36 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 5, 2009

T he regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, March 5, 2009 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:09 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-four Senators, 36 were present for this meeting. Senators Bagatto, Carroll, Gilliland, Hamed, Licate, Plummer, Schantz, and Vinnedge were absent with notice. Senators Arter, Clark, Cockley, Kruse, Migid-Hamzza, Miller, Moritz, Vierheller and Yi were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Sterns called the meeting to order and asked for approval of the agenda as presented. Senator Gandee (second by Senator Tabatcher) moved the agenda be approved. The motion passed and the agenda was adopted.

II. Approval of the Minutes – **Senator Lillie** moved the minutes of February meeting be approved as published in the Chronicle. Senator Rich seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as published.

III. Chairman's Remarks & Special Announcements – **Chair Sterns** "I want to make a brief statement in the Chairman's remarks today. We will be talking today about a number of issues that involve faculty administration collaboration. One that has been extremely important to the Executive Committee has been the issue of class scheduling. I'm sure all of us are in favor of the use of our facilities to the greatest extent possible. There are patterns of scheduling that have worked well for many years and at the same time innovative approaches can lead to new opportunities. So clearly change here is important as well. I personally believe, and it is the feeling of the Executive Committee as well, that the choice of class patterns and scheduling should be a mutual decision between the faculty member and their Chair. Faculty expect to be involved in the decision regarding the scheduling and patterning of classes. I think there is no doubt that faculty members, as professionals, are entitled to being involved in decision making. At the same time of course faculty need to be willing to meet the departmental needs. The Council of Dean's policy document on class scheduling has given us a chance to discuss how changes are to be made on the campus and how they are to be implemented. I just want to point out that we need to work together with mutual respect and making sure that we do our class scheduling in a way that is beneficial both to departments and to the faculty. As you will find out later in the meeting I requested the Academic Policies Committee to take up this issue. [The executive committee] discussed this at an earlier time with the President and the Provost, but I formally wanted to put it on the table.

So I have nothing else that I would like to say at this time so I think that we can now move to special announcements. I call upon Senator Gerlach who would like to share some information about one of his colleagues who passed away."

Senator Gerlach: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak to the memory of Henry S. Vyverberg, who was once my colleague in the History department. He was born December 31, 1921 died October 21,

2008. As Professor Emeritus of History, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. Vyverberg earned his Doctorate at Harvard under the direction of the rather famous Crane Briton who is notable for his work in French Revolutionary history. Two of Vyverberg's books were published by Harvard and Oxford University Presses. In addition to many articles and book reviews, his textbook The Living Tradition subtitled Art, Music and Ideas in the Western World was used here at The University of Akron for the general studies course Western Cultural Traditions which he taught while he served in Akron, 1957 I believe it was to 1968. Before coming to Akron he taught at Alliance College and then in 1968 he moved to the Southern Illinois University campus at Carbondale, Illinois. A veteran of World War II and the Korean War Vyverberg was noted among those of us who remember him, for his great love of music, gourmet cooking and quiet wit. Thank you."   (Senate observed a moment of silence in memory of our esteemed colleague.)

IV.   Reports –

a. Executive Committee - Senator Stratton "The Executive Committee met four times since our last meeting. On February 19th we met with the Provost and the President. We also met on February 12th, 25th and 26th. In our meeting with the President and the Provost on the 19th the President shared his understanding of the status of the state budget at that time, an ongoing issue. Second, we expressed our ongoing concerns with the Council of Deans policy on class scheduling, as Chair Sterns has already indicated. The Provost assured us that the policy was not final; it was under review. There had been two attempts to meet with the faculty union to discuss the issues, but both meetings had to be postponed for reasons outside of the control of either side. They continue to try to arrange a meeting. Third, the Provost also reported that she had appointed senators Frank Bove and Malik Elbuluk to the Budget Committee. They were two of the four senators that we put forward for her consideration.

Fourth, we were informed that the revision of the Code of Student Conduct, which you have before you today, would be ready for today's meeting. Fifth, we reported to the President and the Provost at that meeting that the first meeting of the Curriculum Proposal System Committee had met and Dr. Sterns has agreed to chair the committee until another senator volunteers to do so.

Sixth there was discussion of the e-mail digest report from the Office of Accessibility. As you may remember an e-mail was sent by that office indicating that they were making some changes in policy that would affect faculty. Vice President Fey informed us that it really wasn't a change in policy, but simply that the memo was very poorly worded. We agreed with Dr. Fey that there should be further discussions along those lines and as you will see later on the Executive Committee has a recommendation for how that might go ahead.

We discussed with the Provost our concern that the issue with the Graduate faculty. Specifically, we are concerned about the change in the way in which graduate faculty can be appointed and whether or not tenure track faculty can gain temporary status under unusual circumstances. We reminded her that we had not heard anything from the Graduate Faculty and brainstormed on how we might get that process going again. And finally we invited the Provost to present to the Senate the USO metrics which she is going to do later on today.

At the other meetings, the Executive Committee discussed the Curriculum Proposal System Committee that Dr. Sterns is chairing. That discussion led to a meeting between the Executive Committee and the Curriculum Proposal System Committee with Frontline Logic which is the company that the university is partnering with to try to update the software for curriculum process. Dr. Lillie wanted to be sure that it was clear that there are university rules that apply the way in which the curriculum proposal system works after it gets out of the college and is under university wide review and wanted to be sure that the committee understood that it's charge was both to review that process and also to review the software that implemented it.

We discussed the spring elections, in particular the splitting of the college of Fine and Applied Arts. We considered how to address the representation for the two new colleges. There are currently eight senators from that college, two have a continuing senate term and will end up in the college of Health Sciences and Human Services; two others with continuing terms will end up in the College of Creative and Professional Arts. It is the recommendation of the Executive Committee that those four members whose terms do not expire this year continue to serve in the capacity of senators and that the two new colleges be authorized to elect additional new representatives as soon as we find out how many faculty are in each college and therefore the number of representative to which they are entitled.

Because of the continued issue concerning the College of Deans policy on class scheduling, the Executive Committee agreed to send a copy of the Dean's policy to APC with the charge to determine its impact on academic programs and to report back to the Senate any recommendations for change in the policy. And as Dr. Sterns indicated he has communicated that with APC.

To facilitate the dialogue between the Senate and the Office of Accessibility the Executive Committee recommends the creation of an ad hoc committee on accessibility, the charge would be to review with the Office of Accessibility the processes and procedures that impact academics with a view to strengthening them and to insure that appropriate control of academics by the faculty is continued. I assume creation of the ad hoc committee will be considered under New Business.

And finally, the EC received a letter from Maria Maisto who is a senator representing part-time faculty. She expressed concern about several part-time faculty issues and in response to that the Executive Committee recommends the creation of an ad hoc committee to address part-time faculty issues. The charge will be two-fold; first to develop and consider recommendations for the rights and responsibilities of part-time faculty including measures to improve morale and academic effectiveness, and two to consider the possibility of creating a permanent standing committee of the Faculty Senate on part-time faculty issues. That concludes my report for today. Are there any questions?"

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman I think if it's necessary, it would be appropriate for the full Senate to act on the recommendations now that the committee has made: one concerning the representation of the two colleges created out of Fine and Applied Arts and the other two ad hoc committees that are proposed. If that is in order I will move that the senate approve those recommendations."

Chair Sterns ruled the motion was in order. Senator Gandee seconded the motion. It was noted that new committees must be approved by the Senate. **The motion passed.**

Chair Sterns then invited President Proenza to present his remarks.

b.   Remarks from the President - President Proenza "Thank you Mr. Chairman and good afternoon colleagues. Just a few updates today, first it is most gratifying when one of our colleagues for advancement and recognition and in that spirit I want to tell you what you already know but recognize Beth Stroble for her just recently announced appointment as President at Webster University effective July 1. Beth you've given great service to The University of Akron. We thank you and congratulate you at the same time. There'll be many other opportunities for us to celebrate Beth's accomplishments and to share with her in her new success. I don't think we had a chance to do that at this meeting so again our congratulations. I see that David Baker has joined us and as I think most of you are aware David has kindly accepted my invitation to immediately begin working with Beth and effective June 1 to serve as our interim Provost, Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer. He will as I indicated in my memo to campus of course particularly in the operational responsibilities be assisted by the full senior leadership team. Take a bow in case your colleagues don't know you. Congratulations David and thank you for your willingness to serve.

