



29 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- **Provost invited the Senate to co-host an information session on the University System of Ohio performance metrics. 8**

- **Heard two motions from CRC. One recommend curriculum changes; the other to modify University Rule 3359: 20-05.2. 10**

- **Passed a resolution of appreciation to Senator Lillie for his work as co-chair of the University Council Exploratory Committee. 15**

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 December 4, 2008 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of December 4, 2008

- A. Report from the Senior Vice President and Provost 20
- B. Recommendations from the Curriculum Review Committee 22
- C. Resolution from the Curriculum Review Committee 26
- D. Report from the University Libraries Committee 27
- E. Report from the Faculty Research Committee 28
- F. Minutes from the Computing and Communications Technologies Committee 29

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 4, 2008

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, December 4, 2008 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-five Senators, 28 were present for this meeting. Senators Arter, Ash, Bagatto, Carroll, Cockley, Elbuluk, Elliott, Green, Hallett, Halter, Hamed, Hansen, Lenavitt, March, Miller, Plummer, Sadler, Sancaktar, Shanks, Tabatcher, Vinnedge, Wesdemiotis and Yi were absent with notice. Senators Clark, Gurnak, Moritz and Sotnak were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Sterns recognized the lack of a quorum but opened the meeting since the President had to leave early.

Senator Gerlach reminded Chair Sterns that no action can be taken without a quorum.

Chair Sterns asked for and received approval of the agenda as passed out.

II. Approval of the Minutes – Chair Sterns asked for approval of the minutes for the November 6th meeting, as published in the Chronicle.

Senator Gerlach indicated his absence with notice was in error. He was present and participated. Also, toward the bottom of page five the word “breach” ought to be “broach.” “I broach this...”

Chair Sterns asked if there were other corrections or omissions. There being done, Senator Gamble moved the minutes be accepted as corrected. The motion carried.

III. Chairman’s Remarks & Special Announcements – Chair Sterns “I’d like to start by just sharing with you some brief thoughts. Obviously we are in the holiday season and one thing that has really had an effect on me the last few days is something from the opening of Gerontological Society of America meetings in Washington. The MacArthur Foundation has announced a new initiative dealing with longevity where they are now looking at the expected increases in longevity between 2030 and 2050. They feel we are underestimating longevity by about five years. And so with some of the estimates that have already been somewhat problematic or challenging may even be more so. But I think nothing really has prepared us for what’s happening immediately in terms of the world of work and what’s happening with our industry and employment and the area of personal finance. Obviously we are seeing a very challenging period on the horizon. So I think we all are thinking about that a great deal.

Just this week we were meeting in the University Council Exploratory Committee and we had a discussion the other day about service. We were discussing an area of the regulations that dealt with what considerations should be given for service on a governance body? And I thought it was a very interesting discussion because having been interested in the area of university service for many years; I think one of the things that I wanted to say to all of you is thank you for your service number one. Thank you for being here at the end of the semester. Thank you for taking the interest in our governance structure, that's really important. And I think the thing that triggered in my mind in this discussion about the value of service is that often we expect people to serve but often when push comes to shove it isn't valued the way it should be. And in some of our approaches those of you who've done all kinds of committee work, all kinds of taking on all kinds of assignments, I think we have to remember that it is an important part of what we do everyday at a university, that is to serve. I think many of us who serve on the Faculty Senate once in a while will get a remark from our colleagues about why are we doing that? Why are we serving? In fact I always remember shortly after I was elected Chair of the Faculty Senate a very good colleague of mine who carries great leadership ability on campus said to me "Have you lost your mind?" So I think we have to understand that we have to appreciate this kind of service. We have to make sure that others value it and I'm concerned when it isn't valued. Because if we don't take this kind of work into consideration, if we don't value it, then we've lost a great deal. And so I'm saying this because when we were discussing this issue I think we were a little stymied do we give release time, do we give a monetary compensation, how do we recognize that? I know that's always an issue for us, but I think it's important that we not lose sight of what it means to serve our university in that way. So that's my thoughts, I want to wish everyone again a happy holiday season and let's turn to special announcements

Hearts for Humanity fundraiser will take place on February 6th, 2009. It's one of the reason we're announcing it today is because we don't have an opportunity to meet again before Hearts for Humanity. And we want to call attention to this. Heather is on the committee representing the Faculty Senate. And I just want to mention that it's \$25.00 per ticket, table sponsor for \$200, and they also allow you even if you can't attend to donate, which is very thoughtful of them. They'll be a website up in January. And from what I am told that this is a wonderful event, I'm going to try to be there myself this year, I know Provost Stroble has mentioned a number of times how nice affair it is. So I wish to call that to your attention." There being no other announcements Chair Sterns asked Secretary Stratton to report on the Executive Committee.

IV. Reports –

a. Executive Committee - Senator Stratton: "The Executive Committee met on November 18th and discussed several items including the Student Judicial Policy, changes in university rules that are necessary to comply with OBR and the Higher Learning Commission definitions of distance learning classes. You'll see that that's on the agenda; there's a motion from CRC with respect to that today. We discussed how soon the curriculum proposals and software committee could be convened and the progress of the university council bylaws. We drafted the agenda for the meeting with the President and Provost on that date and we also drafted an agenda for today's meeting.

On November 20th after a brief meeting to organize ourselves, we met with the President and the Provost and at that meeting several things occurred. The Provost has requested that the Executive Committee

identified three individuals to serve on the Budgeting Hearing Committee. She also asked the Executive Council to appoint the faculty members to the Student Success and Retention Committee; since that is the traditional way that committee has been set up.

The President shared with us some of his thoughts. We talked about the Confucius Institute celebration; we talked a little bit about the uncertainty of the state budget which we may hear more about today. Also the Executive Committee mentioned that there seemed to be a lack of progress with respect to the Student Code of Conduct and the President asked and has in fact started the communication lines again on those discussions. We also discussed the progress of the development of the bylaws of the University Council with the Provost and the President. That's the end of my report for today, are there any questions?"

There being no questions, **Chair Sterns** called upon the President for his remarks.

b. Remarks from the President - President Proenza: "Thank you Mr. Chairman and let me begin by echoing your thanks to all our colleagues because indeed we have much to be thankful for and this university is most grateful for your service and the opportunity to exhibit the success that we are enjoying, despite the challenges that we are about to confront together.

