SENATE ACTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 1, 2010

T he   regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, April 1, 2 010 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

Of the current roster of sixty-one Senators, 37 were present for this meeting. Senators Bagatto, Cheh, Dejbord-Sawan, Gamble, Kelly, Marich, Oswald, Sotnak, Steiger and Ziegler were absent with notice. Senators Arter, Carson, Concannon, Ducharme, Elliott, Hamed, Homa, Kruse, Licate, Mancke, Otis, Prichard, Rearick, and Yi were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda - Chair Sterns called for approval of the agenda.
Senator Gerlach moved that the agenda be amended so that the Spring Graduation List would be addressed earlier in the meeting under Roman numeral IV.
The agenda was approved as amended

II. Approval of the Minutes- Chair Sterns explained that the printed version of the Chronicle had not been sent out in time for all senators to receive it before the meeting. This was in part due to the inclusion of the full text of the University Council Bylaws and the Student Judicial Code. An electronic version had been sent on Monday before the meeting.

Chair Sterns offered a correction from Senator Murphy, who had not yet arrived at the meeting. The correction was to change a portion of Ohio Faculty Council Representative Fenwick's report on page 5 to say that the STRS overhead costs should be 1% not 10%.

There was no objection to voting on approval of the minutes so a vote was taken.

The minutes were adopted without objection.

II. Chairman's Remarks and Announcements - Chair Sterns: I regret that I was not able to be with you at the last Senate meeting. I was attending the meeting of the Association for Gerontology and Higher Education. I want to thank Vice Chair Bill Rich for chairing the Senate meeting in my absence. I also want to thank Tim Lillie for representing the faculty and union group in the presentation of the viewpoint of the faculty to the Board of Trustees at their meeting with the committee providing input on the Provost search. It is important that we have a team effort here and I want to thank both of you for helping with that. I also would like to be one of the first to officially welcome via our record, our new Provost and Chief Executive Officer, Dr. William M. "Mike" Sherman who will be joining us on June 1. On behalf of the Senate we would like to officially say that we are glad to welcome him. I would also like to say on behalf of the Senate how grateful we've been all this year to work so closely with Dr. Baker in his role as interim Provost. We have accomplished a great deal this year and I want to thank you for that. Reviewing the Chronicle this month I saw many of our endeavors that have been in some cases multi-year efforts, coming to a level of

closure. I think we can feel a sense of accomplishment even though we're not completely finished. I also want to thank our committee on the judicial code for the great deal of work and continued refinement and effort to create the very best document possible. We really appreciate that effort as well.

You may have seen in the Chronicle of Higher Education this week that around the country there's an awful lot of discussion regarding organizational issues, program issues, program changes and program termina- tions. It is quite sobering to read that many very established universities are undergoing some dramatic changes. We are facing some of those issues but not anywhere near to the same extent at this point in time. One of the things that came out of that article in the Chronicle of Higher Education was the difference between those campuses where the Faculty Senate had strong involvements in the decision-making as opposed to those campuses where faculty had not had involvements. I think that we should be prepared to offer our services if they are necessary in that regard.

Following the amendment to the agenda made by Senator Gerlach, Chair Sterns next called for approval of the Spring 2010 Graduation List.

Senator Lillie made the motion that the list be approved subject to the completion of all requirements.

The motion passed without objection.

Chair Sterns then called for the report of the Executive Committee.

IV. Reports
Executive Committee - Secretary Robert Huff: Thank you Chair Sterns. The Executive Committee met twice since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The first meeting was on March 11. The issues discussed at that meeting included the next steps to be taken in the implementation of the University Council bylaws and the proposed Code of Student Conduct. The committee also approved curriculum proposals. On March 23rd the committee met with President Proenza and Provost Baker, issues discussed at this meeting in- cluded again the implementation of University Council and the Provost's office transition and the University Park Alliance. Members of the Executive Committee also participated in several joint meeting over the last month. Members whose schedules would allow met with the ad hoc committee on Organizational Effec- tiveness and Innovation and with the Graduate Council. The purpose of the meeting with the Graduate Council was to discuss the relationship between the two groups and to facilitate a working relationship. Topics of discussion included a review of current bylaws of each body as approved by the Board of Trustees and ways of improving communication and cooperation. That concludes my report.

Senator Gerlach asked for more specific information regarding the progress of the University Council bylaws.

Chair Sterns called on Associate Provost Ramsier to comment on the issue as the chair of the University Council Exploratory Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier said that he understood the proposed bylaws to be under consideration by the president.

Senator Lillie stated that it was his understanding that all of the bodies that are supposed to give approval below the President have done so. It has now gone to the President by formal memo and by the Senate bylaws he has 45 days to make a decision about it.

Chair Sterns: That would be correct. There was some discussion regarding how the implementation committees would work and that point is still being discussed. One suggestion that came from the committee was that a chair of an implementation committee could request that there not be faculty on that committee and that they would seek the permission of the president to do that.

Remarks of the Provost - Dr. David Baker: Thank you Chair Sterns, good afternoon colleagues. The month has passed rather quickly and I'm pleased to see those of you in attendance on this fine spring day and to provide an update from the Provost's office. As Chair Sterns mentioned, after a year of transition we are preparing to welcome our new Provost, Dr. Mike Sherman to the University of Akron. Dr. Sherman will officially assume duties as Vice President, Provost and Chief Operating Officer on June 1. The transition process has started. As Dr. Sherman is finishing his duties at Ohio State University he is also able to spend a few days every other week at The University of Akron. I'm pleased to be able to work with Dr. Sherman to ensure a smooth transition.

