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a national publication.

Just that morning the new President of the Knight Foundation, Alberto Ibarguen, had visited the campus. “I cannot tell you how thrilled, excited and enthusiastic he was, first by the campus but secondly by that sculpture. I can tell you that it will serve us in good stead.” The President went on to share how, over the past several months, since completion of the new Landscape for Learning, he and his colleagues have hosted visitors to campus from across the country, but particularly from throughout northeast Ohio. He commented that what was important was that people visited who never before would have set foot on the University of Akron campus, yet invitations were now accepted. He mentioned that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Case Western Reserve University came to see the campus, an invitation that would have previously been simply waived aside. The President and owner of the Cleveland Indians had also been to campus along with many others. “I am excited that they are carrying the message forward.”

President Proenza concluded his remarks by emphasizing that we begin the new academic year with enthusiasm and a wonderful crop of new students. He encouraged everyone to visit the new Student Union and the Rec Center to see just how thriving the facilities were. He said it spoke well of our future.

He offered to entertain questions, those he could answer. Senator Qammar cited a recent Plain Dealer article that discussed the topic of overlap within disciplines in higher education in the State of Ohio. The Senator addressed some of his viewpoints and opinions in that direction and some potential solutions he had offered. “One of the things that you posed as an example was that, in fact, perhaps one of the solutions to that overlap problem was that the housing of the polymer

science program at Case may move to someplace like Akron to be more differentiated in focus and then some of the engineering programs might move over to Case.” The Senator’s question was how he might suggest that the engineering faculty, of which she is a member, should respond to their students who wonder why their President posed such a potential possibility. The Senator also asked him why, based on past successes in Engineering, we did not provide a higher quality education for engineering at far less cost than Case.

The President thanked the Senator for raising the issue and responded, “I think the first advice that I would give you for what you should say to your students is: don’t believe what they read in the newspaper. I was misquoted.” He related that he had certainly talked with Jim Wagner about a collaboration between the schools. “At the time we did not have an Engineering Dean and what I *did* suggest was that maybe *they* could help orchestrate and manage our engineering programs with us and *we* might help them manage *their* polymer program, but at no point did I suggest that we, as the paper suggested, cede our engineering program and have it move to Case.”

Senator Qammar questioned the timeliness of the article which was published recently and yet the college has had an Engineering Dean for a few years. President Proenza replied that the interview took place three years ago. “I did write your Dean and a couple of your faculty have a note—my note to the reporter—and she has since apologized and asked if she could make it up. But since it would appear as a little correction which never would be seen, I’m happy to address it.”

The President commented that, “the ‘fourth estate’ continues to surprise me” and offered apologies to those who loved the ‘fourth estate.’ He then related an anecdote to help illustrate this. “Roughly in 1985 there was a major earthquake in Mexico City. I was, at that time, at another University, they knew I was originally from Mexico, so the reporters called me. ‘What do you know?’ It so happened that we had just installed a satellite receiver for my mother who was living with us, so we were actually watching live feeds from Mexico City. So I said to the reporter, ‘Well, I haven’t talked to anybody but we happen to have this thing and we’ve been watching the live feeds and from what I can tell, etc. etc.’ The next morning I was quoted, ‘Through a ham-radio operator, Dr. Proenza says his family is fine.’ See? The fourth estate gets it wrong nine times out of ten.”

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any other questions for President Proenza or the fourth estate. None were indicated, so he thanked the President for his comments.

**c. Remarks by the Provost** – The Provost offered her welcome to the Senate and commented that although she was not a Faculty Senator, she was almost always present at the meetings and so felt an affiliation with the proceedings that took place. She stated that the business of the Faculty Senate was important and that she was glad to be included as part of the conversation and shared thoughts, and to include the Senate “as we can, in many conversations.”

The Provost announced that later in the meeting, she would make a short presentation on the latest developments with the Balanced Scorecard and Academic Plan. “Many of you have been a part of that planning this summer and in the prior meetings that led to that, so I will wait for most of my report at that time.”

Provost Stroble used the interim time to introduce two new colleagues to the University of Akron, results of successful searches in the Library and the College of Arts and Sciences. “It’s the tradition of Faculty Senate to have a formal introduction to these new Deans and also to welcome them, so I am glad to introduce these two new individuals.” She first introduced Dean Cheryl Kern-Simirenko and gave a brief synopsis of her degrees and experience. Dean Kern-Simirenko holds four degrees: a Bachelor’s in Russian, from the University of Minnesota, a Bachelors in History from the University of Wisconsin, a Master’s in Russian History from Penn State, and a Master’s of Library Science from the University of Pittsburgh. Her prior positions included library roles at Purdue, University of Oregon at Eugene and Syracuse. The Provost added, “So we certainly bring to the Dean of University Libraries someone with great experience and a very solid liberal arts background. We’re glad to have her and welcome Dean Kern-Simirenko.” The Senate welcomed her with a round of applause.

Provost Stroble then introduced Ronald F. Levant as the new Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences as well as Professor in the Department of Psychology. Dean Levant’s degrees include a Bachelor’s degree in Psychology from the University of California – Berkeley, a doctorate in Clinical Psychology and Public Practice from Harvard, followed by an MBA in General Management from Boston University. His previous positions included: Dean and Professor at the Center for Psychological Studies at Nova South Eastern University; prior to that he served on the faculty at Boston, Rutgers, and Harvard; and as a clinician in solo, independent practice and a clinical supervisor in hospital settings. She reiterated that he was well-grounded in the liberal arts, in social sciences, was a very experienced administrator as well as faculty member. “We’re glad you’re here, Dean Levant.” The Senate welcomed him with a round of applause.

The Provost reserved further comments until the ‘New Business’ portion of the meeting, but offered to take questions, if that was appropriate. Senator Schantz asked about the new Interim Director for ITL and asked if there were plans for a national search for a permanent director. Provost Stroble responded that she had convened a search committee back in the Spring and had planned to begin a national search. However, within a short period of time, the AAHE (American Association of Higher Education) abruptly announced their plan to disband within three to six months. She went on to explain that this was the organization that had sponsored the University’s successful bid for Carnegie Cluster status, not only closely related to the legacy of ITL, but also its future.

She stated that there was some uncertainty about whether another organization would assume the Carnegie leadership work and how the University would sustain its role. The Provost felt that in light of the turmoil, it was unlikely that, nationally, people would want to throw their hats into the ring for searches because of the shake-up around AAHE. “So my strategy, really, was that when it’s not exactly clear what one should do, that what you need to do is take an approach that maintains and works on activity that keeps you in forward motion but doesn’t commit you to a direction on a permanent basis.” The Provost appointed David Baker, who most recently served as Interim Dean of Libraries, a full professor in the Department of Psychology, and also Director of the Psychology Archives. She related that an upcoming issue of *Perspectives from the Provost* would feature an article about ITL, where Dr. Baker would address his assessment of what ITL is positioned to do

this year, returning much of the activity and direction to key faculty/staff/contract professional kind of leadership and getting us back to what the WOW groups initially imagined that we would do. The Provost's opinion was that Dr. Baker would incorporate much of the work that Paulette Popovich and David McConnell did, which was exemplary.

She added that they recently made a purchase that would make possible the campus-wide use of the "clicker" technology. "We will continue the assessment work that Paulette Popovich developed. So those initiatives will continue this year." Provost Stroble added that we would see added focus on ways to advance our own scholarship of teaching and learning, be more visible in presentations, publications and provide faculty with data support related to innovation in the classroom, whether through technology, inquiry or strategy. She emphasized the need to identify ways to support faculty in gaining the data and "putting the experimental design behind that work so that it's quite publishable and presentable, not only to improve your own career but the prestige and the acclaim of this institution." Currently her strategy is to get ITL up and running this year "in order to build it and keep it moving in a positive direction that Tom Angelo first established for us and then David and Paulette." This would allow time to see how the AAHE situation would be resolved and what we would be best positioned to do in a successful search.