Let me comment on a few things beginning with just a personal observation of another kind of service, as many of you are aware I've had the privilege of serving on the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology [PCAST] for the last many years. That service is of course coming to an end as is natural to do so. For me it is ending in a very pleasant series of notes. First of all at our last meeting as has been typical each year we do meet with the President and review some of the issues that we're working on. On this occasion we had the unexpected graciousness of being invited not only into the White House but into the Oval Office and into the rose garden. So if you've like to see what that looks like up close and personal I do have some photographs of that. It sort of signified that an opportunity not only to converse with the person who was chosen by the nation eight years ago, despite of what you might think has happened in the mean time. I might just reflect on that a moment because I think the interesting thing about Mr. Obama's selection is that he ran on an agenda of change. And I think most of you have dealt with issues of change know that change is an equal opportunity enemy. We all hate it equally. And so to find that you can campaign on that issue and make change and equal opportunity friend was quite remarkable in and of itself. But I mention that because I think that the challenges of the office are such that I'm sure before long we'll find something to complain about and Mr. Obama's presidency; hopefully not too soon because we have a great deal of work to do. More to the point however, as a result of the last piece of work that we did under PCOST we published a report just a couple of weeks ago on university industry partnerships which is available on the web for you to peruse if you like. It gives you a sense of where things are going, you can find it by going to ostp.gov and then going from there to PCAST and there to PCAST Reports and it's there University-Private Sector Research Partnerships 2008. But what I mention is that as a result of that, because I co-chaired that the subcommittee of PCAST, I was invited on Tuesday to speak before a panel of the National Academy of Sciences on these issues. I don't know when you were there Harvey, but I just got back yesterday.

And indeed I might have been in Columbus today but for some other obligations and the assurances that we were not going to learn anything particularly new from the Governor that was not contained in his press release earlier in the week. Let me just touch on that for a moment. The state is anticipated to have for the balance of this fiscal year, that is between now and the end of June, a deficit of 640 million dollars. That's a small sum of money in this late stage of everybody's budget. For next biennium the estimate is that the state would be running a 7 billion dollar deficit or in other words a 3.5 billion dollar deficit in each of the two years of the biennium beginning July 1 of 2009. Clearly the discussions that are being held in Columbus and I'm sure which would be presaged by the comments that you heard through the press on Monday, you might not have read it until Tuesday, and which are being discussed with the other university presidents and we do have a representative there today are obviously ones of encouraging us to do all we can to hold expenditures down and to plan for managing with less. We do not at this point as I said at the last meeting with you know what managing with less means for the University System of Ohio. It could be as generous as a very small increase or no increase at all or obviously it might be a cut in state funding. Now as I mentioned to you before and I would like to mention it again, The University of Akron is somewhat buffered in this context because state funding is only about 25 percent of our now more than 125 million annual budget. We receive approximately 90 million dollars from the state and that's even if we had a five percent decrease even that come up to about one percent of our total budget and surely we could manage one percent in some fashion. Except of course we're a highly labor intensive institution and that really translates into our inability to potentially replace some colleagues as quickly as we might wish or maybe we'd have to defer some hirings for a longer period of time. That's not the case for private institution colleagues who almost exclusively depend on either their endowments or their tuition revenues or obviously both and thus undoubtedly you would have read that Harvard university is experiencing a twenty-two percent decrease in their endowment which translates for Harvard to 8 billion dollars which is a larger fraction than the state deficit for the next two years in one fell swoop in the last month and a half. So be careful what you ask for, you might get it you might say. But I mentioned that because I think it puts things in perspective, we are in a better position to manage through this financial downturn than perhaps some of colleagues in the private institutions are. So we'll see how that evolves and we will certainly keep you posted on that.

Three follow up sets of comments. I think all of you know how proud I am of the achievements that the university has made in the last few years. Clearly this year as I reflected in the State of the University address and would be happy to spend as much time doing with you another occasion we continued that progress and significantly with the enrollment increase that we had evidenced and we're projecting into the spring and next fall as well. We're excited about that. And what is particularly exciting is that others have noticed and without violating any confidence let me just tell you that about three weeks ago four trustees from a sister public university the Chairman of the Board and three of their significant trustees asked for a meeting with me and some of our senior colleagues just to ask and see what we've done and how we've done it. Now let me assure you that I did not tell them any state secrets here and I also counseled them that what's worked for us may not necessarily work for them. We're quite different institution and quite different location what they made need to do is probably different than what we've done but clearly and they reflected this time and again, not only have they noticed but they're impressed. And a great deal of that gratitude from them goes to you because it reflects on what we've done. Secondly, we're approaching commencement at the end of next week, the December or Fall commencement exercises, I hope to see some of you there. We're going to be honoring two people with honorary degrees, Judge Harold White

who's wife regrettably passed away just a few weeks ago who she shared the honorary degree with him but which had to have a special ceremony because her passing was imminent. Fortunately at the time that we visited her in hospice she was alert and most gracious and most grateful at the same time for the honor. The second person is one of our own, Professor Joe Kennedy of our Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering College. Joe as you know is know in his 80's but he remains as active as any one of us who are hopefully somewhat younger than that and he just recently had another distinct honor that is receiving his 100th patent. Wow, 100 patents to his credit. Quite a remarkable achievement, so if you see Joe please extend your congratulation, our collective congratulations for his exceptional career which he continues to develop as we speak, he's certainly not slowing down by any means. And finally let me offer you my very best wishes for a happy holiday season. Spend wisely but spend a lot, do what you can to stimulate the economy. Thank you."

Chair Sterns asked if the President had any opportunity to follow up on the issue of the student judicial code.

President Proenza deferred to Provost Stroble, who reported she talked to Dr. Fey. She believed Dr. Fey and the committee members are arranging to continue talks.

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman, before the President escapes, I wonder if I may pose a question. It may not be answerable at this very moment but it's something for the future. I refer here to a paper on the University System of Ohio and the various segments including a section for example on accountability. You know all about that. Some of us retirees got to thinking of an item under the [USO accountability metrics that set a goal of] increasing, amongst other things, total enrollees aged 25 and older. The current level is sighted as 171 odd thousand and for 2017 the target is set at 351 odd thousand that is twice as many. Now what we're interested in, because we were here to see those days, is what's happened to the old Evening College wherein it was possible for the older, non-traditional student to earn degrees. As I understand it now that's only possible in the case of the School of Law. Do you know if there is any planning by you, the Provost or anyone else in the administration to perhaps reinvestigate this and with a view of starting up something that seemed to work very well or might work again?"

