



22 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- **Passed a motion to refer issue from College of Education to APC..... 13**

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle* may be directed to the Secretary, Robert Huff (x5966).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held February 4, 2010 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 4, 2010

- A. Provost Update to Faculty Senate 15
- B. Report from Curriculum Proposal Software Update Comm 17
- C. Report from University Council Exploratory Committee 18

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 4, 2010

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, February 4, 2010 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Of the current roster of sixty-two Senators, 39 were present for this meeting. Senators Barrett, Cheh, Dejbord-Sawan, Ducharme, Hajjafar, Hamed, Kimble, Kruse, Lazar, McDonald, Marich, Roadruck, Schantz and Vierheller were absent with notice. Senators Arter, Bagatto, Maringer, Ritchey, Steiger, and Yi were absent without notice.

I. Chairman's Remarks and Special Announcements - While waiting to achieve a quorum, Chair Sterns made announcements. The first of these concerned the unfortunate passing of several members of the university community.

Dr. Claude Mead died on December 25th. Dr. Mead was a professor at The University of Akron for many years. He loved history, reading, travel, gardening and classical music. He traveled extensively throughout the world. He received his B.A. from the university of Minnesota. From 1942 to 1945 he interrupted his studies and served in the military during the Second World War. In 1957 he completed his Ph. D. at the University of California at Berkeley. He taught French language, culture and civilization at eight universities including the University of Colorado, the University of California, George Washington University and The University of Akron. Many of his students remember him as a fascinating teacher. He retired as professor emeritus in 1989 after 42 years of teaching.

Dr. Lathardus Goggins, 79, former associate dean of the Graduate School and a professor emeritus of geography and planning, died on December 4. Dr. Goggins was employed at The University of Akron for 36 years and retired in 2005. Dr. Goggins earned a B.A. at Central State University, M.A. at The Ohio State University, a Ph.D. at St. John's University, and an Ed.D. and M.S.T.E. at The University of Akron. He was also the founding director of our Black Studies program (now African Studies). He was involved in many of the early discussions on this campus regarding race and was a major proponent of black studies. Dr. Goggins for many years was the major recruiting arm for The University of Akron in terms of national outreach to bring graduate students in general and minority students in particular to The University of Akron. He is well remembered as both a teacher and administrator.

Dr. Jerome Kaplan died on December 20th at Mansfield Memorial Homes, an organization that he had served as Executive Director from 1958 until his retirement in 1988. Dr. Kaplan was an internationally renowned gerontologist who served his nation, state and community. Dr. Kaplan was President of the Gerontological Society of America, Vice President of the World Congress of Gerontology, Founding President of the Ohio Network of Educational Consultants In The Field of Aging, and Founding Chairman of the Ohio Research Council On Aging. He was a Delegate to three White House Conferences On Aging. Dr. Kaplan was also secretary for the Center on Aging in Albany NY, a leading resource for physical fitness and aging. He served as Editor-In-Chief of *The Gerontologist*, a leading journal in the field. Dr.

Kaplan after his retirement in 1985 joined the Institute for Lifespan Development and Gerontology and was a professor here and taught with me a course for many years called Retirement Specialties. He also was in charge of our program in Nursing Home Administration that combined a degree in Human Resource Management with a Certificate in Gerontology. Dr. Kaplan received his Bachelor's, his Master's and his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota and was a major figure in the world of aging internationally. I'm sorry to talk a little bit more about him but he was one of my closest friends and closest associates. We are very lucky to have his time with us at The University of Akron. I did not mention in the case of Dr. Kaplan that he was also a Lieutenant and Captain of a rocket ship during World War II and actually saw action at Iwo Jima.