No questions were raised, so Chair Fenwick thanked the Provost for her comments.

**d. Well-being Committee Report** – Senator Erickson presented a sub-committee report from the Well-being Committee (**Appendix C**). She explained that the written report did not contain recommendations because the Well-being Committee had yet to meet and planned to do so the following Tuesday. However, this presentation covered the issues that would be discussed at the September 15 special meeting of the Senate.

She offered some background information about the healthcare provider selection process as it related to the Well-being Committee's involvement. For many years, the Well-being Committee had developed recommendations for insurance plans for the University of Akron. Each time they have done this, there have been issues raised dealing with escalating healthcare costs, necessitating the Committee's involvement to review and suggest alternate proposals. "In addition, over the past five years we've been involved with the process of developing details of the call for bids—that's the RFP—by vendors and recommending those vendors. These two aspects of what we do have been tied together in that sort of process."

Senator Erickson explained that the University has two-year healthcare contracts, with the present one set to expire in December [2005]. For each new contract, an RFP is developed in early spring with all the alternatives on which bids are sought. That proposal includes the different cuts—alternate pieces—that can be built into the health plan. Each time major changes in healthcare have been sought, the Well-being Committee has worked to develop a recommendation for the changes and brought the proposals to the Senate for ratification so they would be included in the RFP.

Senator Erickson related that this process had been followed two years ago, at which time the Senate passed a resolution on the level and form of premiums. "We had been asked to look at premiums and came up with the format that represented what we thought was fair in those terms."

The Senator further explained that after the bids have gone out—with alternatives worked out—then the RFP is sent out, vendors bid and recommendations are developed over the summer, based on those bids. “In other words, the Health Vendor Review Committee looks at the bids and suggests who the vendors should be so that the Board can vote on the insurance contract by October in time for the enrollment period that takes place in November.”

Senator Erickson related that this year, the Health Vendor Review Committee, which consists of representatives from HR, Purchasing, NEOUCOM, and three members of Well-being—a sub-committee from Well-being—developed the RFP in early spring. At that time, no requests to consider major changes had been made to Well-being by the Administration or anyone else, and the RFP went out with essentially the same guidelines as in the past two years. “We knew that AAUP was suggesting changes for the faculty bargaining unit and that they’d be included in the RFP, that’s our other alternatives but that was a separate issue. Our job was to provide input from Well-being as outlined in the University Rules under which we still exist and in which we represent the whole University community as elected representatives.” Senator Erickson related that in this case, the proposal especially reflected the interests of the non-bargaining unit majority of employees (approximately 1200) more so than the 600 in the bargaining unit.

Senator Erickson reported that, after the bids were received, the Health Vendor Review Committee met June 10 to review the materials. Steve Lickovich, the health insurance consultant for the University presented a summary of the bid information which also included the estimated costs coming in from the bids. At the end of that meeting, the committee asked the Administration and the Board to comment on a technical issue relating to methods of insurance. “I don’t want to go into that at this point, but we agreed that was the way to go.” The committee expected a reply within a few weeks and a return to the discussion and review of vendors, yet no meetings were scheduled. We kept on asking and were told that nothing was happening. Like everyone else we then got an email from Vice President Ray referring to the problems of having Summa in the PPO.

A meeting was finally called for Monday, August 29. “The three of us from Well-being expected to return to consideration of vendors, but instead we had a complete surprise.” At the August 29 meeting, Mr. Sid Foster announced a counterproposal that the University Administration had on the bargaining table with the faculty, one which made major changes in the healthcare insurance that we now have. The University’s proposal would substantially raise the aggregate employee health contributions; those non-bargaining unit employees would have received this information from Vice President Ray in an email; we were given the information at that meeting. Their proposal would raise the aggregate employee healthcare contributions from eight to twenty percent of the total healthcare cost. It involved contributions for all employees: income-based contributions for employee coverage, significantly higher deductibles and co-pays; spouses, children, and family coverage would require an additional flat fee ranging from \$1,000 to \$1,800, depending upon the type of coverage, which is, of course, higher for employees with families. Those with income higher than \$220,000 could conceivably be spending ten percent or more of their income on healthcare. A one-and-a-half percent pay-raise was suggested as a means to offset this higher burden on everyone. In his memo, Mr. Ray said they were interested in our input and response to their proposal.



The members of the sub-committee had serious concerns with the Administration's proposal. Apart from the details of the proposal itself, what they were concerned about was the *process* and the *timing* in that the proposal was a total change in the *process* by which healthcare insurance plans had been developed at the University. For years, recommendations had been developed by the Well-being Committee, gone through the Senate, and been accepted with minor changes by the Administration. Faced with problems of cost increases, Well-being developed a premium system as part of the shared leadership structure of the University. "There's been no negotiated change in the method of developing healthcare proposals, so it seems to us—that's all we can say at this stage—that there's been a major breach of trust at this stage with special relevance to the non-bargaining unit. The Administration's request now for input is not an adequate inclusion of Well-being in the process; the timing of their proposal is such that there's no time to do any real analysis of alternatives." Senator Erickson related that two years ago, Well-being spent months working with our constituencies to work out what was fair.

Regarding the current situation, she commented that, "if they had wanted real feedback, they would have made their proposal to Well-being before the alternatives were bid and the RFPs went out earlier in the year." Because our health insurance contracts expire at the end of the year and the new proposal must be voted on [by the Board of Trustees] in October, there were only two or three weeks to respond to this new development. At that point, Well-being had no recommendation to bring to the Senate from the Well-being Committee because Well-being had not yet had a chance to meet. That meeting was planned for Tuesday, September 6, at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room, later relocated to Carroll Hall 321. All were welcomed to attend.

"We've asked the Executive Committee of the Senate to schedule a special meeting of the Senate to discuss this issue on Thursday, September 15. Of course, that will give us time to collect the information to get feedback. As the President was saying earlier, I think we all want to work collaboratively on these issues. We thought in this particular case that it was so, but we hope that what is involved here is *not* a breakdown of the process, because we would consider that a very serious kind of issue." This concluded the report from Well-being.

Chair Fenwick asked if there were questions for Senator Erickson, and added that more details would be forthcoming from the Senate. He commented that, "we appreciate the opportunity to provide input, as Vice President Ray mentioned in the memo that he sent the staff and contract professionals. So you will be hearing more about this in the next two weeks."

## **VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**a. Academic Policies Committee** – Associate Provost Stokes brought forward a couple of motions from the APC, as discussed at the May Senate meeting. There were two proposed policy changes related to student success (**Appendix D**). The first one:

*Students who fail to complete their General Education English, Mathematics, and Oral Communication requirements during the first 48 credit/load hours attempted (including withdrawals) at the University of Akron, shall have their registration restricted.*

During the discussion in May, an amendment had been put forward from the floor (from Senator Sugarman and seconded by Senator Gerlach) to add the language (after “shall have their registration restricted”) “until they see their advisor.” The majority of the Senate body voted in favor of the amendment to add the phrase to the original text. (There was one opposing vote.) After further discussion, the body voted unanimously to approve the amended Policy 1, the final version read:

***Students who fail to complete their General Education English, Mathematics, and Oral Communication requirements during the first 48 credit/load hours attempted (including withdrawals) at the University of Akron, shall have their registration restricted until they see their advisor.***

Associate Provost Stokes then presented the second policy:

***Students who are not accepted by a degree-granting college by the time they have 48 credits completed, shall have their registration restricted.***

She suggested that, in view of the passage of the most recent amendment to Policy 1, the phrase “until they see their advisor” be added to avoid having to amend it later on. Hearing no discussion, the Senate body voted to approve the motion as amended; the motion passed unanimously. The final text follows:

***Students who are not accepted by a degree-granting college by the time they have 48 credits completed, shall have their registration restricted until they see their Advisor.***

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS:**

**a. Executive Committee Elections** – The Chair moved on to the first order of New Business, election of three members to the Executive Committee. Senator Lenavitt nominated Robert Huff from the College of Fine and Applied Arts. Senator Huff accepted the nomination; there were no other nominations and the body voted unanimously to approve his election.