President Proenza: "The Provost will have far more detail to add in a moment but let me comment. Several years ago we began the process by creating a program that we called Adult Focus and that is continuing with a great many additional nuances and a great many additional initiatives precisely directed at the recognition and the ultimate service to the adult student who needs to acquire new skills either because they're coming back from Iraq and need to apply for employment or because they have lost a job not to outsourcing because — just need a moment of reality colleagues, the jobs that are being created abroad are not the jobs that were here, they are other jobs. The jobs that are being lost here are the same kinds of jobs that were lost in the agricultural industry when productivity hit that industry. And we went from more than fifty percent of our population being engaged in production agriculture to less than two percent of our population being engaged in the production of agriculture. The world economy is global, it's moving very rapidly and only those continue to improve their skills and that includes older working adults who may not be working anymore, need those skills and we have significant plan which can you elaborate on that briefly Dr. Stroble?"

Provost Stroble: “We think there are a number of things that need to be done to improve services and availability of courses for adults. One is certainly using sites other than main campus so creation of the Medina County University Center was very much targeted towards meeting the needs of adults who need to have a place close to home and drive to the main campus. I’d say Wayne Campus certainly is seeing enrollment growth as a result of reaching out to adults. I would say sites that we’re doing in Brunswick, more degree programs being done at Lorain, interactive video and distance learning is part of what we’re doing but the problem you identified is definitely part of The University of Akron context. We as a Council of Deans looked at how often courses and degrees are taught other than in a very narrow band of time in the middle of the day perhaps two days a week. And over time we have moved away from expanding class availability across the day and evening and even on the weekends. We’re not nearly as plentiful across days and times as we once were. So the Council of Deans met this week, we voted to be true to what the Registrar truly expects us to do in terms of scheduling and so every Dean will review fall 2009 schedule with it in mind that many more courses will be offered evenings and weekends and across the full range of the week because you’re right we’ve lost the ability for people to come and do degrees on a more flexible basis.”

Chair Sterns, recognizing that the President had a pressing appointment, thanked the President and wished him a wonderful holiday.

President Proenza: “Thank you very much. Thank you all and have a great holiday.”

Chair Sterns invited Provost Stroble to continue with her remarks.

c. Remarks from the Provost - Provost Stroble: “It is a great topic and I will let you know what the President said that we really expect that 300,000 veterans will be returning to Ohio soon. And they will come with Federal rights as well what Ohio legislation should create; which is in state for a veteran of the wars who comes from any state in the country. So we are really trying to get ourselves organized to say not only what do you need to do around course availability but services to veterans who are likely to need a whole range of assistance to reintegrate to an academic program. So I think there are great opportunities here and the issue you raise is a real one. Laura Conley, director of Adult Focus, met with me this week. She said one of the most critical needs is scholarships and financial aid for those 25-year olds and up. I know that the retirees group has been quite generous in providing scholarship dollars. You might want to target scholarship dollars to an adult. Since that’s a cause you care about.

Alright so the USO metrics, very much on target here. This morning we presented to the Board of Trustees in an information session our best thinking about how The University of Akron can contribute to each one of those state goals and they gave us feedback. We will take a formal report to them next week at the December 10th meeting with what we believe are the best data projections we will provide to them based on where we’ve been for the past 5 or 10 years and the initiatives we know we have in place that are likely to help us continue to grow. So I would like during spring semester to co-host with Faculty Senate an information session that we can provide as small or as big an audience to as Faculty Senate wishes to roll out those metrics and start talking very much in the spirit of what do we need to do differently to be successful.

A couple of other just academic topics that I introduce today for your information: From the Higher Learning Commission we know that for years in every visit by the Higher Learning Commission not just at The University of Akron but at every institution assessment has been one of the primary topics because higher education has not been nearly as progressive in being comprehensive in their assessment of student learning as maybe P-12 schools have been or other professions. So there's been a real focus on that in these accreditation reviews. We are given language that's sort of come out of a recent update from the Higher Learning Commission where they're really defining the relationship among the concepts of teaching and assessment in a slightly different way and putting much more of the focus on assuming that most people got the message and are doing assessment but saying you really need to be very clear about what it is you expect student's to learn, to know and be able to do and then making the assessments follow course. So Helen Qammar, director of Institute of Teaching and Learning, has been doing focus groups around what could be seen as core competencies for a University of Akron undergraduate and we'll be moving that through a Faculty Senate committee review process right now and it's very much in the spirit that it's hard to do assessment well if you're not clear about what the desired learning outcomes are.

And then finally on the front page is the National Study of Student Engagement. We don't do NSSE every single year, it's a cyclical assessment but we are getting ready to do it again in the spring. And so ITL and University College invited Dr. Jillian Kinsey about 120 faculty, administrators, staff came to her presentations and she does research on what are the instructional strategies that create success and engagement for students? Recently there's been national research being done that shows that nationally for students who are first generation college students from challenging socio-economic circumstances they are much less likely to experience these kind of high impact instructional strategies that students that are from more traditional college going families. So our focus here at The University of Akron on engagement, on doing the kinds of things that are really seen as high impact strategies, student success seminars, learning community, service learning, study abroad, focus on globalization and diversity, undergraduate research those are high impact instructional strategies that actually do cause students to be successful and learn so we're going to be doing much more work in the Institute of Teaching and Learning about how we can make sure that every single University of Akron student has those kinds of experiences while they're here, not just a select few.

And then another great topic, Rethinking Race: Black, White and Beyond it's only the second year and this gives you an update about the planning that's going on. Right now is the time for faculty to start thinking about building those topics into course syllabi for spring and I've given you the website where you can get more information about that. So in the spirit of just some great evidence of what a wonderful academic community this is, I think these are some good updates and I am thankful as Chair Sterns said for your participation in these and many other things and I'll answer any questions you may have."

Senator Gandee: "From your perception with the reporting that you were referring to last month in presentation to the state, what's your perception of the ultimate outcome?"

Provost Stroble: "I can tell you what I think will happen in some steps. Every single institution will submit this report. Chancellor's Office will review them and then give us feedback. I don't know what form the feedback may take. The form might be on this measure we want you to be more aggressive, stretch yourself more on this measure yes we accept your target. So I think there will be some negotiation back

and forth among the institutions and the Chancellor's Office. Ultimately I think it's possible that some of those statewide goals maybe pulled back a bit to be more realistic. I don't know what the timeframe is going to be. Part of what we're reporting too next week to the Regents is what we would imagine our undergraduate tuition rate to be next year which hinges on how much subvention or subsidy we get from the state. In the current economic environment you know hard to know what that means. So my guess would be that the economic situation here in Ohio doesn't put all this in jeopardy but it changes the context quite a bit and it may be some time until we get the feedback to know if he thinks that our projections are sound."