The Ohio Board of Regents has just released its third annual report on the condition of higher education in Ohio. I want to take a minute to report some of that to you. The report titled *The Condition of Higher Education in Ohio: Meeting the State's Current and Future Needs Through a "Student Centered University System of Ohio"*, examines the issue of whether the University System of Ohio has student centered strategies and policies capable of meeting the needs of what is described as a diverse and ever changing student population. The report is organized around the following eight questions: are programs streamlined to shorten paths to degrees? how effectively is Ohio addressing college affordability? are Ohioans ready for college and work? are educational programs managed effectively? are administrative services managed effectively? are current levels of educational and degree attainment participation in higher education adequate for a 21st century economy? what is the financial strength of higher education? and are higher education's current contributions to workforce development research and technology transfer adequate to support a thriving 21st century economy? I think these are all important because they are all issues that impact us locally and also because we need to stay cognizant of what the views and perceptions are at the state level. The report ultimately concludes that overall the University System of Ohio has taken tremendous strides to try to implement student centered polices that aim at meeting student needs. Creating specific strategies to attract more adults into the system and monitoring the success of newly adopted policies related to career and college readiness are areas identified as priorities for immediate action. I would encourage any of you that are interested to read the full report, which can be found on the OBR webpage.

The Faculty Senate's curriculum proposal process improvement project is moving along well. The curriculum proposal project team completed eleven 90-minute focus group sessions between March 22 and March 30th. More than fifty faculty and staff attended. Attendees reviewed the prototypes of the new curriculum forms and provided the project team with feedback. The forms design will be completed by the end of next week. The team will post the updated forms on the website for any final comments. We are

asking to have all comments submitted regarding the forms by April 16th. An e-mail digest will be sent with the details. You can always access the project details from the link that is provided on the Provost's website.

The University of Akron will hold it's 3rd annual Black Male Summit on April 9th and 10th at the Student Union. The Summit attempts to bring awareness to critical issues in higher education for young black men. The summit's theme *Charting Your Legacy* will identify challenges and provide solutions to promote success for African-American students both academically and in the community. Presenters include Grammy award winning hip-hop artist and activist Common, who will deliver a lecture on both common ground and empowering African-American males. Dr. Joseph White, a frequent visitor to campus, Professor Emeritus of Psychology and Psychiatry at the University of California at Irvine will speak about major psychological challenges facing black males. Randy Man, who is the marketing personnel manager for LeBron James and partner in LRMR Marketing will talk about achieving success.

I would also like to draw your attention to the 9th annual Celebration of Excellence in Learning and Teaching to be held on Tuesday, April 20th also at the Student Union. One of the topics that have been popular in past meetings is faculty conversation. Being able to sit and talk with each other about teaching is a rarity. There are many topics and questions that we all have and would benefit from discussing with each other. Once again this year the program has built in time for conversations through roundtable discussions. I would encourage all of you to consider participating by suggesting topics for discussion. A link on the ITL website asks for suggestions. At the awards luncheon this year the following awards will be presented; the 2010 Outstanding Teacher/Scholar, the 2010 Outstanding Part-Time Faculty, 2010 Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant for both the Masters and Doctoral students, 2010 Outstanding Teacher/Mentor to Students and the two new awards this year, the Scholarship of Community Engagement Award and the Service Learning and Engagement Award. Information about all of these again can be found at the ITL website.

The University of Akron received national recognition for it's comprehensive campus programming as the winner of the *Campus of the Year Award* from Campus Activities Magazine. The award acknowledges the Residence Hall Programming Board along with the Zips Programming Network for their efforts in planning a wide variety of activities. This is UA's fourth time receiving this award, previously garnering recognition in 2006, 2003 and 2000. The other 2010 finalists included Methodist University, The University of Houston, The University of West Georgia and Western Michigan University. Finally I would like to add that this evening and tomorrow evening at 8 pm The University of Akron Dance Company and The University of Akron Symphony Orchestra will be performing a joint program and one that promises to be outstanding. I have four complimentary tickets that I am happy to share and will leave those on the desk and welcome you to take part. I look forward to seeing you next month as we near the completion of the 2010 semester. Mr. Chairman that concludes my remarks.

Committee Reports - Academic Policies Committee
Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns. Academic Policies Committee brings forward one recommendation for your consideration. (appendix A) Based on a report that you have available and the pilot study that was done by the First Year Experience Computer Literacy Committee of the First Year Experience Task Force, the APC brings forward for your consideration the recommendation that the university implement a computer literacy assessment of students beginning with the incoming freshmen in summer of 2011.

Senator Lillie: If this is passed and is approved through the Board of Trustees, then there will be a computer literacy assessment implemented beginning in the summer of 2011. Is that going to be in the nature of admission requirement? Or is that going to be in the nature of something that will be done but will have no impact on the admission of students?

Associate Provost Ramiser: It will not impact the direct admission. It will impact the student who comes in and tests. If a student's test results demonstrate literacy at a certain level, they will have to either take some preexisting courses in literacy or find another mechanism that will improve their literacy before they start taking classes. The point here was that the FYE task force came to us about a year and half ago with this concept. APC asked them to do this pilot to gather more information. The reason we've suggested that we don't implement for another year is that the actual details of how we're going to do this campus wide are not yet ironed out. This is going to involve a lot of departments on campus; Admission in particular, Registrar, etc. So the details of how it's going to happen are not fully worked out yet.

Senator Lillie: So this is not in the nature of a test that would keep someone from getting admitted to The University of Akron. It is an assessment that would help someone, once the details are worked out, figure out the best way to achieve computer literacy that's needed.

Associate Provost Ramsier: That is correct. This would probably occur in new student orientation when they come in and they take their compass exams in math and things like that. They would take a computer test and that would help the advisors place them if needed into appropriate supplementary courses. I don't know exactly what the details of the true implementation will look like. That is beyond the scope of APC. As a policy matter we think we should do it because there's data to demonstrate that we should.