Mr. Donald Sabatino passed away on January 24th after an extended illness. Don went to The University of Akron where he earned a degree in Education in 1964 and a Masters of Arts degree in Secondary Education in 1968. He worked his way through school as student manager in the Student Center, a position that propelled him to a 27-year career at the University after graduating. Among his titles were Director of Gardner Student Center, Associate Director of Student Services, Director of Auxiliary Services and also Director of Game Day Operations for Zips basketball games at Memorial Hall. Don left the University in 1985 to become regional vice president for Barnes & Noble, where he also served on Barnes & Noble's board of directors. He closed out his career as business manager for Kent City Schools and as a consultant for NEOLA.

Dean Emeritus Robert Clark Weyrick passed away on January 25 at age 85. Robert was a veteran of World War II having served with the Army Air Corps in the Pacific Theater as a communication and radar specialist. He held engineering degrees from The University of Akron and Case Institute of Technology and was a registered Professional Engineer. Following employment with the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co., Babcock and Wilcox Co. and Goodyear Aerospace Corporation, Robert joined the faculty of the newly established Community and Technical College (now Summit College) at The University of Akron in 1964. He served as Dean of the College for many years, became Associate Provost of the University, and retired as Professor Emeritus and Dean Emeritus in 1989.

The senate then observed a moment of silence in honor of these distinguished colleagues.

Following this Chair Sterns invited Dr. David Baker to address the senate.

II. Remarks from the Provost - Dr. David Baker: Thank you Dr. Sterns. I'd like to welcome all of you to the spring 2010 semester. I hope that by now your students are settled in comfortably and are enjoying an engaging pursuit of knowledge. Many of my comments are not news but I feel they deserve mention. First I extend my appreciation to members of the Akron AAUP and the University Board of Trustees who have ratified a new agreement. I know that the hours committed to this agreement were many and long. I extend my thanks to the members of both negotiating teams for their service.

The search for a permanent Provost is underway. The first candidate, Dr. Antonio Moreira, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, completed a visit earlier in the week. Dr. Larry Nielsen, professor of Natural Resources at North Carolina State University will be here February 7th through 9th. And Dr. William Sherman, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, The Ohio State University will be visiting campus February 17th through the 19th. A session has been scheduled to provide faculty

members with a chance to meet with Dr. Neilsen. This is a faculty only forum to be held Monday, February 8th from 5-6 pm in the Simmons Hall auditorium. There will also be an all campus forum on Tuesday, February 9th from 10:30 to 11:30 am. This forum is also being held in Simmons Hall. Announcements of time and place for Dr. Sherman's visit will be forthcoming. It is important to note that I will continue to serve as your interim Senior Vice President and Provost and Chief Operating Officer until a permanent Provost is in place and will do all that I can do assist in that transition.

I'm pleased to report that we had a very productive and engaging visit with the Higher Learning Commission this week regarding our offering of a fully online Master's degree in Instructional Technology. I thank all of the faculty and the staff who worked tirelessly to make this possible.

I had mentioned in our last meeting we had a deadline of January 19th to submit an update on our progress towards the USO metrics. The Ohio Board of Regents is seeking to create efficiencies through data driven processes. I think we'll be hearing much more about this in the months ahead through the work in Columbus of the Advisory Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness in the University System of Ohio. It will be important for all of us to work together to get ahead of the game if you will and to begin to look at some of these issues ourselves. Some of this is beginning in the work we are doing in administrative and academic review. As a first step in that direction I've asked Dr. Sabrina Andrews and Dr. Chand Midha of Institutional Research to join us very briefly to review our progress on the USO metrics. I believe everyone has picked up a handout that provides a snapshot and dashboard on some of those metrics. (appendix A) Dr. Midha if you could be recognized.

Chair Sterns asked the senate's permission for Dr. Midha to speak.