Senator Gandee: "The background for this question is a couple of weeks ago I was in Columbus and it was the young lady from the Chancellor's office Jody I think was her name, she was explaining all of this to this group. And she was expressing that the Chancellor was going to control the whole state and make the decisions and so forth and people on different campuses are going to do the things that they're better at."

Provost Stroble: "I think that is very much a part of the plan. I mean control the whole state? That could take lots of different forms. But I do think in the spirit of saying he wants to not duplicate services, duplicate programs and he wants more interinstitutional cooperation rather than competition. I think the only way that's achievable is by sort of a centralized authority saying yes, no, maybe. That's a very different way for us to function but there is evidence in almost every interaction we have with the Chancellor's office on a variety of topics that more centralized authority for these kinds of decisions is what's being enacted."

Chair Sterns: "Thank you very much."

Provost Stroble: "Thank you. And I do apologize that I have a four o'clock meeting downtown that takes me away today."

d. Committee reports -

Chair Sterns: "Well so far we've been a loose confederation of states in Ohio, but they could be drawing closer together. I think we have first report from the Curriculum Review Committee. I think all we can do is present, since do we not have a quorum yet. Well I would suggest we go ahead and present it."

Associate Provost Ramsier: "Curriculum Review Committee brought two resolutions. Let's look first at the rationale for resolution number one. The recommendation basically changes three courses in the College of Fine and Applied Arts and one program change in Summit College. So if we had a quorum we would ask for your approval. Are there any questions on number one or the rationale associated with that while looking at it? Okay, number two actually may be of interest in the sense that it's the curriculum review committee is bringing forth proposed changes to a Trustee's rule 3359: 20-05.2 there are several reasons for these proposed changes. First it was mentioned by Secretary Stratton the changes are suggested on what is page two of the report in sections B-1, B-3 and B-4. These changes are to bring our Board rule in line with the State of Ohio and the Higher Learning Commission's current definition of what's considered to be distance learning. If you think back to when these board rules were written, distance learning included the distance learning classrooms that we had on campus. The classroom with a camera and a classroom in some high school with a camera and the students sit there in synchronous real time interacting with the instructor in a face to face manner. That as the Board Rule stands now is still included

as DL or distance learning, the state and the higher learning commission no longer considers synchronous delivery as special. Synchronous is face to face like I am here with you today or it could be face to face ie a camera on the wall and someone somewhere else was interacting with us: face to face synchronous. It's the synchronous versus asynchronous that's now the distinction. So these changes would remove from our Board rule the requirement for us to review every course proposal where people want to change the mode of delivery simply from a face to face, synchronous meeting in person to synchronous via television if you want. So if we make those changes in this section 1, 3 and 4 this will bring us in line with the standard definitions now. It will also enable faculty who want to provide their course through distance learning synchronous mode to not have to do a curriculum proposal to change their mode of delivery. So it will save a lot faculty a lot of time. And of course the committee and the Senate. Do we have any questions on those proposed changes it could be either 1, 3 or 4? Or the reason behind it. So that's what Senator Stratton mentioned earlier.

In section 7 and 8 these proposed changes are actually for a different reason. These changes are to bring up our current Board rule into line with past and current practice. The way the current electronic curriculum system works, the way it was programmed it never followed section 7 of Board rule. So the way we've been operating probably for ten years has been out of compliance with section 7 of Board rule. The only way we can figure out in the near term to fix this problem now that we're aware of it is to change the Board rule to reflect reality and then presumably after the new ad hoc committee for the new curriculum system figures out how the system should really work, they will bring forward potentially change the Board rule to come into line with the new system. But right now we can't change the electronic system so we feel the need to change the Board rule so we're not operating out of basically out of line. So that's the reason for the changes to 7 and 8. Do we have any questions on that?"

Senator Kruse: "Just a comment. In 7-b you refer to DLRC and CRC neither one of those are defined. In the new language that the old language be struck you might want to include definitions."

Senator Cox: "To follow up on the definitions, since whether it's synchronous or basically it seems to be the lynchpin on whether you have to do anything it might be very useful to have actual definitions of asynchronous and synchronous learning. It may seem obvious but they are going to say is it asynchronous based on maybe 99% web based it would be very helpful to know what you really mean by synchronous. So someone will know if they have to submit a proposal."

Associate Provost Ramsier welcomed these comments and agreed to incorporate them in and I'm assuming I can bring forward a revised motion in February meeting.

Chair Sterns: "Thank you very much. Okay I might point out let's see you've all seen the report of the Research Committee from Laura Gelfand. The asterisk that follows Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee really belongs after the Research Committee."

Senator Erickson: "If you're going down this list after Faculty Research there is one before, University Libraries. We appreciate that the Library committee met and that we've got minutes from that committee, but I had hoped there would be someone from the Library committee here. What we've got is the statements of the topics that they discussed but no information on what was presented. It is the point of the

report to provide us with information. Perhaps you could point out to them that CCTC did a much better job of saying what actually happened in the meeting allowing us to determine what questions we had or what issues we wanted more information about. Maybe that's what they could do next time, it would be appreciated."

Chair Sterns agreed to provide that feedback. He then turned to the Computing and Communications Committee report.

Senator Erickson: "Perhaps someone on the committee could give some information. This is on the computer recycling system. It says that donations were not secure means they are not donating computers anymore. As somebody who's been involved in that donation program which goes to schools that don't get computers otherwise and where they took every single thing off the hard drives I wasn't sure how they were then not secure. That it might be better that they might generate some money for the university by doing it differently. I was a little confused about if you wipe everything off the hard drive what else you've got that is not secure? Comment?"

Senator Bove asked for clarification.

Senator Erickson: "It's says right here, addressing the computer recycling system, "donations are not a secure means of disposing of computers anymore". I'm asking a question about that."

Senator Bove: "One of the things about when we recycle a computer out of use and the University a lot of times we used to donate it but before it was donated to like a high school or something like that you had to make sure the hard drive was cleaned and what happened was that if I remember correctly that primarily students were doing it and it was very possible that data would leak out. The contract with this company in fact they guarantee that if they basically strip down the computers and recycle anything that they can and they shred the hard drives, if the hard drives is usable they actually can put them back together and I believe the University has the option of buying the computers back if they wanted to donate them later."

Senator Erickson: "Well in that case it's the donation issue. I know that the school I got 50 of our university computers for, a primary school on the east side of Cleveland in the Cleveland School system had no computers. It was a great deal for them. We were talking earlier about service and it was a service provided by the university. And though I understand the issue I would to see that the university had at least evaluated some potential for still maintaining some kind of service activates."

