



2007-2008, No. 3

November 1, 2007

20 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- Approved two curriculum change proposals page 9
- Approved changes to membership rules for the Research Committee to require members to have graduate faculty status, if appropriate for their discipline and or college page 10
- Postponed consideration of a motion to request the University Council Exploratory Committee submit a second draft of the University Council proposal one week prior to the March Faculty Senate meeting page 13
- Approved a motion to support House Bill 315 page 14

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle* may be directed to the Secretary, Richard Stratton (x7440).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held November 1, 2007 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of November 1, 2007

 A. Report of the Senior Vice President and Provost 16

 B. Proposals approved by the Provost 18

 C. Report from Athletics Committee 19

 D. Report from Student Affairs 20

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 1, 2007

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, November 1, 2007, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-five Senators, 32 were present for this meeting. Senators Arter, Ash, Bove, Elbuluk, Elliott, Gerber, Gilliland, Hallett, Ofobike, Oswald, Plummer, and Williams were absent with notice. Senators Bowman, Broadway Gamble, Hamed, Ida, Leigh, Licate, Sadler, Sancaktar, Tabatcher and Zingale were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Sterns called the Senate to order and asked that the agenda be approved. Senator Gandee moved to approve the agenda (second Senator Hajjafar). The agenda was approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes – Chair Sterns noted that several senators had not yet received the October Chronicle and wondered if we can approve those minutes.

Senator Gerlach moved for approval of the October minutes (Senator Clark seconded).

Chair Sterns noted that on page 6, President Proenza did not speak at Ford International University but at Florida International University.

Senator Gerlach asked correction of two additional items. On page 8, in the middle paragraph starting with his name, the word should be “aberrant behavior”, not “adherent behavior”. And on page 23, again the paragraph beginning with his name, there’s a reference to “murder” which should be “suicide”.

The motion to approve the minutes of October 4, 2007 passed.

Senator Gerlach asked the following corrections be made to the minutes of September 6th. First on page 19, toward the bottom of the page, “Chair Sterns called for a vote on the motion, the motions passed” should read “Chair Sterns called for a vote on the motion, the motion passed.” It is a single motion. Second on page 21 the last paragraph in which Senator Erickson is speaking “I and Senator Lillie is co-chairs” should read, “I and Senator Lillie are co-chairs”.

III. Chairman's Remarks & Special Announcements – **Chair Sterns** thanked Senator Gerlach. He then began his remarks “by saying that our business today and the business that is coming up at our November 8th special session is extremely important. Since our last meeting I’ve been attending, as have many of you, various committees that relate to the University Council Exploratory effort. I’ve asked Heather to send to everyone a copy of the document that came out of the committee and that will form the basis for any initial discussion that we choose to have today. It’s especially important that everyone carefully evaluate it and look at it for our discussions on November 8th. We are on the verge of again an evolution in our governance structure and this is very important and we want to do it in a way that will take us to the future in a very positive way. So I just want to encourage you to do as much as you personally can in terms of getting in touch with your core values, your thoughts about governance issues in general. One of my very close friends queried me about why in the world I’d want to be Chair of the Faculty Senate. I thought a little bit about that. And I must tell you I come from a small town in Maine, it’s Skowhegan, Maine which every year has town meetings where the whole town goes to the municipal building and where various issues of allocation of resources or building new schools or whatever were deliberated in the auditorium of the municipal building. As a child I remember, very well, educated people of the community like my parents and factory workers deliberating on a new school. I learned as I heard people who were working in the shoe factory say the old school was good enough for me it’s good enough for my children. And then hearing other parents like my own say no we need a new school; and it must be better, we must look to the future. But the deliberation and the discussion when you see people in the chamber discussing or making allocation of resources, making decisions for the community, I think since that day, those days, I’ve always had an interest in governance. And just to place this in the time perspective, this is the time when a motion would have been introduced against fluoridation as a Communist plot to take down the United States, so this was the wonderful 1950s. Some of you may remember that discussion. In any case, we have an important charge. And I want to encourage all of us to take pride in our role in Senate governance and for those of our colleagues who are not as enamored with this situation, I think we have to speak up about how important governance is on our campus. I can’t think of anything that is more important than having input from the faculty and to have an active Faculty Senate.”