Dr. Midha: Good afternoon everybody. The sheets we have provided you talk about twenty major points of the University System of Ohio metrics. As you recall the Chancellor has set aside any specific plans for the period 2007 through 2017. Last year each institution was asked to provide the update based on the baseline that they had started with from the years 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and they're looking at projections for the year 2013-14 and eventually going to 2017. For today there are 20 metrics. If you look at the second sheet, I'll go over a couple of them. For example, the very first one talks about associate degrees awarded, bachelor's degrees awarded, graduate degrees awarded etcetera. If you look at the current trend line of 2007-2008 for the entire state of Ohio and if in the state of Ohio we were granting 100,000 associate degrees, the Chancellor set the goal that by 2013-2014 we want to increase that number by 31%. That means by 2013 we would be awarding 131,000 degrees. Our share of 100,000 degrees at that time would be only 5,000 degrees. In order to increase 31% of that our number should be about 7,000 degrees. We looked at our current plans and then augmented it with our current enrollments and projected the numbers whether we can meet that 31% increase in the category of associate degrees, graduate degrees and so on. We presented all these metrics to the Board of Trustees, as we were required to do. With each of these twenty major points, wherever there is a green circle we were saying 'yes we can meet the Chancellor's established goals'. Where there is a red circle we are saying 'we cannot meet that goal'. Where there is a yellow circle our administration decided that we were within 50-75% of the goal. There is some debate whether 75 % is meeting the goal or not meeting the goal. Every institution in the state was asked to go through this exercise. The Chancellor was supposed to collect this data and inform us whether collectively we are meeting his goals or not. We have some partial information in many of the

major points; the state was not meeting the goals there. They have not asked us yet why you are only awarding 100,000 degrees and why not 120,000 degrees? They said go through the exercise one more year and see whether you're on the track of red or green dashboards. You don't have to take it to the Board of Trustees, however send this information now and we may ask you later on to get the blessing of the Board of Trustees. In early January we presented this information to Board of Trustees subcommittee on education for their information. So this presentation is just for your information. If you need any more information I will be available to provide it. Sabrina Andrews is actually the one who does all the work in telling us we should put the red dot here, the green dot there. Thanks Sabrina for doing that. Thank you, any question I can answer?

Senator Erickson pointed out that that the information provided indicated many problems with "enrollees age 25 and older" and "facilities in satisfactory condition or needing minor repair". Senator Erickson went on to say that the university had a history of "deferred maintenance" to existing buildings and that in this economy adult education opportunities should be a priority. She asked how those problems were being addressed

Sabrina Andrews responded that the facilities issue is concerned with academic space only. Our new stadium and student union have very little academic space. New academic buildings are considered "satisfactory". After about five years all buildings are considered to "need minor repair". Even the Arts and Sciences building is verging into that category. With "enrollees age twenty-five and older" the trend is a decline in the number of adult students.

Chair Sterns commented that the cost for delayed revision, reconstruction, delayed maintenance needed might exceed 100 million. He also stated that the Facilities Planning Committee (prior to 2003) did a campus wide survey looking at classroom quality. This was a survey of the entire faculty. They reported on the rooms where they were teaching. This included information on equipment, electrical outlets, screens, and draperies hanging threadbare. When this information was reported to Provost Stroble she had described it as documenting a non-performance. The classroom quality issue is still very important and should not be just set aside. The ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee might take a look at that old survey. If the survey were repeated, we could see how much improvement has been made. The quality of classrooms might be a factor in retention.

Dr. Midha addressed the adult enrollment by saying that since it includes undergraduates and graduates, the number of those offerings we have at the present time in the evening is on the decline compared to ten years ago and that we no longer have an evening college on this campus as we once did.

Provost Baker responded that he appreciated that fact. He also mentioned that the Adult Focus area is a program that is growing. They have a mandate under the USO metric of access to improve and this year we've launched our Veteran's Services center which is another new provision that you've got working on that issue as well. He stated that these are issues worth paying attention to.

Senator Mancke expressed concern that mandated increases in STEMM graduation rates would ultimately result in decreased resources for other academic areas of the university.

Senator Elliott asked about the current number of STEMM degrees being awarded and pointed out that percentage increases were more or less possible depending on scale or total numbers.

Senator Gandee asked what the implication is for the universities if they fail to meet the Chancellor's goals?