Senator Bove: "I believe Herb said that the contract with this company provides the service cost free to us. So they provide this service and they recycle what they can and then the university has the option of buying back some refurbished material from this company at dirt cheap prices. I don't recall the prices. I don't want to quote prices because I don't remember maybe Dick remembers something."

Senator Stratton: "A couple of issues. Number one, we can buy back refurbished machines from his company at less cost than it would cost us to clean them and refurbish them and do it ourselves. Number two, when we were scrubbing the hard drives we could not certify that every single item was taken off the

hard drive and if something happened to slip through we would have the liability. With this company, they clean the hard drives to the Department of Defense's criteria as far as wiping them clean if they're usable. And then guarantee and take on the liability of any problems that we have. Therefore, at no cost to the university we have basically been able to move that liability from the university to that company. The discussion of the donations was restricted to the liability issue. Continuing the old donation process is not an option. The University would have to buy back the machines from this company and donate those to the school districts."

Senator Erickson: "And how much would it cost?"

Senator Stratton: "I don't know the exact amount, I think it was very very inexpensive because it would cost us less to buy them back then the cost of redoing them ourselves. So I don't know what that is, but whatever that cost was and we had to do that anyhow before they could be donated, we can buy them back from this company at a cost that's less than that."

Senator Erickson: "Yeah, well you can and will are two different things and my concern is that that's the end of donations from the university and I think we really should maintain our donations. Maybe CCTC could continue looking at this at least in terms of getting it done this way, or finding a way in which our machines can be donated at least find out. I suspect if we have to buy them back they're not going to do it, but we'll see. There are school districts that are just short of computers and I know the problem. I know the problems going in the school districts. If at all possible, I would hope that CCTC could at least look at the issue. Even if you can't do it yourself could you at least provide people on campus with information on where they can find machines that can be donated? I understand the cost issue, but I would like to see more discussion of the service issue."

Chair Sterns: "If I'm hearing Senator Erickson correctly I think she's trying to say that intact computers could be given to schools and other groups can be a valuable resource for them. Obviously we have to be in compliance. Obviously we have sympathy that we've been able to help other educational institutions at levels by offering that service so I guess we can ask the committee to, I mean would could develop a donation program where someone suggests we raise this much money so this could happen."

Senator Erickson: "Yeah, at least could they provide the value."

Chair Sterns asked for the report from the University Council Exploratory Committee

Senator Lillie: "This will be my last report to the Senate as co-chair of the University Council Exploratory committee. I will continue as the Senate's representative to this committee until the business of the committee is done but I wanted to say a word or two about that. I've been involved in this committee now for two and a half years, except for a semester when I was on sabbatical. I've learned a lot not only about service which we've heard a couple of people talk about already but also in terms of the different roles there are within The University of Akron and the imperfect understanding of the roles that different people have that I had before I had the opportunity to be on this committee. I've learned a lot about the views and the role and the function and the importance of contract professionals, staff, students, and yes even Deans, Chairs, vice-presidents in terms of the structure, role and function of how a university operates. We have

done a lot of education of each other, we have done a lot of very hard negotiating. I believe that we are coming down to the last part of the deal. And as you know the last part of the deal, the last \$25 that separates the two parties sometimes seems to be the hardest. We had a meeting a couple of days ago that Chair Sterns referred to, in which some of these issues were highlighted. We are continuing to think about them and work on them in an effective way. I just want to remind everybody we're talking about developing a consensus of eight separate constituencies for this kind of a process, so it is something that we need to be aware takes a lot of time and patience. However I do think we are, we are very close to agreement on a set of bylaws. One of the advantages of considering the university council proposal at this point and sending it to the other constituencies in terms of the changing role and function that were going to have as a university vis a vis the university system of Ohio. It's going to be more important than ever for us to have a university wide body in which the concerns of each of the constituencies is going to be able to be heard and is going to be able to be effectively discussed and in which long term plans, long term goals are going to be able to be worked on and for which stake holders will then have a major role. We have a ten or eleven page bylaws document which following the recommendations of our office of general counsel and was based on the template of the Faculty Senate bylaws. There are some differences that we're still working on and some similarities that we found. I'm not sure exactly how many more items there are but I'd say it's probably getting down to few, that last \$25. Associate Provost Ramsier."

Associate Provost Ramsier: "I'd like to first of all go on the record to thank Senator Lillie as co-chair on the committee. I've only been on this work for over a year, but Senator Lillie has really served the Exploratory Committee really well and Faculty Senate. He really has demonstrated leadership in the service role and you should thank him as a senator. I would echo what Senator Lillie has said we have all learned a lot about the roles of each unit on campus I think the students in particular as well as myself have learned things that we were never even aware of and I think all of us have this we are very close to being done with the bylaws which is the critical document for implementation of the council. We continue to meet we'll be meeting next week we've been meeting now every week and hopefully well, the first Senate meeting of next year is February and we'd certainly hope to have something more tangible to report by then. I'd be happy to take any questions as well as Senator Lillie and we're going to miss his leadership on the committee as well he'll speak to that as well."

Chair Sterns: "I'd just like to make a comment and thank both of you for your good work. I would like to see if we could have an informational session in January where the group might be able to view the document with the idea of adoption at our first meeting in February. I don't know if that's realistic, but it would make sense to me. As we had planned to do before we could call a special meeting so that there could be a chance to discuss the document and then there would vote in the February Senate meeting. Do you think that's realistic?"

Senator Hajjafar: "By document do you mean the bylaw?"

Chair Sterns: "Yes. Because my impression is, and I know the co-chairs would agree with me, that they are getting very close. I don't think we can walk in here in February and just vote on it unless we have a chance to review it and discuss it. So operationally I'll see what I can do, I'll want your guidance collectively. Another approach would be to use the February meeting as our initial exploration and calling a

special meeting in the middle of February for a vote but I think we have to get this in place. Our goal had been to finish it today, we're a bit off but I would like to see it happen as soon as possible as long as we're not cutting short the process."

Senator Lillie: "The process has been to basically honor every concern raised by every person who shows up for a committee meeting, as a member of the committee, and to take every concern seriously. That is, as you might imagine is a slow process. I would hope that what we've done is to demonstrate our serious commitment to everybody's concern and also demonstrate that we are concerned for what everyone thinks. To the extent that we have developed trust and that people can now believe that our bylaws are representative of the principles that we've spent so long hammering out is really the question. I think that if that's the case, if people will and are able to trust that the bylaws have as their intent the implementation of the principles, then I think we can move quickly. If there is a lot of concern expressed by many members of a particular constituency over the wording of a bylaw or whether or not a particular bylaw is specific enough or big enough then I think it might take us longer. I think that that's really a question for the people who make up the committee to decide."