Chair Sterns asked the Senate to remember three individuals who passed recently. “Donald Metzger passed away in September 2007. He came to the University of Akron in 1968 as Assistant Professor and was promoted to Associate Professor in 1974. Prof. Metzger was instrumental in developing the Anthropology program at The University of Akron and retired in 1996. Dr. David L. Jones, 79, retired professor of English from the University of Akron, passed away September 2, 2007. Karen Sinclair passed away on October 17, 2007. She was an adjunct instructor, teaching Western Cultural Traditions.”

Senator Gerlach shared that “Professor Walter Macior died on the 5th of October 2007. He served in the U.S. Army in World War II as a Japanese linguist. Received his first two degrees from Columbia University, earned a Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin in 1959. He came to Akron to teach here in 1967 and was finally named distinguished professor of Biology. He was highly honored during his tenure and in the obituary that I have many students remember him with fondness as an outstanding mentor and he was given the Alumni Association’s outstanding teacher award in 1990.”

The Senate rose for a moment of remembrance and silence in respect.

The report from the Senate Executive Committee was given by Senator Stratton.

IV. Reports –

a. Executive Committee – Senator Stratton reported “the Executive Committee met three times: once on October 18th and again on October 30th and then again on October 31st with the President and Provost. At the October 18th meeting we had discussions with the Graduate Research Council committee Chair Laura Gelfand, which the Executive Committee found very useful. We also considered requests to have the Executive Committee nominate a person for the search committee for the Associate Director of ITL. We certified elections of Summit College, College of Engineering and Wayne College. We also considered some of the comments as Chair Sterns has already mentioned about the University Council Exploratory Committee; we tried to understand how that might best be brought before the Senate on November 8th. We also at that time set the agenda for today’s meeting.

At the October 30th meeting we heard a presentation by Joe Wilder on the University Council Exploratory Committee proposal. We responded to the Provost’s request for nominations to this year’s OAC and to the Student Success Committee. We approved an agenda at that time for the meeting with the President and the Provost.

At the meeting with the President and the Provost we had what I would consider a wide ranging frank and very constructive dialogue. We talked about everything from horticultural practices on campus to more serious or at least more widespread issues for example with a Northeast Ohio study commission and the University of Ohio System. We also talked about various issues with the academic alignment document; its status and its progress. I notice the Provost will be talking about some of these issues in her remarks. We discussed parking issues, including the current renovations to and safety issues surrounding the Exchange Deck parking facility and future parking facilities on campus. Finally, the Provost indicated the budget process would begin as soon as the membership of OAC was finalized and the committee convened. That is my report for today. Are there any questions?”

There being no questions of the Secretary, **Chair Sterns** invited President Proenza to make his remarks to the Senate.

b. Remarks from the President – President Proenza: “Thank you Mr. Chairman good afternoon colleagues. I want to begin by thanking all of you who had the opportunity to attend the October 15th State of the University address and many of you who watched it elsewhere or took time to comment. Bill Lyons, thank you for your good comments and suggestions. As I think most of you know, I took the occasion to share just a few highlights and thoughts about the future of our university particularly in light of some of the discussion that had been engendered of late by either the [Northeast Ohio Universities Collaboration & Innovation Study] Commission process or the University System of Ohio process now being led by the Governor and the Chancellor. Thus I obviously did not have a chance to share as many other thoughts and recognitions as I might have wished. That said, I hope all of you know that one of the most important pieces of news to come out of that day was our announcement of a very aggressive, but already very successful, comprehensive campaign to raise five hundred million dollars for the future of The University of Akron. As I noted, we have already raised in excess of two hundred and seventy-five million dollars and in fact last Friday at the meeting of the Foundation one of our foundation trustees pledged a million dollars towards the outdoor living room which shall henceforth be known as the Corbin Commons. So that is very exciting, in case you are unaware this of course has been a process that has involved all of the departments and colleges. The Provost has worked with your Deans and Department Chairs to effectively understand the wish that all of us have. The broad goals of the campaign are to build the program infrastructure needed for the academic success of our university; to provide opportunities to strengthen our faculty, at one of the most competitive hiring marketplaces in decades; to provide incentives for talented students to choose The University of Akron and to succeed at The University of Akron; to continue making improvements to our campus facilities; and to fuel the continued growth of our role in the vitality of Northeast Ohio. In short, to roll out a bridge to our future. The Provost is working closely with Vice President LaGuardia to be sure that the prioritized needs of every college are appropriately documented and used as we seek these additional gifts and donations. In the immediate future as you know the trustees approved the construction of a stadium, an additional parking deck which is still under discussion, an additional residence hall and the acquisition of Quaker Square. These projects are the next phase. Some people have called it the second phase of the new landscape for learning I like to think it’s already the third phase and obviously a continuing process because it’s vitally important that we continue to ensure that we have an exciting campus. I trust that those of you who’ve been here more than the nine years that I have been have just as I been able to notice the difference in just the vibrancy of our campus. We’ll keep you updated on the matter of the parking deck as Senator Stratton indicated.