Senator Speers asked about the potential cost of additional classes students might be required to take.

Senator Lazar asked if APC had considered larger issues of critical thinking, research and resource evaluation type of skills.

Senator Bove spoke in favor of the motion and also in support of the comments by Senator Lazar. He referred to computer literacy as only a component of needed information literacy and information fluency.

Associate Provost Ramsier agreed that these are important issues. He then went on to clarify that the Academic Policies Committee had only acted on the issues that were brought to them by the First Year Experience Task Force.

Senator Lazar then asked if the First Year Experience Task Force was a senate committee? .

Senator Roadruck answered that it originated in the Student Success and Retention Committee. Dr. Monroe and Dr. Mugler are co-chairs.

Senator Lillie asked if this is a two-part kind of effort? First part being, to gain the approval of the Senate for testing, and later we will have an academic issue to consider.

Associate Provost Ramsier answered that at this time APC is only seeking approval of testing.

Senator Rich responded to Senator Lillie's point with the following statement. "My understanding is that what the Academic Policy Committee is proposing here is that we approve the assessment of the students skills and knowledge in this area. I would encourage those that think the assessment ought to be broadened out to make some sort of proposal along those lines to the Academic Policies Committee so that the committee can consider what sounds like a good idea to me. But as I understand this proposal, it is asking us just to approve the doing of the assessment, it wouldn't change any academic program requirements in and of itself. If as a result of the assessment people think that we need to have some sort of new requirement that would apply to certain students that we determine have deficient skills that that would require some further action on the part of the body. Is that not correct?"

Associate Provost Ramiser: That is correct. If an advisor were to see the assessment and say to a student we think you need to take this course so you'll be more successful, that's not a change in admissions policy. If we were to say we want to make a student who tests below a certain level have to take a course that's something that's substantially different. That would need to come here.

At this point Chair Sterns asked Vice Chair Rich to temporarily chair the meeting so that he would be free to comment on this issue.

Senator Sterns then asked if applicants to The University of Akron would know that they are going to be assessed in this way? Are we going to publish some kind of notification that a student coming to The University of Akron would be expected to have certain skills such as Word, Excel, PowerPoint and so forth? Are we going to state in our documents that when you come you will be tested on this so that there is adequate notice and it is not a surprise?

Associate Provost Ramsier said it was his opinion that the university should do that.

Senator Bove expressed concerns about the assessment being focused on Microsoft products.

Senator Williams replied that Microsoft is the most prominent product that's being used currently for software. She went on to express strong support for the motion.

Senator Roadruck stated that as an academic advisor one the things that came out during all these meetings and discussions are that we found that the lack of computer skills drastically affects retention. "The students are not able to compete well in English classes or any other writing classes and so we see this having a very big effect on withdrawal rates and failure rates, just because of not knowing properly how to write a paper and make attachments. So that's part of where this came from, that's why it's in the First Year Experience area but it did come out of Student Success and Retention."

Senator Clark spoke in favor of the motion and commented on the importance of word processing skills.

Senator Gerlach moved that discussion end and the senate consider the motion from APC.

The motion passed by more than the 2/3 majority required.

The senate then voted on the motion from the Academic Policies Committee.

The motion from APC passed without opposition.

Following the vote Chair Sterns resumed his duties as chair of the senate.

Ad Hoc Committee on Accessibility

Senator Lillie: At the last meeting this body adopted a proposal to consider whether or not and how to integrate within this body the issues of accessibility and disability. It was put into the hands of the EC for further consideration. I'm particularly interested in that area and I'm chairing that ad hoc committee now which is continuing during this transition process. I would hope that we would hear from people who might have an interest in ways in which they think accessibility and disability issues might be best brought in terms of the academic issues into the prevue of this body. That's just for information.

Curriculum Software Review Committee

Chair Sterns reminded the senate that Provost Baker did comment on what is happening from the Provost's side of the house.

Computing and Communications Technologies Committee

Senator Bove: We met earlier today and basically there were two outcomes from the meeting. The first outcome is that we're preparing for the faculty refresh of the computers that's slated to start next summer and second is that I have been elected as the new chair of the committee. I will start fall term next academic year. Thank you.

Ad hoc Committee on Organizational Structure and Effectiveness

Chair Sterns then called upon the chair of the Ad hoc Committee on Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness, Dr. Julia Beckett.

Julia Beckett: Good afternoon. I'm Julia Becket. I'm an associate professor in Public Administration and Urban Studies and as you can probably gather from my quick conversation with Harvey, I haven't been a member of Faculty Senate, and I have not presented a report here before. I believe that you were sent the preliminary report from our committee (appendix B), the ad hoc Committee on Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness. We don't have a nice short acronym. Our charge began in February. There had been a letter from President Proenza on October 29th about revisioning the University. In that letter he talked about the organizational structure. He provided information about looking at the different units and how the university could be reorganized. If you want to read that letter, it is online. You can search the title *Revisioning* or *President Proenza October 28th* to find it. Following that letter, the Interim Provost, David Baker, sent a letter to Faculty Senate asking for the Senate's leadership, input and dialogue across campus on this issue. The Faculty Senate then made a call for volunteers interested in being on this committee. Our first meeting was on February 19th. I was lucky enough to be chosen as chair. Erol Sancaktar is co-chair.

We had a very good first meeting. We discussed what kind of ideas we could address. If there was to be reorganization, we wanted to be involved in it. Our general agreement was that people were not anxious to start reorganization. The group consensus was that there were a number of things that faculty could suggest to improve organizational effectiveness and that those should be addressed first before talking about re-structuring. So that tended to be the focus. We talked about the how to improve effectiveness using the umbrella term of *interdisciplinary*. Interdisciplinary can have a number of meanings. Our shared meaning is trying to encourage learning, research, and service across the different disciplines or organizations on campus and how can we encourage that type of approach. That's what has been the focus of our committee. We've been trying to meet weekly.