Senator Erickson: "I would like to move a *motion of appreciation for Senator Lillie for all his work as co-chair of the University Council Exploratory Committee. I'd like us to have a motion of appreciation.*"

Chair Sterns: "Seconded by Senator Cox. Further discussion? I can say as someone who's been serving ex-officio since last September that I have also observed the great commitment and concern and thoughtfulness and occasionally acceptable humor. The fact of the matter is and Associate Provost Ramsier as well, I think Tim is very deserving of our thanks. Is there further discussion on the motion?" There being none, **the motion was called and it passed.**

Chair Sterns asked if there was any guidance for the Chair about the progression of meetings to consider the bylaws of the University Council. He proposed to stay in touch with the committee and if it's realistic he will move things along. Remember there are different groups who have to approve this so we could be one of them. He then thanks Senator Lillie and Associate Provost Ramsier for the report and asked for the Judicial Policy Committee report.

Senator Bove: "We're hammering out some final details regarding the policy and we expect to bring the recommended policy to the Faculty Senate at the next meeting in February."

Chair Sterns: "Okay so we should have an exciting meeting in February. Is there any unfinished business? Is there any new business?"

V. Good of the Order - Chair Sterns: Anything for Good of the Order?

Senator Bowman: “I just wanted to say that Student Government is going to be giving out five subject notebooks. We get 10,000 of them January 7th, 8 palettes of them. So if you’re contacted by your college senator or student government asking to come by your class I would appreciate it. We want to get them out. They’re really great; we got them for free and we’re just trying it out. Hopefully it will be something we’ll be doing every semester. So if someone contacts you please cooperate. It’s just a notebook, but I know it’ll help out the students. They’re usually five to nine dollars a piece. Thank you.”

Senator Gerlach: “I’m moved to say Mr. Chairman that we’ve heard more about the University Council proposal and your comments about service, but I’ve been noticing today is a case in point, no quorum. What’s the matter with the members of this Senate that they don’t have proper sense of service once they’re elected to office? And I have a sneaking suspicion once the University Council gets in operation the Senate will become absolutely worthless. I think that’s what some of my active colleagues are professing. Perhaps whoever made that remark to you, Mr. Chairman about are you out of your mind taking on this job, think the Senate is not going to amount to much any more. I will regret that having been in on the birth of the Senate in 1994. But who knows what will happen. But there’s one thing I’d like to make a request of the Executive Committee an odd thing that was brought to my attention this past week I guess. There were signs posted in Olin Hall and I don’t know where else ordering that students should not be sitting on the floors in the hallways, I don’t know whether any of my colleagues currently occupy Olin Hall can testify to that but one person did. And then as they said the students tore down the signs and proceeded to do it anyway. I’d like to know who was responsible for putting up the signs; if they don’t want students to sit on the floor for reasons sanitary or otherwise why don’t they put some benches around the place so they’ll have some place to sit. Could the Executive Committee make a slight inquiry to see if this happened only in Olin Hall or is it elsewhere and what’s the idea, who’s doing it? It’s an odd thing, in my day there were students sitting wherever they pleased whether it was chair or on the floor and they would create a nuisance by doing it that lounging around but I don’t see that very often so.”

Chair Sterns: “I can tell you in the Arts and Sciences building I was walking by just yesterday and a student sitting on the floor and I said wouldn’t you like to take advantage of the furniture we’ve purchased and she said no I’m perfectly comfortable so.”

Chair Sterns: “We will be happy to look into it. Some of us understand what sitting in means. So, in this case, all I’ve observed is students sitting on the floor studying, slightly different. I want to respond to something that Senator Gerlach said. I have not had the experience of two and half years of serving on the UCEC, nor do I think necessarily that a Senate session in the last week of the semester when everyone is really under the gun, we had many formal excuses from people for various good reasons why they weren’t here today, it’s very difficult because we can’t do business and I agree with that. But the thing that I have seen in the discussions regarding the UCEC is that the Faculty Senate retains all of it’s authority, in that all academic affairs and all academic decision making stays with the Faculty Senate. When you see the bylaws for the UCEC you will see that budgeting and long range planning and some of the areas which have wanted to have input in since the change in our bylaws are coming forward. I think for many of the people on that committee the intention was to have a strong Senate and a strong UC. But I don’t know how that can happen because the UC by itself can not pass on any academic issues the way it is set up at

this time. And so this body is as relevant now as it has ever been. Now that's the question. But I don't see that as an issue. There may be other issues because the division of the house for academic decision making versus university wide planning budgeting. You clearly when you do a budget you also affect the academics, when you do long range planning you construct buildings you're also making academic decisions. So there has to be a balance back and forth there. I listen to you very carefully, I accept the wisdom of your experiences and years but I can't let my personal optimism be completely crushed. So I hope that your wrong, but I think we're not there yet, we have to see the document and we have to see what we're voting on. At this point we're unconstrained by data, that is the actual document. That makes it easiest to discuss issues when we don't actually have the document in front of us but I hope that you will see and appreciate all the work that has gone into this. Faculty governance as I've talked to as I've gone to the meetings of the chairs and representatives of faculty senates around the state you know Rudy Fenwick the immediate past chair of the Senate is the Secretary of that group and they've taken on a formal role. Chancellor Fingerhut has asked them to be officially umbrellaed as a body of under the Board of Regents so there will be a coordination of all faculty senates in Ohio. I think that's a good thing because if you hear what's happening on other campuses one of the things that struck me was that at least two or three other campuses are going now through collective bargaining. So they're dealing with some issues that we've already dealt with a few years ago. And now why this is happening on their campus is another issue. But the fact of the matter is that Cincinnati by comparison is having a very difficult governance battle situation right now. There are concerns going on at Bowling Green University and other places so this issue of faculty governance is a demanding and challenging issue on campuses and the balance between this new corporate approach to higher education and faculty involvement in decision making I think is very important now. For those of us who have been in higher education I have for almost forty years now, I still think the role of faculty in this process as active contributors to decision making and what goes on in universities is absolutely essential. So that people may try to use a more corporate approach but we don't have to let it happen as faculty. But I think what Dr. Gerlach is getting at is through apathy we can turn it over. If you really believe in the role of faculty in decision making in having control of our curriculum, and having our say in the classroom, in making decision making in terms of priority setting in terms of our colleges, the only way that isn't going to happen is if people show up for meetings and so I think our enemy is apathy. And this faculty certainly has taken action in the last few years we shouldn't stop now, we should continue to hang in there and try to play a valuable role in decision making because if we give up then we get nothing. There must be some great quote from the revolutionary period what I guess: United we stand, divided we fall."

