



SENATE ACTIONS

- **Passed a resolution from APC renaming the Department of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held October 7, 2010 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7, 2010

A. Recommendation from Academic Policies Committee 22

B. Minutes of Athletic Committee meeting 23

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7, 2010

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, October 7, 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 sixty Senators, 44 were present for this meeting. Senators Barrett, Hamed, Kruse, Li, cKnight, Miller, Queener, Scotto, Thomas, Thornton, Vierheller and Wesdemiotis were absent with notice. Senators Beneke, Gerhardt, Lyndall, Marich, Miller-Motley, Murphy, Newton, Roadruck, Rostedt, Veillette and Yi were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda - Chair Sterns called for the approval of the agenda. (So moved, seconded and approved)

II. Approval of the Minutes- The minutes of the September 2 meeting had not yet been distributed due to the difficulty in transcribing the recording. They will be considered at the next meeting of the senate.

III. Chairman's Remarks and Announcements -

Chair Sterns began the meeting by making several announcements. The first was to ask any senator that had not been given a committee assignment to contact the Faculty Senate office. The second was to ask senators to cooperate in making the audio recording of the meeting by not sitting near the microphones, not conducting side conversations and to rise when they are recognized and address their comments to the Chair. The poor quality of the September meeting audio recording made the transcription more difficult.

Chair Sterns also encouraged all senators to participate in a symposium on student retention to be held at Quaker Square on October 25.

Chair Sterns - Yesterday I was placed in an unusual position at the Board of Trustees meeting when a resolution from our Graduate School was introduced to change the acceptance of students from a two-year period to a one-year period. I have no issues with the policy but the fact of the matter is that I am greatly concerned because this is clearly a major change in an academic area that did come through the Faculty Senate. According to the bylaws of the Graduate School and the bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate is to affirm all decisions of this type before they are presented to the Board of Trustees. I wish to say as strongly as I can that this is a violation of the relationship and trust that we have. I don't like having to say this but it is a problem. I have asked numerous department chairs on this campus if they are aware of this change of policy and I've asked some Deans. The problem is that this change was not discussed fully in the academic community. There may be reasons why this policy needs to be changed but what I am saying is that it did not get the full process.

I don't mean to catch you off guard Mr. President.

President Proenza: It was brought to my attention so you're not catching me off guard. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Before we move on to remembrances of faculty of The University of Akron who have passed away, friends and colleagues in the Library asked that we read a special statement regarding Ruth Clinefelter. Last month we did have a brief presentation about Ruth but many of the staff and faculty in the Library wanted a special statement to be read which I am happy to do.

Ruth W. Clinefelter, 79, died on August 12, 2010. Professor Clinefelter was the History Bibliographer and Emeritus Professor of Bibliography at the University Libraries, serving the University of Akron for 43 years. Professor Clinefelter was deeply involved in local history, which was reflected in part by her contributions to the Summit County Historical Society and Progress Through Preservation, as well as her collaboration with Tom Mussara and Chuck Ayers of the Beacon Journal on the book Celebrating Akron's History in Picture Postcards which was published by the Summit County Historical Society in 2000. Professor Clinefelter was the 2009 recipient of the Individual Achievement Award from the Ohio Association of Historical Societies and Museums, for her lifetime of "service to local history projects and organizations including Progress Through Preservation, Cascade Locks Park Association and the Akron Women's History Program." Professor Clinefelter was a 52-year member of the American Association of University Professors, as well as past president and secretary-treasurer of the campus chapter. She was a tireless advocate for shared governance and faculty rights, and a great and devoted friend to many on campus.

Another well known member of the faculty on our campus for many years, **Julia Anich Hull**, Professor Emeritus, died September 5, 2010. She received her bachelors in English from University of Akron and while working on her Graduate degree she was asked by the head of the English Department to help teach the many veterans returning from the war in 1947. She began teaching and taught until her retirement 43 years later. She taught literature, drama, poetry and Western Culture in addition to Freshman Comp. I refer you to her obituary, that is one of the longest, the most literary and erudite obituaries that I have read. She even took a little slap at the administration and that's not easy to do after you're dead. I do want to point out a piece of this obituary because I think that it is very telling. "Whilst retrieving her transcript one spring day she bumped into the head of the English department and he inquired with a straight face whether she had found employment and told her of his desire for the need of bodies to be thrown in front of the flood of returning veterans attending college under the GI bill. She took up the task of teaching men older than she was who had seen the ravages of war and the actual buildings they would read about. She bunked in an office with her former professors which was very intimidating. At the end of the term she approached her mentor wondering if she would be able to be retained for another semester. Her involvement here lasted for 43 years." I remember Julia Hull very well as I did Ruth Clinefelter. When I first came to the university in 1971 she was one of the folks that sat in the middle of the faculty dining room and we would have many interesting conversations and lots of really interesting discussions and observations about life on campus and off campus. Many people who knew her found her to be solid, a wonderful academic who really had the values and concerns for students that many of us aspire to in our own careers.

Please join me and stand in silence in memory of these two wonderful women. (Senate observed moment of silence) Thank you very much.

IV. Reports

Executive Committee -Secretary Robert Huff: Thank you Chair Sterns. The Executive Committee held two meetings in the month of September. The first was with President Proenza and Provost Sherman on September 14th. At this meeting President Proenza shared his views on the state budget process and the implications for the university. Provost Sherman discussed the new Office of Academic Affairs and three other working groups that he's bringing together. Other issues that were discussed at this meeting included the status of the University Council proposal, an update on the proposal to merge the College of Nursing and the College of Health Sciences and Human Services, the status of the unfilled deans positions, an update on strategic planning, how the new Code of Student Conduct will be communicated to the university and the issue of consistency in academic standards and practices at the several campus locations. Our second meeting was on September 30th. At this meeting the committee certified the election of nine new senators representing the College of Engineering, The College of Creative and Professional Arts, the College of Arts and Sciences and Summit College. Summit College needs to conduct a runoff election to fill three additional seats in the Senate. The committee also reviewed committee assignments for senators and set the agenda for today's meeting. That concludes my report.

