## SENATE ACTIONS

·   **Passed a motion from the Executive Committee clarifying the curriculum approval process.**

·   **Passed a motion congratulating the University of Akron Soccer team.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 2, 2010

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, December 2, 2010 in Room 121 of Buckingham. Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Of the current roster of seventy Senators, 57 were present for this meeting. Senators Barrett, Bouchard, Hamed, Rostedt, Sedlock, Sterns, Thomas and Wesdemiotis were absent with notice. Senators Elliott, Friberg, Gerhardt, Li, Marich, Maringer, Miller, Newton, Ritchey Sancaktar, Slusarczyk, Speers and Yi were absent without notice.

**I. Approval of the Agenda - Chair Rich** called for a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was made, seconded and approved.

**II. Approval of the Minutes-** The minutes of the November meeting were not ready for approval.

**III. Chairman's Remarks and Announcements -**
**Chair Rich** announced the death of Mr. David E. Waddel. Known as "Gene" Waddel, Mr. Waddel died on November 18th at the age of 82. Mr. Waddel was a trustee of The University of Akron from 1993 until 2002. He served as the Chairman of the Board of Trustees in 2001-2002. At the end of his term he was awarded an honorary doctorate of humane letters and the title Trustee Emeritus. He received his undergraduate degree from The University of Akron and law degree from Western Reserve University Law School. He practiced law for fifty years and served as chairman of the Summit County Republican Party from 1965 until 1978. He served on numerous boards including the President Ronald Reagan Ranch Board of Governors.

Chair Rich then asked all those in attendance to rise for a moment of silence. (Senate observed a moment of silence)

In conclusion, Chair Rich wished everyone a happy holiday season.

**IV. Reports**
**Executive Committee -Secretary R. Huff:** The Executive Committee had two meetings in the month of November. At the first meeting on November 11th we discussed the Graduate Council's relationship to the Senate and the status of the University Council proposal. We also developed an agenda for our planned meeting with the Provost on November 18th. Unfortunately the Provost was not able to attend that meeting. The Executive Committee did meet on that day and at that meeting discussed the curriculum approval process issues raised at the November 4th meeting of Faculty Senate. It was agreed that the software demonstrated at the meeting enlarged the role of deans in the approval process. Under the current university regulations that are copied in your handout, deans may comment on curriculum proposals and may be responsible for releasing them for university level review after they have been approved by college level process. Deans are not however given authority to approve or reject curriculum proposals that have been approved by the appropriate faculty bodies of a college or academic unit. (appendix A)

Accordingly the Faculty Senate Executive Committee offers the following resolution:
**Whereas under University Regulation 3359-20-05.02(A) (5) and (6) deans are not given the authority to approve or reject a curriculum proposals,**

**Therefore be it resolved that the new electronic curriculum proposal system should be changed to reflect the fact that deans do not have this authority.**

That concludes the resolution and my report.

Chair Rich noted that motions from committees do not require a second and then invited members of the senate to comment on the motion.

**The motion was then approved without objection.**

<u>**Remarks of the President -**</u> President Proenza: It is a pleasure to see a legal scholar chairing the senate. Let me provide my comments for you with a note of caution, followed by a brief outline of accomplishments that you have attained this year. The note of caution is that we continue to watch what the new governor and the legislature is likely to propose. As I mentioned at our last meeting we will not know specifics of the budget until sometime in late March or early April. We do anticipate a reduction in state support as a result of the 8 billion dollar deficit that the state is facing. State support is a small fraction of our total budget. It is roughly 27-28% of our total budget. We expect a reduction of that state support to be no less than 10% and not be more than 50%. Until we get the actual numbers we won't know what the impact will be. If it is closer to 10%, with the anticipated increase in enrollment and the likelihood that the state will provide us the opportunity to make adjustments in tuition; we can probably manage very well. If that's not the case, we will continue as we have in the past to do our very best to manage reductions in terms of personnel attrition and in terms of efficiency measures. I ask everyone to be particularly mindful of creating innovative approaches to both cost savings and creating new revenue opportunities for ourselves. That is the cautionary note. Now let me turn to much more positive things.