Senator Gerlach: "And remember not all change is progress."

Senator Lillie: "Perhaps your thinking now is the time that tries men's souls."

Chair Sterns: "Any other good of the order? If not I hope everybody has a wonderful break and I want you to come back with great enthusiasm to deal with all these issues in February."

VI. Adjournment -Motion to adjourn by Senator Gerlach, seconded by Senator Bowman.

The meeting adjourned at 4:24 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,

Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 4, 2008

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

FACULTY SENATE

DECEMBER 4, 2008

USO METRICS: A QUICK UPDATE

We presented data trends and projections to Board of Trustees members this morning for their review, prior to formal approval at next week's December 10th meeting. In the spring semester, I would like to co-host an information session with Faculty Senate to provide an overview of the metrics, data trends, and projections and to begin the work necessary for us to meet the USO goals.

UPDATE FROM HLC: RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHING, LEARNING, AND ASSESSMENT

From the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) publication "Institutional Accreditation: An Overview", dated March 1, 2007:

**Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching.
The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.**

3a. The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

Please note the emphasis has shifted from assessment (of student learning) to student learning outcomes (that make effective assessment possible). This is a philosophical shift discussed at the HLC Peer Review Corp training that Rex Ramsier attended in November, and that will be dominating future accreditation visits. The emphasis is that student learning outcomes, clearly stated for each program, are what is needed, and that assessment is presumably already in place and functioning on a continuous improvement basis across all campuses. Defining student learning outcomes is primarily a faculty-driven process and is currently being coordinated by ITL.

NATIONAL STUDY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (NSSE): HIGH IMPACT INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

I'm happy to report that Dr. Jillian Kinzie's visit to campus on November 19th proved to be a valuable experience for the approximately 120 faculty, administrators, and staff who attended her sessions, sponsored by the Institute of Teaching & Learning and University College. As the University strives to reach the higher education metrics set by Chancellor Fingerhut, all of us can increase students' success by increasing student engagement. High impact activities require that students interact with their faculty and peers about substantive matters. Among the programs at UA which are cited by researchers as promising options are Student Success Seminars, Learning Communities, and Service-Learning. As students progress in their studies, research with faculty, study abroad, as well as internships, co-ops, and clinical or student teaching experiences help students learn and grow. You will hear about more opportunities as we administer the NSSE to first-year and senior-level students during the Spring term.

RETHINKING RACE: BLACK, WHITE, AND BEYOND

This is the second year in our ongoing and pro-active work in implementing the design principle of Inclusive Excellence. Led by a group of faculty, students and contract professionals from every college, UA is implementing a unique and creative way to integrate diversity and multicultural education in every college.

Rethinking Race: Black, White and Beyond will occur from February 3rd through the 12th and feature 10 keynote speakers across many disciplines, a film festival, a student led unity march, and at this time more than 12 face to face discussion sessions. More face to face sessions are expected. I invite you to join many of your colleagues who are including Rethinking Race in their spring semester courses. In addition, this year's events will lead to research and other scholarly work. You may find more details on the Rethinking Race web site at www.uakron.edu/race.

APPENDIX B

November 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Curriculum Review Committee
RE: **Approval Recommendations**

Recommendation I

1. SC-08-48 Surveying & Mapping

The proposed change makes necessary adjustments courses which have already been taught as “Special Topics” courses, incorporates new subject areas highly desired by students, and evenly adjusts course material load appropriately between classes.

2. FAA-09-003 Graduate Audiologist III (7700:749)

The School’s clinical practicum courses need to be repeatable to accommodate circumstances where additional work is needed. The proposed recommendation is to make this course repeatable up to 24 credits which will serve student needs as well as bring the course into alignment with other clinical practicum courses. Course co-requisites will also be added.

3. FAA-09-004 Graduate Audiologist IV (7700:750)

The School’s clinical practicum courses need to be repeatable to accommodate circumstances where additional work is needed. The proposed recommendation is to make this course repeatable up to 24 credits which will serve student needs as well as bring the course into alignment with other clinical practicum courses.

4. FAA-09-005 Graduate Audiologist V (7700:751)

The School’s clinical practicum courses need to be repeatable to accommodate circumstances where additional work is needed. The proposed recommendation is to make this course repeatable up to 9 credits which will serve student needs as well as bring the course into alignment with other clinical practicum courses.

Recommendation II

1. Rule change: 3359-20-05.2 Curricular changes

The following change will bring our current process concerning synchronous distance learning courses in-line with national best practices, and Ohio Board of Regents and the Higher Learning Commission expectations.

(B) Curricular change process for ~~distance learning proposals including~~ changes in mode of delivery.

(1) Definitions:

- (a) Ohio board of regents defines one credit hour as 750 minutes of instruction. The percentages in the following definitions are based on this Ohio board of regents calculation.
- (b) Traditional delivery: 100% face-to-face instruction; ~~could be web-enhanced~~; this mode of delivery can be web supported **but the number of face-to-face sessions is not reduced.**
- (c) Web-enhanced course: 1-30% online instruction; any class that meets more than 70% of the time in a traditional classroom setting with the remaining instruction delivered over the intranet/internet. **This online instruction is intended to replace the equivalent face-to-face class sessions.**
- (d) Web-based course: 31-99% online instruction; any class that meets less than 31% of the time in a traditional classroom setting with the remaining instruction delivered over the intranet/internet. **(See OhioLearns definition (B)(2) below)**
- (e) Online delivery: 100% online delivery; any class that does not meet in a traditional classroom setting.
- (f) ~~Distance learning course: 25-99% distance delivery; any class that meets less than 25% of the time in a traditional classroom setting with the remaining instruction delivered in a distance learning classroom connecting two or more sites~~
- (g) Non-traditional instruction such as independent study and internships are excluded but may be coded web-enhanced, if applicable.

- (2) The Ohio board of regents and the Ohio learning network broadly describe distance learning as “the process of extending the majority (70% percent or greater for inclusion on “OhioLearns!”) of learning or delivering instructional resource-sharing opportunities to locations away from the classroom site using video, audio, computer, multimedia communications, or some combination of these with other traditional delivery methods.”