Finally, I’m pleased to note that The University of Akron is one of ten exemplars cited in an NSF commissioned report that was released two weeks ago for its ability and competency in the creation, protection, marketing and commercialization of new technologies. I thank all of you who have participated in all of the work that gives us that kind of national recognition as well as many others. I’m sure that as your Chair remarked it’s not always good to be in the news, so let me just make a comment about the issue that “is raising eyebrows”. First of all, I am confident that the university followed appropriate procedure in the acquisition of a piece of property that happened to belong to the son of one of our Trustees. That said, in order to be completely above board, I have asked our General Counsel and our Chairman of the Board of Trustees to request a review by the ethics commission of Ohio and in that request Mr. Morrison, the Trustee who’s son’s property we

would like to buy, will join in making that request so that there is no question but that we followed appropriate procedure. The news and the fourth estate are always interesting entities, so let's just put it all out on the table and have a third party review it as appropriate. Be happy to take any other questions you may have. Mr. Chairman."

There were no questions for the President. **Chair Sterns** thanked the President and then invited Provost Stroble to come forward and give her remarks.

c. Remarks from the Provost – Provost Stroble "I selected a few topics based on our conversation in Executive Committee and I just want to go on the record to say that continuing to work with the Executive Committee is a great pleasure. We're forming a great partnership I think around the kinds of news you heard the Secretary report on today; appointments to committees, thinking about who best can we connect with, which Faculty Senate committees and the ad hoc committees make sense as the interface on a number of topics and I want that to continue.

So leading off an effort that was assigned to me around Quaker Square, there are lots of Quaker Square topics, but this is the one that I was assigned. There is some space in Quaker Square, some now probably more eventually, that can be used for uses other than the hotel rooms that we need to operate for two years and the residence hall and associated services for residence hall. So we had the task of saying how can we make some determinations about what would fit there and what would make sense. As soon as Quaker Square hit the newspapers, people had started to send e-mail notes, some to me but not always something you know here's an idea and what do you think of this and could we put that on the list. The subcommittee that we put together, which includes two faculty senators who are also members of the ad hoc facilities committee for Faculty Senate, decided that a formal RFP process was going to be the most fair thing to do. That would force us to be clear about what's the process what do you include in a description and what are the criteria we'll use. That [RFP process] just closed out this week. I just received from Senator Londraville today the actual tabulations of data. I have not looked at it yet; I'll look at it over the next week and I'm sure that our next step will be doing some follow-up. Twenty different proposals came in and they are diverse. I mean it is truly amazing and I think the most fun part about it for me was that if you have space available and there's not anything that's already you know a foregone conclusion about what's going to go there and you give the academic community the opportunity to dream about well, what would make sense in that space, you get wonderfully creative ideas. So I'm hoping we've built a model here in this little RFP process that can be used much more often into the future. I thank the people that participated and as soon as we know more about where the ratings turned out and what we think makes sense we'll get back to you.