Several of us have just spent a few days in Washington, D.C. and as you might expect we were chasing of the federal dollar. Sometimes I wonder what it is that took me from being a professional academic to being a professional amendicate but it seems to be what I am forced to do on occasion. The mode in Washington it's interesting, obviously there's quite a bit of discussion about the stimulus package and how it will be allocated, when it will be allocated etcetera. I'm sure you're seeing most of the coverage. It was however the first time that all of the partners in the Bioinnovation Institute visited with our professional delegation. And I just wanted to share with you that our county executive Russ Pry, the mayors and the CEO's of the hospitals and medical school were all most helpful in advancing our requests to the delegation and our communication with the delegation. But Russ specifically commented to members of the delegation how especially pleased he was that a truly representational cross section of the major organizations of this community had come together, were traveling together, were presenting these issues together in advancing the interests of our community through the Bioinnovation Institute. It shall be a very bright spot in our future and I look forward to sharing with you further details of this as they unfold.

Next as you know in November at the state of the university address I announced that we would be starting a strategic thinking initiative. We have during the month the month of January appointed a strategic planning steering committee, they have begun to meet. We have obtained the services of the Stillwater Group to assist us in facilitating the process. On Monday I held two sessions for the campus to join with me and hear about our preliminary thinking. Several of you were there and I thank you for your attendance, thank you for nice note Tim and some others that I see here as well. So the process is underway and I think that again in that spirit of charting the course we shouldn't see it as a static process, indeed think of it more as strategic thinking. I'm delighted that one of the things that we've wanted to is to invite to campus some very important and prominent features who think deeply and passionately and creatively about the issues in higher education. Elizabeth Erickson and I had shared for some time now the wish that we might Ron Ehrenberg, a very distinguished economist at Cornell who served there also as their Chief Financial Officer, has written a number of books including among them the book Tuition Rising. In any case, a small world phenomenon has made it possible for us very likely to have him visit our campus probably on June 3rd; we're working on those dates. Likewise as a result of another set of coincidences we have on our campus today a distinguished psychologist and her husband, Bob Barnhill who is an old colleague who is very creative and I'm hoping that Dr. Barnhill will be able to lend some of his talents to help us think about some of the issues.

Finally let me comment on the emerging dialogue in Columbus about the budget. I think you are aware based on what happened in January and early February that the Governor has made some very positive recommendations as it pertains to higher education. His budget is very positive with regard to the first year of the biennium, including in it is his proposal that he would allocate a full six percent incremental addition to the state share of instruction line item, what supports basically our general fund budget to support our teaching activities. In exchange for that new money which he hopes to get from the federal stimulus package, and hence some uncertainty still underlies that proposal, he would ask that we continue the freeze on any tuition increases so that our students, many of who are of course significantly impacted by this economic downturn that we're seeing, would be able to better afford coming to college. For the second year of the biennium he did not make a specific proposal in his budget however he privately told all of the presidents of the IUC, the university council, that he has set aside money again from the federal stimulus package for an additional six percent on top of the first six percent so six percent on top of the base and the base plus six plus six for the second year of the biennium assuming that the legislature would so agree and hopefully again continue the tuition freeze. The general plan that the Governor and the Chancellor are working on is to try to provide for higher education sufficient additional funds in each year for the foresee-able future such that by approximately ten years from two years ago the tuition for Ohio students going to public higher education would be at approximately that of the national average. Presently it's about twice the national average and clearly that puts Ohio at a disadvantage. We sincerely hope that he will be able to fulfill this, if you wish, early initiative.

Now let me pause and comment a little bit about what is happening across the state and the country as institutions adapt to this rather daunting economic climate. No doubt your aware that the stock market has lost in many cases as much as fifty percent of it's value. And therefore many endowment portfolios, particularly of the very large private universities such as Harvard and Yale and Princeton and Case Western and Northwester and Stanford and others have lost a significant amount of their endowment. Many of those private institutions have a fair degree of their annual operating based on revenues from those endow-ments and all of the sudden they're worth half. In short they're not sufficient to support the amount of operating revenue that is being allocated to those institutions. No doubt you have seen but I want you to very carefully separate what you're reading about private institutions from that which you will read and continue to read about public institutions. They're slightly different in how they're being impacted. The second that private institutions are being severely impacted is that their tuitions are forty or fifty or sixty thousand dollars a year and there are a number of people who also depended on the market value to gain revenues to pay their children's education now no longer can make those payments. I talked to a good friend who has two kids in a private school and they simply can't afford two 50,000 dollar a year payments and that by the way is for preparatory school never mind college. So many of those private institutions are going to see a drop in their ability to operate because of endowment losses and because students who might have otherwise come to those institutions will now no longer be able to do so and are seeking the ability to enter of course some of the very fine public institutions across the country. Now across the country different states are being impacted in varying ways but all in fair degree by the economic downturn. You only have to look on a daily basis to how California is trying to fair with a 47 billion dollar deficit to see that Ohio's 7.5 billion dollar deficit is of course a mere fraction of California's deficit. But virtually every state is having to adapt in some way and we are seeing that in some states like California, like Arizona and many others the Governor and legislature are imposing very significant cuts on those higher education systems. And no doubt you are seeing that in some cases there are layoffs, in some cases there are

furloughs, in some cases there are other means of severely cutting back on plans that had been made or commitments that hopefully would have been continued etcetera etcetera. Within Ohio again different institutions are being impacted differently. Miami University recently announced a significant need to cut their budget and made some announcements with regard to how they were going to manage personnel; with many layoffs and certainly deferred decisions. Other institutions have said they are putting on a hiring freeze, they're doing this, they're doing that and they all differ in one degree or another. Now we too are going to be challenged. Dr. Case is here in the background and he can provide detail if you want to have detail but his office aggressively estimates that all of the things being equal before we do anything we will have to reduce our budget by somewhere between five and ten million dollars. That's five to ten million dollars out of a 450 million dollar budget so it's a modest percentage but hey a million here and a million there and it's real money. That said, the Operations Advisory Committee, the Position Review Committee that works with the Provost and with Dr. Case have over the last several years already been enabling us to manage on a yearly basis without any of those kinds of drastic announcements of cuts and so forth that any other institutions seem to think is what they have to do. I am confident and reasonably optimistic and obviously there's some catch words there that we will be able to manage in the way that we have through those important committees without any significant impact on existing personnel. Yes we may have to defer some hirings, we may have to make some adjustment in the timing of others and certainly priority of those hires that we do make. But in addition as you know, the Provost and Dr. Case have invited all of you working with your department chairs and deans to examine scenarios for how we might be able to cope with what will be some need to decrease our budgets. And I've asked that they think with you with your department chairs and with your deans of a creative and strategic approach to managing any shortfalls that we find in our operating budgets for this coming year. It is too early to close the books on these issues because the legislature has not enacted the final budget, nor have the state and communities received the exact amount that they hope to receive from the federal government so we will have to make our own plans and look forward to of course the best conditions that the Governor outlined.

I think one final point is in order. As I look across the state or across the country, and although we will not be unscathed by this economic crisis we are in somewhat of a better position than most. Our growing enrollment, the great interest and enthusiasm of our students and of you our faculty and students have placed The University of Akron in a much better position to be somewhat buffered from this economic situation that in some cases has produced quite critical situations for other institutions. So please share some degree of optimism, don't assume that we can just continue as if nothing had happened. This is an opportunity for us to look carefully at what we do and why we do it and explore how we might be able to do it better and most effectively, most more cheaply and move forward to even a much more better position for The University of Akron position of excellence. I think I've said more than I wanted to say so let me pause there and invite any questions."

Senator Elliott: "The state has been putting initiatives in place for the STEMM programs, so on one hand they're trying to do more STEMM emphasis and on the other they trying to take away. Is there going to be any influence of that in the decisions that are made at the state level?"

President Proenza: "I think that the state is going to maintain a strong focus on the basic decisions they've made and they're going to continue to support those programs in the STEMM areas, they are doing some very creative moving of resources around. I have not seen any significant program in that area

canceled. The Third Frontier Program will continue; Dr. Case and or Dr. Stroble may have some finer details but all that I am hearing in fact from a colleague today the STEMM programs are a priority. I was particularly heartened by this person's comments that The University of Akron has faired much more successfully in those competitions than any other. So it's a testament to certainly to you Beth and your staff and all of you. I expect those to be continued. Some others might be delayed a little that weren't there in the first place yet."