Provost Baker responded that the University System of Ohio and the Chancellor's plan we're trying to develop a new way of doing business. The University of Akron is responding to some things that are in our control but we're also responding to a number of things that right now are not very clearly defined and not necessarily under our control.

Chair Sterns pointed out that some of this planning process was developed with the idea that there would be certain levels of resource from the state. Those resources are ambiguous at this time.

After this discussion of the information presented by Dr. Midha, Provost Baker resumed his remarks.

Provost Baker: We have an important event this semester, *Rethinking Race: Black, White and Beyond*, a series that is running now through February 11th. I would highlight a number of our keynote speakers; Hazel Symonette, senior policy and program specialist at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, will present "Inclusive Excellence Imperatives: Mobilizing Self as a Responsive Instrument for Social Justice" on Monday, Feb. 8 at 6 p.m. in the Student Union. John Flores will present "Mexican Migration to the Midwest: A Historical and Contemporary Perspective," on Tuesday at 2 p.m. in the Student Union. Tim Wise, considered one of the most prominent antiracist writers and activists in the United States will present a talk "White Like Me – a reflection on race from a privileged son" on Tuesday, February 9th at E.J. Thomas, Stage Door at 7:30. Retired football coach Herman Boone who many of you will recognize from *Remember the Titans* will present on "Lessons from the Titans" on Wednesday, February 10 at 7:00 in the Student Union theatre. David Williams, the Florence and Laura Norman Professor of Public Health, African and African-American Studies and Sociology at Harvard University, will present, "Social Inequities in Health: Patterns, Causes and the Cost of Doing Nothing" on Thursday, Feb. 11 at 1:45 in UA's Student Union Theatre. And finally Robert Roche, executive director of the American-Indian Education Center, will present "The Invisible People" on Thursday, Feb. 11 at 6 p.m. in the Student Union Theatre. An exciting part of this series is the ability to integrate all this activity within the class. I would refer you to the website of the Institute for Teaching and Learning for more information on how you can make these programs and speakers part of your curriculum.

A reminder also that tomorrow evening is the Hearts for Humanities dinner/dance. The event is supported in part by the University administration, the Akron AAUP and this Faculty Senate. As you know proceeds help defray the cost of UA students who are traveling to the Gulf Coast and Jamaica over spring break to do relief work. There will be good food, good company, an auction and a DJ. I invite all of you to come and support a cause of our students working in service to others.

Finally, on the arts scene I think it's exciting that some of the works of 2009 MacArthur Genius Arts Grant recipient Camille Utterback are on exhibit at the Myers School of Art. Ms Utterback is a pioneering artist and programmer in interactive installation art. She is also the 2010 Myers Artist in Residence and during her residency she will work with a variety of students from studio areas including the school's latest pro-

gram New Media Art. Finally this evening The University of Akron Symphony Orchestra concerto competition winners will perform at EJ Thomas at 8 pm and I'm very happy to supply two tickets to anyone who would like to attend. That ends my report, thank you. I'm happy to take any questions.

Senator Bouchard: In both the old contract and in the new contract the rate of the payment for summer independent studies is set by the Provost's Office. Your predecessor had set it at zero. I would like to suggest a way to increase revenues which is to once again set it the way it used to be; allowing a faculty member to supervise summer independent studies on the small classroom formula. If you had one person for one hour an assistant professor would get \$120 and a full professor like \$200 or something. Even though the state is moving toward reimbursing us for graduation rate, by far the bulk of the state money that comes to us is still based on raw numbers of student credit hours. At the graduate level it's over \$400 per credit hour. This struck me that we were basically throwing away free money from the state because if you couldn't get paid for supervising summer independent studies, you also couldn't get credit for summer independent studies, which means you couldn't ask the state for subvention for summer independent studies. It also caused problems. In the sciences our grad students should be in the lab every day all summer long. They won't be able to graduate unless they're in there. Professors were almost in the position of having to sneak in and illegally supervise independent studies in the summer. I think this policy distorted the progress toward graduate degrees of our students. This is something that can be changed by the Provost's Office with brief consultation with the union. It could be done in time for this summer.