Then secondly, the academic alignment update if you saw my Provost's Perspectives last week you know that after the formal state of the university address I had about fifteen minutes with the Chancellor to really say the public message is based on data and process where we're trying to be very clear about what it is distinctive about The University of Akron. What makes us different from other institutions and what value do we think we bring to our students, to our community, to research, to our professions. We've been going through lots of processes that get us clearer about

that; the design principles being sort of one lens; what we're learning from program review being another; and academic alignment that we undertook this summer being a further refinement of that. The Chancellor was quite impressed that we have that process in place and that we hadn't handed the task of saying what was distinctive about us completely to public relations. That it was based on some reality. His response was: I want the next step of real. I'd like to know for your distinctive areas, what are your goals, what are your metrics, what are your targets? We will go back to the work that was done by those six original academic alignment teams in phase one and see how well we can map their data against our current version of that academic alignment message. My guess is we'll have a lot, but we'll be missing some things. Then it will be up to me, with great consultation, to say: what's our process for filling in the gaps where there are gaps. So the work is not finished simply because the Chancellor asked a question that we will be expected to respond to. And as I've indicated in my little narrative today, as I go to NEO commission meetings and I typically go to every single one, and I go to the academic subcommittee meetings, I'm beginning to get the very real sense that the need for us to provide data to substantiate what we say is distinctive will just grow. I think that the same will be true for the University System ten-year master plan. So we're going to be in the data business and the data analysis business on I think a very aggressive timeline. I'm grateful that we did some early investment in the technology that allows us to have data accessible and institutional research staff that have given us much higher creditability around that data than we once had. So more to come and I'll be glad to be very open about what I know when I know it.

And then finally, some updates on searches. It really has gone public now, the Associate Vice President for Inclusion and Equity and Chief Diversity Officer with Spellman Associates assisting with that search, the Dean of the College of Education search has been launched just this past week with RH Perry assisting. The Director of The University of Akron Press we've launched with no search firm because that's such a small club of people that are interested in directing presses or that actually are part of that network so that one we think we can use academic university press listserves and attract the right audience. Associate Director of ITL for Student Success and Retention is a campus internal search and that has been posted as well. And then finally, at the Board of Trustees meeting I recommended the appointment of the person who had been interim Dean of the College of Nursing, Dr. Margaret Wineman to be the Dean. She had the enthusiastic support of her colleagues in the College of Nursing and the healthcare community and I think it's entirely appropriate and I was glad the Board agreed that she had the title that was really a good match for the leadership she provides. And I'll answer questions that you may have."

Chair Sterns asked if there were questions for the Provost.

Senator Gerlach was reminded by the mention of Quaker Square that he had not been down there for ages. He wondered if, with our possession of that property, the shops would continue or whether those spaces will be taken over for strictly university purposes.

Provost Stroble responded that "for the time being the shops will continue and one of the proposals that came to us was really a proposal about should the shops continue on into the long term future. So that's part of what we'll be weighing."

There being no further questions for the Provost, **Chair Sterns** thanked her and continued with the agenda.

d. Committee Reports – **Chair Sterns** noted there was no report from the Graduate Council and so asked the Senate’s permission for Dr. Ramsier to provide the report from Academic Policies Committee. There was no objection.

Dr. Ramsier reported the “**Academic Policies Committee** has been meeting. The issues that we’re dealing with now are questions concerning the final exams and the scheduling of exam during final exam weeks. The second issue is residency requirements, in many shapes and forms that appear in the Board rule and how they impact on students. And third is the process through which students can retroactively ask for appeals on their grades. And finally at our next meeting we have a hearing scheduled to address the objection to a pertinent proposal from Summit College posed by department of Computer Science in Arts and Sciences College. Thank you.”

There being no questions, **Chair Sterns** called upon Dr. Ramsier for the report from the Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Ramsier reported the “**Curriculum Review Committee** has also been meeting. There are two proposals on one of the handouts down front for your approval. And our recent work has been with respect to distance learning and the review committee functions. In particular, we’re trying to help the College of Fine and Applied Arts to rewrite some proposals before we take them for approval. Thank you.”

Dr. Ramsier, on behalf of the committee, moved the approval of the two proposals presented: ED-07-12 and NU-07-44.

Chair Sterns noted a motion that comes from a committee does not require a second. He called for discussion. There being no discussion, the motion passed without dissent.

Senator Lillie noted that there was a written report from the **Athletics Committee**.

Senator Vollmer indicated there was no report from the **ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee**, but they were trying to schedule a meeting.