One exciting piece of news during the year was our new strategic plan, Vision 20/20, the New Gold Standard. We will be hearing much more on that. We welcomed Mike Sherman on the one hand and regrettably we said goodbye to former President Dominic Guzzetta and Gene Waddell. Thank you for recognizing his contributions. He was one of the most bipartisan colleagues that we've had over the years. We also celebrated the 140th anniversary of the university and our 200th commencement with the awarding of our 150,000[th] degree at our past August commencement. Next week, on Saturday the 11th we will be holding our next commencement and I invite you all to be in attendance. The State of Ohio recognized another center of excellence; this one in Enabling Technologies: Advanced Materials and Sensors. We received national recognition in partnership with the Austin Bioinnovation Institute and our University of Akron Research Foundation from the Department of Commerce for an I-6 challenge award, one of only six given around the country. Just last week we were recognized by the Ohio Psychological Association as the 2010 Psychological Healthy Workplace Award winner. The OPA also nominated us for a national award. We were also named national campus of the year by Campus magazine. Our Nursing graduates had pass rates of 95% or better. We learned that over the last two years our Akron Law School has had a 92% pass rate on Ohio Bar Exams. This ranks us second in both years among all nine Ohio universities.

Bloomberg ranked our College of Business Administration best in Ohio for return on tuition dollars. More than 90% of the College Engineering students passed the Fundamentals of Engineering exam on their first try compared to a national average of 78%. We became one of the first in the country to join to National Academy of Inventors with 60 of our colleagues inducted into that academy. Forbes magazine very nicely reported that Ohio is home to four of the country's top 15 affordable college towns, Akron being at the top of that list as most affordable in Ohio. You know that our soccer team continues it's quest for a national title. Please come on Saturday as we play in the *elite eight*, hopefully in route to the finals, the *final four*. We also inaugurated five new facilities; the national polymer innovation center, the Spicer Residence hall, our newly renovated History of Psychology Center, South campus parking deck and the renovated soccer field on Lee Jackson Field. We expanded our international collaboration particularly with Peking University with a joint PhD program. Our law faculty will travel there to hopefully start a program in IP Law. I could go on and on. In the interest of being brief, let me end by wishing you a most happy holiday season and thanking you for all that you did towards these accomplishments and so many more that I could not cover in these brief few minutes. Thank you and happy holidays.

**Remarks of the Provost** - **Provost Sherman:** Good afternoon everyone. I'm having fun and that's making time fly. I have been here for about six months now and you've been incredibly hospitable to me and my wife and daughter, who is going to school here. I wanted to make a couple of comments related to some of the ongoing activities that have been happening over the last six months and a few things that will emerge in the future.

Today I finished my meetings with every college. The College of Engineering was my last meeting. I would say that those interactions have been both informative and helpful in understanding the needs and the wishes of the faculty at The University of Akron. Some common themes emerged from those interactions. One question was "when will there be a focus on graduate education?" My response to that consistently was "undergraduates first, graduate education next". This spring and beginning next fall we'll begin to focus very intensely on graduate education. Another question was "where are your priorities?" My response was that our number one priority is to increase the number of full-time faculty at The University of Akron. Another question was "what are we doing about student success?" I had a great opportunity to interact with you and others over the last couple of months to begin to think through and perhaps develop a different paradigm for how we think about the success of our students in consideration of their academic preparation, in consideration of their career aptitude and finally thinking of them from a holistic and developmental process perspective from which we can provide wrap around services that customize their experience. This will create their 'My Akron' experience. I believe that if we can do that right, that is the perspective from which we can be distinctive and through which we will be distinguished. Increasing the number of faculty in focused research areas, thereby working to stimulate the interdisciplinary research is another goal. I began conversations with the deans this past Tuesday that will prompt a dialogue to develop a mutual understanding of the roles of each college in the context of the goals of Vision 2020. That will focus on the plan to transition to the right number or proportion of full-time and part-time faculty in particular colleges because one size will not fit all. This will also begin an interaction to discuss how each college contributes to our teaching agenda, our research agenda or a combination of the two; particularly attending to what capacity exists in programs that is unmet and how do we fill that capacity, where do we need to add capacity to move programs from a level of strength to prominence or a level of presence to strength.

Also to improve the quality of the instructional enterprise such that the faculty and the TAs feel supported in improving the quality of instruction. That is partly why our students will be more satisfied with their experience at The University of Akron.

We're working on scheduling my interactions with the eight constituency groups related to the University Council proposal. I believe we're going to have an initial meeting of the constituency groups as a whole and have kind of a collaborative conversation about that proposal. After that we will have individualized conversations with each of the constituency groups.

Our Higher Learning Commission accreditation visit is scheduled for 2013. It was originally in 2012. We've asked for that to be in 2013 so that we have time to be more responsive to some of the issues that you urged from the previous accreditation interaction. We have time for some of the initiatives that have been underway to realize a greater indication of their support of the academic enterprise. The leadership of the various constituency groups will be contacted very shortly to recommend and nominate individuals who would be willing, available and energized to serve on the different committees that will be required to be appropriately responsive to that accreditation visit.