Provost Baker: I'll take that under advisement.

III. Approval of Agenda - Chair Sterns thanked the provost for his remarks and then moved on to the approval of the agenda. Senator Li asked to add an item from the College of Education under New Business.

Senator Gerlach requested that the Executive Committee provide a more detailed agenda listing specific issues to be addressed under general titles such as "Unfinished Business".

The agenda was approved without opposition.

IV. Approval of Minutes - Chair Sterns: Thank you for indulging the Chair in changing the order to fit our challenge of meeting our quorum, which we have done. Let me start by thanking Provost Baker. Just in the past few weeks through a number of different meetings dealing with a number of different issues I just want to thank the Provost for his kind attention to detail to his concern about a number of organizational issues as well as student issues. The Chair on behalf of the Senate appreciates your work and what you are doing. I want to make that as a major point.

Chair Sterns then called for consideration of the minutes from the November and December meetings. Senator Lillie moved that the minutes of the November and December meetings be accepted.

The motion was approved without opposition.

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

V. Reports –

Executive Committee - Secretary Huff: “Thank you Chair Sterns. The Executive Committee was not able to meet with the President and the Provost since the last meeting of the Senate. The committee did meet twice, on December 7th and January 21st to discuss ongoing issues including the Provost search, the university council proposal and the reorganization committee. The Executive Committee received a letter from Provost Baker concerning the reorganization effort. This letter calls for a report to be prepared on or before April 15th of this year. In order to move the process forward the committee sent out a university wide call for volunteers and nominations For clarification this committee will be known as the ad hoc Committee on Organizational Effectiveness and Innovation. The Executive Committee also set the agenda for today’s meeting. That concludes my report.”

Chair Sterns: We don’t have a report from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, but I would like to comment on Graduate Council issue. There have been ongoing discussions, as you know regarding the relationship of the Graduate Council to the Faculty Senate. In the last few days I have been having some conversations with a number of members of the Graduate Council about how to improve communication between these two bodies. One of the first issues is the fact that there are supposed to be two representatives from the Faculty Senate serving on Graduate Council. Simultaneously there are supposed to be two members of Graduate Council serving on the Faculty Senate. Even though this connection exists on paper, it has not been our actual practice. Some of the disconnects that have taken place recently between these two bodies would be greatly rectified by correcting this. I intend to call upon the Executive Committee to appoint two official representatives to the Graduate Council. If you have an interest in being one of these representatives please contact me. The Executive Committee makes appointments as a group so I don’t think I could just ask for volunteers on the floor of the Senate.

Senator Lillie reminded everyone that the Faculty Senate bylaws require that the people who are appointed to represent the Senate to Graduate Council must be a Category 2 status.

Senator Li suggested that the two senators that are appointed not be from the same college.

Athletics Committee

Senator Lillie did not make a formal report. He did announce that all of the student athletes who were on the Dean’s list were honored during halftime at the basketball game the night before. He also mentioned that the role of our athletes as students is something that the Athletic Department is continuing to address on their own and in cooperation with the Athletic Committee.

Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council

Representative Rudy Fenwick: Thank you Dr. Sterns, Provost Baker and Senators. I want to talk about what Ohio Faculty council is doing. There’s an upcoming meeting next Friday, a regularly scheduled meeting in Columbus. At that time we’re going to address concerns with changes and proposed changes in the STRS pension funds. We have invited Michael Neff, who is Executive Director of STRS, as well as Larry Lewellen, who is Vice President for Human Resources at Ohio State. He is also the IUC representative on a coalition of STRS stakeholders called Healthcare and Pension Advocates for STRS. Mr. Lewellen started putting out a newsletter online in December at Ohio State called *Retirement Matters*. He did so in response to something that I’m going to talk about in a minute.

