

## UA Faculty Senate Meeting

November 1, 2012 3:00-4:50

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senate, please come to order. First item of business is the approval of the agenda, which has been distributed. Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns. Is there a second? Senator Buldum. Any additions to the agenda? Hearing none, all those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted. The next item on the agenda is actually the approval of the minutes, but in light of the lateness of distribution of them I'm going to skip that if there's no objection and we'll adopt, approve them next time.

Next item is the Chairman's remarks. I did want to say a few things about what will be, I think our major topic of discussion today. The General Education Revision Proposal.

First of all, as I indicated in the E mail, by which I transmitted the documents to you, I think we all need to be clear that the committee is not proposing this for adoption at this time. The committee understands that this is something that is not ready for adoption, but rather is distributing it so that the committee can, so that the faculty around the University can review it and comment on it to the committee so that the committee can revise it in light of those comments. And our discussion later in this meeting will be part of that process, only part of it, of course. The proposal is being distributed to the campus as a whole.

Shortly when Senator Bove presents the Executive Committee report, you will hear a proposal for a resolution in which the senate states its intent not to consider and ultimately approve or disapprove this proposal until the faculties of each of the affected colleges, when I say this proposal I mean the eventual proposal, not this version, until each of the faculties of the affected colleges has had a chance to deliberate on and vote on the eventual proposal that comes out of the committee. That does not mean, of course, that the faculty of any individual college will have a veto, but they will have the opportunity to express their views collectively on the proposal.

I also want to point out that this is, this process of changing the general education requirements is really a two stage process which we're part way through stage one.

Stage one is that there will eventually be a proposal from this committee, an ad hoc committee of the senate, that will be, I assume, voted on at some point by this body. That will establish if it passes, the architecture if you will, of the General Education Revision.

There will, if that is adopted, be much construction to be done, to continue the metaphor, and that is that in order to actually effect these changes, there will have to be curriculum changes that go through the normal curriculum review process including through the curriculum review committee.

What the draft proposal is about is the architecture of this. The Faculty Senate will make a decision at some point about whether to adopt this or some version of this architecture. And if it does, then the, then we'll have to get down to the brass tacks of actually changing the curriculum.

That concludes my remarks. We do have some deaths to report.

Dr. Robert William Roberts, one of the founders of the University of Akron's Department of Chemical Engineering, died October 8. He was 89. A native of Riverside, Illinois, Roberts earned a Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering at Washington University in St. Louis in 1948 and both a Master's Degree and a Ph.D. at the University of Iowa in 1960 and 1962, respectively. He worked for Alcoa, W.R. Grace, Dayco, and Hercules Powder before joining University of Akron in 1966 as an associate professor. From 1969 to 1976 he was the head of the Department of Chemical Engineering. Roberts retired in 1988 but continued to teach part time until 1996 and he wrote a history of the department.

Dr. Gerard "Gerry" M. Sweeney died Tuesday May 15, 2012 at the age of 69 after a struggle with lung cancer. He died at his home in Readfield, Maine. Sweeney coupled his academic passion for Gothic literature with a love of life, especially for the nature of Maine, his home since 2004. He earned a BS in English in 1964 from Manhattan College, an MA in English in 1966 from New York University and a Ph.D. in English from the University of Wisconsin, Madison in 1972. During his 33 years as an English professor at the University of Akron, his passion for the written word and teaching inspired countless students.

Charlotte M. Hanten, 90 died on October 7, 2012. She was born and raised in Crofton, Nebraska. Akron had been her home for the last 54 years. An accomplished artist and art professor, Charlotte received her BA from William Penn University and her Master's Degree in Art Education from Earlham College. She taught art at Rankin Elementary School, Kent State University, and University of Akron. She retired from University of Akron in 1983. She painted in oils and acrylic, and watercolors. She was also accomplished in pencil and charcoal drawing, and oil pastels. With an eye for nature and beauty and composition, her art was skillful, highly developed, and inspired both her students and the professional art community.

Coleman Joseph died August 21st, 2012 at 96. He earned his BS degree in chemical engineering in 1937 and Ph.D. in chemical engineering at Cornell in 1941. He served as Dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Akron until his retirement in 1980.

And I understand we have at least one additional announcement. Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Giannina Pianalto died on October 30th. She was born in Italy, and at the age of 14 moved with her family to Akron, Ohio. She earned her bachelor's degree in Spanish, bachelor's degree in Secondary Education Spanish, Master's Degree in Spanish and a Ph.D. in Education from the University of Akron. She began teaching with the Department of Modern

languages in January of 1990. Throughout the years she taught and served in administration of several institutions including the University of Akron, Cleveland State University, John Carroll University and Kent State University. She has many publications and has received many awards and recognitions during her career. She was a passionate and beloved Italian professor, and she will be missed.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Osorio. Are there any other death announcements? Will you all please rise for a moment of silence? Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is the Executive Committee report.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, guests and senators. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on October 11 to appoint unassigned senators the (unintelligible) committees of the Faculty Senate. The EC discussed how the Akron Experience and Culture Quest may intersect with academic matters under the purview of the Faculty Senate. The EC also discussed how to disseminate and gather feedback on the preliminary findings of the ad hoc General Education Revision Committee. Excuse me.

The Executive Committee met on October 18th to review the agenda and to prepare for the meeting with the President and Provost later that afternoon. At this meeting the Executive Committee discussed how to target faculty users of clicker technology to call for nominations in order to appoint members to the ad hoc Clicker Technology Review Committee.

Instructional Design shared its contact list and the call for nominations was sent to the group via E mail. Seven voting faculty and two ex officio non voting members were appointed to the committee. The Executive Committee also certified the Buchtel College runoff election.

Later that afternoon with the President and Provost updates to initiatives were presented by Associate Dean Subich regarding the General Education revisions, by Vice President Sage regarding UA Online, and by Vice President Tressel on the Akron Experience.