Finally, in my interactions with the colleges there has been some discussion of the college reorganizations. For the time being those discussions will continue in an informal fashion. Beginning early in spring semester, we will begin to interact with you and the different constituencies from a more formalized perspective. And that ends my remarks.

Chair Rich: Are there any questions for the Provost?

Senator Mancke asked for a clarification on the date of the accreditation visit and if the number of full-time faculty was seen as an issue to be addressed prior to the visit.

Provost Sherman answered that the visit would be in the spring of 2013. He also said that he thought the full-time to part-time proportion had been identified as an issue during the last visit.
He said this would mean that we would have to demonstrate our plan for moving that agenda forward.

## Committee Reports

### Computing and Communications Technology Committee

Senator Bove: CCTC has met twice this semester, on October 25th and November 22nd. We will continue to meet monthly for the remainder of the year. Frank Bove was elected Chair for the 2010-2011 academic year. The committee was approached with a concern regarding the downloading of student information to personally owned computers. Are University Rules and policies in place that expressly prohibit downloading student information on to non-university owned, non-encrypted machines? CCTC is working with the Office of General Counsel to clarify this issue. If no such rule or policy exists, CCTC will work towards drafting a recommendation. CCTC is also working with the ITS on efforts of the typically triennial computer refresh for faculty. The refresh is tentatively scheduled for summer of 2011. CCTC is currently gathering data to review in order to develop a pragmatic recommendation in light of the economy. CCTC would also like to encourage feedback from the university community to the committee regarding academic computing and communication concerns. You may contact the Chair, myself, at fjbove@uakron.edu or at my extension, x5104. I would be happy to bring that to committee to discuss. Thank you very much.

**Ad Hoc Curriculum Process Committee**

Vice President Sage (by permission of the body): Good afternoon. I'm Jim Sage. I'm the Vice President for Information and Technology. Harvey Sterns asked me to provide an update on the curriculum approval project since he's traveling today. Before I turn it over to the project managers who really know what's going on, let me share with you just a few comments. One is that I'm truly delighted with the way that we've put this system together. I think it's been an excellent collaboration between faculty, the college administrators, the Provost's office, IR and our division, ITS. The technology that we've implemented that will enable this new curriculum approval process is technology that can not only be used on the curriculum approval process but any other business process that requires streamlining and improvement. So the cost that we've incurred in this project can be spread across other process approving initiatives on campus. At this point what I'd like to do is invite Matt Petras, who works with me in ITS and Karen Green from the provost's office to come up and talk about what we're going to do between now and the time that we come back with a recommendation in February to go live.

Matt Petras: Thank you Jim. I just want to let you know since the last Faculty Senate meeting in which we had a demonstration of the software, we've been engaged in what we call user acceptance testing of the system. We have completed about two cycles of 3-day sessions and brought people in from various roles in the process to test and inspect the software. We've captured any defects, any bugs in the software that we found. We have also captured any enhancement requests that come up in the process and other tasks and training issues that we'll need to prioritize. We're using an online ticketing system with the vendor. We are tracking each of those tickets in the system and we're currently engaged in resolving all the defects. I expect that would be lasting through next week. To give you some statistics, of we've opened 184 tickets in that package and that's a mix of enhancements, tasks, defects. We've closed about 57% of the defects that we logged in the system as well as come up with 37 enhancements and 27 other tasks. There's also been work going on in our training group in ITS. Sara Wyszynski is our team member in charge of the training materials. She's been generating job manuals and online materials for the process. We'll have training for both originator groups, for those people entering proposals and we'll also have training for the reviewing groups in the process.

VP Jim Sage: I think what you hear in Matt's comments is that the tools we've elected to use for this curriculum approval process allow us to very quickly make changes and do retesting. That's the beauty and it's pertinent to the technology that we've selected. So as processes change, we can quickly change the system and retest it. I am very confident that by the first part of February we will have made all the changes required and completed all the testing. We're applying more rigor to testing on this application than we have with many of the things that we've done in the past.

Karen Green: We will be having the final round of user acceptance testing once we feel that we've gotten the majority of the enhancements and defects completed. We will do another complete round and the full curriculum proposal committee will participate in that so when we do come back in February we'll be confident that everybody has seen the system. Matt has talked to you about the training so I won't go into that again. Another issue is that we're going to be contacting all the colleges very shortly to identify individuals that need to be put on the e-mail notification system. We are also going to be confirming that the

workflows that you have put forward back in May are still accurate. Each of the colleges will have your own workflow acceptance testing to make sure that you're comfortable with how this has been built for you.

Senator Steer: So when do we transition from the old system to the new system?

Karen Green: We did want the 1st of January. Because there were concerns expressed here in the Senate for the college level review process, we're going to try and at least get one college in. So that will start in January.