The OFC is also going to address some concerns about changes in eligibility in retirement calculations made in STRS. It is a fact that in 2015 the 35-year bump is going away, that we're contributing a higher percentage of our salaries and our employers are contributing a higher percentage into the retirement system. A lot of concern has been expressed to OFC representatives around the state about these issues.

Secondly and probably more troublesome is an issue that came out in the January 3rd edition of the Beacon Journal. There is a coordinated attempt to shift the STRS as well as other public employee pension funds from *defined benefits* to *defined contributions*. It is to make them more like our 401, 403 plans. We know how those fared last year. STRS is a *defined benefit* program which set benefits pay out over the course of your retirement. There was a coordinated newspaper attempt to bring light to the issue under the false assumption that taxpayers pay for these benefits. They actually do not. The only way that taxpayers pay for the pension fund is property taxes and into the school systems. State employees through our deductions and employers through their deductions pay for it as well as the investments that the funds have made. So I would encourage everyone to get a copy of Mr. Lewellen's reports on the pension fund and to know that the Ohio Faculty Council and our colleagues on the Ohio Faculty Senate which represents the two-year schools around the state and the IUC and other stakeholders in the system are going to be watching and be very careful about what happens. A couple of weeks ago I had occasion to run into John LaGuardia, who is our Vice President for Development. He said that any kind of changes in these directions are far down the road or down the road. We want to make sure that we are well positioned to understand and to deal with proposed changes. So that's really all I have to say about that.

Are there any questions?

Senator Gandee commented that national research has shown *defined benefit* plans to be 4%-6% more efficient than *defined contribution* plans. He went on to ask if the OFC meetings were open to the public?

Representative Fenwick responded that Mr. Lewellen points out in his newsletter a number of talking points in favor of *defined benefits* over *defined contributions* and that efficiency is one of them. Overhead costs are much lower in *defined benefit* programs; the return to the state of Ohio for every dollar put into the retirement the defined retirement through the state employee retirement system gets \$1.33 back. He also answered that the meetings are open to the public.

Senator Erickson asked if Representative Fenwick would report to the Executive Committee before the next senate meeting the outcome of the OFC's next meeting.

Representative Fenwick agreed to report and pointed out that the meetings and minutes are on the website, *Ohio Faculty Council* and it is linked to the *Ohio Board of Regents* website.

Senator Speers asked if STRS has a history of being accountable to their constituencies.

Representative Fenwick responded that the OFC has found STRS and its members to be very responsible and responsive to their constituents.

University Council Exploratory Committee

Chair Sterns noted that although Associate Provost and committee chair Rex Ramsier was not at the meeting, the senators had been provided with a written report (appendix B) and that two members of the committee were present. He went on to comment that outstanding issues have not been resolved. The Vice Presidents, at their December 10, 2009 meeting expressed concern about the parallel committee structure between the current committees that operate under the Vice Presidents and the oversight committees provided for in the bylaws.

Senator Erickson stated that the committee suggested a change in wording but pointed out that oversight was exactly what was intended. The committee should be independent of the Vice Presidents

Senator Lillie expressed concern that the change in wording could have significant impact on the independence and substantive nature of the University Council.

Senator Erickson replied that she and other members of the UCEC understand these concerns and would not support making substantial changes to the proposed bylaws that would diminish the independence of the oversight committee.

Chair Sterns stated the importance of having a faculty voice in decision-making and that that really is what the bottom line is. He then invited Senator Ziegler as president of ASG to comment on the ASG's resolution of the University Council bylaws issue.

Senator Ziegler stated that ASG ratified the revised document that would move one UC seat from GSG and add it with ASG. ASG would have three representatives on University Council and GSG would have one. He said he had spoken with the President of GSG and she indicated that GSG would ratify the new document

Curriculum Software Review Committee

Chair Sterns: You have a brief written report coming from Bill Braisinton. The schedule for phase two is as follows; February through March work will be done with focus groups to define functionality acceptable to the majority of users. Beginning in mid-April they will begin to build the system, that is the actual software will be developed. In July they expect to begin testing and early training. In early August they will begin pilot deployment and the goal is full-scale rollout and training in the beginning of Fall semester, 2010. This will be subject to change as necessary.