Remarks of the President - Thank you Mr. Chairman and if I may colleagues in light of Professor Stern's comments offer an apology. In the institution there are times when things get done that everybody thought they'd checked with all concerned. This didn't happen so my apologies. Secondly in that regard, Chair Sterns I will ask the Provost to initiate a prompt review. I'm informed that this happened at the request of several departments but certainly not all. It was an oversight and in the event that your collective wisdom says that you want to abridge the flexibility of your departments by going back to the original that is your prerogative. We will so do if that is your recommendation. Although the Board has approved the change we do have however the opportunity to delay implementation, which we will so do. Is that reasonable?

Chair Sterns: I have learned not to speak for the entire Executive Committee, but that sounds reasonable.

President Proenza: Thank you I would hope that you do since you nevertheless spoke on behalf of the Senate. There are times colleagues when the best thing one can do is apologize and figure out how we fix it if there is something to fix. If there is something to fix, we'll fix it.

Let me just share a few things by way of celebrating our good institution and it's increasing recognition. I know that I have shared with you at various occasions how it is that the various initiatives that our university has taken over the past few years are getting increasing recognition nationally and in some cases international. All of these continue to build very positive momentum for us and it is becoming known in various circles as the Akron Model, as I told our Board of Trustees yesterday. We are being asked more and more often to come to various forums and describe this Akron Model to national audiences. This was the case on September 23rd, when Trustee Nick York and I attended a national conference on clusters of innovation as the basis on which to build new economic activity for the nation. It was by invitation only and I was privileged to be invited to represent universities and to talk about the Akron Model. The University of Akron was the only university invited to the event, which was hosted in conjunction with the White House and the Brookings Institution, the Council on Competitiveness, the Center for American Progress and the National Association of Development Organizations. Let me share a little bit about how the meeting was structured and what happened.

The program focused on the significance of regional economic clusters to the future of the American economy. It began with a keynote address by the Secretary of Commerce, Gary Locke. Much to our delight and certainly to our surprise, Secretary Locke chose this occasion to announce the winners of the so-called I-6 competition, which the Department of Commerce launched earlier this year. There were over 450 proposals and only 6 awards in each of the six regions of the Department of Commerce. One of the winning teams from the Chicago area of the Department of commerce was none other than your University of Akron Research Foundation in partnership with the Austin Bioinnovation Institute. What does this mean? It means that this winning team will receive a one million dollar grant and be eligible for additional fundings from the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation. The project was entitled “Innovative Solutions for Invention Acceleration”. *Acceleration* is spelled *Xceleration* with an “X” just for impact. If you were in Washington it would need to be an interesting acronym. Following the keynote there were two panel discussions. I served on the second panel that examined how regional actors operate in strengthening clusters, a topic for which our Akron Model held significance.

At lunch the keynote speaker was the chairman and CEO of Eli-Lillie and Company, John Lechleiter. He was introduced by the President of the Council on Competitiveness Debra Witt Smith who I believe some of you know is a native of Akron and knows us well. To our delight she interrupted her introduction of Mr. Lechleiter to congratulate The University of Akron for this singular award.

The president of one of the most prestigious universities in the Netherlands, the University of Utrecht, has asked to visit our university. His name is Bert Venderswaan and his title by the way is ‘Rector Magnificus’. Let’s not go there please. He is the ‘Rector Magnificus’ or president of Utrecht and he’s interested in learning more about our collaborations with industry and the spin-offs and in short how we interact with the community. He heard about us from his friends at the university of LeMonde in France who had visited us. President Venderswaan was making a visit to the United States and he asked his host if he could please arrange for a visit to our university. He will be coming to us next week to see what he can learn that he can take back to Utrecht.

Of course most of you are aware that we are in the midst of China Week and we’ve had additional guests on our campus that are celebrating one of our newest and most far reaching collaborations with the Chinese. We are hosting the Confucius Institute in partnership with Henan University and you’ll recognize obviously its importance to one of our strategic goals of creating global relevance for ourselves. Today we celebrated the opening of our Confucius Institute Chinese Cultural Experience Corner in Bierce Library. The Vice President of Henan University Dr. Zhao joined us. Some other activities this week involved Dr. Yuefan Deng speaking on the Chinese contribution to the world of science during the last 100 years. He is an internationally recognized figure for developing parallel computer algorithms that are used universally by scientists and engineers in various applications.

I trust that many of you had a chance to hear, Thomas Friedman who spoke last night as part of China Week. I’m glad some of you were able to catch that remarkable prescient observer of globalization and it’s economic and cultural impacts. Although his most well known book is The World is Flat, my favorite of his books is The Lexus and the Olive Tree, and I commend either one of those two to you including his more recent book, Hot, Flat and Crowded.

Let me just close by sharing with you two significant related highlights. Our university has been recognized as one of the 99 best places to work in Northeast Ohio by the Employers Resource Council. The award was tenured on September 14th along with those of others in our area that include the Infocision Management Corporation, The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Akron Children's Hospital, Akron General as well as Summa Health System and the Cleveland Clinic. Late last week we were informed that the university also was selected to receive the Ohio Psychological Association's Healthy Workplace Award. Now this is significant for several reasons. It comes as a result of a rigorous process that includes not only an in-depth application but also it actually includes that organization doing a survey and interviews with employees during site visits. So this is by a team of professionals from that organization. Let me close by extending an invitation for you to join all of us on Tuesday, October 26th at 2 pm for our annual State of the University Address. The event will be held at the Student Union ballroom and will include faculty and students telling the attendees of their work and how they add to the life and of course the success of our great institution. Mr. Chairman that concludes my remarks and I am happy to answer any questions should anybody have any.