Senator Sotnak reported that **Library Committee** met once and had no report at this time.

Senator Rich reported the **Reference Committee** is trying to schedule a meeting.

Senator Gehani indicated that there was written a report from the **Research Committee**.

Chair Sterns remarked that Dr. Martin Murphy from the department of Psychology was added to the research committee and he’s taking an active role in the current evaluation process. Additionally, the report asked the Senate to approve a change in committee membership to require members

to have graduate faculty status, if appropriate for their discipline and their college. The committee's goal is to have the same energy and cache as the IRB committee and is seeking members who are actively engaged researchers in their own fields. And so that comes forward as a motion. The motion is: "The Senate approves a change in committee membership for the Research Committee to require members to have graduate faculty status, if appropriate for their discipline and or college."

Chair Sterns asked if there was any discussion on the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion passed without dissent.

There were no reports from **Student Affairs Committee, Computing and Communicating Technologies Committee, General Education Advisory Committee**, or the **Ohio Faculty Council**. **Chair Sterns** then recognized Senator Lillie to report on the **University Council Exploratory Committee**, and asked the Senate's permission to allow Associate Provost Ramsier to speak to the Senate. Senator Lillie and Dr. Ramsier are co-chairs of the committee.

Senator Lillie indicated the report would be short, since next week's special meeting of the Senate is devoted to the consideration of this particular proposal at some length and in some detail. He went on to report that the committee has "been meeting fairly regularly to try to prepare for the November 8th special meeting of the Senate. There is a proposal that describes the nature of the proposed University Council and also tries to take into account some of the ways things have been done and how they might change as a result of the moving forward of this particular proposal. So we wanted you to be aware that we have been working on it. The report on the proposed university council was actually finalized in December of 2006 and was sent at that time to all the constituency groups of that particular committee. It is being resent to you again so that you will have it, if you'd like or can't find it easily. In line with what Chair Sterns has said, I would encourage you to examine the proposal carefully to look at the core values that are reflected in that particular proposal and be prepared to come with any questions you may have for the next meeting. The purpose of the meeting at this point is to gather feedback that can be used, along with the feedback of the other constituent bodies, provide a second and hopefully final draft of the proposed University Council. If there are any questions at this point I'll be happy to try and answer them or pass them off to Rex."

Senator Gerlach rose to ask: "Are we to understand that we just want to engage in another free-for-all, hoorah, around and about, or are we going to proceed on the basis of the specific motion to do something? I think it is important to get down to cases at long last. If we're not going to have a specific motion to adopt something or propose this or that, perhaps you ought to consider making a committee of the whole, where you can discuss these things and get and make recommendations to the Senate as to what the committee of the whole might recommend. That's another alternative, but I think it's time we need a specific draft just as if we were going to adopt the bylaws of the University Senate. Move for adoption, move some things for adoption so that we can move to amend it or so forth and so on. But I think we ought to get down to cases like that."

Senator Lillie replied: “I think the intent of the committee is to have something that the Senate can actually act upon. Now whether or not the motion will be formed and be suitable to everybody I don’t know, but we do intend to provide some kind of a specific that the Senate can respond to.”

Chair Sterns noted that “the Executive Committee has had some considerable discussion in regard to this, about whether or not we should use the mechanism of committee of the whole or whether we were better off operating with a formal motion on the floor. It’s been our decision to operate with a formal motion being introduced at the beginning of the special session. So I think we heard you already in your admonition to us about being ready to do business.”

Senator Lillie added his “personal perspective. I would agree at this point too, speaking as a Senator and not as the co-chair of the University Council Exploratory Committee, that yes indeed I think we are at the end of the 4-year period and it’s time to begin to have proposals coalesce. And I would hope that in the very near future we can have some specific proposals that will actually turn into action.”

Chair Sterns asked for other comments.

Senator Matney asked “Does the committee have a firm timetable for when they’d like to have a second draft written?”

Senator Lillie responded no. “Obviously the intent is to do it as quick as possible; but we’ve got no particular set timetable at this point.”

Dr. Ramsier wished “to remind the senators that the Senate is one of the constituency bodies from which the exploratory committee is requesting feedback. So in order to come up with a second version, if you will, of the proposal, there’s more feedback than just from this body.”