The EC met again on October 25th to set the agenda for today's meeting, and appointed a faculty member at large to the University Council IT Committee to fill a vacancy. Associate Dean Subich also met with the EC and it was agreed that Dr. Subich would present an interim report on the General Education Revision to the Faculty Senate today. We look forward to the presentation.

It also came to light that some faculty members are having problems with the curriculum proposal system. If you have trouble logging on to the system, please contact the support desk at phone extension 6888 or by E mail at [supportdesk@uAkron.edu](mailto:supportdesk@uAkron.edu).

Other faculty have noticed that they are not receiving notification of proposals in the system at the point of university review. Receiving these notices is an opt in process. If you would like to receive these alerts, please navigate to the curriculum proposal system website and select the opt in link.

And before I conclude the report of the Executive Committee, the EC has one resolution to bring forward.

Resolved that the Faculty Senate will not consider the adoption of a proposal to reform the General Education Requirements until after the faculties of the affected colleges have had the opportunity to deliberate and vote on it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion is before the body. Is there a debate? Hearing none, I take it that you are ready to vote on the motion. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries without dissent.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Senators, thank you very much for your service to the senate and the university. This concludes my report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Next item is the remarks of the President. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. A few items for your information today, and some broad comments that are prompted by some of our recent discussions.

First of all, please be aware that the Provost and I have initiated a series of, I guess it's one out of many or two out of many meetings with all of the colleges of the university. We were at the College of Arts and Science on Monday, and earlier today with the College of Engineering, and this is an opportunity to share some details of what is happening both within the state, the nation and of course within the University, and hear more broadly from our faculty and staff about their ideas as well as concerns. So we'll keep you posted on that.

Secondly, I think you are aware that the Governor has asked the University Presidents to a committee that is chaired by Ohio State University President Gordon Gee to make some recommendations regarding the restructuring of the state share of instruction funding formula or better said, allocation formula, because it isn't quite a funding formula. And I'm going to invite our Chief Financial Officer later this afternoon to alert you on some of the considerations there.

I'm pleased to tell you that at least to date that proposals really provide an almost neutral aspect to our likely ongoing appropriations, but do be aware that both Ohio as well as many other states are increasingly interested in funds being allocated according to performance criteria. And in the case of Ohio, the criteria are increasingly being seen as course completions, retention of students, and progress towards graduation and graduation itself. In other words, degree attainment.

So that will continue over the next few weeks and a proposal will be put on the Governor's desk by Thanksgiving. Obviously this would need to be approved by the legislature, et cetera, but we do expect that whatever deliberations continue and recommendations are put forward will have some impact in the next operating biennial appropriations affecting the state share of instruction.

I mention that of course because all of us are in a position to work actively to ensure that those three factors that are being looked at are factors that we are increasingly paying attention to and resolving to

help our students attain, completion of the course, continuing on in their education and obtaining a degree.

Now, colleagues, for the last two meetings that I've had with you, questions have come up about online learning, distance learning, the role of the internet in education, and I want to just share a few more thoughts with you so that we are all hopefully on at least the same radar screen if not the same page necessarily.

Suffice it to say that a lot of things are happening. They have been happening technologically for decades, not just the last few months or even years. I think I mentioned at our last meeting that about 15 years ago I had the occasion of witnessing a professor at the University of Pennsylvania teach a course to students around the globe for credit with exceptional results, and really a truly magnificent exhibition of what we as faculty are capable of when we put our minds to it.

All of a sudden, as you know in the last few months, there's been this hype about massively opened online courses as if they were something totally new. That is not the case as exhibited by the example I just cited. But what is happening is that very respectable institutions just as Stanford, Harvard, MIT and dozens of others who have joined the Coursera group, for example, have all of a sudden come forward and began to legitimize this in a significant way.

So what I wanted to share with you are two things. First, to repeat my admonition that next month is too late. And since this is two months later, we had better pay attention to at least the nature of my comments a little bit, but also to let you know that I am going to be hopefully initiating a national discussion with our colleagues in the Association of Public and Land grant Universities about how we as a public higher education association and group can best participate and perhaps advance this.

And to let you know a little bit about what I have in mind, let me just create a little context. In 1995 a professor from Columbia University wrote an article entitled, Electronics and the Dim Future of the University. I sort of underscored dim because I want you to know that by that he did not mean poor or ill or problematic necessarily, but he meant poorly seen. Because anything that is disruptive or new does not necessarily come accompanied by a clear sense of what the future will bring.

In that article, Eli Noam also indicated that the institutions that we currently have are shaped by the nature of the times and the nature of the technology of the times and the nature of the economy of the times, and he added that if you change the technology or change the economy, the institutions themselves must change.

And colleagues, I think what we're witnessing is precisely that sense that the economic forces that are letting us know that the rise of cost of higher education likely unsustainable. Same applies to several other things such as health care, for example, and that the technology is making available the possibility of some new ways of doing things. So just that we look at some things collectively, not only within our own university, but with other colleagues at other universities, and look for ways in which we can continue to successfully approach our responsibility to our students at the same time that we find ways to bring down overall costs.

So I was privileged a couple of weeks ago at a meeting at the National Academy of Sciences to hear more directly about how Coursera and edX, Coursera out of Stanford and edX out of MIT and Harvard, were approaching these questions. And I was intrigued to see that they were rightfully appreciating the value of having hundreds of thousands of students potentially take a very, very good course.

And they outlined, as I hope you have perhaps have had a chance to even read or witness by going on line and looking at some of these courses, how truly exceptionally interactive and engaging they are, and how they can provide immediate feedback to students about their performance.

They also indicated that one of their goals is to make such high quality education available to students anywhere in the world and through that availability to raise the educational standard of people around the world.

What they did not suggest, but it is beginning to now circulate in the press and in various arrangements, is how we in the United States could use such approaches to begin to bring down the cost of education to our students and also amortize the cost of courses in education across students as well as across institutions.

Now again, this is a topic that will raise many questions. And this morning in the electronic issue of Inside Higher Education there began to appear a series of questions that it would be well for us to explore, because clearly the future is dimly seen. It's not well delineated for us, but that it's coming, that it is happening, that it will impact everything that we do is arguably undeniable.