There being no further questions of the President, **Chair Sterns** thanked him and invited Vice President and Provost Stroble to give her remarks.

c.   Remarks from the Provost - Provost Stroble: "And I will save my remarks for my formal presentation in New Business and not use more time right now unless I need to answer questions."

d.   Committee reports - Chair Sterns thanked the Provost. He then invited Associate Provost Rex Ramsier to the report on Curriculum Review Committee, including GEAC.

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Thank you Chair Sterns. Academic Policies Committee has no formal report but I can verify that we received the charge that you mentioned previously so it will be brought to the committee at our next meeting which is next week. Now to Curriculum Review Committee we have two motions: one report that was filed with the Executive Committee early enough to be on today's agenda. It involves a list of curriculum proposals. Be It Resolved that the recommendations by Curriculum Review Committee involving each of the listed proposals be approved."

Chair Sterns asked for discussion. There being none, **the motion passed.**

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "The second item that I would like to ask permission to bring to the floor is the proposed rule change to 3359-20-05.02 and I'm not really sure how to go about asking permission."

Chair Sterns: "This represents a change in the university bylaws which we will then recommend to the Board of Trustees. This changesthe bylaws of the Board and so we are making that recommendation. You can see here on the bottom of your agenda. It basically this brings us into compliance with the current operations so we have a synchronous and now we're going to correct it."

Chair Sterns: "Is the Senate willing to consider this piece of legislation even though it was not given the full notice? The vote would be on whether or not we are willing to do that. Are there any objections to considering this legislation? Seeing none I think we can proceed."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "This was previously presented to the Senate in December. At the time there was not a quorum so no action could be taken but the ensuing discussion provided comments that we took back to the committee to change the language to be clearer. As Chair Sterns mentioned, basically these changes will do two things: first it changes the Board rule to be in line with the way we approve curriculum changes. Second they permit much more flexibility for faculty that want to offer synchronous distance

learning courses in distance learning classrooms. If this is approved, those classes that will be taught in distance learning classrooms do not have to undergo the formal review. They're already on the books as an approved courses; the faculty can obtain a distance learning classroom and teach the course. So we'd eliminate the need to come back to the curriculum process just to use what we call DL rooms."

Senator Stratton: "I think there are some grammatical errors and some errors in spelling. If you look at section 2 subsection 3, I believe you mean asynchronous, not in a synchronous manner. Synchronous means at the same time, and I think you are talking about classes that are taught asynchronously so I think it needs to be reworded to say what you mean. The same is true in section 2, subsection 7."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Let me clarify, thank you for bringing that to my attention. This is actually correct. The issue is the change in mode of delivery to a web based or to an online course still need to be reviewed by CRC and by this body. This whole phrase that Senator Stratton has just pointed out is for any existing course proposed to be taught in "a synchronous manner" but not utilizing a distance learning classroom, still needs approval of the Distance Learning Review Committee. The distinction there is synchronous teaching can take two forms if you will, one is the form we understand today which is using the distance learning classroom with cameras and classroom somewhere else with cameras and faculty and the students all can see each other. That's what we currently do. There is new technology coming onboard where synchronous learning could be taught not in a DL classroom. For example from home, where you might have cameras on your computer screen now, the students stay home, the faculty all stay home, like University of Phoenix. We are not ready to accept that we will allow any kind of synchronous learning to go on without a review by this committee. So that's we're trying to enable faculty to use the technology that we've invested in that we trust because people have tried it out, but to be a little more conservative about other possible mechanisms for synchronous learning until we're convinced that we truly believe this meets the needs of The University of Akron. I hope that clears it up."

Senator Stratton: "I guess I'm still confused. And my confusion comes because I thought that this was primarily to address issues with asynchronous web-based kinds of classes, and I would assume that any synchronous class, any class that is face to face or at the same time, would go under the same review process as a regular face to face class and you're saying that that's not the case that they use different technology that that course has to go through a separate review process."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Yes, it would still consider that change in mode of delivery today but today we would also still include using a DL classroom as a change in mode of delivery. So this opens up the possibility of using the DL rooms, not just the ones on campus, the ones that we have at our sister, our partnering institutions. But we're not willing to recommend at this stage that we allow any form of synchronous learning for which none of has any experience and doesn't' even know what it looks like or how it is done without further review. So this is actually then one step that we would take this year, presumably the new committee looking at curriculum process and the policy that goes along with it will pick up where this leaves off next year."

Senator Stratton: "I'm still not clear. Excuse me, the way it's stated then any class that is proposed that has a change in delivery has to go through this process no matter what kind of course it is. Even if it's, if it goes from a face to face to a synchronous not face to face or whether it goes from a web-based to a synchronous face to face course it has to go through this committee?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Well right now all of them do. But they haven't been. So what we're doing here is making it so that people that are already doing this without proper approval are now able to do it. So then we're consistent with them and consistent with the Board Rule. It actually is just, it doesn't include or propose any new reviews it will require fewer reviews at the present time."

Senator Stratton: "I still don't understand how a face to face class would be handled."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "It's like any other normal proposal. We haven't modified that part. Normally a new proposal for a class is handled just as it always has been. This is just the back of this part of the Board Rule, it starts…"

Senator Lillie: "I did just want to follow up with this a little bit from what I'd seen today. Back when I was on the CRC and we first looked at some of these kinds of things that were a few years ago we wrestled a lot with the various proportions of time that would follow web enhanced or web-based whatever you want to call it so I assume that I know there's a lot of effort trying to figure out how those are mutually exclusive categories and so forth. But one of the things that we did discuss then that still occurs to me now is that there may be many classes for which the formal mode of delivery is indeed face to face and what's called be here, 100 percent face to face instruction but could also be a class in which the person who is actually teaching it says let's try this web-based stuff to see how it works. The way it appears to be reviewed now or changed now is that if for instance I was going to take a class of mine that I taught that was 100% face to face and I said let me try a couple of things on Springboard I would have to do that over and above meeting he entire class time of the class, because this says you cannot reduce the number of hours of face to face sessions. Is that really intended or is that just sort of to make sure if it does say that it is the face to face instruction you have those numbers of sessions scheduled even though there may be alternate ways of delivering it up to up to as I recall we had discussed this in the past up to approximately thirty percent."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Capital B, part one, little c is exactly the same as it always was, which allows you to do exactly what is described."

Senator Lillie: "But B says one hundred percent face to face. You can add it or the committee has added language that wasn't there before such as: 'the number of face to face sessions is not reduced'. Would it be possible for me if I did that to say okay, even though we are scheduled to meet say three times a week, we're going to use Springboard for one day a week in order to deliver instruction and to do discussions and to perhaps have chats or whatever happens to be something that I'd like to try because I want to try it and see how it works out perhaps before I go a little more formal with it. Could I still do that?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Yes the intent of this change would not affect what you describe."

Senator Erickson: "I was just trying to sort out what Senator Stratton had in mind. They are talking about distance learning classrooms. If you're putting your class in distance learning situation you don't now have to have a separate review for that is that right?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "That's correct, if this is approved."

Chair Sterns asked if there where further questions. Senator Li asked for the definition of a "distance learning classroom." She indicated that without the definition it is difficult to know when the rule in section B would apply.

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "The university has invested in distance learning classrooms; those are already well defined entities. They're in Leigh Hall. You can get one of them for your class and they have cameras on the walls, there are cameras in high schools and the Medina County University Center. Those are the distance learning classrooms. So we're not defining distance learning, we're using what everyone at the university already understands is distance learning classrooms. So that's the distinction."

Senator Gerlach: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, I may have caught an answer from that earlier remark by the Associate Provost. On page 2 item 7 why are a, b and c stricken there and then on page 3 under new number 2 is b stricken there as well? Is that no longer necessary? Why are they stricken?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "All of section 7 has been stricken."

Senator Gerlach: "I see section 7 has been replaced."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "No 8 was there, we had a 7 and an 8 previously. We took out 7 because that isn't the way the curriculum review process works. So the way we do the curriculum process does not match 7; all that's stricken. So that the way we really do the reviews is consistent with the current system. Striking what is old 8 little b on page 3 to us is obviously not needed because for "a" the course is treated as any new classroom course. Of course the instructor or someone designed the course, it wasn't necessary to say that it was like stating the obvious to us."

Senator Lillie: "I think there could be a logical distinction between somebody creates the course and the instructor of record develops the course. Those could be some very different ways of doing things. Just saying somebody is going to do it versus the person who's got the academic expertise perhaps and background and all. It just seems to me that there is something there that perhaps needs be thought about."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "The committee did not consider little "b" to be of any matter of importance and perhaps I've stated it poorly. It seemed to me that there are a lot of variations where you as a faculty member may propose a course but then not be the instructor of record. Could that be possible? This would say that's not possible. This is not intended in any way to tell departments and colleges how they provide the curriculum; this only talks about after it gets in the system. When it's on the electronic system is when this kicks in."