At the second meeting we tried to do some brainstorming, putting lists of ideas of what might be possible, what we might be able to achieve. The next couple meetings we took a step back and asked ourselves "can we write an overarching philosophy or emphasis of what we want to do?"

Last week, on March 24th, we were lucky to have to have two Deans, James Lynn and Margaret Wineman come to speak to us about their experience in reorganization. The College of Fine and Applied Arts has been split into the College of Creative and Professional Arts and the College of Health Science and Human Services. Some people were unhappy about the way the split had occurred. There has been some discussion about creating a new college of health sciences for the 21st century. Deans Lynn and Wineman gave a charge to their faculty to form three visioning groups about what could be possible. They are still in the midst of the process but they are very enthusiastic about the progress so far and their plan is to recommend that a new college be formed this summer. Next year they'll figure out the infrastructure and details. They provided some interesting insights for us to consider.

We are supposed to have a report given to the President on April 15th. So we have two more meetings scheduled and those meetings will focus on writing a final report. Our future meetings will consider feedback you provide me or the rest of the group. Our final report will be given to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and my assumption is that it will be passed on the to President on the 15th. At this point the question is participation in university structure and governance or getting faculty involved. The feeling of many members of the committee is that this is a useful type of service that faculty provides to the university. Maybe rather than sun-setting this committee in the middle of April, that you may want to consider the responsibilities of this committee be included either in some current subcommittee of Faculty Senate or continue the charge of our committee. Members think that this kind of discussion has been beneficial. It has been interesting and it has encouraged new ideas.

That is a brief outline of what we've been doing so far. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Since I've been attending those meetings and there are others in the room that have as well, one of the things we realized is the very short time frame that we had. The best we could do in that time was to offer an approach to considering these issues. The committee is asking for concerns, questions, and ideas so that the input of the Senate is part of the process.

Senator Norfolk asked if the report indicated the possibility of creating a new college.

Chair Sterns replied that he understood the proposed new college to combine the College of Health Science and Human Services with the College of Nursing.

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman, in view of what is at the bottom of this report, that is for the consideration of the Faculty Senate, and in view of what we have heard in this chairman's report to us, I suggest that the Senate await until this committee submits it's April 15th report. At the May meeting of the Senate, this business should be brought back to us for consideration. In other words I move that we postpone further consideration until the May meeting of the Senate. We could then decide what best to do based on what this committee's report is going to be.

Senator Lillie: I'd just like to point out that if we actually adopt this motion, we aren't proposing to debate the issues, we're only proposing to delay the decision on whether or not to continue the committee. I don't want people to get the wrong impression.

Chair Sterns: So we're voting on postponing the discussion of whether or not to extend the committee until the next meeting of the Senate?   We can have further discussion of the report after the discussion of the motion. Any further discussion? (no response)

All in favor of the motion please say aye. (aye) Any opposed? (none)

The motion from Senator Gerlach was approved.

Chair Sterns: So let's go back to the discussion.

Senator Speers: With all due respect the motion that was made is that we wait and have this discussion after the committee has…

Chair Sterns: That was not the interpretation of the Chair. The interpretation of the Chair is that the motion that was passed has to do with whether or not we will extend the committee beyond April 15.

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to say that I tried to make the motion to postpone this issue for discussion for another…

Chair Sterns: That's not how the Chair interpreted it. I feel that we should have this discussion. It seems to me that Senator Lillie made it very clear what the focus of that motion was. Dr. Gerlach if you would like to make a new motion, fine.

Senator Gerlach: Well I'll try Mr. Chairman. I said when I first stood up that I was looking at the bottom of this preliminary report that was brought to us for our consideration. There were two questions facing us. Shall we ask this committee to continue beyond its May 15th deadline, or shall we refer this subject to another standing committee. My response to that question is that until the committee makes it's report, I do not know which way to go and therefore I would like to move that the Senate postpone this whole issue for further discussion and decision until the May meeting of the Senate. Then we will have some report and better idea of what to do next.

Senator Lillie: I understood Senator Gerlach's original motion to refer to the decision on what to do with the committee and not just defer the entire consideration. That's why I supported it. If I had understood that it was going to be to postpone everything until May 1ˢᵗ then I think I would have been in opposition. I am in opposition to the current motion as it has been expressed.

Senator Rich: I believe that the Chairman may be interpreting very narrowly the scope of discussion that's pertinent to the motion to postpone, because some of the comments that have been made bear on the question of the timing of this body's consideration of the committee's proposals.

Chair Sterns: I understand your viewpoint but I also feel that this is a report of an ad hoc committee of the Senate who is charged with a definitive responsibility to attempt to address this issue and they've come here today seeking input from the collective body as a whole which seems to me perfectly appropriate.

Senator Rich: Which also goes to the merits of the motion to postpone and I rise in opposition to the motion to postpone. The committee is seeking some informal guidance from us. I think it would be foolish of us not to give it when it's been asked for. The committee is not asking us to take a definitive position on the specific proposal. I understand we could be very formal about this. That has not always been the practice of this body and I think it would be unwise to send them away and say sorry we have nothing to tell you. Go work it out for yourself without the benefit of our thoughts. We could do that but I urge that we not.

Senator Gerlach: I have nothing to say to this committee, no advice to give them. I simply do not know whether to suggest a continuation of the life of the committee or referral of its business to a standing committee of the Senate. I just want some more time and to hear what they have to report in mid-April.

Senator Rich: That is the question upon which the body did already vote not to take action today. It is the rest of it that remains before us. That is where I think it may be possible for individual members of this body to say some things that would be useful for the committee to consider.