Chair Sterns: Thank you President Proenza. I now call upon the remarks of our Senior Vice President, Provost and COO.

Remarks of the Provost - Good afternoon. You can call me Mike. Thank you for the opportunity to interact with you this afternoon. I'd like to update you on the Office of Academic Affairs. I hope this will illustrate the types of things that are underway to enable the faculty and the colleges to accomplish the academic agenda, with the help of the support units, the vice presidential areas. I indicated at the last meeting that I would be visiting colleges over the semester. By the end of the day tomorrow I will have visited four colleges where I spend an hour and half with the college. The first 30 minutes is with the dean and dean's leadership. I leave it open for them to show me what they feel is important. For the last 60 minutes I have the opportunity to interact with the faculty and staff of the college. Once I finish those or as I get closer to having completed those visits I'll compile perspectives that I've observed and perhaps ask for your further comments on those perspectives.

I do want to say that these visits have reaffirmed that the faculty and staff are absolutely dedicated to this university, conscientious about the success of this university and most importantly, focused on and dedicated to student success by placing students first. This further affirms that this university is on a great trajectory towards our number one goal, student success. You heard in the report of the Executive Committee of the Senate that the Board created an Office of Academic Affairs. You may be surprised that there was not a formal Office of Academic Affairs at the university. This office allows an interaction of leadership of the university in different ways through different approaches and processes that really allows us to stimulate and enable academic excellence. It is a venue where individuals are discussing what's on the table and really creating the opportunity for alignment of those issues, for vetting and implementation and discussion across different layers of the university. This in affect should eliminate any further skips or missteps in something going to the Board of Trustees that for example hasn't been appropriately vetted by the Faculty Senate. You will see that there will be an advertisement for a Vice Provost for Academic Planning. That is a position that has been held by Chand Midha. It is clear that I need a person that's full-

time interacting with the university and focused on academic planning. Rex Ramsier's position will be re-titled Vice Provost for Academic Operations. His portfolio will be expanded and enhanced and in particular he'll be responsible for institutional effectiveness that we'll pull into the office of Institutional Research. I'm pleased to announce the Knight Foundation has provided the university a \$425,000 grant that will allow us to focus on student success, retention and graduation and support for all students but with a particular focus on the African-American male. It also will provide for the Office of Multicultural Development to hire an individual who'll be focused on student success with emphasis on the African-American. This will enhance all of our programs out of that office to support student success.

At the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday the first student recognition award was presented. Deans of the colleges nominate to the office of the Provost who forwards to the Board of Trustees individual students who have performed in an exemplary fashion in their programs. The Board of Trustees recognizes them by having the nomination read in the public session. There are also pictures and the Board of Trustees makes an official resolution recognizing that student for their accomplishments. We're going to rotate this among the colleges and we are considering expanding it to two students per Board of Trustees meeting. I also have had an opportunity to address the Board of Trustees on the academic affairs issues and our progress on agendas such as student success and institutional effectiveness, the environment for teaching and learning and other matters.

The chair read to you earlier the invitation to participate in the conversation on retention coordinated by the Office of Student Affairs. This is one of a number of things to focus on student retention and student success. You may be aware that about a week and half ago we had an all campus meeting of academic advisors and faculty advisors, department chairs and deans. The focus was on enhancing our ability to touch students at the right point in time in order to have an opportunity to guide them, advise them, intercede, support them at points in time during their academic program that would benefit them and enable them to be retained and to better achieve their objective to graduate from the university.

I've also become aware of nearly 200 students who have accumulated credit hours well in excess of 200 credits without having completed a degree. I've asked the deans to work with their leadership and faculty to review those transcripts. They will determine first why that is the case and second how we might otherwise interact with such students to facilitate appropriate completion of the right courses to complete the degree. That is another step that we're taking to optimize student success.

You heard earlier that the Executive Committee is interested in and concerned about different academic issues related to the program offerings at Wayne and Summit College. Dr. Ramsier facilitated an interaction with the Chair and the deans of those respective colleges to begin to address and discuss those particular issues.

Finally, I would like to recognize Holly Harris-Bane and her staff for creating a wonderful China Week. Dr. Lin has been outstanding. The faculty who have been involved, who have incorporated different issues related to the culture of China into your courses have contributed to making this China Week an exemplary activity of the university. Thank you. That concludes my remarks.

Chair Sterns: I would like to say a few words about another stellar presentation at the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday about the new office of Veteran's Affairs. It is not a new office but there is a committee on veteran's affairs that includes the leadership of two deans, as I understand it and veteran students of the university that have been working over the last year to support our effective interaction with veterans who are students at this university. We were recently recognized as a veteran-friendly university and thought it might be appropriate to have the Board see what it is we're doing to support veteran's here from a couple of veterans themselves. So Deans Wineman and Belsky who chair that committee provided a perspective around which it makes sense to focus on veterans as a group of individuals who have served our country, who have educational opportunities provided to them by ourselves through our taxes by federal government. We hoped to illustrate to the Board that if we focused a little bit more our veteran students could be even more supported and be successful. Two students addressed the Board. The first was from the Navy and served in the 80's. He was older and had come back after realizing higher education was the next step in his career. He is majoring in the School of Music. The other individual, a young lady, had actually served in Iraq, I think twice, again was in the Navy. Both of them found the Veteran Services Office and the Adult Learning Office to have been very supportive to their re-entry into The University of Akron and really indicated their great appreciation for that.

Provost Sherman: We are assuring that there's an interaction with the Board at every meeting that illustrates the success of programs and initiatives that are under way at this great institution. One of the earlier ones was from the Chair of Biology talking about our hydrology initiatives and the different reserves that have been donated to us that provide for the study of the issues of hydrology. Another one was an illustration of the activities that are underway through academic program delivery by units at the Akron campus to Midpoint and Medina University Center and students who have benefited by being able to take courses there that are now completing degrees. Those are just two illustrations of the kinds of presentations that we've had to the Board. If you have other ideas or perspectives from which a 15-minute interaction with the Board would advance our agenda those ideas would certainly be appreciated.