Senator Gerlach asked for the names of the current members of the committee. Besides Chair Fenwick, Vice Chair Erickson and Secretary Konet, they are:

- Senator Tim Lillie, now serving the second of a two-year term
- Senator Dick Steiner, who just finished a one-year term
- Senator Jeff Schantz, who just completed a one-year term
- Senator John Hebert, whose Senate term had ended

The Chair added that Senator Schantz has chosen not to run again but that Senator Steiner had expressed a willingness to continue.

With that, Senator Gerlach nominated Senator Steiner, from the College of Arts and Sciences. There were no other nominations for that seat and the body voted unanimously to approve his election.

Senator Moritz nominated Senator William Rich (School of Law) and he accepted. Senator Gerlach nominated former-Senator David Witt; however, he was no longer serving on the Senate. Instead Senator Gerlach nominated Senator Bill Lyons, who declined. Senator Erickson nominated Senator Russ Davis, who declined. No other nominations forthcoming, so the Chair called for a vote. The Senate unanimously approved Senator Rich to serve on the Executive Committee.

Chair Fenwick welcomed the Senators as members of the Senate Executive Committee.

**b. Change of Nomenclature for Honors College** – The next motion on the Agenda regarded a recommended change in the nomenclature for the Honor’s College which had been presented by Senator Gerlach at the September meeting of the Faculty Senate (**Appendix E**). Senator Gerlach commented that, “As the mover, I will only say this. I gave you all the rationale in a very short statement. I thought it would raise a hornet’s nest and it has. It appears that the administrators involved are mightily opposed to being called ‘Master.’ They would rather be ‘Dean’ and possibly ‘Director.’ All I can say for directors, the title strikes me as prosaic, pedestrian, undistinguished. Since this College is a distinctive college, I thought simply that the term ‘Master’ would also be distinctive and surely not so confusing that no one could explain the difference or the non-difference between Masters and Deans. However, we’ve got the argument of the heads of that College, as they presently exist, so you can consider it and I don’t intend to drag the issue out. I simply wanted to make a proposal and let the Senate vote it up or down.”

The Chair invited Dean Dale Mugler to address the Senate on the issue; there was no objection. Dean Mugler thanked the Senate for a chance to address the issue with respect to Senator Gerlach’s intentions. He explained that one of the main parts of his position was recruiting and mentioned two such events, Scholarship Friday and Scholarship Saturday. He also mentioned that he and Dr. Katz spend a lot of time out in high schools at college fairs recruiting. “It turns out our students—the students we recruit—just aren’t familiar with Oxford and Yale and the procedures that go on there. When we tell them that we are a dean of something, they understand what that means and it helps us. It helps us recruit. If we tell them we’re a ‘Master,’ they either have no idea what that means or it has negative connotations. For African-Americans that we’re trying to recruit directly it’s offensive to them. We’re trying to recruit women, as well, and we don’t think ‘Master’ is respectful either. So we respectfully ask you to read the things we have out on the table and vote against this.”

Chair Fenwick thanked Dr. Mugler for his comments and asked if there was any further discussion on the issue. None was indicated, so he called for a vote on the motion to change the nomenclature from ‘Dean’ to ‘Master.’ A few of the Senators voted in favor of the motion; the majority voted in opposition to the motion. The motion did not pass.

**c. Presentation of the Academic Plan and Balanced Scorecard** – After one final check on the technology, Provost Stroble began her presentation. She encouraged everyone to pick up a note-taking guide that had been provided to follow along the PowerPoint presentation, then stated that she thought that by the following morning, the entire PowerPoint presentation as well as a draft of the Plan would be available on the website. “We’ll send out an email note so that you’ll know when it’s actually up there. Similar to the previous drafts, we’ll provide a web-based survey where we will ask for some specific feedback on a number of topics—I’ll try to highlight those as I go through the PowerPoint slides—and gather that feedback.” The Provost said that the nice thing about doing a web-based survey was that there was no limit to participation and it provided a quick way to capture the responses without the need for transcription, allowing for a fast turn-around as the revision process continued.

As previously reported to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, there was still work to be done. “When you read the latest draft, you’re going to recognize that different groups of people wrote different parts or at least revised different parts, because sometimes there are different voices, different tenses.” The Provost added that it did not make sense to do all of that “clean-up” editing before it was loaded on the website prior to the last round of feedback. She thought it important that everyone see the work that was done over the summer. In addition, after they have received substantive feedback, including further revisions, “someone will come in at the end of the day and make it coherent as a document and do that final edit.

“Alright we’re going to pair two topics and do just a quick overview: Academic Plan and Balanced Scorecard, two topics that have been going on for some time.” She utilized two colors—red and blue—in the presentation to give everyone a sense of how long they had worked on this. “Balanced Scorecard predates Academic Plan as a topic, although I really see Academic Plan to some degree as the ‘child’ of Charting the Course and taking that planning process on to give it much tighter focus and more of a focus on what it means for us academically.”

**Text from the Provost’s PowerPoint presentation (see Appendix F for printed version of slides referenced below:**

This is a rough draft version of what we’ve been doing to have this be a shared process with as many opportunities for as much input as people chose to give us.

Here’s what we did prior to Summer 2005 (see slide #2). This gives you what actually happened in summer (see slide #3)—lots of work and many people in this room were engaged in that work—and I thank you—both on Balanced Scorecard and trying to get it to the finished product in terms of: what are the institutional indicators that we can all agree to measure about ourselves and the design principles of the Academic Plan. How can we get it in good enough shape that we are ready by the beginning of Fall semester to share the draft with everyone?

This is who worked on the design principles of the Academic Plan (see slide #4) and if you remember a version I shared with you last winter and different versions we had on the website, we’ve had different labels for these principles, we’ve had different numbers of principles; we went

from a smaller number up to a larger number, then collapsed them back. Just as a reminder, these principles grew from several places: the 1998 Master Academic Plan that had been used on this campus and then updates to that. What had the colleges done about the 1998 Plan? What had they accomplished? What did they still see as unfinished work? What did they see as new work? What did the Deans and VPs say about the various academic units and the administrative units, operations and services? What came out of all those planning forms? How do we marry access and excellence in this institution? What is our legacy and how do we carry that forward into the future? These terms were a way of giving some common, generalized nomenclature to what we were saying about ourselves and how we designed our work and what we think makes us different.

There were also groups working on the Balanced Scorecard indicators (see slide #5). These categories of indicators were established a couple of years ago. The difficulty we had was that as we kept rolling these things out to more and more work groups, not only institutionally but in VP units, in offices, in departments and programs, we were getting such a long laundry list of things that we thought we ought to measure, that we really had lost any focus and we weren't going to be able to say to ourselves or to anybody else, "yes, we are on track with student success," "no, we need to do more work in communication." We had too many measures. When Sabrina Andrews, our new Institutional Research Director, came onboard a year ago, she looked at some of the things that we said we wanted to measure and she said that, from an IR standpoint, we needed crisper definitions of what it is we're measuring and we've got to be sure that we actually have the data to measure these. So she worked with these groups on figuring out what would be a crisper, more articulated list.