Senator Gerlach: Motion to close debate.

At this point a vote was held to close debate on the motion by a show of hands.
The motion passed by the appropriate majority, ending debate on Senator Gerlach's motion.

Following this a vote on the motion to end discussion of the ad hoc committee's report was held.

The motion was defeated.

Senator Clark asked if Dr. Beckett could provide more specific ideas being discussed by the committee.

Julia Beckett: I think some of our most interesting questions and possibilities were about how could we improve the organizational effectiveness. How can we encourage students to perhaps look at interdisciplinary interests? The other is the discussion of crossing disciplines, how do faculty work together on grants and research projects. That would need to be encouraged from the department level. The chairs need to

think amongst themselves how they might be able to work together. Some of the big grants require interdisciplinary work. How do we go about encouraging it? One of the suggestions is that we give grants for research. Perhaps the faculty should get grants to try to develop interdisciplinary approaches to teaching or research. We've gotten a lot of encouragement for STEMM. What about some of the other disciplines that might be out there where you can look across disciplines and provide innovation, creativity or what's next, rather than following the lead nationally on what the hot topic is. So some for this discussion on organization effectiveness is how do we get students and faculty excited, willing to investigate, willing to work across their own departments, willing to work on ideas in a broader range. That's what we've done so far. Some of this goes back to fairly simple ideas, like how do we cross list courses? Why can't we cross list courses? Can we look at departments and say; okay we both share a course on this. Can we figure out either how faculty can work together or have a couple of departments that might be able to alternate presenting that kind of course? Can we get faculty involved and students involved in how to do cross-disciplinary research where new ideas will come from in the 21st century?

If we're going to reorganize, how do you get faculty involved in making recommendations on reorganization now. If it is the administration's vision to move more towards changing the organizational structure or moving the chairs or shuffling the boxes, then we could not deal with it in this short period of time. The Faculty Senate is a good body to keep track of and provide ongoing input and suggestions on reorganization. We spent more time on the exploration and ideas and how to present what our philosophy is. The question of what we are recommending to be done is going to be the hard work for tomorrow and next week. It would be very helpful for the committee to have input from you tomorrow and next week before we write a report. I was trying to provide what we know so far and what direction we think the report will take.

Senator Lazar: My understanding as a member of the subcommittee is that regardless of how we choose to proceed in the future we need to provide the President with a report on April 15th. What we're trying to do is get some input prior to writing the report and to keep the Senate body updated. I think that the final decision of where we proceed from here could likely wait but I think getting input from the body can't.

Senator Erickson: There are two way of dealing with reorganization. One is to make a big structural change. The other way is that it's done incrementally, from the ground up. People find out how they can interact more effectively, how they can do go across disciplines. They come up with ideas and then move slowly forward from there. Where that goes we don't know. Those are the two sorts of extremes. If you read the interim report, it says we decided that we were going to develop a process and that is all. It wouldn't be how the faculty were going to come up with ways to reorganize across disciplines, but that we were going to start with this ground up approach. For example, if there be money set aside so that faculty could get grants to see whether you could get certain kinds of cross disciplinary approaches to research or teaching or service. Then maybe those are really effective and one would grow to something bigger. It was our job in the short time that we had available not even think of what the ideas are that the faculty might be able to come up with, but to set up a process to let that happen. What we were interested to learn from the Deans was that about the process that they had got going. Within those groups, there were people who were excited about trying to see how they could do interdisciplinary things and it was that that we noted positively.

Senator Lazar thanked Senator Beckett for volunteering to chair this committee. She went on to emphasize the importance of the faculty having a strong voice in any consideration of reorganizing the university.

Senator Elbuluk stated that the April 15th deadline was to short a time to be able to address these issues.

Julia Beckett: The letter from the Provost said that they wanted the Faculty Senate's leadership in considering reorganization and that they would be very grateful if it was by April 15th. The committee accepted the short deadline with the understanding that we would provide the best advice that we could in a limited period of time. We tried to gather as many ideas as possible and to do outside research on how other universities reorganize. This was a very large task. We will recommend in the next step that this be done in a way that time would not allow us to do. So we started with what do we know, what ideas do we have, how can we work as a faculty group to provide information in the short period that we had. Our choice was what could we do within the current structure to perhaps improve university effectiveness.
The second question is can we give advice on restructuring? I think our conclusion will be we might be able to, but we can't do that in a two-month period. We also believe that our group is not sufficiently representative to be able to provide a definitive statement on that. We think it needs broader discussion. We do think detailed study models are useful and necessary; we just didn't have the manpower and time to do it. I know you want to know what our specific recommendations are. At this point we are still working on those recommendations and the discussion with the senate today will help us bring the information together in our final report.

Senator Speers: You will never get changes that are fruitful and accomplish the things that we hope that they will accomplish unless the faculty are involved in the reorganization. You have to get the faculty of the colleges involved. For us to go at this kind of scatter-shot would not be very helpful because we would not have had the faculty involved.

Senator Lillie: Considering that Senator Speers is a member of the committee, she could make those recommendations at any time. One of the things I wanted to say is that when this committee was formed we realized that we had been asked to do a particular task by April 15th. One of the things that we talked about in the first committee meeting was do we even think that we want to do this? Do we feel that there's anything we can do that would substantially impact organization and organizational structure and organizational effectiveness in three and half months. The committee realized that of course you couldn't do organizational changes if we don't have substantial grass roots kind of involvement. There is no doubt that you have to have that. I think Chair Beckett has done a great job. Knowing that they had little time, the committee focused on broad principles that should drive this effort. One that everybody from across the university seemed to recognize was some form of promoting interdisciplinary opportunities. If we're going to do interdisciplinary work, one of the things that we have to think about is how do we make sure that the interdisciplinary work is facilitated by the campus structure and not hampered by a hierarchical structure. That's a principle that we feel that perhaps we might move forward.