Committee Reports

Academic Policies Committee Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns. Academic Policies Committee considered a proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences Department of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics to change their name to simply the Department of Mathematics. (Appendix A) The request was simply that the renaming of the department would reflect the current departmental structure and also it would actually be easier to find it in the university directory, students look for "math." The resolution from the APC is: **Be it resolved that the Academic Policies Committee unanimously has recommended that the renaming of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics to the Department of Mathematics.** We bring this to you as a motion from the committee.

Chair Sterns found no questions or comments from the members of the senate. A vote was then called for. **The resolution passed without opposition.**

Chair Sterns then asked Associate Provost Ramsier to comment on the presentation to the Board of Trustees Rules Committee by the University Council Exploratory Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier: I'd be happy to. University Council Exploratory Committee did reconvene with Chair Sterns in attendance and some new members replacing people who had been on the committee to discuss how to approach the process by which the Rules Committee of the Board was entertaining the proposal that was submitted to them through this body. We decided to have Senator Lillie and myself stand as the spokespersons for the committee. Others on the committee were in attendance at the rules committee meeting. We were given almost 45 minutes to discuss the proposal and answer questions. Questions were asked and answered by the Board members. The President and Provost were there and engaged. I thought the meeting went exceptionally well. My takeaway was that everyone in the room believes in the concept of shared governance. To me that was the most important thing. People had read the documents and understood the situation and where we were coming from. We had every opportunity to be heard. I would ask Senator Lillie to add his perspective.

Senator Lillie: There really isn't much to add except that one of the things that I left with was that we could have made our presentation, answered a couple of routine questions, been thanked and sort of been shooed away. Instead we received what I think was a very serious and thoughtful kind of review. I think it's an extremely positive step forward in any kind of institutional governance and I hope we continue in the direction that we started.

Associate Provost Ramsier: I can't agree more.

Chair Sterns: I can add that at the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday the committee chair reported that he is awaiting recommendations from the President and the Provost and that they were favorably disposed in the process so far. I would expect that we would move ahead over the next month or two. I would hope that we could start spring semester with a new university council.

Athletics Committee

Senator Lillie: You have as a handout, a copy of the minutes of the committee meeting of September 22nd. (Appendix B) Under point number two you will note that there was some confusion over the role of the Athletic Committee in terms of reviewing and passing along to the Senate the Student Athlete Code of Conduct as well as the Student Drug Policy. I can report that we have had that clarified and those do go through the Athletics Committee and then they will come to this body for review and for the will of this body to be known on those areas. We received the proposed drug policy from the Director of Athletics two days before our meeting. We had a pretty good discussion with him and Mary Lou Gribshaw who is the Senior Associate Athletic Director. Over the course of the next week with the help of Heather Loughney and others we were able to provide them some feedback that we felt was important to make the policy clearer. One section had some wording that took into account our concerns and that's going out for a vote. If things continue as they are I would expect that we could bring before you at least the Student Drug Policy for Athletics at the next meeting and possibly the Student Athlete Code of Conduct as well. Thank you.

Faculty Research Committee

Chair Sterns: I would like to just say on behalf of that committee that they are looking for some additional members. Many of these important research grants come from the hard sciences. The committee is looking for individuals from the sciences to be involved in the evaluation of these grants. Anyone with an interest should contact the senate office.

Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council

Representative Rudy Fenwick: (Dr. Fenwick serves as the Chair of the OFC) Thank you. It is always a pleasure to be back with friends here. It is a pleasure to finally meet Mike Sherman. I've heard a lot about you from your colleagues at Ohio State, Tim Gerber and Susan Shockley, who've worked on committees and are very pleased that we hired you as the new Provost. I look forward to working with you in any capacity possible in the future.

I was happy to hear that the ADA has named this a healthy workplace. As a job stress researcher, it's always good to practice what we preach, or have your employer practice what you hope our employers preach. I'd like to know more about the Knight Foundation grant on student success for focusing on African American males because on November 3rd I have to give a report from Ohio Faculty Council to the OBR on what's called the Fourth Year Condition Report of Higher Education. That is going to focus on the underserved populations. I'd be very interested in knowing more about the report and the grant because I think that would fit into what I have to present.

What we've done on Ohio Faculty Council since the last time I spoke to this group is to look at three issues. The first has to do with faculty concerns over some of the elements in the Ten Year University System of Ohio plan. Two points in particular have troubled faculty members from other universities or at least the representatives on Ohio Faculty Council. One has to do with policies in committees on transfer and articulation. There is some concern that was expressed by one of our representatives from another university after having polled many of his colleagues that there were pressures from these panels, which approve these guidelines, to cut books, cut subject matters out of courses so that they could meet the guidelines. He felt that this was interfering with academic freedom of choosing books and choosing materials for your courses. The other point is related to that in that it was not clear who sits on the committees that approve transfer and articulation guidelines and how they get appointed to these committees. I was nominated a few years ago but I was not appointed and so we weren't clear. Over the summer John Cuppoletti, from the University of Cincinnati, who is a past chair of Ohio Faculty Council and myself met with the vice chancellors and associate vice chancellors at the Ohio Board of Regents. We discussed these issues and also what's going on with changes in the subvention formula from subventing universities on the basis of total enrollment to subventing universities on the basis of retention and graduation. Again there's some fear that this is occurring among some of our members and that this would put pressure on faculty and especially adjunct faculty to increase grades. John Cuppoletti and I talked about these matters with the vice chancellors and associate vice chancellors. We are working to set up a structure between faculty and OBR where these issues can be addressed and faculty concerns that are raised can be dealt with. Perhaps this will be a place where appeals or where questions can be answered. One of the reasons that the Transfer Articulation Guidelines (TAG) committees are not transparent is that by necessity they are kind of kept hidden so they won't get inundated with comments and complaints. We are trying to work with OBR and the Chancellor's office to make the process more transparent. That was followed up last month with

a meeting with Dr. Stephanie Davidson, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Approval. It was a very productive meeting. We learned more about what her office does and she was able to answer very concisely and very clearly many of the faculty concerns and alleviate many fears and concerns. Tomorrow we have our October meeting. John Brighton, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and System Integration will be at the meeting. In the future we're going to meet with Dr. Paul Compton who is the Associate Vice Chair for Articulation and Transfer. He leads an initiative regarding veterans and easing veterans' transition into universities. So that's one set of concerns.