Senator Lillie: "I just had one other question: it occurred to me we've also heard about the new curriculum proposal system that is being considered. Is it possible we might see further refinements of this as this is developed?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Yes I think that mentioned that earlier, this is literally a band-aid to make all that has to taught right now is DL classrooms legitimate with respective to Board rule. Because most of them were never reviewed the way the Board rule stands today."

Senator Lillie: "So that if someone did say would it be possible for us to get a definition on what distance learning means that's something that would happen in the future as we go through the rest of this process."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Certainly and in particular the State of Ohio is looking at that definition, as is our accrediting agency the Higher Learning Commission. So we didn't feel that we could put down today's definition because it's actually not clear yet, they're still kicking around the percentages and what does it mean to be distance learning etcetera. We need to do something to come in compliance with Board rule for now. Classes offered last fall and right now today are out of compliance in numerous classes."

Chair Sterns: "And as the Associate Provost pointed out this captures what we are doing so it has been proven by action."

Senator Rich: "I wondered if I could follow up on a point raised by Senator Stratton. I just wondered if this wasn't inadvertently drafted more broadly than it was intended. Any existing course proposed to be taught in a synchronous manner in that we teach students who are physically present by you are in the classroom in a synchronous manner, but not utilizing a distance learning classroom shall be subject to review as needed for mode of delivery. You switched from some sort of distance learning to in-person, face to face therefore synchronous teaching, you are subject to this review. Then when you look at subsection 7 to see what the review is, it kind of doesn't make sense that you could do that kind of review for this kind of a change. That is regarding whether the university has the technology to support the course and whether it has the electronic resources available to support the course. It would make more sense if you were to ask does it have the classroom to support he course. I wonder whether they meant to encompass that there. I think that's part of what Senator Stratton was getting at before or do you mean only where there is some kind of distance learning element involved?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Well this is the piece of Board rule that specifically addresses changing mode of delivery which is with respect to courses, it is historic of always being face to face to mean something else so if you're suggesting…"

Senator Rich: "I understand that the change your making would sweep up maybe it's just empty set I don't know maybe there's never been and never will be an instance where someone will switch from distance to in-person but if that were to occur under this provision that would be treated as if you were going from in-person to distance and you'd ask all the same questions that it makes sense to ask if you were going to distance from in-person but would make sense to ask when you're going from distance learning to in-person."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "I understand, I would respectfully suggest that the empty set is probably the null set. Quite empty. Those are references that involve the use technology in any form were proposed originally as face to face, traditional classes and the faculty have moved which is the cumbersome part to doing another curriculum proposal just to be allowed to teach it a little differently with technology. I don't know of course it was proved only to be taught online or web-based or anything. Usually they are to be either/or if someone proposes a new course. So maybe we won't even see them because next year the committee will come forward with a different set of rules."

Senator Lillie: "I have one other scenario to put it to you. Suppose I've got a course that has historically been face to face and I'm convinced that with our wired for wireless campus, Springboard and our IT infrastructure and the fact that not only do the students of today use technology but I've managed to learn a little bit too I would like to deliver about a third of it online, and I will use Springboard and whatever that is at that point if I'm going to do that and say at that in those circumstances this class is going to go from meeting three times a week to meeting two times a week in person and then once a week in this web-based pattern, would I have to go through the entire curriculum review process or just distance learning review?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier: Today you have to go through the entire process, because of the way our system works.

Senator Lillie: Under this system.

Senator Hajjafar asked for some clarification. He asked if the change was to be permanent.

Senator Lillie responded that under this scenario it was a permanent change. He decided to that it's a good idea to make use of this technology and rather than have students drive to campus three times a week he would have them come twice a week.

Senator Hajjafar indicated that would be a change in the mode of delivery. It has to go through the process.

Senator Oswald: "It occurs to me that I think that I had last fall just the exact situation that you're talking about with our Wayne cohort, a graduate cohort that meets at Wayne College. And we had some students from Millersburg where we also have a facility with a DL room and those folks wanted the courses DLed to Millersburg so those were regular literacy courses that had never been DLed and they were requesting that now as it turned out the test of the DL system from Wayne to Millersburg failed so we couldn't do it but it was being considered and never occurred to me as the advisor that we would have to do a curriculum change to do that. So I think that would have in that situation that this would not allow."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Correct. There are about a hundred people doing it anyway. And the committee figured that the courses were running that way and if they weren't working they would stop. So let's grant them, change the Board rule to come into compliance …"

Senator Oswald: "But my situation was the opposite where the course had never been DLed."

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "Well now it won't have to [go through the process]."

Senator Rich: "A variation on that illustrates what I was talking about before I mean suppose you had the students in a remote location and then you didn't anymore for some reason. I propose to amend out the silliness in this: change B (3) the bolded sentence there by inserting in after the words 'taught in a synchronous manner' 'at the distance'. So it would read 'in addition any existing course proposed to be taught in a synchronous manner at a distance but not utilizing a distance learning classroom shall be subject to review …' Is that what is meant?"

Assoc Provost Ramsier indicated it was.

Senator Lillie provided the second to the motion.

Senator Li wanted to raise a question about university approval of DL classrooms, but was ruled out of order.

Chair Sterns asked for a vote, since there was no further discussion on the amendment. **The motion to amend passed.** The discussion returned to the main motion.

Senator Li speaking now to the main motion: "My concern is that it would be if we are so specific about the rules that would be used when we try to offer course at a distance of course we must use room approved by the university. Then it might be necessary to be specific about the DL room approved by the university. Otherwise I really could turn my room into a distance learning room, my own living room and turn it into a distance learning room."

Senator Hajjafar: "Your living room is the place that you teach. But distance learning room is where the students receive. So that where the students are in the room at the university and this distance learning means we don't care where is the teacher? Is coming, the instruction is coming to them to that room, that is the distance learning room. Now you can teach it from your home but home is not distance learning room. The instruction will be received is distance learning room."

Senator Li: "I agree that's the reason I believe we need to communicate that we must use the distance learning room approved by the university because the current proposed rules having very specific about using the course management software approved by the university. And it's possible that students can be different in room and I can use YouTube and it can really turn my living room into a distance learning room. I want it to be more specific."

Senator Stratton: "May I suggest an amendment that would clarify that? Under definitions simply change "utilizing a distance learning classroom" to "utilizing a university approved distance learning classroom". Thus in section B – 1 – b, about the third line down it the amendment would read: "synchronous instruction utilizing a university approved distance learning classroom". I would simply argue in favor of the motion saying that I could turn a departmental lab into a distance learning classroom using cameras and software. Students would go there to learn and I could be at home. That would be a distance learning classroom; according to this amendment it would require an approval through the change in mode of delivery approval process, if the lab was not a university approved DL classroom." The motion to amend was seconded by Senator Rich.

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "If you're so inclined to accept the amendment there are three places in this document where you have to do the same language, I know that because I had to go in and edit out The University of Akron distance learning classroom because the committee decided they didn't want that language in there so it's actually three places it's big B 1, little b. It's in 3 and it's in G-7."

Senator Stratton and senator Rich accept the change in the wording of the amendment to change all those 3 places identified by Associate Provost Ramsier.

Senator Erickson: "I just wanted to agree to saying they took out that language at least give the rationale for why they took out that language so we can hopefully come to terms in voting on this."

Senator Hajjfar: "Suppose a professor at The University of Akron teaches a class at NASA, that's what we have done before in our department have done that so that's not a university room. So that's maybe we can say in an approved room but not the university room."

Senator Erickson: "I just said university approved."

Senator Stratton: "The amendment indicates it's a university approved room. So that NASA's room is approved by the university then it would be acceptable."

Senator Lillie: "I think this is fine, I have no real problem with it, I just wonder if I were creating a course, where would I go to find the list of approved university rooms? Or is this something that we're going to have to add a little asterisk so that…I'm just asking I'm not…"

Chair Sterns: asked for and received permission for Provost Stroble to speak.

Provost Stroble: "I actually think that Information Technology does the check on equipment and usability so there may not be a list but they would be your go-to place."

Senator Lillie: "Would they then have the ability to do that kind of test on the NASA classrooms or also on a classroom at a high school or someplace else, okay."

Provost Stroble: "They do that and that's the only way you really are safe to use it."