Senator Norfolk: This is to address Senator Lillie's issues. Considering interdisciplinary work, we have people in our department who work with Education, who work with every single one of the sciences, with Polymer Science and now we have a group who's doing interdisciplinary work with Sociology as well. It

seems that if that's what you're going to focus on, then maybe you should ask the people who are already doing the work what problems they're encountering? That would seem to be the easiest thing to do rather than to look at a blanket approach.

Senator Lillie: That is certainly the kind of feedback that this committee is asking for. But once again the purpose of the committee was not to examine where the problems were in interdisciplinary. You've given us something to think about in regard to interdisciplinary, maybe that's not a good way to go. We've got you're feedback.

Julia Beckett: I want to add two things. First of all we had difficulty with the term 'interdisciplinary'. We've moved toward working across disciplines, trying to encourage the environment where classes can cross disciplines. If we are going to move in a different direction or figure out a different structure, how do we encourage faculty to work across boundaries or to find ways of synergy that will not just help faculty with research but provide a better education for students. We focused more on faculty research and learning classes for students than we have on community participation. We've looked at those two topics and issues. We explored possibilities and ideas that we think need to be addressed in more depth later but we started out with the assumption that we don't want to do a big reorganization without encouraging faculty to think about different ways to promote organizational effectiveness. We start with encouraging those types of ideas those types of suggestions before moving to a requirement of reorganization. So those are some of our principles that we expect to be in the report. Looking at whether interdisciplinary works in other departments, keeping faculty within the units and involved in the process, those are two very good suggestions. If you have other suggestions of what needs to be included in the committee you can e-mail me. I'm afraid by next Tuesday it will be to late. I thank you all for your concerns and comments. I think it's been helpful.

Senator Roadruck: I am also on the committee and I just wanted to offer that as we reorganize the university and as we've looked at the model of Arizona State which is what the President has been very interested in, their model which is a pretty drastic reorganization model, let us not forget the work of the First Year Experience group and the experts already in place, the learning communities, post secondary, advising, orientation. Let's not forget about that work of University College and first year experience and make sure that those processes and that developmental work that's being done is included in the model. Thank you.

Senator Hajjafar: This is exactly the point that I wanted to make, the President supposedly is impressed with the Arizona State model. I think the committee's job should be to explore other models as well and inform the president as much as possible other models to have a basis for comparison.

Chair Sterns: In conversations the Executive Committee has had with the President there is no doubt that he has explored many models and has looked at many different organizational approaches. He is someone who is widely read in a lot of these issues. So it's not as though he is only stuck on the one model. I think that he has quite a broad perspective.

Senator Speers: I think one of the things that we can suggest to the president is him simply putting it out there that he wants to see more interdisciplinary work. He wants to see more bang for the buck so to

speak, that he encourages this cooperation because so many times faculty and their own units become very competitive, they become very exclusive. Any reinforcement from the head down to say get your act together and start working with each other instead of against each other.

Senator Norfolk: All of those groups that I mentioned are working with undergraduate students classes and graduate students. The point being that that's functioning without reorganization. My experience and reading on reorganization is it's a way to hide complete inadequacy.

Senator Gandee: I think the major thing is that whatever you come up with, those people working in this interdisciplinary have to be compensated or recognized or appreciated and your model has to involve that. If you look at those deans or department heads who are running licensed programs, that's where their bread and butter is and that's where they're going to compensate the faculty at. And you're program if you've written that in you've got to have compensation coming from the President's office for these people. Look at Harvey. Harvey is 30 years of beating his head against the system you know. And he survived but the majority of faculty can't survive that. They've got to get in line with their departments or their deans to survive. And that's the most important thing for interdisciplinary because all of us can believe in interdisciplinary unless you're getting compensated and rewarded it's not going to work.

Senator Lillie requested that Senator Gandee's comments appear in the minutes verbatim.

Senator Xiao suggested that interdisciplinary issues are different for teaching and research. Interdisciplinary research has fewer obstacles. Collaborative teaching situations present difficult problems in evaluation and testing.

Senator Speers commented on the value of the work being recognized through the awards given by the Provost's Office through the Institute of Teaching and Learning.

VI. Unfinished Business
Senator Gerlach asked about the status of the issue from the College of Education that had been referred to the Academic Policies Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier: The committee meets bi-weekly. One of the meetings fell on Spring Break week so we did not meet. The last meeting was held Tuesday of this week and was focused on a discussion of a new policy for withdrawal from a course. I believe this TK20 issue is what you're referring to. I can summarize what is in the minutes, which are available online on the Provost's website. The consensus of the committee was that the TK20 issue is a college level issue not an Academic Policies issue for the campus. We have recommended that the college implement this $100 fee as a fee to students when they enter the College of Education instead of having the students pay an outside vendor $100 to use the software. This is not an official report because the committee hasn't voted on the language that I'll bring to you but that's the result.

Senator Li: First I want to thank you Dr. Ramsier for your review and recommendation. I am the person who brought this issue to the attention of the Faculty Senate. I want to report back to the Senate that I'm

in the process of writing my own report. I understand the policy position and the committee perspective but I respectfully disagree with the committee's decision. I am a member of the Academic Policies Committee. I'm working on a report.

V. Good of the Order:

Chair Sterns: Okay thank you. Any good and welfare? If not the Chair will entertain a motion for adjournment.

VI. Adjournment:

 The meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

Transcript edited by Robert Huff,
Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 1, 2010

<u>APPENDIX A</u>

March 26, 2010

<u>MEMORANDUM</u>

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Policies Committee

RE: **Academic Policies Committee Recommendation**

The Academic Policies Committee recommends, based on the attached report and pilot study by the First Year Experience Computer Literacy committee of the First Year Experience Task Force, that computer literacy assessment be implemented for incoming freshmen beginning in Summer 2011.