Second set of concerns or issue that we've dealt with has to do with House Bill 365. This is a bill that would extend collective bargaining rights to adjunct faculty and graduate assistants. This was voted out of the House Committee of Commerce and Labor in May. It has not been brought up to vote because the Speaker of the House doesn't believe it has the votes to pass the House. It may be brought up for a vote in lame duck session of the House after the elections. I will keep you posted on that.

Finally, issues of concern to many here are proposed changes to STRS and the defined benefit programs. There are two sets of concerns. The first set of concerns are over issues brought up in newspaper articles for the last several months. These are stories about abuses and the costs to the taxpayers of retiree benefits and not only state teacher retirees but also all state employees. Many people read into this a concerted push for changes from defined benefits program to defined contributions such as we have with a 403B or a 401K program. We met last winter with Michael Neff who is the Executive Director of STRS, Larry Luellen from Ohio State who puts out a newsletter on retirees affairs and Representative Todd Book from Portsmouth who is shepherding reform legislation about STRS through the House. They assured us that there weren't enough votes to do that in the legislature. However there is something more immediate and that is proposed changes to STRS eligibility and retirement calculations. They are proposed to take place in 2015. These have not been voted on by the legislature but they're probably going to happen in one form or another. I see Dr. Gandee is still here but that Dr. Gerlach is retired. I'm going to miss him very much. You can confirm or challenge what I say on these retiree issues Dr. Gandee. One thing that's probably going to change is the calculation of retiree benefits from your highest three years to your highest five years, as of August 1, 2015. That would have the effect of reducing benefits or monthly payments. The other change would be to eliminate the 35-year enhancement, where your retirement, the percentage of retirement goes up 11% on your final salary calculations. Another thing that's probably going to happen even sooner is reducing the cost of living allowance from 3 to 1.5% per year for anybody who retires after July of next year. Nothing has happened on these matters but there may also be a vote in a lame duck session legislature after the elections. That is my report.

Senator Speers: You said the cost of living adjustment would change from 3% to 1.5%. Is that going to be across the board, even if you retired earlier or is it just going to apply to those people who retire after a certain date?

Dr. Fenwick: If you go to the STRS website they have the information. It is called the STRS Ohio Plan to Strengthen the Condition of the Retirement System. Regarding the cost of living adjustment, this is what it says "beginning July 1, 2011 current retirees would receive an annual 2% COLA. Members retiring after July 1, 2011 would receive a 1.5% COLA each year." So that seems to say that if you retire before July 1 of next year you'd receive a 2% COLA.

Ad hoc Curriculum Process Review Committee

Chair Sterns: At our last Senate meeting I had promised that we would have a full report from TEAM Informatics. What has happened is that as a result of ongoing work on the curriculum programming, Vice President Jim Sage and I as co-chairs decided that it would be in the best interest of all parties to have a full demonstration at the November Faculty Senate meeting. That will be a principal focus of that meeting. I have been meeting weekly with the project team. Development continues and we are scheduled for completion at the end of October. Dr. Richard Stratton, who is sitting at the back of the room, has been attending those very same meetings. Richard, please if you want to add anything to what I'm saying please feel free. We are working on improving the flow that was approved at last month's Faculty Senate meeting. In November the complete system installation will take place and they'll be testing by the first week of November. A pilot roll out will occur during which selected users will process live proposals. Training for faculty members will be available by mid-November while the pilot test is underway. In the Faculty Senate meeting in November we will actually come with a demonstration that will show how exactly how the forms will look. We will use an LCD projector and have the opportunity to show you exactly what the process will look like. As we move through and develop each of the pages we still uncover things that were not considered. Just this week we found that there was a glitch in the point people can continue to change the document. We discovered that once it had left the originator, it might not be able to be revised after at the college level. Now we are incorporating that correction and this is how it goes. As we go through each of these special operations that are necessary for various aspects of the curriculum change process we keep finding new and different issues that have to be dealt with. A general rollout of the new curriculum proposal process will begin around December 7th and will be completed by December 15th prior to the start of winter break. The new system will be operational on January 20th and serve as the only curriculum entry system for the university. At that point the old system will be closed permanently and the entry of all new curriculum proposals will use the new system. However, I might want to point out that closing the old system does not mean that all proposals must be completed at that time. All proposals that are entered under the old curriculum database will move through that system until final approval is granted. Richard would you like to just comment from your perspective, how you think it's going?

Dr. Richard Stratton: It is progressing. The intent of the process is very user friendly. I think it will be a big improvement over what we currently have but with all such huge processes there are glitches that have to be overcome.

Chair Sterns: Richard is very meticulous and I wanted others to hear his views on this. Thank you for all the good work that you're doing.