So, I'm gonna begin that conversation with our colleagues, and I hope that you will join in that and explore how we can best respond to the opportunities rather than to simply lament the fact that things are changing, because they are.

One final broad topic, and then just a couple of little things that have happened. The other thing that is also undeniable is that the very value of higher education is once again being questioned. Now, this is not unusual. It has been questioned at many stages in the last 30 or 40 years, certainly in my experience, as I'm sure you've seen in your own work.

What is different today is that the whole concept of a public value of education is largely being ignored. Rather than our nation proudly proclaiming that they support public education as the creator of a public good, they're assuming it creates more of a private gain than a public good. Thus we find ourselves in an unusual stage in which the forces of the economy and technology are at once pressing on us to do something new, and the public is questioning the value of supporting us.

Now, that means several things to me. Number one, first that we need to find new ways of exhibiting, communicating, and frankly simply demonstrating, most of my colleagues when they hear of these concepts they say, oh, we have a wonderful story to tell. All we have to do is tell it better. That is true, but I have been hearing that approach to solving our problems for all of my career in higher education and it isn't gonna work today any more than it did 30 years ago.

What will work is demonstrating our value and creating new ways to demonstrate our value, and I believe that's what the Akron model is all about, engaging more vigorously with the community, creating more opportunities for ourselves. And indeed I think the message for us at the University of Akron is to know without any doubt that the state is not going to bail us out of any of these issues, and that we must create the opportunities for ourselves to be successful. And if you have been around the University for the last 14 years that I have been here, you will recognize it's a similar theme that I have articulated previously.

So just understand that it's there. Understand that we need to create the opportunities for ourselves. Certainly if you have the idea that all of us have been lacking about how to tell the story, maybe you have a way of telling it in a way that people would listen. However, it's not been apparent certainly for the nearly 40 years that I have been in higher education.

Perhaps you saw that we dedicated the Timken Engineered Surfaces Laboratory a couple of weeks ago, a wonderful event and a wonderful new model with our engaging in our community in a vigorous and productive way.

We also signed a memorandum of understanding with MAGNET, the Northeast Ohio Manufacturing Extension Program as a lead university in enabling manufacturers of small and medium sized companies to engage with the university in ways that allows them to access new technology and seek the expertise of our faculty in support of their ongoing struggles to compete and be successful.

Please congratulate Dean Stephen Cheng. He has been selected by the American Physical Society as the 2013 recipient of the Polymer Physics Prize, a hugely prestigious prize.

And finally, let me just invite you and hope that some of you will choose to come to the annual State of the University address next Thursday at E.J. Thomas Hall at I believe, anyway, sometime in the afternoon. That concludes my report. I'm happy to undertake any questions with your permission if there are any.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there questions for the President?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: 2:00 is your talk.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, sir.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Chair Rich, I would be interested in, I'm very interested in the discussion about the opportunity for public institutions and land grant universities and different ways to develop the online education, and I would ask if the President has A, a reading list that he recommends, not just, I'm very familiar with the basis of the discussion of some of the issues such as making, if they're for credit how you would unify, how you would evaluate what is actually learned through these courses and things like that, as well as possible funding models to make them sustainable. The ones that I am familiar with are all free. And if he would be able to put an update about the progress of this

particular initiative, I know I would be very interested in checking on that and seeing how that is going.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Lazar.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Certainly I will keep you updated as things do progress. I do have a broad reading list. I don't have it all on the top of my head. I would invite you to look at the web sites for Coursera and edX. I think the Western Governors University also is one that I think arguably best illustrates the opportunities that exist for collectivizing and amortizing (inaudible) and making them available for students.

What is hardly being discussed is the assessment side of things, although each of those courses that were described by either edX or Coursera comes from their own assessment protocols that are very, very, very sophisticated. But I believe, I'm sorry, one other thing that I mentioned in this forum several times is Anya Kamenetz' book DIYU. I think that contains a wealth of information about what is available and some of the anticipation of what might come forward.

And to the question of assessment, I think therein lies a very important opportunity, one that I briefly mentioned at one of your previous meetings six or eight or 10 months ago, I don't recall exactly, because I think if students present themselves as they already do, for advanced credit for example, and we have the protocol for assessing them for placement, we also ought to be willing to say, okay if you can demonstrate the knowledge and skills and competencies required by x or y subject, we ought to be willing to give you the credential, and if you collectively achieve the credits for however much dollars we expect for an associate's degree or baccalaureate degree, we ought to be willing to award you that degree.

Now that, I think you understand, is anathema to most of us in academics, because we've grown up with the assumption that unless our students take 75 percent or whatever percentage of the courses from our university, we would be loathe to offer them a degree. Okay?

Folks, what's the difference between our assessing that they know it and our having had them through our courses and maybe not having assessed whether they know it or not? So I simply am inviting you to keep track of this. The daily articles are appearing in the Chronicle and Inside Higher Education and other forums. I will certainly happily make available copies of the presentations that are heard at the National Academy.

And again, I would just sort of underscore that I think in all of the questions lie opportunities for us to do some things innovatively and thereby A, secure our place in this environment and B, create some new opportunities for ourselves.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: In furtherance of opening or continuing a dialogue along those lines, I wonder whether I might suggest Mr. President, putting a reading list on your website with links to those materials that are available on line. I think faculty would be interested in that. It might help stimulate some more



PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: We'll work on it. And of course you know we've established a committee of the faculty to explore those issues and so we'll do that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: But knowing that you have done reading in this area

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: It's been on my radar screen for about 30 years. It looks like the train is arriving and now departing the station again.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions for the President?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you very much, colleagues.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item of the agenda are the remarks of the President. I'm sorry, remarks of the Provost.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Did you want to hear them again?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I was listening.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Chair Rich, with your permission perhaps David Cummins could give the update on the SSI reformulation.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If there's no objection. Mr. Cummins.

CFO DAVID CUMMINS: You are likely aware that Governor Kasich a couple of months ago directed the universities to, and the two year colleges to come together and review the current funding allocation method for higher education with the idea that they would make some changes and improvements.