Slide #6 gives you a sense of the people that just worked this summer (see slide #6). It doesn't track back to all the people who gave us feedback, to all the people who participated in forums, this is just the summer volunteers who answered the call for: "we need some good focused work this summer, can you give us a little time?" Faculty, contract professionals, staff, students, colleges were represented, as were administrative units. The little footnote at the bottom reminds you that last year, when reps from the Provost's office went around unit-to-unit, to get feedback about the Academic Plan as it was being drafted, we touched base with lots of groups. So, it's certainly the case that we've harvested these concepts of the design principles from what people were saying about themselves at the ground level and then tried to bring them up to a level of higher language and generality. Now the task is to take it back to the people from whom we think we harvested those concepts and say, "how real is this?" and "how can we describe your work in a way that helps to give it focus and importance?"

So here is what we asked the design principle support groups to do (see slide #7). Give us good working definitions. What do we mean by innovation? What do we mean by assessment or by any of those other principles? How does that concept relate to the University mission? What does it mean here? How does it define, not only what we can become but what we are now with what we want to become in the future?

Then the Scorecard workgroups (see slide #8) looked at all those objectives and measures that people had generated over the years and they started to ask, "how does it line up with the Academic

Plan design principles?” They did a lot of revisions, additions and many deletions. Then they began to develop those definitions and ask where the data sources are and is there any benchmark data that helps us know how we are doing relative to other people that we might care about?

Here is how these groups reported that they were feeling during the summer as they worked. (see slide #9) There certainly was healthy argument and debate during this whole process and that’s what it takes to get to a good product.

They persevered through that and they want us to know—and I do acknowledge it—there was a lot of work. (see slide #10) Over 75 people met for almost 60 scheduled times. There were also three times with just with Scorecard chairs and another three meetings for the Academic Plan. On August 17 we brought all the groups together. They are quick to point out to us that the schedule doesn’t include all the times they met one-on-one or in small groups to do the work that was necessary to prep for the scheduled workgroups. So it’s a huge debt of gratitude that we owe these people for the time they put in.

Here’s what the Design Principles group gave us (see slide #11) in a snapshot. Tomorrow morning you’ll see their whole description on the website. When they talked about leadership they said they saw it happening at several levels: an institutional level, an individual level, and at a student leadership development level. There needs to be a commitment to develop leadership at all those levels. The Engagement group talked about the importance of experiential learning, how we need to have both internal and external collaborations and partnerships, and how a global presence, an international flavor to everything we do, is part of what we need to do in our engagement work. In innovation we talked about entrepreneurship, the generation of creative ideas and solutions to all the work we do and a general willingness to be open to change. The assessment group talked about assessment for a couple of reasons, of course from a compliance viewpoint, but not that alone and not that primarily. Moving onto what good does assessment do from a continuous quality-improvement aspect? How does it express our shared values and how does it help align everything we do? Through inclusive excellence and a real focus on equity of outcomes, improvement of educational quality by being more inclusive and creating a campus inclusion environment that makes it possible for all of us to feel like we have a home here and a place to be successful.

The Scorecard group (see slide #12), I won’t try to give you a snapshot of what they came up with because it’s really more complex. I’ll give you the link to the URL in the email note tomorrow, but they came down to a much smaller set of numbers than was once present.

Here is what that link is going to send you to (see slide #13), a list out to the left—in that left hand column of the big objects—what we’d be trying to accomplish or measure, what the ideas of the measures are, what some suggestions are for the metrics, what we would actually keep track of, and then a stab at what our baseline data tells us, what the benchmark data might tell us, and what percentage of change we might expect. This is going to require some feedback from you before we’ll know whether you think that this makes sense to you and today is not enough time to do it, so I’m really going to refer you to the email note where you’ll get to look at this at length.

Clearly, we needed to make sure that these two weren't going on such parallel paths that they didn't intersect at some point (see slide #14). So, at our last meeting on August 17, and again you're going to need to look at this in more detail if you choose to, what we really wanted to do was to say, "the Design Principle workgroups and the Balanced Scorecard workgroups put these two categories of concepts together, let's see if we have enough area of overlap to believe that we're talking about the same things." These numbers indicate (see slide #15) how many groups actually weighed in to say, "yes, it seems that what we say we're measuring and what we think is a design principle is a suitable intersection and we've covered bases." In a few places we've got zeroes; we know that we need to go back and look at those.

Well, next steps (see slide #16), we know we need to get this out for feedback. Simply, what I need in your feedback as you go on the website is: does this look to be on the right track? Know that we are going to continue this year to figure out how this actually gets implemented. What we need to know now is, if we're not on the right track, what do we need to rethink that would help us get it on the right track? We'll keep making revisions and we want to present this campus-wide on September 27; we're also going to find other groups that we need to make presentations to between now and the 27th. Then, the implementation part of this is really where I'm going to need your feedback. As I met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee last week, they said, "what happens next with this" and "we need you to flesh this out a little bit more so we can react to that and tell you whether we think the ideas you are thinking about from an implementation standpoint are even sensible." So I know I need to do that and I am in the process, but I'm not finished yet.

But what I want to do is show you a graphic (see slide #17) that we've started to develop that's really based on a graphic I saw this summer from the University of Calgary. I think the graphic helps to show what I think the implementation needs to look like, better than narrative does. I brought a few copies of this [Calgary's graphic] so if you're really dying to see what the University of Calgary version looks like, I brought a about 20 copies. You certainly are free to have one; I just didn't think that making multiple copies of this in color was a good use of university resources. When I went to a seminar at Harvard for two weeks this summer, we were each put into small groups to share case studies. One of the fellows in our group was a VP from the University of Calgary. He said, "what I brought to share with you is the process by which our institution developed an academic plan last year." I felt like this was going to be a great learning opportunity and surely it was, because he didn't give me any narrative; he just gave me a graphic. He said this is the shorthand that says what our academic plan is. So here's the way they depicted what their plan was about. We did a variation on theirs; we put the mission statement down at the bottom. That's at least the most recent statement that we've been using university-wide about what our strategic vision is and what we think we're about.

Then, I realized sometime mid-summer that calling this thing "academic plan" really wasn't very descriptive. As I met with the chairs and the deans earlier this week, I said it's kind of like calling "dog," "dog" or "book," "book." I mean it's what it is, but it's not what you ought to call it. So I thought we needed a name for this thing. Somebody suggested this "Access & Excellence" this week. Again, feel free to take potshots at this name on the website; it's just a placeholder and if you think that's not a very good name, please feel free to suggest others. We tried "Access & Excellence: Our Plan for Student Success" just as a way to put something out there.

Then you see the design principles up above that. That is really the guts of the Academic Plan that you will see on the website that the design principle groups drafted for us this summer: Innovation, Leadership, Assessment, Engagement, and Inclusive Excellence.

Then four big categories. If you remember from *Charting the Course*, it established that we had four ‘clusters of excellence’ across all the University. Rather than calling our ‘clusters of excellence’ by college or by VP unit, it instead said, “what is it that seemed to be the outcomes, or the themes or the broad strokes of what we’re accomplishing academically across those various units?” So this borrows from an older language that we’ve been using on the campus for planning: Discovery and Innovation, Cultural Enrichment, Community Well Being, and Economic Development.

The implementation phase of Academic Plan needs to respond to what I will say hands down was the most prevalent question in all the forums, in all the feedback we got on the website last year and that was the “million-dollar question”: where’s the list of which programs are priorities at the University of Akron; isn’t that what an academic plan should be? Most academic plans are that, but they have to have a process for getting to that. So the process we’ve been using for this academic planning has not been to start out with trying to create the list, because if you start out with trying to create the list you wind up creating a list based on anecdotal stuff—who has prestige or maybe power or influence in an institution; who has great PR; who has maybe won an award recently. So it’s not the conceptual ‘ground view’ that I think that we really tried to exhibit in this planning process and that’s why linking it with Balanced Scorecard makes so much sense. It really needs to be grounded in reality not just sort of what’s getting good play at the moment.