Senator Lillie: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a process that has been going on for a long time and has been involving a lot of people in a lot of different areas. I'm really glad to see that we're coming towards a resolution of some of the issues. I just would like to clarify that you stated that there would be a rollout between December 7th and December 15th and that the new system will be used the following month in January. I am assuming that that is subject to Faculty Senate approval, because it would be a major change in the way our system of curriculum review goes. There is a meeting of the Faculty Senate early in December where it would be good to have that kind of documentation clear so that it can move forward. Secondly, I think that the time for the rollout is right around the time of final exams, so it's going to be an

extremely difficult for the faculty to give the kind of attention to that they ought to. If there is some way that there can be some continued work done so that the faculty will be able to review these things in a timely fashion, I think it would be helpful. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: In November there will be a pilot rollout that will allow for any of us to have our interaction with the system. I understand there have been reservations made in the computer center for some special testing stations for those who want to do that. I think you're statement regarding our final approval is probably a good one. I don't know how we as a body will be able to implement that. I would welcome suggestions.

Senator Lillie: The role of this body is to review and to recommend policy. When we began this process a number of years ago it had two roles. One role was to review and update the computerized version to make it much more user friendly. The second role was to review and revise the curriculum process rule. That would be in my mind the particular document that the Faculty Senate would need to see and approve. I do realize that we've had some discussions about that curriculum review process with regards to the Distance Learning Committee. I know people are aware of it and have been looking at it, but that's what I'm referring to. I'm referring to the policy rule, not to the details of the implementation, if that helps you understand what I'm referring to.

Chair Sterns: Yes it does. Dr. Lillie is correctly raising the fact that we as a group approved a flow diagram process that documented the decision-making that would take place so that the programming can move ahead. We still need for a written document to fully explain the flow diagram and it's various facets and that the actual drafting of that has been a discussion in the Executive Committee. We are still in the process of having that draft developed and it will need final approval. Dr. Lillie is correct.

Senator Lillie: What I'm referring to is not an explanatory statement for the diagram, which I think is what I heard you say. What I'm referring to is the university rule that will be recommended to the Board of Trustees that will tell us all what the policy is for the approval process of new curriculum proposals. It has nothing to do with or not much to do with the technical issue. I see those and I think the Senate did when it approved this some time ago as separate issues. I think they're both important. Thank you.

Senator Mancke: Can this new system be implemented for the entire university without Senate approval?

Chair Sterns: I'm pausing. It is what is called a pregnant silence.

Senator Rich: We have a rule approved by the Board of Trustees that's been in place for a while. It is very badly drafted but it describes the curriculum review process. This new system can be implemented as long as it's not inconsistent with that rule. There is in the works a proposal to change that rule in various respects. The Faculty Senate awaits the final language in that and there are still some substantive and procedural details to be worked out. It will probably need at that point to go to the Reference Committee because there's also some change needed to the Faculty Senate bylaws to make all this work. That is going to be forthcoming, assuming this body approves it or some amended version that will go on to the

President who can send it on to the Board of Trustees. The relationship between these rules and the software that's being developed is another question. In the end this software needs to be able to be used in way that's consistent with the rule that eventuates from this process.

Chair Sterns: The answer is then that there will be some rule changes that we will have to approve. I believe Senator Manke was asking about the system.

Senator Mancke: Until the rule change is made, the existing rules are in place. Can there be a fundamental change in the processing of curriculum proposals without that fundamental change going through the Faculty Senate? It seems to me that the implementation of this software constitutes a fundamental change. The timeline that you presented does not include approval by the Faculty Senate. So where in that timeline is Faculty Senate approval being inserted? I recollect that you did give a timeframe of something like January 7th that it was going to be implemented? If that's the case it will come before the first meeting of the Faculty Senate in spring semester. I am just a little bit confused at a logistical level on how Faculty Senate review and approval of that system will take place.

Chair Sterns: The reason I'm not being more definitive is that we haven't fully discussed that. We will know in November exactly what those rule changes should be and we will also have more information about the system itself. It would not be inappropriate for us to take that up in the November meeting or at the very latest the December 7th meeting. You are very right to ask this question because being caught up in the day to day I have not nailed that down. You're very right to raise it. I would like to ask Associate Provost Ramsier what his perspective on this is. We've been working hand in hand on this.

Associate Provost Ramsier: It is a very good question. The flow diagram that was approved by the Senate in September 2010 exactly duplicates the current Board Rule on curriculum. That is what the programmers are programming to. So what the electronic system will do when we see the demo in November and implementation in January will be to exactly follow the rule that is currently in place. In that respect I do not believe that the Senate needs to approve the electronic system because that's a technical detail about how you get materials through the system that follows the Board Rule. If we wish to change the Board Rule in the future it may force us then to change the system, the electronic system and it may cost more money. You will recall that Curriculum Review Committee brought in the May meeting of 2010 to the Senate a revised rule. There was some form of consensus that the concepts of the revised rule were agreeable to the Senate but specific language details were not agreeable to members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in particular who then in essence tabled the proposed rule change. This was to be addressed over the summer by the EC. As of the first meeting of the Curriculum Review Committee in September of 2010 we had not yet received any feedback from the Executive Committee about what language they wanted modified in our proposed rule. We could not act on changing the rule because we did not have the information about what was wrong with the rule as proposed. We have asked a member of the Curriculum Review Committee, Senator Hajjafar, who is also now a member of the Executive Committee to be our liaison to help us figure out how to get the rule language in front of this body as fast as possible. We are all on the same page and proper approvals will be in place before the electronic system is implemented.

Senator Hajjafar: Senator Rich and I are working on that. Of course there were some ambiguities on the rule and we are working on that and it will be done pretty soon.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Excellent. Now that is currently with the Curriculum Review Committee, not the ad hoc committee. So we will bring it forward as a motion from the Curriculum Review Committee as soon as we have the language fleshed out. I think that will clear it up. The flow doesn't really change. The approval points and the decision points are the same as the current rule. The only addition we suggested was the addition of the GenEd Committee becoming part of Senate and a new committee called the University Wide Review Committee that would have a new role. Both of those were in the proposed rule we brought forward in May.