At the beginning of the process there was a conversation at the Board of Regents and the Governor's office staff where the Governor's office provided certain reaction to some research they had done on the current methodology. And among the things they observed was that the current formula seems to set a priority on stability and to the degree a given institution may be performing well in some of the priority areas, they wouldn't necessarily see that in their funding allocation. In other words, a high performing institution would not necessarily see significant increases in funding.

Obviously we could argue all day, all night and all week of how much that's a reflection of the funding level, but in our current environment we need to think about what that means for the formula as it exists. And in that context the Governor put together a task force of four university presidents and four community college presidents and then the, Gordon Gee is the chair of that committee, to look at this issue on a very short timeline, by Thanksgiving.

So the fiscal officers have a role in this, so not the only players. With regard to looking at the state subsidy, the state share of instruction formula as we call it, and identify changes or potential changes that would be responsive to the charge of the Governor's office.

And a couple things that are coming to light is currently, I won't get too technical here, but this is a provision in the current formula that no institution's funding will fall below a certain level. And it's something like three percentage points of the change. So last year when the total funding fell 14 percent, no institution would fall more than 17 percent. That's a ballpark number. One of the proposals now is to take that out. That's called the stop loss component, take out the stop loss. So there's no maximum amount an institution can fall in funding.

Another component of the formula is that each institution's subsidy earnings would be based on their two year enrollments or their five year enrollments, and they would be funded at whichever was greater. One of the proposals we're looking at is using two years of enrollment data period, regardless of who benefits or who loses.

The more significant change is currently the formula provides 80 percent of the funding based on successful course completions. In the old days it used to be based on 15th day enrollment. Now it's based on the number of students who get a D or better at the end of the term. To the degree students withdraw or fail, they're not included in the funding. 80 percent of the funding is distributed that way in the university sector. 20 percent is based on degree completion. Everyone's share of degrees they award generates a certain level of funding within the formula.

The proposal that's most significant is to go to a 50/50 split; 50 percent of the funding based on course completion and 50 percent based on degree completion.

Another change, and the last one I will bring it up of the major changes is a lot of debate going on about merging, right now we fund, the funding formula is slightly different from the regional campuses to the main campus. The big difference being regional campuses are strictly funded on course completion. There's no degree completion component. So another proposal is to merge for the sake of running the calculation the populations of the regional campuses and the main campuses, and then also providing a degree component to the regional campuses.

So we went through a process of analyzing at the Board of Regents all of these changes. And interestingly enough, every institution is different, but for the University of Akron, our funding would go down half a percent with one, back up half a percent with another, down with one, up with one and when all is said and done, if we were to do all of those things I just mentioned, and I should stress this is just a projection, but using fiscal 12 data, and you have made all of those changes, we would have received one percent more than we actually received. By the time these changes are implemented and we go through updates and enrollments and so on, who knows what the numbers will look like. But holding everything else constant, they would increase our funding about one percent .

Interestingly, Wayne would fall, main campus would go up a little bit, net effect would be about one percent.

So the bottom line, most of the changes that are being considered do not dramatically change our funding from a state perspective, but they do address the issue of making the formula a little more dynamic by getting rid of these stop loss types of coverages and making it more accountable by putting

more funding into degree completions, because the emphasis at the state level is we want to see increasing graduation rates.

There are other pieces to this discussion that don't involve the fiscal officers directly, because it has to do with things outside of the formula such as what is higher ed's role in economic development and so on. But the parts that have potential immediate impact on funding really focus on the SSI. So that's a thumbnail sketch of where the conversations stand.

The presidents are getting together on November 6 next week to take the next step in developing their recommendations, and again, that's all in the time frame of having something completed by Thanksgiving.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions? Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Chair Rich, my question has to do with the underlying reasoning behind changing the formula. I assume it has something to do with motivating the University Presidents to see to completion courses and degree programs, right? And do all of the Presidents agree that changing the formula would have that effect?

CFO DAVID CUMMINS: That would be easier to answer after November 6, I suppose, when they get together and talk about it. You know, I briefed President Proenza just a couple days ago, and his reaction was, I mean, I think conceptually we understand this idea that if more of the funding is based on degree completion then they're certainly creating an incentive for degree completion. One of the shortfalls though, is you know, it's hard to say where we'll end up once the legislature does the next budget. But as of right now we're really not talking about additional funding.

So if everyone was to improve at a fairly similar level, the funding wouldn't change at all. So it certainly makes a statement that we're putting more emphasis on degree completion, but whether that truly changes behavior or truly creates a reward for an institution that does well in that regard is purely speculation at this point.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Just to follow up, I am a little concerned that the implication at least is that we're not concerned with the degree completion somehow. And that this impetus, if we change the funding formula then we'll get on the stick. I don't know any faculty members who aren't interested in having students complete their courses, for example. And I don't think I know an administrator one who would argue that it's not important before this.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions for Mr. Cummins? Senator Buldum.

SENATOR ALPER BULDUM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask by meaning of the degree completion. Is it the percentage or total number of completions?

CFO DAVID CUMMINS: It's a total number. Essentially they track your total number of degree completions and that's added to your earnings. But the problem is that then the earnings is a function of the appropriation. So, you know what I mean? So eventually they say the earnings would equal this, the appropriations, this. So we're gonna provide one third of the earnings and that's the subsidy.

Quite frankly, in the university sector it's less than one third. So it's based on a number, but I make that distinction because shares do come into play since we only get funding based on a fraction of that number.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I am not sure if this is the question now or it should be directed to the Provost later. Quite clearly, one issue that becomes relevant under those circumstances is one always can increase degree completion. As somebody who has, I work every semester to see how many of my students can pass. But if they don't make it, you know it's a, I teach a subject which is not very easy. And one reason they don't is because they don't meet a standard. And so I think quite clearly, one question you would ask is how are the quality standards of that degree being measured? Because you can increase the number. The easiest way is by reducing the standard. And that of course I think is what all of us as faculty, and also in 2020 where we're talking about the quality of the degree we have, and then for those things we need measures. And I don't know if this is part of the discussion or not.