FYE COMPUTER LITERACY REPORT
COMPUTER LITERACY ASSESSMENT PILOT
February 9, 2010

SUMMARY

As requested by the Academic Policies Committee, the FYE Computer Literacy Committee ran a pilot computer literacy assessment of primarily freshman students from November 2 through November 14, 2009. The committee worked with Institutional Research to identify sections of Basic Writing and English Composition I courses that were invited to take this assessment. The exam consisted of nine multi-part questions using a graded simulation of Microsoft Office 2007. The pilot assessment was more basic than the proposed criteria created by the committee.

Based on the results of this survey, the committee now estimates that 50% of the main campus incoming freshmen would pass a basic computer literacy assessment. This has been revised downward from the original estimate that 60% of freshmen students would pass such an assessment.

ASSESSMENT PREPARATION AND PROCESS

The committee worked with Institutional Research to identify sections of Basic Writing and English Composition I courses that were invited to take this assessment based on matching this target population to the total campus population profile. Of the 4,648 students enrolled in either English Composition I or Basic Writing, 837 students from the main campus were invited to participate.

Pearson supplied 1,000 temporary student logins to the myITlab.com training and assessment website free of charge for the committee to use. These IDs were printed and distributed to the instructors of the targeted sections, along with student instructions. These IDs were to enroll in one of ten sections created online by Pearson to enable students to take the assessment exam.

A subcommittee of the FYE computer literacy committee put together a nine multi-part question skills exam that they felt could be completed in the fifty minute target window for the exam. Three multi-part questions each were asked about Word, Powerpoint, and Excel (see Appendix A for more information about the questions). Some questions and sections of questions would pertain to any product, such as the Excel question about saving a document within a folder and the Powerpoint question about changing font styles. The assessment was limited to a fifty minute period in order to encourage faculty to bring their entire class for testing and to encourage student participation. Students were given five attempts to answer each question (all parts) correctly. Students were able to skip a question and the question would be presented to them after the presentation of the nine questions.

A test window from November 2 to November 24, 2009 was created for students to take the assessment. Computer Based Assessment, led by Kathy Dubose, coordinated the testing of students at three facilities: the regular assessment lab in Shrank Hall North (SHN 152), a writing lab in Polsky Hall (Pol 336) provided by Marjorie Keil, and a lab in Olin Hall (Olin 374). Instructors were encouraged to bring the students as a class to a facility and students were able to come individually to the Shrank Hall North facility. Students who completed the exam were entered into a drawing for one of four $50 gift cards as encouragement.

RESULTS

178 students (21% of invited students) started the exam and 169 submitted it. Of those, 155 earned non-zero scores. It is not easily possible to tell whether the students who earned a score of zero attempted to answer any questions or simply submitted a blank exam. Here is a summary of the correct responses:

Correct Answers (during class)	Basic Writing		English Comp I	Unidentified (not taken during class)
			Number of Students	
Started, Not Submitted	0	0	9	9
0	8	6	0	14
1	17	6	0	23
2	13	24	0	37
3	8	22	2	32
4	12	18	3	33
5	3	13	2	18
6	0	10	0	10
7	0	0	1	1
8	0	0	0	0
9 (100%)	0	1	0	1
AVERAGE (%)	23.66	36.21	48.6	32.26
MEDIAN (%)	22.2 (2)	33.3 (3)	44.4 (4)	33.3 (3)
AVERAGE w/o 0 (%)	27.23	38.5	48.6	35.18
MEDIAN w/o 0 (%)	22.2 (2)	33.3 (3)	44.4 (4)	33.3 (3)
Total Students	61	100	17	178

Note that AVERAGE and MEDIAN are calculated without the scores of those who began, but did not submit the exam.

Students had some difficulty registering their ID, but once in the exam did not seem to have difficulty with the exam process itself. Most students either completed the exam or exhausted their attempts prior to the end of the time period.

CONCLUSIONS

Results of the assessment confirmed that many students are not prepared to perform basic document editing and formatting upon entering college. The committee consensus was that based on the responses and recommended changes, a realistic estimate of the percentage of UA freshmen students who would pass a computer literacy exam is 50%.

Changes that should be made for production based on the pilot experience include:

- A streamlined method for students to have testing accounts. This was known to be more difficult for the pilot than it would be in a production situation due to the short timeframe and the one-time processes involved.

- The exam should have more questions, and each question should have fewer parts.

- Include a few practice questions at the beginning of the test that are not scored.

- Increase the allotted time to 60 minutes in order to cover more material.

APPENDIX A
COMPUTER LITERACY PILOT ASSESSMENT FALL 2009 QUESTION OUTLINE

WORD
Creating Folders for Document Storage and Saving a Document

Begin saving the document. In the Save As dialog box, create a new folder named **Word Chapter 5**. Save the document in the new Word Chapter 5 folder with the file name **5A_Application_Letter**. Type **Thank you for** [remaining text will autocomplete]. Type **Yours truly,** Press ENTER four times and then type **John W. Diamond**. Center the text vertically on the page.

Inserting Pictures from Files

Without moving the insertion point, insert text from the file *w07A_Photography_Flyer* from the My Documents folder. Delete the blank line at the end of the document. At the beginning of the paragraph that starts with *Memories Old and New*, insert the picture *w07A_Ore_Cart*.

Creating and Entering Text into a Table

Open the file *w07B_Price_list* from the My Documents folder. In the second blank line under *Price List*, insert a table that is 2 columns by 5 rows. In the first cell of the first row, type **Unframed Prints** and press the DOWN ARROW. In the first cell of the second row, type **Hometown Mine #1** and press TAB. In the second cell of the second row, type **$95** and then press TAB [remaining text will autocomplete]. Save the document in the *My Documents* folder as **7B_Price_List**.