Senator Lillie added “this is the last constituent body from which we feel we need to have formal feedback. So we would be moving as quickly as possible, but there is no set schedule that I’m aware of.”

Senator Matney then asked if the second draft will emerge through dialogue with the administration or with the constituents of the council itself.

Senator Lillie replied: “I would anticipate that it would be similar to what we have done, which involves the constituent groups and also has involved discussion with the administration, through the Vice Presidents and Deans. So I would say that we are having a discussion that is meaningful and that does involve people at all levels of the administration.”

Dr. Ramsier concurred.

Senator Lyons asked that the constituent groups, other than those already represented on Faculty Senate, be identified.

Senator Lillie replied that constituent groups that are represented on the proposed University Council, but are not represented on the current Faculty Senate are the Vice Presidents, Deans, and department Chairs.

Chair Sterns, for clarification, listed all of the constituent groups represented on the proposed University Council: Vice Presidents, Council of Deans, and Department Chairs [not represented on the current Faculty Senate]; Student Government, Staff Employee Advisory Committee, Contract Professional Advisory Committee, Associated Student Government and Faculty Senate [are represented on the current Faculty Senate].

Senator Moritz observed that “there are eight or so standing committees that are proposed in the original structure, many of which appear to be designed to replace current committees at the university. Not necessarily committees of this body, but other committees that are operating. Do we have a sense of whether or not the entities that constituted those original committees are willing to dissolve them and substitute the committees of the University Council?”

Senator Lillie responded: “I would not say we have commitments of any sort. I would say that that is an issue that has come up in the last meeting or two of our body. It is an issue that still needs to be addressed, in my view in some detail, but we have postponed the kind of hard discussions that might arise until we’ve received the feedback and can look at that as a committee. I would say that we’ve heard what you had to say, but I would not say that there are any final decisions made.”

Chair Sterns, attempting to clarify the process, indicated that “we, as the last remaining group, must first take action. When that is accomplished then we move into the next stage of deliberations.”

Senator Gerlach noted that “the report we received on October 4th from this Exploratory Committee [in] item seven on the backside...stated that the Deans and Vice Presidents responses provided feedback suggesting a different direction for the University Council than that proposed by the committee. Etcetera. So what does that forebode? What does that suggest we’re going to have to face come the next week’s meeting? Are you going to tell us where they disagreed with this proposal and what they themselves proposed or what?”

Senator Lillie replied that “at this point the intent is to get feedback from this particular body and take it back to the University Council Exploratory Committee along with the feedback from the other bodies.”

Senator Gerlach again asked if the Senate will be informed of the exact sentiments of the Deans and Vice Presidents so that we can say whether we agree with them or we don’t agree with them.

Senator Lillie replied: “We’re in a position of trying to respect that all the constituent bodies have feedback that they want to give in a variety of ways. Clearly in our system the Deans and Vice Presidents have a lot to say. Yet their feedback shouldn’t, we feel, be anymore important conceptually than the Associated Student Government or CPAC or SEAC. So at this point, after some dis-

cussion about this, we have decided to take the feedback back to the University Council Exploratory Committee, to process it there and then to come forward to all the constituent bodies again with a revised proposal as soon as possible.”

Chair Sterns: “So I think what we’re really trying to say is first things first.”

Senator Matney noted that the proposal was first raised ten and a half months ago. He has served on the Senate for six years, this being his last, and would like to see a resolution to this issue before he goes “out to pasture”. So in the spirit of moving things along he proposed “that the Faculty Senate request the written second final draft of the proposal one week prior to the March Faculty Senate meeting so that we’ll have time to discuss these things and not have a rush of extra meetings at the end of the year in order to resolve something. So the motion would be: to request a second draft of the University Council proposal one week prior to the March Faculty Senate meeting” (motion was seconded).

Senator Rich indicated he would support the motion at the appropriate time. But since the Senate was meeting next week to consider the University Council proposal and the outcome of that consideration is yet undetermined, he suggested that we entertain this “motion in the next meeting when we’ve arrived at some sort of position as a body on the proposal. I therefore move to postpone until the next meeting” (second Senator Gehani).