Chair Sterns called for a vote on the amendment, since there was no further discussion. The motion passed. He then asked for further discussion of the main motion. There being none, the **main motion was called and passed.**

Chair Sterns thanked everyone and asked if there was a report from the University Council Exploratory Committee.

Assoc Provost Ramsier: "University Council Exploratory Committee has no formal report except that yesterday we reached the last page of the bylaws document. It will be done next week hopefully; next Friday is our scheduled meeting. And we will then bring it to all the constituency groups for review. Thank you."

Chair Sterns asked Senator Bove to present the Student Judicial Policy Committee report.

Senator Bove: "All of you in front of you should have the copy of the revised Code of Student Conduct and it's been a long time in coming and I'm very happy that it's here. I'd like to thank our members of the

ad hoc committee; Senator Lillie and Senator Rich for all their good hard work and for Dr. Fey and the people in his office and Student Judicial Affairs it was quite a process, long time coming. But I think what stands before you is a very decent document and the ad hoc committee would basically like to resolve that if it is approved by the Faculty Senate today. This was a collaborative document in a lot of ways and basically the administration and the ad hoc committee agree on all these points with one substantial disagreement on page 20. I just would like to elaborate on that. Basically the difference is under E Roman numeral 7: 'The standard of proof or preponderance of the evidence shall apply to all hearings.' The ad hoc committee felt that the standard of proof in those cases that may warrant suspension or dismissal from the university should be based on clear and convincing evidence. Basically that's really the only substantial difference between the two parties. That being said I hope that you've all had a chance to read it and digest it and I hope that we can approve this as a body."

Senator Erickson: "Would it be possible for me just to make clear that statement between the two of you? Is this do we do it with the clear and convincing without it or what?"

Senator Bove: "We are voting on the document that is in front of us so the standard of proof in all cases is preponderance of evidence except in those cases where suspension or dismissal is a possibility in those cases the evidence needs clear and convincing."

Senator Rich: "Close, but not quite. What this says and what it is intended to say is that there shall be no suspension or dismissal unless there was a finding by clear and convincing evidence. So it's not just whether it's a potential sanction, because in theory it's always a potential sanction, but rather that the sanction will not be imposed unless the hearing board has concluded by clear and convincing evidence that the person committed the violation or violations alleged. If I may continue more broadly, I want to give special thanks to Vice President for Student Affairs Charles Fey for having worked with me very closely as a representative of the ad hoc committee over a period of time and for working out some problems that existed and I think vastly improving the document. I want to thank him for the collaborative way in which he worked and just say that it was ideal, it was ideal. I also want to extend my appreciation to his Administrative Assistant, Ginger Golz who did wonderful work under not always the easiest circumstances. Highly competent and always cheerful and helpful. I want to put that on the record. In general I think what we've achieved here is a vastly improved Code of Student Conduct, that's it's new name, it didn't really have a name before. The definitions of offenses or violations are now I think clearer and more appropriate, the procedural protections are I think more detailed, again clearer and fairer to the student. The training requirements are explicit, they'll have to be of course implemented and followed up but of course they are training requirements that are quite explicitly for the hearing board and the appeals board members and the document as a whole is much better drafted. As Senator Bove has already indicated there was one point of disagreement between the members of the ad hoc committee and the administration and that had to do with the burden of proof. I did want to elaborate on that and explain why it was the committee's view that a preponderance of evidence is not sufficient when we are talking about as serious a sanction as suspension or dismissal of a student and then I do have one amendment to offer to make another provision to make it consistent with that this simply slipped by us before the document was sent out to everyone and the committee is in agreement on this. Essentially the committee's view is that when there are serious sanctions involved such as suspension or dismissal, those are the ones that we're talking about. It should not be enough that on the basis of the evidence before them that the hearing board thinks it's ever

so slightly more likely than not that the person committed the offense alleged. That's not a high enough probability to base such a serious sanction on. So what we concluded was that there needed to be clear and convincing evidence in order for there to be a suspension or a dismissal from the university. Any sanctions short of that could be based on a mere preponderance of the evidence. The amendment that I now propose to make would make the appeals provision consistent with that, this was simply an oversight, is to 3359-41-09 subsection C-3 which is found on page 24. That subsection C concerns the grounds for an appeal and 3 in particular says that ones of the grounds is 'To determine whether the hearing board or officer was reasonable in concluding that a violation of the code of student conduct had been proven by a preponderance of the evidence" and I hereby move to amend that provision by inserting after the word "evidence" immediately after the word "evidence" the words "of if applicable by clear and convincing evidence'."

Senator Lillie: "I'll second that as well."

Chair Sterns asked for further discussion on the amendment. There being none, the **motion to amend passed.**

He then asked for further discussion on the proposed Code of student Conduct as presented. He asked for and received permission for Vice President Fey to address the senate.

Vice President Fey: "Let me tell you how humbled I am by the wonderful remarks by Senator Rich. For me as a professional, I found the work with the Senate, with the ad hoc committee, Senator Lillie, Senator Rich and Senator Bove, to be some of the best and educational opportunities I've had as a professional to work with these fine faculty. Yes, it is absolutely true we worked diligently with my staff and with the senators to find a position in which we thought we are putting forward the best possible student-centered as well as university-centered disciplinary code we can. It's based on a lot of really good thinking, on national standards and on fine advice from these three wonderful colleagues. It is also true there is also still a disagreement among the administration and the committee about that level of evidence and I just want to be sure that all of you and I know that Senator Rich knows it and his colleagues know this, that the university's administration will be asking the Board to approve it as we submitted it with the lower standard of evidence upon the advice of legal counsel and general counsel. I've also committed to Senator Rich that I will ask Provost Stroble to invite Senator Rich as well as myself to the Rules Committee when they begin to review it so that your voice will be heard by the Rules Committee as well as our voice of the other side of it. So just to be fair I wanted you all to be aware of that and I will absolutely ask Provost Stroble to have you invited as we do this. Thank you."

Chair Sterns: "On behalf of the Senate let me also say that how pleased we are with the cooperation from you and your office. It's mutual."

Senator Gerlach: "Well Mr. Chairman I read this rather hurriedly so you'll forgive me if I sound ignorant in my questioning but I regret I did not having access to the old existing Code of Conduct. To be able to determine where in the differences here provided are shown from the old code. I did detect from my memory of having served on hearing boards and so one was sensing that new part was clearly added about these training sessions. I wish to have without expending too much paper that we had had the language of

the old showing what was being replaced by comparison but as I said I suppose I could have gotten this if I had looked up the old text in some other way. I found that everything sounded fairly much on the up and up but as a layman sometimes given to legalisms and so on I quite frankly do not understand and maybe I ought to ask this in another case, what the difference would be if I was sitting on a hearing board in understanding that terminology "preponderance of the evidence" is a bit of phraseology that strikes me as exactly meaning other words "clear and convincing evidence". There has to be a preponderance of that, it has to be clear, but I don't understand why we are quibbling over those two differences."

Senator Rich: "These are terms that have very well established meanings in law. And this is a subject on which of course the members of the hearing board and the appeals board would need to be trained and will be trained. Whatever the standard ends up being they'll need to be trained in that standard. But for the benefit of those senators who may be unfamiliar with these standards the "preponderance of the evidence standard" is the standard that is used in the ordinary civil case, non-criminal case ,where there's no particular reason to prefer erroneously ruling one way over erroneous ruling the other way. Erroneous ruling for the plaintiff over ruling in favor of the defendant and so what the jury is instructed to weigh the evidence and if the weight of the evidence favors by however small a margin the plaintiff then rule in favor of the plaintiff, if the weight of the evidence rules by however small a margin the defendant then rule in favor of the defendant. Let me just contrast that with a criminal case which a yet higher standard but I think it's one you're all familiar with as the "beyond a reasonable doubt standard" in a criminal case we have to reason to favor one type of error over another; we would prefer that a guilty person go free over an innocent person being convicted and so juries are told don't convict unless the evidence of guilt is so overwhelming that one could not reasonably doubt guilt. In this situation we don't want to take it that far, because these are not criminal sanctions, but these are pretty serious sanctions; suspension and dismissal and it's not just that they interrupt the student's education they are a blot on the student's record that could have severe consequences later on. So when we instruct that a student should not be suspended or dismissed from the university unless they are have been found by clear and convincing evidence to have committed the violations alleged what we're saying is don't suspend or dismiss if the evidence is close but you think on balance it favors the finding of a violation rather it has to be more clear than that, it has to clear and convincing; a standard that is significantly higher than preponderance but not as high as beyond a reasonable doubt. But these are standards that have established legal meanings and of course the members of these boards will need to be trained to understand what they mean."