Senator Mancke: I actually have those rules and I'm not concerned about those rules. I think it's early January when there is supposed to be a roll out. Technically it may be exactly like the flow chart. I don't have that confidence in the exactitude of technology. That may be my humanist flaw but I don't. I'm a little bit puzzled about what the final approval is in this university for that exact technological system. Who gives the final approval to this?

Chair Sterns: Well the person who has been taking the major financial responsibility and organization responsibility is Vice President Jim Sage. And Jim Sage and I have been co-chairing the effort. TEAM Infomatics is responsible to the university through Mr. Sage's office for the performance of the contract. In that sense it is Vice President Sage who will say whether or not the system is finally operational. Our committee of course will make a recommendation to him but he has the authority. We are hitting new ground here so I would be interested in other people's opinion if I am sequencing this right. I think the question is exactly the right one.

Senator Lillie: I think this is an important question and one that is probably important to distinguish from the content of the technological stuff itself. I think that will be a vast improvement over what we've had and will be very useful for us. I commend you and the committee and Vice President Sage for the work they've done to make it possible. Having said that, we know that the devil is in the details. We recently heard a different lawyer say, "Rules is rules." If we have a rule in which there are some specifics about how a curriculum proposal is to be made and reviewed at the university level or some other level, we need to have confidence in that and it needs to be something that is passed through the Faculty Senate. As you said we are breaking new ground and it may be that it would be good for this body to see and to have some hand in the final approval of the technology as well because we're the ones who are going to be using it. While I would hope that this could be done by early January. I would think that the principle of making sure we're doing it right and the principle of making sure that faculty are in control and maintain control of the academic mission of the university is important enough for us to think carefully about that. I hope that it's understood that it's not meant in a way that would obstruct the possibility of this going through but to make sure that when we do it, we do it right. This should be a clear rule that people understand so we aren't coming back later with people confused about the meaning. I believe that is the role of the Faculty Senate in this particular issue.

Chair Sterns: Dr. Mancke expressed a skepticism that is well known to me. My aunt is a sociologist of technology and is with NASA's research station at Berkeley. She wrote a book on systems analysis a

number of years ago that is translated now into I think thirteen or fourteen languages. Having read her book and knowing her work led me to the idea that we had to look not only at the computer programming but also the value system underlying the decision making process that goes along with that. Dr. Stratton and I were involved in a conversation where we were told to think about the revised process as we were developing our flow diagram. Whatever deviations we may have to do in the final analysis we will bring here for consideration.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Having people pilot it, to see it here on display, to get people's active input, I think that's the way to go about it. Let people see it, use it, try it out. The beauty of this process has been that anytime there's a glitch noticed, it gets fixed. We have been doing that now for at least three months. If there are more glitches, let's keep fixing them until we get it right.

Chair Sterns: Vice President Sage and myself have taken the position and are making sure that TEAM Informatics is on the campus the first week of November so they can make their presentation and also so they can be here to deal with any glitches that may happen in the roll out. That was not their original plan. We had to insist on that because we have the same skepticism. If you see any hesitation on my part in giving closure to this it is because I am in the unusual role of serving as both the Chair of the Senate and the Co-Chair of this ad hoc committee. Let me remind everyone why I'm chairing that committee. I convened the committee and nobody else was willing to chair it. I'm doing the best I can. The point is we do have to get it approved. We will hope to have the document in November that Dr. Hajjafar is working on. We will have the review of it and then we have the opportunity for further discussion. We still have the final meeting in December 7th if there are issues that are carried over.

Senator Lillie: I'm encouraged to hear you say that indeed the final decisions on this process will be made by the Faculty Senate which is responsible for the academic mission of the University.

Senator Lazar: I heard you explain that the current design of the program is based on the old rule. If changes were going to be made to the old rule, then changes may have to be made to the new system. That might cost more money or take more time. If we have the new and improved rule coming to us in November and we approve it, is there sufficient time to make the necessary changes to that program to reflect the new rule before it's rolled out in the middle of November?

Associate Provost Ramsier: I guess it would depend what kind of change was made. It is mostly about flow. If we change language in a rule that does not affect the flow then that will not change the software. If there was some substantive change such as the decision point of a yes/no/maybe and where it goes next, if that were to be changed then I think it's up to the programmers to decide if they can do that overnight or is that something that will take weeks. I just can't answer that. The reason we brought the rule to you last May was to get the rule done before the programming started. Obviously we didn't manage that so we're sort of doing our best. We do know that the flow chart that was approved by the Senate reflects the programming of the software and as long as we don't change something in the rule that changes the flow, how a proposal goes from department faculty all the way to the Board, we should be okay on the software side.

Chair Sterns: You know not all colleges have exactly the same process so there are some final local programming that has to be done to reflect those internal college processes. One of the reasons why this whole process started was we are using a new flexible programming system which allows for changes to be much more easily implemented. This platform will be used for many other things on campus, not just for this one process. So my concern is in making sure that we have the alignment of rules and the process and that we get that appropriately approved so we can get it implemented. I think that was very constructive for you to probe on that because I hadn't turned the page to worry about that issue yet. Thank you for bringing it up.

Senator Hajjafar: There will not be substantial changes. We are trying to make the rule changes consistent with the flow. The flow chart was made after we made the first changes to the rule. So we are trying to make these two consistent with each other and of course explain some things that are missing. It will not be a major change.

Chair Sterns: For those of you who are wondering why we are changing the process at all, we discovered in our task analysis in the early part of the project that we were getting approvals for some things very late when they should have been right up front. One of the benefits of this is that when it is done, we will have taken care of things like the Board of Regents request. That is automatically built into the system. When you do a course change or a course revision the old course descriptions and all the old information will populate everything so then you can change it as you see fit. That will come up automatically. Once the course descriptions have been finished in the system they will then be able to move over to the Registrar. If this thing works as we are planning we won't need to retype and reenter and reprint the same stuff over and over. However, Dr. Stratton and I have not yet been to one of these sessions where there wasn't some little glitch. We're going to have that. It's part of the process.