CFO DAVID CUMMINS: Well, you know, I would like to leave the tough questions for the Provost. I mean, I think the fiscal officers, there's an awareness of tension of maintaining quality and not creating too much incentive to just move students along because otherwise they might negatively impact your funding. One of the beauties of being a numbers guy is you kind of limit yourself to your purview. And we've been asked to look at the formula in this political reality that there's a lot of emphasis on graduates and making sure students are completing their degree.

Certainly we want to see students succeed and graduate. But there's just a, it's national, and certainly in Ohio there's emphasis on we need to see more graduations and more timely graduations. So we're looking at what that means in the context of the funding formula. The presidents and provosts will have to take on the tougher question.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions? Thank you.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you. You will recall that for the capital appropriations a similar committee was assembled, and the end result was the distribution remained proportional to previous distributions. However, the rationale for those distributions changed. So you can see a similarity perhaps emerging here. So to the point that the end result is hold harmless, that would be to our advantage at best.

I think the questions being asked really go to establishing a base line, and then from that base line recognizing success for improving academic success. And that obviously is not in the equation at this stage of the game.

Earlier in the week you should have received notice in E mail Digest that the draft self study for the Higher Learning Commission visit in March was posted to the web. That is the result of your steering committee for the HLC self study. At this point in time, that document is available for comment, either through track changes by pulling down the Word document or through a form into which one

can paste or type in comments. And we look forward to the receipt of comments across the institution by the, November 16 I think it is, deadline.

The anticipation is that the board of trustees will be involved in discussion about the self study as the steering committee considers the input with the intention of having the self study to the Higher Learning Commission by the end of December, the appropriate amount of time prior to their visit for their analysis of our self study.

An important component of the self study as you well know, is the section related to planning, budget, and governance. And I'd like to point out that you will recall less than a year ago we convened for the first time the University Council. The University Council in the spring assessed its performance and is thereby adjusting its behaviors accordingly to improve the quality of the activities of the University Council. And we believe as the steering committee that we're on track for council deliberations of the proposed bylaws for the December meeting. So, those discussions are moving along quite nicely.

And the ad hoc bylaws drafting group did a wonderful job in bringing the draft bylaws to consideration by the council.

Obviously council members will hear more about that through the council discussions or communications, but please recall that there is a University Council website where you have access to all of the communications and activities of the council itself.

Many individuals particularly in the last two college visits and otherwise have asked, as have the deans and the department chairs, about the allocation of funds for faculty searches, particularly in consideration of continuing searches that were open in the past that had not been filled or were in some stage of the search process. In consideration of that and in consideration of course offering, needs and anticipated separations, we asked the deans to construct some templates or respond to some templates to provide some information to us to assess and analyze that information. We're gonna continue to have discussion with the deans over the next 10 days or so to fine tune those templates, so we can gain a very high level of understanding of the needs of the programs in the colleges.

What I can tell you is on Tuesday we indicated to the deans that as an institution we're allocating \$7 million towards faculty searches and the submissions from the deans will guide the allocations to the areas within those colleges. When I arrived three years ago, the allocation that had been provided for searches that were underway at that point in time was \$4 million. So this is very significant adjustment to kind of the annual allocation. Not only in anticipation of possible separations, but also in consideration of our objective to increase the total number of tenure track faculty.

Obviously until we get into long range planning exercise, we're always gonna be a little bit behind. But Vice President Cummins and myself are beginning to work on a five year budget planning process that at some point in time we'll have available for broader conversations.

If you think about it, the \$2 million allocated for the Achieving Distinction initiative will also primarily be used to hire faculty in particular areas. So one could reasonably suggest that as an institution we've created the opportunity for 9 million dollars' worth of searches.

When I mentioned that to my colleague provosts in northeastern Ohio they kind of have to take a deep breath, because 9 million dollars' worth of allocation to faculty searches in a single year is a very significant investment in the quality of academic programs.

Finally, and skipping ahead in some of the comments I could otherwise make, in particular, increases in support of securing our objective to have 80 percent job placement of students within six months of graduation, there were two very successful job fairs in the last four weeks.

At one fair related to engineering and science there were 147 companies with over 1,000 students in attendance. At the second one which had a broader framework and focus, there were 124 different employers with about 700 students in attendance. And three dozen or so alumni who came back who were job seekers. This averages about 44 percent increase in the number of companies that were at these job fairs compared to a year ago. So that's good news for the students that we work to successfully graduate and place in positions.

I had the opportunity to walk through both of those fairs and interact with employers, and to a person, I could just simply state they said, "Your students are the best." They said, "Your students are the best." And I know we all would agree with that. Chair Rich, that ends my comments.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions for the Provost?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item of business is the report of the Academic Policies Committee. Senator Buldum.

SENATOR ALPER BULDUM: Mr. Chairman, Vice Provost (unintelligible) can't be here today, thus I would like to present a resolution from our October third meeting. Be it resolved the Academic Policies Committee unanimously recommends that the Faculty Senate give final approval to change the name of the Department of Geology and Environmental Science to the Department of Geosciences.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there debate on the motion? Hearing none, I take it that you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Thank you, Senator Buldum. Is there an oral report from the Athletics Committee? We do have a written report, but is there an oral report?

>>: No. Only written.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Next item is the report of the Faculty Research Committee. We have a written report there. Is there an oral report? I gather no. And the next item is the report of the ad hoc Committee on Part Time Issues. Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: The ad hoc Committee on Part Time Issues would like to present a resolution requesting a change in the rule that pertains to orientation of faculty inserting the words part time and omitting the comma. Are there any questions?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I wonder whether you might speak up a little. I am not sure everyone can hear. Would you please read the proposed resolution?