Senator Gerlach: "Thank you I understand that perfectly and I say as Senator Rich was talking about weighing the scales that the scales would have to come down further on one side than the other in this case when you're looking for the clear and convincing evidence convincing so. I have the weight on one side than the other so thank you."

Chair Sterns: "The chair feels that we're now ready for a vote. All in favor of the Code of Student Conduct as amended please say aye. Any opposed? **[The motion passed without dissent.]** Okay, congratulations to all involved, this is a major accomplishment. And now it's my great pleasure to introduce Dr. Elizabeth Stroble who is going to present the strategy, aligning UA strategy with the Priorities of the USO."

Provost Stroble: [*full Power Point presentation available at Faculty Senate website*] "Given the lateness of the hour, I am not going to go through every single slide in the PowerPoint. Do you have and did you pick up from the front table the PowerPoint and also the one-page that I brought with me today, if not that will be a useful thing to get. I will bring some of them around if it will help. You will recall that in previous meetings I've talked about the fact that now that we're part of a system we tend to have goals that are established for us at the system level that require us to adjust our planning and our thinking and our data collection around what the goals of the system are. Ohio is new to being a system so this is new ways of thinking and planning and acting for University of Akron and all the other public institutions. So this system kind of behavior is really new for us but it's long established in many other state systems. So if you went on websites of Pennsylvania system of higher education, North Carolina, Texas, Georgia places that have had systems for a very long time there wouldn't be anything that the Ohio system is causing us to do that would be terribly surprising. But it's surprising for us because it is so new. So what I'm going to share with you is clearly a PowerPoint, just some brief segments of it, that the President and I shared with the Board of Trustees in December and this was designed to help the Board understand what the priorities of the system are, because it's really where these priorities have been set and what we were asked as an institution, along with all of the other publics, is to say what would your data show about how well you're a part of our system right now in meeting these goals and as we project goals out ten, twenty years into the future how will you contribute to those goals as we create them in the future. So the audio visual aid that I used to explain to myself how the system works is that it's very much functioning like a Rubik's cube; at the state level the Chancellor with help of others decided what his goals were for how many people would have undergraduate degrees in the state of Ohio. And how many of those people would get them in STEMM programs. And how many of those people would be first generation college students? How many of them would be African-American or Hispanic? How many of them would have done some work at a community college before they came to a four-year institution? There are multiples goals that the Chancellor has established and he just established the numbers at the state level. Then he's counting on all the public institutions the four-year universities and the community colleges to all line up so at the end of the day he meets his numbers. So it was up to us at The University of Akron to say how do we contribute? And create some models that would allow to do data projections to figure this out. So look at this sheet for just a moment and then we'll take a tour through a few of the PowerPoint slides. This gives you the state level numbers, what the cube is all supposed to add up to at the end of the day. And so if you look in the far right column and I've just put some checkmarks by some that I think I'll show you the slides about if we have time. Here's the current level of how many people are enrolled in post secondary institutions 472,000. By 2017 he wants it statewide to be at 702,000. And then so on and so on and so on, on each one of these measures. Now it takes some challenge to wrap your head around and how do we actually get that done? And if you read the strategic plan you see the Chancellor's ideas about how we do get that done, but it's really going to come down to every single campus figuring this out and their going to be funding incentives tied to how well you figure this out. So at one point where funding largely came to us because of how many students we had enrolled and whether we outgrew the competition, that is soon shifting. And so the funding formulas will tend to line up with how well we are on track to help him add up to his final number. It's a very different kind of activity that we're going to be about in terms of our strategizing about what we do in each of our departments or programs in our colleges. So I'm going to show you how we came up with the data projections that we submitted to the Chancellor's office, they were due by end of December. We submitted those, we've not had a whole lot of feedback about them yet. The only feedback that we've received was one very large meeting that had reps from every single one of the institutions including the

community colleges where conversation happened about the fact that well you know this is nice what you all submitted but the numbers don't add up; we're not to state goal. Which is not terribly surprising is it? So the encouragement seemed to be that we all ought to ratchet up our numbers more because after all we've got to meet the goal. So I'm not sure how we'll get there, I did have a follow up conversation with the Chancellor's office myself after that meeting and I said a room full of thirty some people is not going to get to the desired result, you really need to organize meetings on each campus where more of us can interact with you and explain to you what the challenges and the opportunities are for our particular campus. I've not heard more since then, but we know there's been a lot going on lately and I think in state government trying to manage the budget challenges and how their going to roll out any federal stimulus dollars has taken precedence. So let's see what I can share with you about how we actually created the data projections.

[Showed slides 2 and 3] Just a picture of the strategic plan and they're actually twenty-four measures when you add them all up. And here are the four boxes; access, quality, economic leadership and affordability, efficiency. [Showed slide 4] In some of these boxes the measures haven't been created yet, it's sort of to be determined. I'm going to focus mostly today on a way to give you examples in the access box because I think those are the ones that most closely relate to the work that we do. And how did we get there, how did we create these projections? Well we looked at our mission, we looked at where we know we have some strengths. [Showed slides 5 – 8] We looked at all the strategic documents, we looked at the President's state of the University address and what he's laying out is possible goals for the strategic plan. We looked at some trends and these are important to look at. We know that traditionally high school graduates is going to decline in Ohio. And we know that the economy has rather unpredictable effects on enrollment, funding, endowments, corporate sponsorships and we do know however that adult students age 25 and higher are increasingly going to need to turn to higher education to maintain their livelihood. So there's some things we need to pay attention to as a university. And then we've got some initiatives under way. It's good that several years ago we started doing serious enrollment planning. It's good that we've been paying attention to issues of inclusive excellence; that we created the Honors College. That we revitalized the landscape here to make it more attractive to students and faculty. That we've got retention initiatives that are starting to pay off. And we've got student success initiatives that also create more success for our students. We started doing the right kinds of things before the plan actually started to point to the importance of doing those things and that's good, that just shows our good leadership. Alright so these projections of data are based on what's been true here historically, what we know is true right now is a snapshot. [Showed slide 8] We know that any future changes in the system you know are going to change everything so it's based on our best thinking right now. And some of the measurements are contradictory, this is where the Rubik's cube is such a good illustration for me you know how you can turn one and get one side of the cube and it's all lined up and you think okay so I got it solved and you turn it to the other side and you realize you've totally messed up the other side. These measures work very much like that, they're contradictory. If you want to increase how well you perform on one measure almost by default you will cause yourself to perform less well on another measure. And so it's very tricky business to do the planning around how we try to be uniformly excellent on all these measures and I truly think it's not achievable. I think across the system different institutions will have to play in different roles and play to their strengths in ways that hopefully achieve those state level goals. But I don't think we can all contribute in uniformly positive ways. And then the projections I think for us really represent stretch goals is what we were asked to do. They are probably not unreasonable but then again they're based on a lot of assumptions, about

funding about the fiscal health of the state and country, about student's ability to actually come here, about our ability to keep hiring people. I mean there are lots of assumptions built into these projections and indeed to the whole goal project. [Showed slide 9] Alright I coded them this way I think that there's some of these measures that I would give a green to, we're very close to meeting them right now. Yellow hmmm more cautiously optimistic. Red I'm saying that we're not on track. And then white is where there aren't measures yet. We'll take a peek at a few in access. [Showed slide 11] Alright color coding. 2005 or 2006 is the baseline year for almost every one of these measures. If you go back to here [indicating the single sheet of USO goals], where they measured current level that's pretty much 2006 most of the time for most of the measures. So we can go back and see what's been happening to us since 2003 and have a brief little snapshot of what had been happening and as most of know we had some years where enrollment was going down. This is just the UA data alright? And if we look at the red line this is an important understanding. The goal of UA is to meet it's share of the USO target. So what does share mean? We looked at 2006 and we said alright what percentage of overall enrollment in the whole system does UA have right now? How do we contribute in the current baseline year to the overall enrollment we figured that percentage and we said alright if we go out to 2013 and we were going to maintain that same percentage of the total USO enrollment, what number do we have to get to? And you can see it's a pretty aggressive number. The green line says what do we think we actually can do based on the trends that we're seeing right now? Fifteen percent in the last three years for example. And so we actually think on total post-secondary enrollment, if everything continued to go well and that's a big if that we could actually beat our share of the total USO enrollment by 2013. Let me stop here because almost every projection uses this same sort of logic and if I need to answer questions about what that means it's good for me stop now before I show you another slide."