Senator Steer: Should we be concerned about what would happen if it doesn't work?

Associate Provost Ramsier: We could simply let the current software run another semester if need be. That is what we did for this fall actually. We missed our launch date for fall so we continued with the old system.

Chair Sterns: The old system wasn't that wonderful. Even the addition basic tools like cutting and pasting will improve the new system. Even if the new system is limping will be a dramatic improvement over what we have had to use.

Senator Lazar: Is the training that's in mid-November for all faculty or that's a trial small set? Will everyone have the chance to use this before the roll out?

Chair Sterns: We are planning a full training. There's been a trainer who's in the room most sessions who is designing the training as we're moving through the process. Not everyone is involved in entering curriculum even though the system is ultimately designed so any faculty member could approach the system.

Dr. Stratton: My understanding is that the original pilot will be among a few colleges but that within that two week period is the training for everybody involved. There is that two-week period when we are testing the system and people will be trained on it at the same time, and at the roll out will be continued training for those who did not care to participate in the very beginning with the proposal system.

Chair Sterns: The Peoplesoft system is not perfect either. We have rolled out programs without the appropriate training and support material.

Dr. Stratton: To relieve some of your anxiety, one of the things that the system does have built into it is a lot of *help*. There's a little question mark at almost every single page where you can click to get help. The ITS has a trainer who is intimately involved in these weekly sessions who is documenting what is going to be needed in order for people to be trained appropriately in the system. So they are trying very hard to make this very user friendly.

Chair Sterns: You may want to know that Matt Petras, who is the technical lead for reporting of ITL application services, is intimately involved in the process. He is one of our own people so the system is being implemented with on campus personnel not just the outside consultants.

Senator Lillie: I have every confidence that the program and the training will be wonderful. I don't think it's the role of this particular body to sort through the training issues. I think it's the role of this body to sort through and deal with the policy issues. I have every confidence that the administration and the committee that you co-chair will come up with wonderful training. I want to be sure that we're clear about the procedure. We're glad we have local people. We're glad you have the people coming back to make sure it's done right. The issue is do we have this kind of final approval? I think from what I'm hearing is that we're getting very close to that.

Senator Hajjafar: I want to comment to Senator Lillie's concern. I think that the ad hoc committee is a committee of the Senate. It has to come to the Senate floor to be approved by the Senate.

Senator Bove: Our current system served us well for several years and now we see deficiencies in it. I'm wondering if in the planning phase in the future do we have any mechanisms built into the process to review it periodically to see if it is still effective? Is the software in the process flexible enough that we could add on to it or modify it?

Chair Sterns: Yes, that was one of the major criteria from the beginning, that it be easily modified. This was not the case with our previous system and it was not easily modified. Using the old system was not that wonderful of an experience; let's make that clear.

Chair Sterns: Any further instructions to the chair or co-chair of the committee? Is there any unfinished business? We've managed to cover a lot today. I'll say that when Dr. Lillie tells me that we have his unconditional belief in our success, that's scary to me.

Senator Lillie: I have every hope for your success Dr. Sterns.

VI. Adjournment:

Chair Sterns called for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made, seconded and passed without opposition.

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF OCTOBER 7, 2010

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

Academic Policies Committee Recommendation

Renaming of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics to the Department of Mathematics

The Department of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics has submitted a request to change its name to the Department of Mathematics. The renaming of this department will reflect the current departmental structure.

RESOLUTION: 10-7-10

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Policies Committee on September 24, 2010, unanimously recommended the renaming of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Mathematics to the Department of Mathematics.

APPENDIX B

Athletic Committee
Faculty Senate
The University of Akron

Minutes
Meeting of September 22, 2010
Student Union 310
4-5 pm

Attending: T. Lillie, B. Gandee, J. Johns, R. Heuer, T. Wistrick, M. L. Gribshaw, R. Oswald, J. D. Carro, N. Raber, J. Sahl, D. Sheffer, L. Krishna, J. Drummond, J. Stafford.

1. The 2009-10 chair, Tim Lillie, called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm and asked for approval of the agenda, with an item about the Academic Performance Rate measure used with the NCAA. The agenda was approved.
2. The Chair announced that (as determined last year by the Senate) the Student Athlete Code of Conduct would need to come to the committee and then the Senate for review and recommendation. However, M. L. Gribshaw reported that in her discussions with John Reilly, of the General Counsel office, the necessity of action by the Senate before the Board was not made clear. The Chair agreed to look into the matter on behalf of the committee.
3. The committee discussed the proposed drug policy (to replace the current rule and at: 3359-48-04 in the UA rules).
 - a. The committee decided, by unanimous vote, to do the following:
 - i. Committee members will send specific proposals for wording changes to the Chair for collation,
 - ii. The proposals will be forwarded by the Chair back to the Committee electronically for vote,
 - iii. The proposals adopted by the committee will be forwarded to the Athletic Director by the Chair
 - iv. The Athletic Director will review the proposals and transmit his final version of the policy to the Chair, who will forward it to the Committee electronically for vote
 - v. The results will be disseminated to the Committee and Athletic Director
 - vi. If there is sufficient sentiment that another face-to-face meeting is needed, members of the committee will so inform the chair, who call such a meeting.
 - vii. The Committee expects to have this accomplished by September 29, 2010.
 - b. The results of the vote are a recommendation by the Athletic Committee of the Faculty Senate to the body of the Senate, under current bylaws.
4. Tim Lillie was nominated for the post of 2010-11 Chair of the Committee and unanimously elected as there were no further nominations.
5. Other actions remaining on the agenda will be deferred to the next meeting, as unfinished business.
6. Meeting adjourned 5:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Lillie,
Chair, Faculty Senate Athletic Committee, 2010-11