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: All right. So there's a resolution from the ad hoc Committee on Part Time Issues to change the University Regulation 3359 20 35 which regards the orientation of faculty members, new faculty members. The suggested change is before the opening of the fall semester of the university a seminar is conducted for new regular full time, so we've inserted new comma, full time comma, auxiliary and part time faculty members to acquaint them with the objectives and the various activities of the university. And we would just like to see that the part time people are also oriented to the work at the University.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The main point of the resolution is to include part time faculty in the orientation, and the secondary point is to correct it, an error in drafting that made it appear that full time modified auxiliary, which I am sure was never intended.

Is there any debate on the motion? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Thank you, Senator Osorio.

The next item is the report of the ad hoc General Education Revision Committee. Senator Subich. You are an ex officio member of the body.

LINDA SUBICH: Thank you. I apologize to everyone, colleagues, for coming in late. I believe everyone got copies of the actual report, and two one page handouts that were suggested as being helpful. One was a one page summary and one is a comparison chart of the current model and the proposed model.

I want to emphasize and I know Chairman Rich did this in the E mail, that this is a draft and it is a report to the Faculty Senate. We are now just opening up the conversation and getting the feedback.

I was here last year, I believe a couple of times talking about the learning outcomes and presenting those to the Faculty Senate, taking your feedback, that was incorporated in the learning outcomes as they are framed right now. So just to, and I've just got a very brief Power Point. The charge, just in case there are new members, was to revise your current general education program. That was given to the ad hoc committee last fall. We started meeting in earnest in about October. We have a committee of about 20 some individuals across campus. All of the colleges are represented, part time faculty, professionals, contract professionals on this particular committee, the library. So some broad representation.

And as I said, we shared those learning outcomes. The, our operative principles here as we've done this is to try to determine the, what would be an appropriate revision of our general education curriculum. It hasn't been revised for about 15 years. We want to support Vision 2020. We want to support as well the development of the Akron Experience, that particular model. And we want to support the effort of preparing for the HLC visit particularly as relates to assessment of our learning outcomes. So these were some things we had in mind. We also had in mind as we talked in spring with about the proposal to move from 128 credits for minimum requirements to 120. So we want it to be efficient in whatever model, appropriate model.

You have, this is a new iteration of our pyramid. As we have developed this further, you saw this, a little bit simpler version a year ago. This is kind of the premise with which we approach general education. We thought about the baccalaureate degree as a whole and we thought about the integrity of the baccalaureate degree as a whole, and it really is a fabulous committee. The names of all of the members are on the website that will hopefully go live in the next day or two, but they've done fabulous work. We wanted to move from a segmented model to a more holistic model where the general education if you think about it in terms of the broad skills and broad knowledge, are supporting the major degree programs.

And we would hope that, it's not our purview to talk about capstone experiences in programs. And we know many programs have outstanding capstone experiences. It would be wonderful if the University of Akron as a whole, all programs had some kind of capstone, whatever would be appropriate to the disciplines.

This is what we were thinking. We wanted to have something that would undergird our degree programs. So the learning outcomes, these have changed only a little. At least in the labeling. The information in the report, the specifics of the details have changed somewhat, but we retained our communication skills and information literacy, critical thinking and complex reasoning skills, knowledge of the arts, humanities, natural sciences and social sciences, and a fourth learning outcome broadly defines that we call responsible citizenship in an interconnected world. And we saw as part of that a definite focus on diversity, both domestic diversity, U.S. diversity, as well as international global diversity. Financial literacy, personal and societal health and also environmental sustainability.

So pieces of knowledge and skills that we thought would lead our graduates from the University of Akron to be well positioned in society, and would benefit our society.

So these, from these learning outcomes we spent the spring semester talking about how to actually put those into a curriculum in terms of credit hour distribution requirements. And again, I believe we are coming at this a little differently than has been done in the past, and this is a draft report. We are not starting with classes. We are starting with learning outcomes. We're thinking about distributions of credit hours, because this is important how this might be distributed, and there are models all over the map as you look around nationally, from 20 credit hours of general education to 50 credit hours of general education, and they're all over the map in our state as well.



Our suggestion as a starting point for conversation is that we would have a 28 credit core of a pretty traditional general education curriculum. So we're calling this a 28 credit core whereby there would be six credits allotted to writing and information literacy and three credits to speaking. And we're assuming three credit classes for the sake of default. We did that throughout our discussion. And I will get to that one four there in a minute.

So, one of the conversations we had was about information literacy, meaning how to access and responsibly use information in an electronic world. Our, a number of our members including a member from the library convinced us that the literature supports teaching information literacy embedded in content. So we talked about the idea of a separate information literacy and were convinced that that was not pedagogically the best way to go, so that's why you see that incorporated.

And indeed, Janet Bean, Beth Graham, other members indicated that in our current writing and speaking classes there are definitely elements of information literacy, it's a big part of it. So it's not like this is a new thing, but we wanted to bring it forward and reiterate it. And again, the learning outcomes are spelled out better in the document.

Critical thinking, math, of course in math, a course in each of the four disciplinary areas, this is where things become somewhat different from our current system, and I'll talk a little bit more about that. The natural sciences is four because we're assuming there must be a laboratory science component to this. And then finally, a new addition to, I think from the current, at least in the way we're framing it, maybe not so new in terms of some of our courses is an express focus on critical thinking and listening. This is based on our examination of literature surveys and research from employers who say that students who graduate from colleges today they're not satisfied with their abilities to think critically about issues. It's also supported by our own internal research from ITL, the causal research model, our projects that they've done which suggested that when we've evaluated our own students they don't stack up particularly well according to national standards.

And this is data that would be posted on the ITL website under the causal project. So that's what brought us to the 28 credit core.

And then the other piece of our model, which we continue to evolve and try to figure out how to talk about in a clear way, and I don't think we're there yet from all my feedback so far, is what we're calling this responsible citizenship attribute embedded in course content. A model we saw out there in the field in many universities, is that they will have courses that are tagged, which is not a good word in Ohio, but that have an attribute, maybe a letter associated with them that indicates that this course fulfills something like global diversity. Many, many universities have used this for the domestic and global. And there are a wide variety of courses that meet that particular learning outcome. And students can pull that course as just an independent free standing course like any general education course in our current system that would be in a category, or it might be a course that happens to be in their major.