Senator Erickson expressed concern for the timing of the process and the difficulty of having true faculty involvement in the summer months.

Chair Sterns responded that he understood the concern and would take that back to the committee. He also commented that these concerns were similar to the ones expressed about the strategic planning process last year.

Senator Lillie expressed concern that the faculty retains control over the curriculum process at the college level.

Senator Mancke stated that faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences had been given several opportunities to be involved in the process in several different ways. She made it clear that she was only speaking from her own experience, but that she thought the level of faculty engagement was appropriate.

Senator Norfolk expressed concern for the amount of money being spent to create the new curriculum software system.

Senator Erickson responded that efficiency in the process is very important, that faculty time is valuable and that the system should serve our needs with minor adjustments for a long period of time.

Chair Sterns, acting as chair of the ad hoc committee said that he had invited Mr. Braisinton from the Frontline software-consulting firm to report to the senate and answer the senator's questions at our meeting in March.

Student Judicial Policies Committee

Senator Bove reported that the version of the Code of Student Conduct approved by the senate in the November meeting has not yet been reviewed by the Board of Trustees. Members of the board, the Office of the General Counsel and the ad-hoc committee have looked at the senate-approved version. Senator Bove anticipates changes to the code will be presented to the senate at the March meeting.

Ad hoc Committee on Accessibility

Senator Lillie reported that the committee would meet on February 17 with the Director of the Office of Accessibility to review ways in which the Faculty Senate can be advised and informed of academic issues that relate to accessibility.

Ad-hoc Committee on Organizational Effectiveness and Innovation

Chair Sterns reminded the members of the senate that this committee had been created in response to the letter President Proenza sent to the university community last October. This letter suggested that we might consider new ways that the organization of university could be improved. We in the Faculty Senate created this ad hoc committee with the idea that there would be faculty input into the process. Chair Sterns then shared a letter from Provost Baker dated January 11, 2010.

“President Proenza in his letter to the campus community in October 2009 asked us all to begin a discussion about new and innovative ways to organize our academic and administrative units. Our goal is to promote student success by defining our institution as one that is relevant, connected and productive. In this regard President Proenza has asked me to fully engage the faculty to suggest ways in which we might begin to reshape and redefine our current schools and colleges. It is hoped that these activities will result in improved organizational and financial efficiencies in support of student success. The President has provided a similar request that this work begins with our administrative units and has asked Scott Borgemenke to lead this effort. We take on this task amidst the backdrop of uncertain State budgets and our need to be responsive to the metrics and goals of the University System of Ohio. As time is of the essence, I am requesting that the Faculty Senate through the ad hoc committee already formed for this purpose present ideas for consider-

ation by the President on or before April 15, 2010. I trust that the strong leadership of the Faculty Senate will demonstrate the role of shared academic governance by encouraging input and dialogue from our colleagues across campus.”

The Executive Committee has been working on an appropriate response to this challenge in the time period that is allocated. We have called for volunteers to this committee. The Executive Committee will make the final appointments as soon as possible. There will need to be some discussion about what can be accomplished in this very brief period of time. Most people feel that it is possible at least to lay out a process that may be helpful and constructive. We asked the first candidate for Provost how long they would think a study of this nature would take; the answer was one to two years.

Senator Elliott suggested the committee produce a written report to conclude the work.

VI. New Business: Senator Li: “I am from the College of Education. The faculty of my college just received a new policy statement concerning the adoption of TK20 as a software program for database management. Some of the faculty members, including myself, are concerned about the adoption, expansion and implementation of TK20. This will place additional undue financial burden on students. Some of the faculty members, again including myself, have been concerned about the new policy. The development of this policy has not been done in consultation with the faculty. We have been concerned that the decision might have infringed on the faculty members academic freedom and the faculty’s rights. On behalf of the faculty members of my college I request that the Faculty Senate Academic Policy Committee investigate this issue.”