So the real principle here is to figure out what the bullet points are that go underneath each of those headings—and that’s really how the Calgary plan works. Calgary has anywhere between six to seven different programs that they list underneath each one of these headings. Their headings are not the same as ours but they are very similar. What we need to figure out this year is how do we have a nomination, a review process, that helps us figure out what programs/services/operations (but primarily programs) do we have that we think best honor those design principles, exemplify the principles, and contribute to one of these four clusters. That’s the part that I know we have to figure out next, how we actually take this and get ourselves to that stage of implementation. So the first strategy is asking questions on the web-based survey: “What would you suggest the process ought to be? What makes sense? Who ought to get to nominated? Who ought to get to review the list and what should they review?” How would we come up with a shorter list of what we think really gets the priority these days: what do we feature, what do we highlight, and what do we strengthen? That’s really what we need to do next. So you have the opportunity to tell me what your best thinking is about that.

The other thing that I’m up to is that I’m doing a little bit of research at institutions that already have gotten to their lists, looking at their websites and also contacting them and saying, “What was your process? How did you do that?” As I know more about that, I’ll share that on the website as well and you can tell me whether you think any of the processes other people have used made sense. But it’s certainly my intent that we will go back to the place where these principles were formed, to say to those who know best, what do we do well, what serves the students well, what exemplifies these principles. If you had to decide in your college, in your department, in your program, what you were going to focus on most, what would it be?



It is not my desire that this list get created in the Provost's Office, so I want to be very clear about that. I think this has to be widely participative and based on these principles and our good data. That's the end of my overview other than to say that I hope you will take me up on my invitation of logging on, reading what's there and giving the feedback that I need to build the next part of the process to make it work well. Thank you.

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any questions for the Provost related to her presentation. Senator Gehani remarked that every time he had heard of the Scorecard discussion, he wondered how it would translate in terms of measuring the performance of academic units or if it would come all the way down to measuring the performance of individuals? The Provost responded that she did not believe it was designed to measure individuals. *(At that point, she asked Sabrina Andrews if she thought it was designed to measure the performance of individuals. Ms. Andrews replied, "No.")* The Provost added that they had other processes to measure the performance of individuals. Senator Gehani then asked if it went all the way to measuring priorities and performance of the academic units. Provost Stroble replied, "...and administrative units, yes. Not just academic units; that's important for you to know."

Senator Stachowiak asked if the evaluations of employees were based on the Scorecard. He expressed the belief that for the last review process, they were. The Provost answered that there were overlaps in the concepts and that he was "absolutely right that the language of the Scorecard is referenced in the reviews that are used for staff and contract professionals. I would say that faculty, based on the RTP process, are not specifically linked to Balanced Scorecard, so there are variations." The Senator continued, "In administrative units, though, it is." The Provost confirmed that those personnel review forms very explicitly linked to Balanced Scorecard." Associate Provost Stokes questioned whether they were linked to Charting the Course; Provost Stroble replied that they link to Charting the Course and also have Balanced Scorecard language.

Senator Lyons asked the Provost if she could define more specifically the 'diversity of representation' slide (**ref. slide #6**). "You had faculty, contract professionals, staff, and students. If you break down to administrators with faculty status, and faculty that primarily do research and teaching, what would those numbers look like?" The Provost replied that, off the top of her head, she had no idea so would need to go back and crunch the data. Senator Lyons asked her if she would be willing to include that breakdown in whatever information she planned to send out to the campus. She replied, "Of course."

Since there were no other questions, Chair Fenwick thanked her. He then pointed out a correction to the Agenda. "Let me point out that what I had put under the 'Good of the Order' really belongs under 'New Business.' Senator Gerlach's expertise at parliamentarianism helps me in that sense."

With that observation he recommended a motion to recognize Dr. William Harpine for his selfless service last year in serving as the Senate Parliamentarian. "He was not a senator and served on his own free time to be a part of this body; it was very necessary and helpful to us." Senator Gerlach so moved. The Chair asked that all in favor of the Senate sending Dr. Harpine a certificate recognizing his contribution to please say, 'aye.' The body responded unanimously in favor of doing this.

Chair Fenwick asked that the Senate recognize two other colleagues, from the Arts and Sciences Dean's office, also no longer here at the University of Akron. He added that "both had served this University and the College of Arts and Sciences very well during my career. I am going to miss them personally. Dean Levant will have big shoes to fill."

The Chair first asked for a motion to recognize Dean Roger Creel. Senator Erickson so moved; the motion was seconded by Senator Mann. The motion to recognize the service of Dean Creel to the University and the College of Arts and Sciences passed unanimously.

Finally, the Chair asked for a motion to recognize Associate Dean Devinder Malhotra for his service. Senator Lillie so moved; Senator Gerlach seconded the motion. Senator Gerlach added that, in the case of Dr. Malhotra, the Senate should also thank him for once having served this body. Chair Fenwick stated that we would recognize that as well. Senator Lillie mentioned that Dr. Malhotra was Chair of the Senate as well. Chair Fenwick thanked the Senator for pointing this out. The final motion was to recognize Devinder Malhotra for his service to the University, as Chair of the Faculty Senate, and as Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The motion passed unanimously. The Chair thanked the Senate.

#### **Senate Resolutions for September 1, 2005 meeting**

- **Approved resolution thanking Mr. William Harpine for his selfless service as Parliamentarian for the Faculty Senate.**
- **Approved resolution thanking Dr. Roger Creel for his years of dedicated service as Dean of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences.**
- **Approved resolution thanking Dr. Devinder Malhotra for his years of dedicated service as Associate Dean of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and for his years of leadership as Chair of the Faculty Senate.**

Senator Gerlach addressed the Senate regarding the dismal attendance records of the Senate during the last academic year. "Having read the May *Chronicle* and noting attendance records on pages 29 and 30, I couldn't help but be appalled by how many elected senators failed to attend meetings and did so without even excuse. I count at least ten people there that had anywhere from five to nine unexcused absences. I think it is time for the Senate to crack down." He addressed this with Bylaw (7) (E) (5) on Membership which states:

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

Senator Gerlach added that the difficulty with this situation was that there was no way to be entirely certain of whether these persons were *unable*, for one reason or another, to attend. “I think the way to go about this is to propose a slight amendment to the Bylaw and I should like to do that with a view that, of course, if it is seconded it could be laid over and put on the Agenda properly for discussion at the next meeting.” The amendment he proposed was to add, after the words “unable to discharge the duties of the office,” the following text:

***“or should a member have four or more unexcused absences, the Senate may declare that seat vacant.”***

Yet even with this added language, the Senator felt this still allowed a good deal of leeway for a Senator to have many absences, provided they were *excused*. He added, “I thought it was scandalous that one of our colleagues had nine unexcused absences, didn’t even bother to say, ‘I can’t come’ or ‘I won’t come,’ but he told me personally that, no, he wouldn’t come until such a time that a contract was negotiated between the faculty and the Administration. I told him, ‘I’m very sympathetic with your viewpoint about collective bargaining, but that’s no excuse for neglecting your duties in the Senate. You were elected to come here, sit and deliberate, now do it or resign.’ Hence, my motion.”

Chair Fenwick clarified that this was a motion to change the Bylaws, a motion that would have to be held over until the next Senate meeting for a vote. Senator Gandee seconded the motion.

The Chair explained to Senator Gerlach that this was, in fact, one of the points of information that the Executive Committee had considered as requiring a change. “We thought about a proposal that was even more strict.”

Senator Gerlach commented that, “Well, Mr. Chairman, we set the wheels in motion and there’s nothing to stop the Executive Committee from coming with a contrary-proposal or a counter-amendment or whatever. So, let them get busy.”