Senator Elliott: "Is this a projection based on just data that we've got now and just drawn a straight line through it or are saying that we have this many high school students at this time and…"

Provost Stroble: "And adults. So let's look at the next slide, this is the answer to your question. [Showed slide 12] So what did we look at? And it may not be quite as scientific as we would wish but it is saying here's what happened the last three years, we know we've got a growth in new freshmen and transfer students, we know we've had increases in grad students, we know retention's improving, we've seen spring and summer enrollment go up and we're seeing more students graduate. So Sabrina Andrews and Institutional Research could give us the data behind that but those are the big premises that it's based on is that we're seeing growth in enough areas and enough segments of the population that it causes us to believe that we can do this."

Senator Erickson: "Are you saying then that these are based on the levels from 2006 to today or that you expect that the rate of increase will continue over the next time period, what do you?"

Provost Stroble: "I understand the question and I don't have the answer today, if Sabrina Andrews were here today she could tell you that. I understand exactly what you're asking. Alright let's look at a few more just to give you the flavor of a few things. [Showed slide 13] We also unpacked it to say what are we seeing at the different degree levels? Associate degrees, less optimistic here. Partially because we see what's happening around the state and I can show you that in the next slide, we fully expect that the

Chancellor will at some point say here's what the Associate degree tuition rate is statewide. And community colleges generally can out economize us on the rate that they can offer an Associate degree. Even at Wayne campus you know where we have students start there, not many students at Wayne actually complete an Associate degree. As most students in the state, they start there and then they fully expect to come to main campus and finish a Bachelor's degree. It's just how students function, so community colleges even that primarily count on awarding associate degrees, tend to be points of access for students who move on and do Bachelor's degrees, so Associate degrees awarded is a hard one to achieve. Now here are some data. [Showed slide 16] Summit enrollment actually did go up 8 percent, Wayne has been steady with slight improvement, we've been seeing some first year retention rates go up for the students in two-year programs but again, if there was a statewide tuition cap on Associate degree programs we don't know what impact that would have on us. We don't know if it might drain all those students away to standalone community colleges or we don't know if it might actually make us more competitive and we'd see an influx of Associate degree students. So this is a good example of where University System of Ohio changes can ripple out in ways that we can't quite project."

Senator Erickson: "Are we saying then that if you have an Associates degree within a university that you would have some ability to change the tuition then or would have to charge?"

Provost Stroble: "You would have to charge the state rate."

Senator Erickson: "You'd be charging the state rate; well then at least at the moment higher, right? So we could get more?"

Provost Stroble: "We could get more. So you know again and who knows and you know the timing issues around this we're hearing a lot of conversation about statewide tuition rate for Associate degrees but we don't know what the process would be that would cause that. I've lost track of Mary at this point."

Senator Tabatcher: "I'm just curious, how viable is an Associate degree in this day and age and are we having conversations about accelerated 3-year programs?"

Provost Stroble: "3-year program you know conversations would happen out in your units, frankly. I haven't initiated those conversations but I'm certainly seeing them in the press. I personally think Associate degrees are highly marketable right now in particular areas."

Chair Sterns: "How does the USO deal with the historic dual role of the two-year college which does have a major transfer function? Are they setting that aside?"

Provost Stroble: "You'll see a metric about it if we get to it."

Senator Sadler: "I was going to say the Associate, in some circles and I speak of it from a minority point of view, the Associate degree is cheaper but we want people to start out as high as possible because it delays them getting into the system it takes too long. This is an A, B, C why can't the go and start with B and be successful then move on to C undergraduate to graduate? That could be another way of looking at it. And I don't know if this accommodates that."

Provost Stroble: "I don't know either and I understand exactly what the point you're making and I think that's why we would hope that we would continue to be able to have colleges within our university that are seen as fully part of this university and not as places where students get dumped. Alright Bachelor's degrees awarded. [Showed slide 15] Recognize now we shifted in these two slides to degrees awarded not enrollment. We all know it takes a lot longer to get a person to a degree than it does to get them enrolled. And because we had several years of our enrollment going down for awhile we thought we would have a dip in Bachelor's degree completion and we did and we have. It's starting to turn around because if you grow your enrollment and you have great retention efforts you'll see the degree completion come up. This is important for us for our funding, because an important element in our future funding from the state of Ohio will be based on people who finish courses, courses and finish degrees. And they can track it all as early as next fall they're going to start asking us to give them our data about how we're doing on course completion."

Senator Stratton: "That brings to mind the old discussion that has been around forever and that is should we reconsider how late in the semester a student can withdraw from a class?"

Provost Stroble: "Yeah I believe that these are Academic Policy Committees that have to be seriously entertained the other topic I'd raise is whether we can afford to keep giving in progress grades. Because in progress counts against you as having completed courses. So I think a lot of our past behavior will be called somewhat under scrutiny by these new metrics and by the new policies and we're just going to have to look at it and decide what makes sense."

Senator Erickson: "I notice this under access; it is supposed quality. The easiest way to get the highest graduation rate is to reduce your standards; that's simple. Really simple but really not clearly what any of us would want. We want to raise them."

Provost Stroble: "And it wouldn't serve us or our students well to do that, that's exactly right. So you're right I mean I could have put a lot of these metrics under a lot of a different of these boxes but it is under access, you're right. Alright and then you can read all this later so I'm not going to go into great detail but let me just it also is going to look at graduate and law degrees. [Slide 17] STEMM degrees. [Slides 19 – 20] This is the official list as published by the Ohio Board of Regents for The University of Akron. There's a way that we register every single course and every single degree with the state of Ohio on a code that's called a CIP code and I won't remember what CIP stands for but you register the course you register and these CIP codes are a national registry and then the Regents tell you whether they think that you've got programs that fit the CIP code for STEMM with two M's; Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, Medicine. So here's where our STEMM degrees are at The University of Akron in 2006-2007 the actual degrees awarded and you'll notice that Summit College has a lot of them. Those are those Allied Health Programs and Engineering Technology. So you know part of what we'll be rewarded for is not just how many degrees get awarded but how many STEMM degrees get awarded."

Senator Tabatcher: "My department is a STEMM discipline and since we were formed in 1999 18 graduate assistantships and deny 25-30 students every year of a place and yet we're considered a STEMM and we can't grow. Is that being looked at?"

Provost Stroble: "I think that that's certainly something that's gotta be looked at by the Graduate School. That's where the decisions are ultimately made about awarding of assistantships. Alright here's another one that they care about. How well do enroll students age 25 and older? [Slide 22] Based on our trend data we don't think we're going to do well. You know certainly many of you remember the time when The University of Akron was a leader in this, but we really have drifted away from being an adult friendly student campus and so that's why I'm encouraged that the APC will partner with this administration in thinking about scheduling, use of facilities all those sorts of issues. Just to let you know we have engaged with AAUP about that topic now and one of the things that AAUP asked us was can you give us the data to show us what actually might be changing this coming fall as a result of the data in this policy. We've gathered that data and we can tell you with some mixed feelings that not a whole lot. It's one thing to have the Deans create a policy; it's another for it to actually have any effect on anyone. So it would seem that of us that were rather concerned about rapid and uneven implementation could have rested easy. So it's going to take more time and appropriate negotiations and deliberations to get there but you can see that we need to get there but because one of the issues is that we're just not open for business when adults need us to be."

Senator Erickson: "In this information 2004-2008 you experienced an 8.4 percent decline in the number of enrollees. In coming up with these projections but certainly the proposal is to ratchet it up. Have we spent time analyzing the reasons for the 8.4 going back to the students involved?"

Provost Stroble: "I think so; Laura Conley is a great leader in this in this area. And we actually have Bill Crouse and a group of people looking at what makes a difference for adult learners, what have we done well, what haven't we done well. And so part of our ongoing enrollment planning now will have a specific plank that's for adults. So yes I think that the same kind of data analysis that helped us turn around traditional for undergrads will do it for us here. Alright here is another one, how well do we serve first generation college students? [Slides 24 – 25] You know this is improving for us for a couple of reasons. And I'll show you the next slide. We're looking at how those Associate degrees and Bachelor's degrees are awarded and we're looking at the fact that we've got programs like Early College High School that actually are designed for first generation college students.