Chair Sterns: Okay we have a motion to bring this issue to the Academic Policies Committee.
Chair Sterns called for a vote.

The motion passed without objection.

VII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

Transcript edited by Robert Huff,
Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 4, 2010

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

Curriculum Proposal Process Improvement Project

Report for Faculty Senate

February 4, 2010

The Curriculum Proposal Process Improvement Project is moving along well. Since the new semester started two sets of activities have been occurring in concert. The project has moved into Phase II and also Phase IIIa. Phase II consists of the design, build and delivery of the workflow system to support the university level process. Phase IIIa is the business process analysis for the colleges.

So far in Phase II, the detailed business and system requirements are being defined, based on the process analysis that was done in Phase I, and we are about to move into the system design stage. From now through the end of March we will be working closely with faculty and administrative staff to define the exact functionality and look of the new system. By mid-April we will be ready to commence the system build. This will take until early July to complete. Next will come testing and early training. By early August we expect to begin a pilot deployment followed by full scale roll out and training at the beginning of the fall semester.

Phase IIIa is progressing nicely. The AS-IS process has been documented for six colleges already and a proposed TO-BE process presented each of these colleges. By the end of March we plan to have a defined TO-BE process agreed on for each college and be ready to commence design activities for the workflow system programs to support these as soon as Phase IIIb of the project is authorized.

The draft forms for the new system can be viewed on the SharePoint site.

Submitted by Bill Braisinton

APPENDIX C

University Council Exploratory Committee Report to Faculty Senate February 4, 2010

The committee met on December 10, 2009 (minutes attached here), and modified the proposed bylaws accordingly. Since that time, Associated Student Government reports that the modified document has been ratified, but we have yet to hear from Graduate Student Government concerning representation issues. In addition, the Vice Presidents have provided further clarification on the issue of committee structures which we will be discussing at the next scheduled meeting on February 11, 2010.

Respectfully submitted, in absentia,

Rex D. Ramsier

UCEC Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2009
8:00-9:00 a.m.
LH 413

Members in attendance: Peter Aubry (GSG), Elizabeth Erickson, Virginia Gunn, Rex Ramsier, Jim Sage, Dan Sheffer, Bob Stachowiak, and Jason Ziegler (ASG).

Vice President's Memorandum – discussion

#6) Oversight Committees and Committee Structure

VPs expressed concern over what appears to be a parallel committee structure between the committees that currently operate under the vice presidents and the oversight committees proposed in the UC bylaws. VPs would like to propose a combined committee structure so to offset potential inefficiencies that may result from having parallel committees. Members of UC would be appointed to VPs committees currently in place. If a VP's committee is not in place, one would need to be established. Since no changes were being made to the intent of the bylaws, only to the wording, no objections were presented; therefore, the UC bylaws will be updated to reflect these modifications.

Associated Student Government Representation

ASG respectfully requests three ASG representatives to serve on UC. ASG's position is that there are many students and not enough representation. The main reason is so they have the opportunity to force an item onto the agenda. It was suggested that GSG relinquish one seat to ASG. ASG was reminded they must be accountable for three representatives each term and those representatives must be active. Repeated vacancies will send a negative message.

GSG expressed concern over reducing the number of representatives for their group since there are no provisions for law students. As a result, they would need to represent both GSG and Law. GSG was reminded that Law was not part of GSG and therefore representation would not be an issue. GSG was also reminded that over the course of developing UC, GSG has not been an active participant. This lack of representation sends a message that this might not be their highest priority. UCEC is not trying to exclude GSG, but members seriously doubt if two seats could be filled by GSG as this time. One "active" seat is better than two open seats, and it was suggested that GSG relinquish one of its seats to ASG to resolve this matter.

ASG and GSG will work out the details and will report back to UCEC.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Greene