Senator Matney asked for a clarification of the meaning of “next meeting.” Is it to mean the next regular meeting?

Senator Rich replied that the motion refers to the special meeting being held next week.

Chair Sterns asked for discussion. There being no discussion, the motion to postpone consideration of the motion passed.

There being no report from the **Student Success and Retention Committee** or **Student Disciplinary Procedures Committee** and no Old Business, the Senate moved on to New Business.

VIII. New Business - Senator Gandee rose to make the following motion. “The Faculty Senate support House Bill 315 and further that the Faculty Senate convey that action to the President of the [Ohio] Senate and to the Speaker of the [Ohio] House. And also encourage faculty members to encourage your senators and representatives to support this bill” (second by Senator Erickson).

Chair Sterns reminded Senators that the issues are described in more detail in the October Chronicle. This is a legislative initiative to preserve healthcare coverage for Ohio’s present and future retired public educators. He then asked for discussion.

Senator Gandee rose to support the motion. “I’d like to also call to your attention that this is vital for those people who are currently actively teaching, as opposed to us [retirees], because there are sufficient funds in the healthcare system to support healthcare up to approximately 2018. At that point, if nothing is currently done, healthcare provided by the State Teacher’s Retirement System will evaporate. So it’s of vital importance to those currently actively teaching and I would encourage your support. It provides 2.5 percent from the employer and 2.5 percent from the employee and is phased in over a five-year period.”

Senator Gerlach also rose in support of the motion. “It should be said, Mr. Chairman, that it’s hard to imagine a pension system without a health provision in it. The pension might very well go on indefinitely but not so this medical provision. I think it’s in everybody’s interest to support this for selfish interest but also for the sake of colleagues. Remember a pension is very well and good but it needs to be supplemented with this very valuable feature. I think [the financing proposal is] designed to be relatively painless because as Senator Gandee points out, if it’s passed it would be phased in over a five-year period at only point five percent each year. So that should not be a hardship for anyone, particularly.”

There being no further discussion the question was called and the motion to support House Bill 315 passed without dissent.

IX. Good of the Order - Chair Sterns: “Of course, since we’ve scheduled our special session we could have used an hour perhaps today but I think we will follow with our plan and so the way to bring us to closure is a motion.”

X. Adjournment - Senator Lyons move to adjourn (seconded by Senator Gerlach). Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

*Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,
Secretary of the Senate*

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 1, 2007

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Faculty Senate

November 1, 2007

Quaker Square Space Utilization Task Force

The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost has received 20 proposals from academic and administrative departments that wish to make use of the open space in the Quaker Square complex. A committee of students, faculty and staff will review the submissions and rank them by certain criteria, with priority given to those uses that best:

- support the goals of the Northeast Ohio Universities Collaboration and Innovation Study Commission, and the University System of Ohio,
- provide new opportunities for our students,
- enhance student retention,
- increase community engagement,
- facilitate positive choices that connect the city and the campus,
- provide a welcoming presence for our campus, and/or
- provide service-learning opportunities.

Members of the committee are

- Joe Crawford, Student Representative, Board of Trustees
- Margaret Halter, Associate Professor, College of Nursing
- Jim Haskell, Assistant Director Capital Planning and Space Utilization
- Deborah Jones, Schedule, Hardware & Operation System Services
- Cheryl Kern-Simirenko, Dean, University Libraries
- Richard Londraville, Associate Professor, Biology
- Laurie Madden, Associate Vice President for Auxiliary Enterprises
- James Sage, Vice President Information Technology/ CIO.

Academic Alignment Update

On October 15th following the President's State of the University address, I presented the "back story" of our academic alignment process to Chancellor Fingerhut. In last week's *Provost's Perspectives*, I shared the powerpoint and accompanying narration. It can be found at this link: www.uakron.edu/provost/alignment-presentation.php. In response to his request for "targets, goals, and metrics" we will now link the data collected by the six Phase I teams to the themes in the powerpoint. Where there are gaps in available data, we will develop a process to fill them in response to the Chancellor's request and as a necessary step in planning for the reporting requirements we can anticipate coming from the NEO Commission and the Chancellor's 10 year Master Plan for the University System of Ohio. As more is known about these data reporting requirements, we will communicate them. At the same time, we are using the feedback from Phase II teams—campus and community—to create a more concise narrative description that will communicate our academic and economic development strengths to external audiences.