EXCEL
Inserting and Deleting Rows and Columns, and Using the Insert Options Button
Insert a row above row 4 with the same formatting as row 4. In cell A4, enter the word **Compacts**. In cell B4, enter **326485.76**. In cell C4, enter **376984.92** [remaining text will autocomplete]. Delete row 8. In cell B7, enter **309725.48**. In cell C7, enter **272558.89**. In cell D7, enter **330373.58** [remaining text will autocomplete].

Constructing a Formula Using the Sum Function, and Editing Numbers in Cells

In cell B8, total the value of cells B4:B7. In cell B4, change the sales figure *326485.76* to **347999.12**. In cell C8, total the value of cells C4:C7. In cell C6, in the sales figure *163446.98*, change the **3** to a **1**. In cell D8, total the value of cells D4:D7. In cell D4, in the sales figure *367540.57*, change the *6* to a **7**. Select cells E4:F8 and sum both columns at once.

Starting Excel and Naming and Saving a Workbook

Start Microsoft Office Excel 2007. Save the blank workbook. From the Save As dialog box, create a new folder named **Excel Chapter 9** within the My Documents folder. Save the workbook as **9A_Auto_Sales** in the new Excel Chapter 9 folder.

POWERPOINT
Changing Font and Font Size

On Slide 1, change the font of the title text, *Skyline Bakery and Cafe*, to Cambria and then change the font size to 48. On Slide 1, change the font of the subtitle text, *Expansion Plans*, to Arial Black.

Applying Font Styles

On Slide 1, apply the bold style to the title, Skyline Bakery and Cafe. On Slide 1, apply the bold and italic styles to the subtitle, Expansion Plans. On Slide 1, remove the bold style from the subtitle, Expansion Plans.
Changing a Bulleted List to a Numbered List
On Slide 2, select the placeholder on the left and change the bulleted list within to a numbered list. On Slide 2, select the placeholder on the right and change the bulleted list within to a numbered list.

APPENDIX B

Preliminary Report for the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness
Report submitted by Julia Beckett, Committee Chair
April 1, 2010

First Meeting; Friday, February 19, 2010
Harvey Sterns, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the first Meeting to order.
This committee was formed by the Faculty Senate in Response to the President Proenza's October 28, 2009 "Revisioning the University" letter to the community and a letter from Interim Provost David Baker asking the faculty senate for leadership on input and dialog across campus.
This meeting introduced the members, the committee elected Julia Beckett as Chair and Erol Sancaktar as Co-chair, and discussed the request from the President and Provost for input by April 15.

The general discussion during the first meeting included a decision to focus on ways to improve university effectiveness within existing organizational structures. It was agreed that this committee would be exploratory and inclusive.

In the context of learning, research and service, five general topics were addressed: the encouragement of interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary opportunities; incentives; support structure; process and next steps; and reorganization. The committee agreed that it would would begin by considering how to improve effectiveness within the current structure

Second Meeting, February 26, 2010
This meeting served as a brainstorming session for considering ideas on how to improve effectiveness for learning, research, and service. The emphasis was on possibilities for interaction, partnerships, collaboration and interdisciplinary practices that could be developed across established units on campus.

Third Meeting, March 3
The topic for this meeting was to continue the discussion from the prior meeting and to move towards developing a statement of philosophy for the committee.

Fourth Meeting, March 10
This meeting continued to discussing the committee's philosophy; it also discussed organizational structure and effectiveness in relation to the university's next strategic plan.

Fifth Meeting, March 24

Deans James Lynn and Margaret Wineman spoke to the committee about their ongoing experience in tasking their faculty to work in three visioning teams for education, research, and field experiences. The purpose of these teams is to develop a common vision for a new college to address education for Health Sciences in the 21st Century and they were provided 6 weeks to work on visions. The Deans expect their entire faculty will to consider reports on April 2 and their hope is to establish this college this summer; they expect to consider infrastructure elements, such as departments, courses, RTP, etc., during the next school year.

Schedule of Future Meetings and Topics
April 2, 1-:2:30 — Feedback from Faculty Senate meeting; report from the process-next steps working group, and form working group to draft report
April 7, 8:30-10 – Consider suggestions for content and consider draft sections of the final report
April 14, Evaluate and Approve Final Report
April 15, Submit report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Committee sunsets

For Consideration of Faculty Senate
This committee began by exploring ideas and possibilities regarding the university. At this point, the committee members believe there is value in the discussions about developing more effective approaches to working across divisions and disciplines. At this midpoint, the members believe that discussions with wider participation by faculty would be beneficial.
The committee also has been working under the assumption that it will sunset on April 15. We recommend that Faculty Senate consider whether the work of their Ad Hoc Committee on Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness should be continued in some fashion. This may be accomplished in a number of way, including adding charge to this ad hoc committee to include review, and comment on ways to achieve strategic initiatives and organizational objectives with broad inclusion of the university community. Another approach is to give the responsibility for review and comment on strategic plans, organizational change and similar campus-wide initiatives to a standing Faculty Senate Committee.

Committee Members
Julia Beckett, committee chair
Erol Sancaktar, committee co-chair
Constance B. Bouchard
Frank J. Bove
Lindgren L. Chyi
Roberta A. DePompei
Elizabeth B. Erickson
Patricia A. Galon

Marlene S. Huff
Robert J. Huff
Lisa A. Lazar
Timothy H, Lillie
Deborah D. Marino
John E. Matejkovic
William D. Rich
Nancy L. Roadruck
Shivakumar Sastry
Jeffry D. Schantz
Susan D. Speers
Richard P. Steiner
Harvey L. Sterns