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any other new business to come before the body. (*None was indicated.*) He then asked if there was anything for the Good of the Order (*again none was indicated.*)

The Chair reminded the Senators that we would meet again in two weeks for the special meeting devoted to the issue of healthcare proposals and the role of the Well-being Committee in developing those proposals. He indicated that more information would be forthcoming before that meeting.

He again welcomed everyone to the Senate and thanked everyone for their attendance.

Senator Lyons made a motion to adjourn. Senator Mann seconded it. The body responded unanimously to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

**Transcript prepared by Linda Bussey**

**APPENDICES TO MINUTES**  
**OF**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2005**

**APPENDIX A**

Akron, Ohio, August 31, 2005 – The University of Akron is offering admissions assistance to areas students who had planned to attend Gulf Coast universities that are now closed due to Hurricane Katrina.

“Many students who were looking forward to attending schools in Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi may now find their college careers on hold,” says UA President Luis M. Proenza. “We have already enrolled a number of students who are concerned about a delay in their academic progress at their home institutions. To assist affected students, The University of Akron is waiving any late admission and registration fees, locating housing options and providing assistance for a vareity of concerns.

“In addition, current University students with ties to the affected areas will be offered counseling and other services,” he adds. “And our emergency management faculty and students are making plants to go to the affected areas to assist in the relief efforts.”

Students or parents seeking admission assistance at The University of Akron can call 330-972-7077.

KT

083105–

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Executive Committee Report September 1, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

The Executive Committee met ten times as a group over the course of the summer and four times with the President and Provost. The meetings were conducted in order to certify the elections of new senators, complete committee assignments, propose new initiatives for the coming year and to discuss many other topics of interest.

In particular, there were frequent discussions regarding the condition of the state budge as well the university's budget. Thus far, the university budget appears to be flat.

Enrollment has increased in a number of areas including the Honors College, Direct Admits, Nursing, and Wayne. Overall headcount and credit hours were down slightly, but final figures will not be available for several weeks. One of our conversations focused on issues of enrollment management, retention issues and the recommendations included in the Henderson report.

The Provost shared updates regularly regarding various search processes and also presented an overview of the Academic Plan, stating that meetings had been conducted over the summer in order to continue developing the plan. However, there is still more work to be done.

In view of some concerns about theft and safety on campus, the committee requested more information regarding the university's Visitor Policy. A committee, convened by the Provost, collected existing policies and is now in the process of drafting a recommendation for a new policy.

Several new initiatives were also proposed by the committee, some of which will be implemented during this academic year. The first proposal is the implementation of an Orientation Program for new senators. The program will provide an overview of Senate, its purpose, goals and accomplishments. There will also be an introduction to each of the senate committees, the purpose of each and encouragement to actively participate in a committee or two of one's choosing. Due to an unexpected development, however, the session originally scheduled for September 15 will be rescheduled for a later date.

In the spirit of communication and information sharing, a newsletter will also be launched this year. This newsletter will highlight the key points and action items completed during senate meetings and will be distributed immediately following the meeting. The hope is that all members of the university community will have a ready source of information and will have an opportunity to react and respond to the items.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Decision Making has also been hard at work developing possible shared governance structures that would include all constituents of the university campus. The key underlying principle to the proposals is that election of its representatives is critical. The committee is still working on the details and hopes to have a proposal to present to the senate late in the fall.

And most recently, the committee was informed of some proposed changes to the health care plan for 2006. At issue and of grave concern to the committee is the process being used to put forth these changes. Due to the late date of this announcement, the committee felt that the original time set aside for the orientation of new senators would be better spent conducting a special senate meeting to discuss the challenges to shared governance that seem to be embodied in the way the changes were proposed.

## APPENDIX C

### **REPORT FROM WELLBEING COMMITTEE TO SENATE, SEPTEMBER 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2005**

This report comes from a sub-committee of the Wellbeing Committee that has continued to meet over the summer as part of the Committee which works on the process of setting up the health insurance contract.

We had hoped to give a short description of our on-going activities, but instead we want to report matters causing us deep concern that we plan to discuss with the full Wellbeing Committee next Tuesday.

To understand our concerns requires a brief explanation of the historic role of Wellbeing in developing insurance plans for the university and of the process of setting up insurance contracts here. For many, many years Wellbeing has developed the recommendations for the insurance plans for the university. In addition over the past five years we have been involved in the process of developing the details of the call for bids (RFP) by vendors and in recommending those vendors.

These two tasks tie together through the time line for the process setting up the health insurance contract. The university has two-year contracts for health insurance: the present one ends on December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2005. For the new contract to be in place for January 2006, the RFP is developed in early spring, with all the alternatives on which the bids are sought. When major changes in health insurance have been sought, the Wellbeing Committee has developed the recommendation for those changes and brought them to the Senate for ratification, so that they could be included in the RFP. We followed this process two years ago, when the Senate passed a resolution on level and form of premiums. Then the RFP goes out, vendors bid and recommendations based on those bids are developed over the summer, so that the Board can vote on the insurance contract by October, in time for enrollment in November.

This year the Committee (consisting of representatives from HR, Purchasing, NEOUCOM and three members of Wellbeing) developed the RFP in early spring. No request to consider major changes had been made to Wellbeing and the RFP went out with basically the plans we have had over the past two years. We know that AAUP were suggesting changes for the faculty bargaining unit and that they would be included in the RFP as other alternatives needing bids, but our job was to provide the input from Wellbeing, representing the whole university community and especially the non-bargaining unit majority of employees.

After the bids were in, the Committee met on June 10<sup>th</sup> to review the materials. Steve Likovich, health insurance consultant for the university, presented a summary of the bid information, which also included the estimated costs. At the end of that meeting, the Committee asked the administration and Board to comment on a technical issue relating to methods of insurance. We expected a reply within a few weeks, and a return to the discussion and interview of vendors, but no meetings were scheduled (we made queries every few weeks). Like everyone else, we then got an e-mail from the Vice President Ray referring to the problem of having Summa in the PPO. Finally a meeting was scheduled for this past Monday, August 29<sup>th</sup>. We expected to return to the consideration of vendors: but instead the three of us had a complete surprise.

Mr. Sid Foster announced that the counter proposal the University Administration had put on the bargaining table with the faculty for health care made major changes in the health care insurance that we have now. The University's proposal raises the aggregate employee health care contributions from 8% (current) to 20% of the university's total health care cost. Those of you not in the bargaining unit have received an e-mail from Mr. Roy Ray with its general outlines. It involves contributions for all employees: income based contributions for employee coverage, significantly higher deductibles and co-pays (up to double) for all, and spouse, child(ren) and/or family coverage at an additional flat fee ranging from \$1000 to \$1800 per year per employee depending upon vendor and level of coverage. It is highly regressive for employees with families: those with less than \$20,000 income could be spending 10% or more of their income on health care. A 11/2% pay increase is suggested to deal with the higher burden on everyone.

They say that they are interested in our input- our response to their proposal.

The members of the sub-committee have serious issues with the new administration proposal. Apart from the details of the proposal, it is the *process* and the *timing* that are major problems.

*Process*

Their proposal is a total change in the process by which health care insurance plans have been developed at the university. For years, the recommendations on insurance plans have been developed by the Wellbeing Committee, gone to the Senate and have been accepted with minor changes by the administration. Faced with problems of cost increase, we developed the premium system that exists now. It is part of the shared leadership structure of the university. There has been no negotiated change in the method of developing health care proposals. It seems to us that there has been a major breach of trust by the administration with special relevance for the non-bargaining unit.