Well I'm going to stop because we're at the five o'clock mark. I wanted to have opportunity to share with you the logic behind these data projections, it's imperfect there's no question about it but the state level goal setting is imperfect and what we needed to do was to say what share of contribution do we do now, what do we know we've been doing and what can we reasonably although in a stretch way say we can do by 2013 and as I told you initially even that didn't add up to what the Chancellor wanted it to add up to so there's clearly going to be more conversation about this and after you've read the PowerPoint and if you have more questions at the next meeting I'll be more than happy to address those questions with EC or with the full Faculty Senate. We look forward to continuing to engage you about these topics because this isn't just a report that went into Columbus this starts to affect almost everything that we do so thank you Executive Committee and thank you Faculty Senate for the opportunity to talk you through parts of this today."

V. Adjournment - **Chair Sterns:** "Thank you so much." Senator Gandee moved to adjourn (second by Tabatcher).

The meeting adjourned at 5:04 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,

Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2009

<u>APPENDIX A</u>

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

RESOLUTION 03- - 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.

ED-08-20   Language Learning in Secondary Schools
EN-08-100   Aerospace Systems Engineering I
EN-08-101   Aerospace Honors Project
EN-08-102   Aerospace Systems Engineering II
EN-08-90   Aerospace Systems Engineering
EN-08-91   Tools for Aerospace Systems Engineering
EN-08-92   Aerospace Systems Engineering Project Management
EN-08-93   Aerospace Structures
EN-08-94   Avionics I
EN-08-95   Aerospace Materials
EN-08-96   Avionics II
EN-08-97   Aerospace Computations
EN-08-98   Aerospace Systems Manufacturing
EN-08-99   Aerospace Design Project

APPENDIX B

February 24, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Curriculum Review Committee

RE: **Approval Recommendations**

Recommendations

ED-08-20   Language Learning in Secondary Schools
The new course 5300:335, Language Learning in Secondary Schools, will be used within the Integrated Language Arts program in lieu of the existing 5300:480 ST: Language Learning in Secondary Schools. This course will replace an existing Special Topics course.

EN-08-100   Aerospace Systems Engineering I
This is a new course for the new Aerospace Systems Engineering program dealing with reliability, life cycle analysis and statistics related to these topics. The course provides an introductory exposure to systems thinking, logic, and techniques. Since the present curriculum is characterized by a strong engineering base in mechanical, avionics and aerospace courses, it is necessary to give the students a strong systems component that will support the role of the co-op experience in the program.

EN-08-101   Aerospace Honors Project
This is a new course to serve as Senior Honors Project for students in proposed Aerospace Systems Engineering Degree Program. Like the Aerospace Systems Design Project (4900:490), this course serves as a capstone design experience. The difference is that the Honors Project is traditionally an individual undertaking rather than with a team. Discussions with the student will deal with the planning and design methodology being used with the emphasis on integrating the design in the overall set of systems in the aircraft. It is intended that in standard circumstances, the project will be part of the SAE Aero Design Competition. This provides a structured, existing design platform that lends itself to integration of multiple systems.

EN-08-102   Aerospace Systems Engineering II
This is a new course for the new Aerospace Systems Engineering program dealing with linear programming and decision-making. This course provides a follow up to the introductory course by looking at more advanced topic such as linear programming and optimization. It again emphasizes the strong systems component of the Aerospace Systems program.

EN-08-90   Aerospace Systems Engineering
It is well-established that the engineering workforce in the U.S. aerospace industry has declined, losing
600,000 scientific and technical aerospace jobs between 1989 and 2002. National resources that are
designated to aerospace have declined along with graduation rates in science and engineering and there
has been a 47% drop in the number of students pursuing aerospace careers. The percentage of
aerospace workers at or under 30 years of age dropped from 18% to 6.4% between 1987 and 1999.
As a result, it is estimated that there will be 25,000 new positions for aerospace engineers needing to be
filled between 2004 and 2014. The need for aerospace programs seems to be obvious. The University
of Akron is uniquely situated to provide such a program

EN-08-91   Tools for Aerospace Systems Engineering
This is an introductory course for new Aerospace Systems Engineering degree program. Course serves
as an introduction to the aerospace profession for first-year students in the program. This is necessary
to track students to first-year internships, and the projects that will form part of their experience. The
computer work will serve as a basis for later studies.

EN-08-92   Aerospace Systems Engineering Project Management
This is a Freshman-level design course for new Aerospace Systems Engineering program. Course
serves as a follow-up course to the Aerospace Tools. The general topics related to teamwork and
planning are covered along with some introductory design concepts. By putting these first-year students
in a project involving 3rd, 4th, and 5th year students, they receive mentoring and valuable experience.
The course also ensures that students will have contact with the department throughout the freshman
year.

EN-08-93   Aerospace Structures
This is a course number change from 4100:336 to 4900:336.

EN-08-94   Avionics I
This is a new course for the new Aerospace Systems Engineering program dealing with aircraft
electronics and control systems. Avionics I is the first of two core courses in the new COE Aerospace
System Engineering undergraduate program. The course covers the fundamentals of electronics for
avionics applications. It is a prerequisite for the second avionics course, which concentrates on aircraft
communication systems, dynamics, and control.

EN-08-95   Aerospace Materials
This is a new course for Aerospace Systems Engineering program dealing with material associated with
the aerospace industry. This course is suitable for junior-level students who have taken a first course in
chemistry and mechanics of solids. It provides students with a fundamental background necessary to
analyze and design aerospace structures.

EN-08-96   Avionics II
This is a follow up course to Avionics I covering the aviation electronics issues in a more advanced
atmosphere. Avionics II is the second of two core courses in the new COE Aerospace System
Engineering undergraduate program. It concentrates on aircraft communication systems, dynamics, and
control. The course depends on the fundamental understanding of electronics, frequency response, and
aircraft dynamics covered in the prerequisite courses.

EN-08-97   Aerospace Computations

Coverage of finite element and finite volume software used in solid and fluid computations in the aerospace industry will be covered in the new course. The finite element and finite volume methods have become primary numerical tools for the analysis and design of aerospace structures, and should therefore be an important part of our aerospace engineering program curriculum. This senior level course provides an introduction to both methods in aerospace engineering. The fundamental principles and general procedures discussed in detail and illustrated through the applications in structural analysis, solid mechanics, heat transfer and flow problems. It will give students the necessary background to solve practical problems and to continue the study of more complex problems.

EN-08-98   Aerospace Systems Manufacturing

This new course for the new Aerospace Systems Engineering program will cover CAD/CAM applications in the industry. This course is designed for junior- or senior-level students who have taken a first course in tools for engineering and engineering analysis. It is an application course providing students with design and manufacturing theory and practice for aerospace components and systems. The proposed course focuses on the geometric modeling, design and manufacturing methodologies of freeform solid objects.

EN-08-99   Aerospace Design Project

Senior design project for new Aerospace Systems Engineering program will serve as a capstone design experience. Discussions with students and/or student teams will deal with the planning and design methodology used by the team with the emphasis on integrating all systems in the aircraft. It is intended that in standard circumstances, the project will be part of the SAE Aero Design Competition. This provides a structured, existing design platform that lends itself to integration of multiple systems.

APPENDIX C

<u>Rule change: 3359-20-05.2</u>   <u>Curricular changes</u>

The following changes will bring our current processes concerning curriculum proposals for synchronous distance learning classroom courses in-line with Board of Trustees rule.

(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. Synchronous instruction utilizing a distance learning classroom is considered equivalent to traditional delivery, and no additional curricular approvals are required.**

   (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.

   (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**f**)   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~~ **to** web-based **or** online ~~and distance learning~~ courses shall be subject to the curriculum review process. **In addition, any existing course proposed to be taught in a synchronous manner, but not utilizing a distance learning classroom, shall be subject to review as a change in mode of delivery.**

(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.~~

Rule change: 3359-20-05.2   Curricular changes

The following changes will bring our current processes concerning curriculum proposals for synchronous distance learning classroom courses in-line with Board of Trustees rule.

(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. Synchronous instruction utilizing a distance learning classroom is considered equivalent to traditional delivery, and no additional curricular approvals are required.**
>>
>> (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.
>>
>> (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~~f~~)   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~~ **to** web-based **or** online ~~and distance learning~~ courses shall be subject to the curriculum review process. **In addition, any existing course proposed to be taught in a synchronous manner, but not utilizing a distance learning classroom, shall be subject to review as a change in mode of delivery.**

(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.~~

(7~~8~~) Process for **review of** new **or existing** courses to be offered either web-based **or** ~~online, or in a distance learning classroom.~~**, or in a synchronous manner not utilizing 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.~~

(**b**~~c~~) The course, with representative examples of all delivery mechanisms and a completed course proposal form, is 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?

(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?

(**c**~~d~~) If approved by "DLRC", the course can be released for university-wide review.