- (3) Changes in mode of delivery for web-based **and** online, ~~and distance learning~~ courses shall be subject to the curriculum review process.
- (4) Web-enhanced and web-based courses, ~~as a subset of distance learning,~~ will be delivered and managed by “WebCT” or other **University** approved **course management** software and mounted on a university server.
- (5) Course content is determined solely within the purview of the instructor of record.
- (6) All courses, regardless of mode of delivery, shall be subject to an assessment of student outcomes.
- (7) ~~Process for existing courses to be offered either web-based or online or in a distance learning classroom:~~
 - (a) ~~The departmental unit shall approve, in concept, the change of delivery.~~
 - (b) ~~The dean of the college shall approve the change in delivery.~~
 - (c) ~~For tracking purposes, the college designee shall enter the course into the curriculum proposal system as a mode of delivery change, only.~~
 - (d) ~~A complete course proposal form with representative examples of all delivery mechanisms submitted to the distance learning review committee (“DLRC”), a sub-committee of the curriculum review committee (“CRC”) which will evaluate the following:~~
 - (i) ~~Does the university have the technology to support the course?~~
 - (ii) ~~Does the university have the electronic resources available to support the course?~~
 - (iii) ~~Does the university have the trained staff to support the course?~~
 - (iv) ~~Does the university have the trained faculty to support the course?~~
 - (v) ~~Is the interface standardized?~~
 - (e) ~~If approved by “DLRC”, the course is forwarded to the senior vice president and provost for approval.~~
- (78) Process for **review of new or existing** courses to be offered either web-based **or** online; ~~or in a distance learning classroom.~~

- (a) The course is treated as any new classroom course and is entered into the curriculum proposal system. ~~The curricular change process is described in paragraphs (A)(2) to (A)(8) of this rule.~~
- ~~(b) —The instructor of record develops the course.~~
- (be)** The course, with representative examples of all delivery mechanisms and a completed course proposal form, is submitted to the “DLRC”, a sub-committee of the “CRC”, which will evaluate the following.
 - (i) Does the university have the technology to support the course?
 - (i) Does the university have the electronic resources available to support the course?
 - (ii) Does the university have the trained staff to support the course?
 - (iii) Does the university have the trained faculty to support the course?
 - (iv) Is the interface standardized?
- ~~(cd)~~ If approved by “DLRC”, the course can be released for university-wide review.

APPENDIX C

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

RESOLUTION I 12-04-08

Pertaining to the Approval of the Following Curricular Changes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the recommendation presented by the Curriculum Review Committee concerning the curriculum proposal approvals listed below, be approved.

1. SC-08-48 Surveying & Mapping
2. FAA-09-003 Graduate Audiologist III (7700:749)
3. FAA-09-004 Graduate Audiologist IV (7700:750)
4. FAA-09-005 Graduate Audiologist V (7700:751)

RESOLUTION II 12-04-08

Pertaining to the Approval of the Following Curricular Changes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the recommendation presented by the Curriculum Review Committee concerning the curriculum proposal approval listed below, be approved.

1. Rule change: 3359-20-05.2 Curricular changes

APPENDIX D

Nov. 13, 2008

University Libraries Committee

We met on Nov. 3rd, 2008. We plan to meet again early in the Spring semester.

We discussed the charge of this committee, recent use of the library, the University System of Ohio E-textbooks, and Coursepack Initiatives. We were also updated on the Learning Commons by Dean Kern-Simirenko. Dr. Mary Myers was earlier elected as Chair of the University Libraries Committee since previous Chair (Dr. Eric Sotnak) is on faculty leave development. Faculty from the committee participated in Faculty Focus Groups on Nov. 10th and 11th. If any faculty has input, please email Dr. Myers at mmyers@uakron.edu.

APPENDIX E

Faculty Research Committee Report
Laura Gelfand, Chair

November 19, 2008

The Faculty Research Committee met on November 7 to consider the 17 Academic Year Proposals submitted to the committee. We have streamlined our evaluation procedure in the hopes of making it more efficient and fair. After discussion we voted to fund the top four proposals. This is less than 25% of those submitted and it is in keeping with our funding rate for the Summer Fellowships.

The deadline for Summer Fellowships is January 16 and the committee will meet to make our final decisions on those proposals February 27. We are expecting a large number of proposals to be submitted and are giving the committee as much time as possible to read all of them and rank them.

The FRC's First Annual Research Colloquium was held on November 14 in the Student Union and was followed by a reception. Faculty who received funding from us in 2006/7 presented the fruits of their research to those in attendance. Many faculty and administrators attended and the day was a great success. The faculty members who gave presentations welcomed the chance to share their research with the UA community and it gave future applicants an opportunity to see what sorts of projects we fund. We are planning next year's event and should announce the date for this soon.

Katie Watkins-Wendell will be giving to workshops for those interested in applying for the FRC grants and fellowships on December 2 and 3, both at 11:45 in the ITL seminar room. Those who wish to apply for our Summer Fellowships of \$10,000 are encouraged to attend.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Gelfand (Chair)

APPENDIX F

CCTC MEETING - THURSDAY, November 6th, 2008, Noon-1pm

Conference Room, Kolbe Hall #111

Call to order 12:04pm.

In attendance: Hoffman, Carson, Matheny, Mortiz, Williams, Bove, Lenavitt, Stratton.

Minutes from 10/08 meeting are approved.

1. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- a. Update on storage and archival of video—
Frank Bove- Has been in contact with OhioLink about digitizing materials. Suggests that such a plan might work better if more than one institution can approach this problem through Ohiolink. Bove agrees to meet and discuss this idea with Dean Kern-Simirenko, then will get back to CCTC with a plan to move forward with discussions with other institutions.
- b. Digital Signage demo-
X2O Systems does demonstration of digital signage solution via WebEx. Conversation following demo again stresses that CCTC would like to see a solution that mitigates sound pollution in public spaces. CCTC would also like to see a set of recommendations go forward that will set appropriate policies regarding advertising content, etc. Chair requests that CCTC plan to set forth recommendations in Spring 09.

2. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Mike Szczukowski- Print Management Program. Szczukowski notes that at this point, the print management plan is in the process of collecting data on printing throughout the university. This includes desktop printers, office laser printers, copiers, etc. According to Szczukowski, the goal of this plan is to reduce overall printing costs to the university by reducing the number of desktop printers in offices. This in turn will reduce the cost to the University of printing according to Szczukowski.
- b. Herb Matheny- Working on computer recycling system. Donations are not a secure means of disposing of computers anymore, so UA is seeking to enter into contract with recyclers who will track and manage all data devices as part of overall recycling process.
- c. Several members of CCTC expressed concern that the wireless network will routinely kick users off. Committee members ask chair to contact Jim Sage directly to investigate what can be done. Problem is common across campus according to Lenavitt.

Meeting adjourned 1:17 pm.