*Timing*

The administration's request now for input is not an adequate inclusion of Wellbeing in the process. The timing of their proposal is such that there is no time to do any real analysis of their alternatives. We spent months working with our constituencies two years ago to work out what was fair. If they had wanted real feedback, they would have made their proposal to Wellbeing before the alternatives for bid in the RFP's went out earlier in the year. Because our health insurance contracts run out at the end of the year, a new proposal has been voted on by the Board in October. We have two or three weeks to respond, with no guarantee that our response will have any meaning.

At this point, we have no recommendation to bring to the Senate from the Wellbeing Committee, because Wellbeing has not had the chance to meet yet. The meeting will be Tuesday, September 6<sup>th</sup> at 3:00pm in the Senate Conference Room. Anyone is welcome to attend. We have asked the Executive Committee of the Senate to schedule a special meeting to discuss this issue on Thursday, September 15<sup>th</sup>. The Wellbeing Committee will be bringing a recommendation to that meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Erickson Chair Wellbeing  
Rosemary Cannon, Member of Wellbeing Sub-Committee  
Russ Davis, Member of Wellbeing Sub-Committee

*Corrected document for distribution 9-09-2005.*



**APPENDIX D****Academic Policies Committee**  
**Student Success Policies****Motion approved at September 1, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting****Motion:**

To better serve our undergraduate first year students by helping them acquire the necessary competencies and to focus their studies so they can progress toward their degree, Academic Policy Committee recommends that the following two student success policies be established.

**Rationale:**

A few years ago the Academic Policies Committee considered a number of student success proposals; they forwarded on to Senate a proposal that required students to complete any developmental courses within the first 32 credit hours attempted. This policy was subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees. It helps set milestones for students; they must take care of any deficiencies during the first year so that they have the skills to succeed. These proposed policies also set milestones within the students' college career, to help them acquire the necessary competencies and to focus their studies so that they can make progress toward their degree. More detail and operational information is provided in the attached document from the First Year Experience Task Force.

**Policy 1.** Students who fail to complete their General Education English, mathematics, and oral communication requirements during the first 48 credit/load hours attempted (including withdrawals) at The University of Akron, shall have their registration restricted **until they see their Advisor.**

**Rationale:**

The University has a "writing across the curriculum" initiative so it is important for students to know how to convey their thoughts in an organized way, to construct and substantiate an argument, as well as to write in the appropriate manner for their various class assignments. Knowledge about mathematics and statistics helps students understand equations, graphs, and other symbolic materials in courses throughout their curriculum. It is critical for students to be able to make organized presentations, whether individually or in groups, in their classes. If students have not mastered these skills during their first year at UA, they are at a disadvantage. Students' grades in courses in which professors assume that they possess these skills will not be as great as they could be if the students had met the requirements within the first year or so.

**Policy 2.** Students who are not accepted by a degree-granting college by the time they have 48 credits completed, shall have their registration restricted **until they see their Advisor.**

**Rationale:**

The longer the student takes to decide on a course of study, the longer it will take them to complete degree requirements should the department or college have a number of courses that need to be taken in sequence. In order for the student to complete his/her requirements in a timely way, and thus not become discouraged at the length of time it is taking to earn the degree, a student should make a determination within the first few terms.

In the event that a transfer student with 48 or more credit hours completed is not admitted to a degree-granting college, but rather is admitted to University College, the student should work with the adviser to develop a contract or plan to take the necessary prerequisites and earn the necessary GPA in order to be admitted into the degree-granting college offering his/her intended degree.

**APPENDIX E-1**

**Motion regarding change to nomenclature of Honor’s College  
for September 1, 2005 Senate Meeting  
(submitted by Dr. Don Gerlach)**

**Motion:**

Proposal to amend the Honors Collecte program: to change the titles of Dean and Associate or Assistant Dean to “Master” and “Associate” or “Assistant Master.”

**Rationale:**

The original honors program director was styled ‘Master’ by the Senate’s predecessor, The University Council. Since the Honors College is not a degree-granting college, but is a distinctive unit within the University (as compared to its Colleges’ heads), this nomenclature will reflect its peculiar status, and likewise be reflective of various titles such as are found in distinguished universities like Oxford and Cambridge which have Deans, Presidents, Wardens and Masters of different colleges.

**APPENDIX E-2**

**Title for administrators in Honors College/Programs at MAC schools**

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>TITLE</b>
Ball State	Dean, Honors College
Kent State	Dean, Honors College
Western Michigan	Dean, Honors College
Bowling Green	Director, Honors Program
Eastern Michigan	Director, Honors Program
Northern Illinois	Director, Honors Program
Buffalo	Director, Honors Program
Central Michigan	Director, Honors Program
University of Toledo	Director, Honors Program
Marshall	Director, Honors Program

A review of 39<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of National Collegiate Honors Council (2004) Participant List shows that all titles are either Director or Dean – mostly dependent upon whether the person administers a Program or a College. Associate Provost Stokes has a copy for perusal.

**APPENDIX E-3****Response to Amendment for  
Change of Honors Program Nomenclature  
for  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
September 1, 2005**

\*\*\*\*\*

With due respect to the intentions of Senator Gerlach and his support of the establishment of the Honors Program many years ago, we wish to vigorously support **keeping** the titles of Dean and Associate Dean for the leaders of the Honors College.

Some of the main positive results of the upgrade of the honors program to the Honors College are terms which provide our program with advantages in recruiting, and a move away from these titles would definitely diminish that advantage. Most prospective students are familiar with the title of Dean, and realize that the University has respect for the person with this title. Any supposed uniqueness of the "master" title does not help prospective students who are trying to discern the role of the person speaking with them about joining the Honors College at The University of Akron.

The advantages to being a Dean for recruiting efforts should be reason enough to not change this to a confusing title. However, another positive result of the title of Dean is the easy assimilation of this person into campus organizations that can affect academically-gifted students at the University of Akron by being a member of the Council of Deans.

A third advantage to the recent upgrade of the honors program to the Honors College is that of fundraising. Most donors with whom we interact have a close relation to UA, and many of them have attended UA as undergraduates. Although these are often very intelligent people, the title of "master" in relationship to a college would be simply confusing to them. However, these people know and understand the title of Dean, and this title gives us an advantage in speaking with prospective donors.

In direct response to the rationale provided in the amendment, a precedent for the title of Dean of a non-degree granting College currently exists on our campus. Additionally, although Oxford and Yale have multiple options for College heads, the most appropriate with the context of the UA academic community is clearly that of Dean.

Please do not remove the advantages that have accrued to the newly-formed Honors College, and keep the titles of Dean and Associate Dean.

Dale Mugler & Karyn Bobkoff Katz  
Honors College

**APPENDIX F**

**ACADEMIC PLAN/BALANCED SCORECARD OVERVIEW**

***(See special addendum with PowerPoint Presentation  
that replaces pp 37-39 in electronic copy)***

## **ACADEMIC PLAN/BALANCED SCORECARD OVERVIEW**

***(See special addendum with PowerPoint Presentation  
that replaces pp 37-39 in electronic copy)***

## **ACADEMIC PLAN/BALANCED SCORECARD OVERVIEW**

***(See special addendum with PowerPoint Presentation  
that replaces pp 37-39 in electronic copy)***

**APPENDIX G**

**AD HOC BUDGET COMMITTEE**

*(replaced PBC)*

**Rudy Fenwick\***  
Committee members TBA

**AD HOC PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

**Maryhelen Kreidler**  
Committee Members TBA

**AD HOC FACILITIES PLANNING**

*(replaces CFPC)*

Russell Davis\*  
Kenneth Dunning  
Elizabeth Erickson\*  
James Frampton  
Virginia Gunn  
Robert Huff\*  
Robert Jeantet\*  
Paul John\*  
Elizabeth Kennedy  
John Kline Jr.  
Katharine Kolcaba  
Rose Marie Konet\*  
Richard Londraville\*  
Craig Menzemer  
Charles Monroe  
Phyllis O'Connor  
Sue Rasor-Greenhalgh  
David Ritchey  
Neil Sapienza  
Mark Soucek  
**Harvey Sterns**  
Linda Sugarman\*  
Louis Trenta