So if I think about psychology, my background, there's a cross cultural psychology course that potentially, if it provided the right kind of learning and the right kind of outcomes, could be designated as global diversity. Okay. That's what I'm talking about here with these attributes.

So consequently, it is difficult to say how many general education credit hours. We could take the broad view and say that students will do a course in each of these areas. So that would be 15 credits, which would take us to a credit hour over our current number, 42. Or we could look at it as say, if a student's major or minor incorporates courses that meet these tags, those courses really aren't gen ed courses. They're meeting requirements. Again, you see this model played out differently at different institutions. And so the institution that has 50 credit hours of general education counts all those hours, even though they're allowed to be embedded in their major and they're not an extra course. So this is where we've struggled with talking about how many credits we're talking about.

Our assumption was that students would have a minimum of six credits from outside their major, because as a committee we could not imagine how any major that we tried could address all of these areas within the major.

It seemed like these, in our discussion some of these areas seem like they might gravitate more to certain majors. Others, you know, the environmental sustainability, more to perhaps science majors. So the idea is that we're expecting students to take at least two courses at least, to fulfill these RC, what we're calling RC attribute credit hours. And it could be up to 15 depending on how they make choices how majors are structured, how departments and programs feel like they could contribute to this.

So that would be the fourth learning outcome. It would encompass these areas. We suggested in our document that perhaps courses could meet multiple attributes. This is also a model we see out there in the field. We may or may not want to do that. It's been suggested by a couple other readers that maybe we want to have these attributes overlap with the core curriculum, which is not something the committee suggested. But again, we need to take feedback on this from the campus.

And the last piece to our proposal and this speaks to the HLC, and if you read the HLC report you will see the need for this documented. We are suggesting that any course approved for general education needs to sign on to an assessment process. We need to institutionalize the assessment of our learning outcomes. And we need to have a mechanism, a valid but also convenient as much as possible mechanism for collecting some kind of learning artifact from each course. It may be multiple learning artifacts. Again, this is all under discussion, and those artifacts would be archived, and they would be evaluated on a regular basis.

Again, we're taking this from other people, we're not making these things up. Maybe one year communication outcomes are evaluated. Committees, what other institutions do is have committees of faculty, disciplinary experts, compensated in the summer for their work to evaluate a sampling of learning outcomes, to write a report, and to feed that back to the campus in the fall for action. And then the next year you do the next learning outcome, and it's a cycle, and closing the loop of getting the information back to the programs.

So that is where we're at right now. Again, we are truly wanting, we need to get feedback. We need to hear reactions to how we have organized this and proposed this. Oh, and I should say, I mentioned the website. There's a website that is put together. The only thing that's holding us back now is the feedback mechanism, and we're trying to iron out the, some problems with a feedback mechanism because we don't want to put this out without an explicit mechanism for feedback.

I have offered, and my colleagues on the committee are arranging presentations in colleges and I will have opportunities for written feedback at those presentations, and I would like to be able to post it and make it transparent it so everyone could see it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I wonder whether you want to encourage the members of the Faculty Senate to go back to their respective departments and colleges and to stimulate and participate in a discussion that they could ultimately take into account in expressing their own views in this body.

LINDA SUBICH: Yes. And really everything that I've read and my committee members have read about general education revision processes suggest that the way it works best is if there is widespread campus involvement, people buy into it, they offer feedback, it gets incorporated, and it works its way through the system that way. And that's what we're hoping for, so that's why this is just a draft.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there questions or comments on the proposal.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: Chairman, I have a number of questions actually that I wrote down, so I don't know if you would like me to ask them all at once if that's appropriate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Why don't you ask one at a time and we'll see how long this takes and whether we need to give an opportunity to others.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: The attribute system is something I'm familiar with from my own experience, and it worked in many ways and it was, you know, from my experience as an undergrad as well as a faculty member at the previous university.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Klein, i'm wondering whether everybody on the far side of the room will be able to hear you.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: I was saying that the attribute system, I am familiar with it and there are many aspects of it that I think are attractive, but I'm confused about a number of things and therefore think students might also be confused.

When is, in this responsible citizenship area being, clarifying whether that's, you said it's outside the major, but it's unclear as to how many courses students could take inside their major and still have it count for the major. Why is there a range? Would it be capped at 15? That's just, the numbers are first

LINDA SUBICH: And this is where we're struggling to be clear. So thank you. This is very helpful. The intention of those, that range, intention of the range is that we thought it unlikely, so it's kind of like nine would be the answer to your question, if it's capped. Three of these areas we thought

potentially could be capped into a particular major. But we weren't sure if there were majors where could four or five be addressed? And we didn't know. The people on the committee were unsure. This is something that if argument is made, we weren't opposed to saying that a major could capture all five. We just didn't know if that was possible. And so we took a conservative and said a range of six to 15 general education credits.

So the six would be, nine would be captured in the major and six would be captured outside. But that may not be necessary at all.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: It's still somewhat confusing.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Would you please stand and speak loudly enough for others to hear?

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: Sorry. Yeah. And okay, why in the 28, I have some questions about massive reduction. So humanities would be reduced from 10 hours now to three, which is

LINDA SUBICH: Really 10 to six because humanities incorporates the fine arts and we split them up so in that humanities category of 10 is included fine arts.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: In the history department it's hard enough to teach, it's hard enough to teach a four credit humanities class and I can't imagine cutting that down to three. Just one point.

And then you know, I know that the University of Akron speaks a lot about being a STEM place, so why reduce the hard sciences from eight hours to four?

LINDA SUBICH: And I will say two things. One is that when we looked at the responsible citizenship, we saw, and we have to make, we made room. We made choices, and they may be choices that do not stand beyond the discussion. We made choices and we thought the health and environmental sustainability seem likely to capture the natural sciences.