VP Jim Sage: Assuming testing goes well and assuming you give us authorization in February to go forward, we'll be ready in early February.

Senator Lillie: When we began this process, we had a two-pronged effort. One prong was focused around the software which I said last time looked really good and is going to be extremely helpful. The other prong that was supposed to be done at the same time was to make sure that the university curriculum proposal rules were also updated and that the two were conforming so that the software package would then be driven by the curriculum approval rule. What I wanted to make sure of was that your committee and our Curriculum Review Committee are working together to make sure that we're going to be able to converge on that. That seems to be to me the key. Can you tell me about how the convergence of the two is going?

Karen Green: I can tell you that the CRC is working on the new rule language and every time that a defect or an enhancement is proposed in our testing, we take that back to CRC or Dr. Ramsier. We confirm that it is indeed following the exact flow that you approved on September 2nd in the flow chart. We are not going to deviate at all in this.

Senator Lillie: I just want to add that the curriculum proposal rule is larger than simply the workflow so they need to be working together. With the new system, will any faculty member be able to start a proposal?

Karen Green: Correct.

Senator Erickson: I am trying to understand these dates for the new system. If a proposal is to have any chance of being approved, it would need to be entered very early in spring semester. I would like to know Senator Mancke's opinion on this.

VP Jim Sage: Senator Erickson, if you're concerned about getting curriculum approved and you want to get started; use the old system. You can use the old system up til February 1st. When we get approval to go live, at that point everything will go into the new system. So anything started in the old system will be completed in the old system and then once you give us the okay to go live then, everything from that point forward will go into the new system.

Chair Rich: Mr. Vice President I wonder if you could clarify one point? You said that anything that's begun in the old system will be finished in the old system but when it goes live everything will occur in the new system. What happens, just anything new?

VP Sage: Yes.

Senator Mancke: I was just asked by Liz Erickson to make a comment about this. I think that we've got two objectives here; one is to get a very good system in place and so I would suggest that the debugging take place as it seems to be happening. You seem to be very thorough on that. While we all might have desired that this could be in place earlier, it's better to have a debugged system. We may end up with an ironic best case scenario in that there are fewer proposals in the spring. That will allow the team to work through the proposals as they come in. After the first of the year we don't guarantee the proposals will be completed. So this may end up as a very good way to start the system because people who enter in the spring have to anticipate that things may be delayed. My position is to get the best system possible and work with it appropriately.

VP Sage: I would just like to say if there are no other questions, thank you to those of you who've been working with us. Most importantly, if there's anything you need beyond the curriculum approval system from IT, call me. I guarantee you I'll react.

Karen Green: I'll just add one more thing for the users of this testing in the next round. If you have questions or you want to participate, let us know. We welcome as many people in this final round of user acceptance as we can. So just e-mail us and we'll be glad to answer your questions, talk to you about the system, show you the system or have you participate.

## **VI. New Business**

Senator Moritz: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I stand to offer a resolution commending Coach Caleb Porter and the University of Akron Men's Soccer team.

With its victory over the University of Indiana this past weekend, the Zips joined a group of eight teams still vying for this year's NCAA Division One national championship. A victory over the University of California, Berkeley, in this weekend's Quarterfinal game would return the Zips to the College Cup, which is soccer's *final four*. The Zips hope to improve upon last year's runner-up finish and bring the University (and, indeed, the Mid-American Conference) its first-ever national championship in any team sport. The Zips also placed four members on the 2010 Academic All-America team, the most of any university in the nation, including Academic All-America of the Year, junior Kofi Sarkodie.

The resolution: **The Faculty Senate congratulates Coach Porter and the University of Akron Soccer team on their achievements thus far and wishing them further success for the remainder of their season.**

**The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.**

**VI. Adjournment:**

**The meeting adjourned at 3:44 pm**

*Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney*

# APPENDICES TO MINUTES

# FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 2, 2010

# APPENDIX A

RESOLUTION FOR December 2, 2010 FACULTY SENATE MEETING:

University Regulation 3359-20-05.2 (A) (5) and (6) state:

(A) Curricular change process for curriculum other than distributed learning proposals

(5)      After a proposal is approved by the academic unit, the appropriate college review committee shall review the proposal and either approve or reject it.

(6)      A college-approved proposal shall then be released by authorized personnel of the college for university-wide review and approval.  The proposal shall be available on the university web server for a period of two calendar weeks from the date of release.

Accordingly, the Executive Committee offers the following resolution:

Whereas under University Regulation 3359-20-05.02(A) (5) and (6) deans are not given the authority to approve or reject a curriculum proposal,

Therefore be it resolved that the new electronic curriculum proposal system should be changed to reflect the fact that deans do not have this authority.