**APPENDIX H**

**The University of Akron – Senate Committees 2005–2006  
(listed by term expiration date)**

**Executive Committee**

**Rudy Fenwick**  
Elizabeth Erickson  
Rose Marie Konet  
John Hebert  
Tim Lillie  
Jeff Schantz

**Academic Policies Committee**

**2006:**

James Slowiak

**2007:**

Amanda Aller  
Meredith Kalapich  
Brenda Marina  
Helen Qammar  
Peggy Richards

**2008:**

Leslie Gordon  
Gwen Jones  
Susan Kushner Benson  
William Lyons  
Charles Monroe  
Emeka Ofobike  
**Senior VP and Provost, ex-officio, non-voting member,  
or Nancy Stokes, designee, as Chair**

**Curriculum Review Committee**

**2006:**

Don Laconi  
Tim Lillie  
Charles Monroe  
Richard Steiner  
Evangeline Varonis  
Richard Yoder

**2007:**

Kathleen Clark  
Ali Hajjafar  
Craig Menzemer

**2008:**

Sabrina Andrews  
Stephen Brooks  
Enoch Damson  
Pamela Kelyka

**Senior VP and Provost, ex-officio, or Nancy Stokes, designee, as Chair  
Ex-officio member, University Registrar**

**Athletics Committee**

**2006:**

**Anne Jorgensen (Committee Chair)**  
John Sahl  
Dan Sheffer  
Loren Siebert

**2007:**

Diana Kingsbury  
Vicky Rostedt

**2008:**

Francis Broadway  
Irina Chernikova  
Cheryl Elman  
James Frampton  
Robert Gandee  
Marylu Gribschaw  
Kevin Klotz  
Alan Kornspan  
Anthony LaSalvia  
Tim Lillie

\* Indicates a Senate Member

**Bold indicates Chair of the committee**



**The University of Akron  
Senate Committees 2005–2006  
(listed by term expiration date)**

*(continued from page 41)*

**University Libraries Committee**

**2006:**

Diana Chlebek\*  
Kevin Concannon  
Pamela Garn-Nunn\*  
Robert Huff\*  
Diana Kingsbury (ASG President;  
term-ending 2006)\*  
Rose Marie Konet\*  
Janice Yoder

**2007:**

Linda Barrett\*  
Jeffry Schantz\*

**2008:**

Lindgren Chyi  
Virginia Gunn  
Hillary Nunn  
Larry Shubat  
**Eric Sotnak (Committee Chair)**  
Brooks Toliver\*

**Ex-Officio members, Dean of University  
Libraries, or designee**

**Mr. Paul Richert, Law Librarian**

**Ex-officio, non-voting member, Director  
Information Services**

**Reference Committee**

**2006:**

John Welch

**2007:**

Mike Cheung  
Paul John\*  
Linda Linc\*  
William Rich\*  
John Vollmer\*

**2008:**

Don Gerlach\*  
**Gwen Jones (Committee Chair)**  
Frederic Marich

**Ex-Officio member, Secretary – Faculty Senate**

**Ex-Officio, non-voting member, Mike**

**Sermersheim, Deputy General Counsel**

**Student Affairs Committee**

**2006:**

Carolyn Embree  
**Deborah Gwin (Committee Chair)**  
Sarah Kelly\*  
Jesse Mann (GSG President;  
term-ending 2006)\*  
LaVerne Yousey

**2007:**

John Vollmer\*

**2008:**

Colleen Curry  
Dianna Ford  
Sherry Gamble\*  
Nathan Ida\*  
Tim Vierheller\*

**Dr. Sharon Johnson, VP Student Affairs**

**Dr. Karla Mugler, Dean, University College**

**Computing & Communications Committee**

**2006:**

James Grover  
Robert Jeantet\*  
James Lenavitt\*  
Richard Londrville\*  
Wolfgang Pelz\*  
Richard Steiner\*  
Richard Stratton\*

**2007:**

Russ Davis\*  
Robert Jeantet\*  
Peggy McCann  
**Tim Norfolk (Committee Chair)\***

**2008:**

Roland Arter  
John Boal\*  
Frank Bove\*  
Lori Fielding  
Mary Hardin  
Phil Hoffman  
Michael Johanyek  
Eric Kreider

*(continued on page 43)*

**The University of Akron  
Senate Committees 2004–2005  
(listed by term expiration date)  
(continued from page 42)**

Herb Matheny  
E. Stewart Moritz\*  
Bruce Taylor\*

**Ex-Officio member, Director – Network Services  
or designee**

**Faculty Research Committee**

**2006:**

Sandra Buckland  
**Kevin Kreider (Committee Chair)**  
Mary Myers  
Ping Wang

**2007:**

Michael Graham  
B. Vijayaraman\*

**2008:**

Maria Adamowicz-Hariasz  
Christopher Banks  
Andre Christie-Mizell  
R. Ray Gehani\*  
Laura Gelfand  
Sharon Kruse  
Tracy Riley\*  
Julia Spiker  
David Steer  
Victor Wilburn\*  
Nick Zingale\*

**Ex-Officio member, Associate Provost for  
Research or designee**

**Faculty Rights & Responsibilities**

**2006:**

Susan Clark\*  
Maryhelen Kreidler

**2007:**

**Lloyd Anderson (Committee Chair)**  
Ann Bolek  
William Brittain  
Michael D'Amico  
Elizabeth Erickson\*  
Dane Quinn

**2008:**

**TBA**

**No ex-officio members**

**University Well-Being Committee**

**2006:**

Lori Fielding  
Ginger Golz  
Al Lieberman  
C. Alan Newman  
Christina Tan

**2007:**

Joan Carletta  
Russ Davis\*  
**Elizabeth Erickson (Committee Chair)\***  
Hal Foster  
Pam Hoover  
Nola Lowther

**2008:**

**TBA**

**Ohio Faculty Council Representative**

David Witt

**Ad hoc Budget Committee**

*(replaced PBC)*

**Rudy Fenwick (Committee Chair)**  
Committee Members TBA

**Ad hoc Planning Committee**

**Maryhelen Kreidler (Committee Chair)**  
Committee Members TBA

*(continued on page 44)*

**The University of Akron  
Senate Committees 2004–2005  
(listed by term expiration date)  
(continued from page 43)**

**Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee**

*(replaces CFPC)*

Russell Davis\*

Kenneth Dunning

Elizabeth Erickson\*

James Frampton

Virginia Gunn

Robert Huff\*

Robert Jeantet\*

Paul John\*

Elizabeth Kennedy

John Kline Jr.

Katharine Kolcaba

Rose Marie Konet\*

Richard Londrville\*

Craig Menzemer

Charles Monroe

Phyllis O'Connor

Sue Rasor-Greenhalgh

David Ritchey

Neil Sapienza

Mark Soucek

**Harvey Sterns (Committee Chair)**

Linda Sugarman

Louis Trenta

## We need your assistance....

We are updating the *Chronicle* mailing list. Please indicate where you want to receive a hard copy of this monthly publication, **if you are not already on the mailing list**, or if you are now receiving it and wish your name removed from distribution list. If you would, also please indicate whether there has been a change in your Zip+4.

**\*NOTE:** *The UA Chronicle* is always available online through the Faculty Senate web page: <http://www.uakron.edu/facultysenate>.



### **New or updated information:**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

• **Department name & Zip+4:** \_\_\_\_\_

• **Is this a new Zip+4?** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **I am currently *not* on the mailing list; please add my name.**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Please drop my name from your mailing list.**