Appointments/Searches

- Searches underway for Associate Vice President for Inclusion and Equity/Chief Diversity Officer; Dean, College of Education; Director, UA Press; Associate Director of ITL for Student Success and Retention
- Appointment of Dr. Margaret Wineman as Dean, College of Nursing

APPENDIX B

Proposals Approved By Provost
To Faculty Senate November 2007

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-07-12	C&I	Add 3150:101Chemistry for Everyone as alternate for the SpEd science admission requirement

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
NU-07-04	Nursing	Add two options to Child and Adolescent Health Nurse Practitioner track - child and adolescent primary health care and child and adolescent acute care

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Provost Office

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

APPENDIX C

Report to Faculty Senate
Athletic Committee
November 1, 2007

Submitted by: Timothy Lillie, Chair, Athletic Committee

The Athletic Committee met once, on October 17, 2007, and presents the following report:

1. Discussion of Athletic Department initiatives
 - a. Committee members asked for and received updates on the Class attendance policy of the Athletic Department and on the effectiveness of the new policy on approved absences from class for University-sponsored events. Both appear to be operating as expected.
2. Knight Commission Report
 - a. The report on faculty involvement in athletics, released by the Knight Commission on October 15, 2007, was discussed in general. The committee discussed the findings of the Commission and ways in which the Athletics Committee might be involved in collecting and reporting (to the Faculty Senate, and in collaboration with the Faculty Athletic Representative) information about ways in which faculty and staff are effectively involved with student-athletes in ways which strengthen the academic function of The University of Akron and which promote effective involvement by faculty and staff.
 - b. The Committee agreed to encourage its members to report events to the Athletic Committee chair that members see as useful or meaningful interactions with student-athletes or the Athletic Department, which can be summarized and reported periodically to the Faculty Senate.
3. Other business
 - a. The Committee agreed to consider the following items over its next meetings:
 - i. Parking (now and in the future) and its effect on students, especially future stadium parking
 - ii. Honors College and student-athletes
 - iii. Graduation information reports to be disseminated to and discussed by the Athletic Committee
 - iv. How to encourage faculty/staff interaction with student-athletes before they matriculate

APPENDIX D

Memo to the Faculty Senate
Re: the Faculty Research Committee
From: Laura Gelfand, Chair

The Faculty Research Committee met on September 7, when I was elected chair. At this time several important things were discussed and decided. We eliminated the spring competition and will have a fall competition called the academic-year grant. This is for work that will be done over the course of the academic year and it is an improvement over the previous grant in terms of clarity. We also increased the possible amount for this award and faculty may ask for up to \$6000. The deadline for these grants is Friday October 12.

We also increased the amount of the summer grant to \$10,000. We believe that this represents an equivalent to what faculty may make teaching in the summer and we hope that it will encourage more faculty to apply for the grant, thus making it more competitive. This change is applicable for this year only and we will see how it works out. If interest in the grants is high and the competition for them results in better grant proposals then we will continue this practice.

We also instituted a few changes over the summer and at this last meeting. We hope that through these changes we can avoid the questions that seem to arise over and over. First, faculty who receive the summer grant may teach one summer class. Secondly, full-time Visiting Professors are eligible to apply for academic-year grants but not the summer grants since we cannot be sure that their contracts will be continued. Finally, those with more than four-credit hours of summer administrative duty are not eligible to apply for summer grants.

In working with Katie Watkins-Wendell we have instituted a few new programs and ideas in order to encourage interest in the Faculty Research Grants and the committee as well. We will host our first annual fall symposium in 2008 where those who have received academic-year and summer grants will present the fruits of their research. Additionally, we plan to host grant-writing workshops for prospective applicants.

We would like the Senate to approve a change in committee membership so that members must have Graduate Faculty status if appropriate for their discipline and/or college. Our goal is for the committee to have the same energy and cachet as the IRB committee and we are seeking members who are actively engaged researchers in their own fields.

Respectfully submitted October 11, 2007
Laura Gelfand