The diversity seems likely to capture humanities, social sciences. May or may not, but that was, so, in our view the level of reduction doesn't seem as drastic. Although clearly if you look at the numbers, absolutely. And it's, you know, I also can't say at this point how the courses will play out. We have asked or suggested I should say, suggested in the disciplinary distribution, that we put in particular language saying that these must be taught by disciplinary experts. These are courses that cannot, that need to be taught by disciplinary experts.

Now, the responsible citizenship, when you open it up into the major, it opens it up to more flexibility. And so there is not, one could imagine and one sees that other programs, probably your program that you had referred to, courses that meet general education requirements that are distributed in many colleges across campus. Although most of them still come home, at least for the models I've seen out there, most of them come home to usually liberal arts and science or whatever the college tends to be called.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Klein, I'm gonna ask you to hold some of your questions and see whether there are others.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: Okay. I just had one more.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Go ahead.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: Thank you. So this critical thinking course, would it be a new course? What department would teach it? In our history department that's our goal, to teach critical thinking.

LINDA SUBICH: Absolutely. And there are courses across campus that teach critical thinking. This is where the labels don't do justice to the concepts. I am hoping people read the document. We tried not to make it too long. But the critical thinking, humanities in the western tradition is critical thinking or, I'm sorry, the new title. But anyway, that course is absolutely, encompasses, I've had multiple conversations, that encompasses the learning outcomes that we're calling critical thinking and reasoning. Ethics encompasses that. These are just a few examples. We're limited by just what we know as a committee, but we need, as departments and colleges get involved others courses will come to light that also teach the critical thinking process.

So we want people, we want these courses, and again I think the stand alone is not useful, it's like the information literacy needs to be embedded in some sort of content whether that's struggling with ethical problems and figuring out how to learn to think about information and view points and work with them to come to some kind of a conclusion that you base on something.

So I mean I definitely, there could be new courses as well, but we saw quite a number of possibilities in the curriculum currently. It doesn't have to be labeled critical thinking.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I have, Chair Rich, I have a feedback and one question. And the feedback, this is very exciting I think, and I really like the idea of on the RCs the financial literacy is probably a long time coming.

The feedback part is, I don't know why we have to have say anything about a minimum six credits at all. Especially if you just can't imagine it, let's just see if it happens. It would be a fun thing.

My question has to do with some of the departments that, their very livelihood depends on general education. It's not my department, but some do, and I'm wondering how those discussions will proceed with an exciting idea like this. This is really a major overhaul, and a lot of people will have questions about whether they'll have departments when it's all said and done. So just a moment about how you expect to dissuade that kind of resistance.

LINDA SUBICH: I know in the College of Arts and Sciences Dean Midha has already urged department chairs to think critically about how this plan might affect the programs and the departments and, you know, to look at their credit hours and to think that through. So I mean, I think that conversation is starting. It's, you know, I guess the committee's approach was to try, our charge was to design the best plan we could, and we were sensitive to those issues, but we tried not to let those issues stop us from doing something we thought was a good thing to do, you know.

But then at some point you come to the rubber hits the road and you've got to come up with something that is the best plan possible in the environment. Because there have been issues raised about capacities of departments that have been built up over the years to provide certain courses and curriculum, and is that wasteful or could that change? And again, I think whether, you know, this conversation about what qualifies and how might things be reconceptualized, I think there are a lot of courses that could easily be tweaked to address the learning outcomes. You know, a little bit of a different focus. So it might mean not doing things in the same way as they've always been done, but the integrity and the function of the course would stay much the same. So I think this is all very important stuff to be talked about.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Buldum.

SENATOR ALPER BULDUM: I would like to ask if the committee considered particular student experiences, for instance, student A, this course, student B, it would be more clear for us how it would directly apply and affect the critical.

LINDA SUBICH: The intention in going to colleges is to have a sample curriculum for, and I've asked my committee members to generate those, and I have some and I am hopeful to have some additional ones, to see what it might look like. It's all very speculative at this point, but we could give an idea anyway of what would a curriculum look like. A couple of people have suggested that, and I think it's an excellent idea.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Cerrone?

SENATOR KATHRYN CERRONE: I also teach in one of the departments that will probably be affected in associate studies and I brought this to my department and asked for responses and I did get a few, so some of the questions I ask are based on their responses. What is the relationship between this new system and the Ohio transfer module?

LINDA SUBICH: The 28 credit core is very consistent with the transfer module. I believe that we did think about that and talk about that, and I think there is a good interface there. And we were mindful because we thought about some other ways to do things that were a little bit more avant garde with the writing. There are some things that Ohio University does that are intriguing. And we talked about, you know, should we go there or not? And we opted to stay more traditional with the sequences here, which we wouldn't have to.

But there are other models out there where the second writing course is embedded in the major. So it might not happen until your sophomore or junior year, and majors would take responsibility. It's very intriguing to do that, and maybe we have a system where there are multiple options. Where there's the English Comp 1, 2 kind of thing which is certainly the bread and butter of the transfer module, but maybe there are other options as well. So that would certainly be out there on the table, yeah. But I think mostly this core is very consistent.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Mr. Chair, I would like to ask the question about how will the decision be made which courses qualify or not? Because obviously many of us may think a course qualifies and it may not be seen that way by the committee. I think that's really the essential question in the whole thing. What's in and what's out. And of course in the past it was highly political, but I think there are lots of courses that could meet a requirement of health or diversity. Obviously I think (unintelligible) is the perfect course to fill all of those. That is the biggest issue in peoples minds, who decides what is in and what is out.

LINDA SUBICH: The view of the committee is that is a faculty issue, that is a curriculum issue. And I'm not sure, okay, at the first phase of where there will be a lot of curriculum proposals, okay, this is just my thinking, it may or may not fit with the way the governance process has worked, but we had kind of talked in the committee that if we had panels of, for each of the learning outcomes of disciplinary experts who were able to review courses for whether they met learning outcomes, they would ask the department or the, whoever was putting forward the course for, you know, the syllabus and specific information, and that they would review them.

So we wanted people who understood the area of the learning outcomes to be deciding. And that's why we have assiduously stayed away, we tried very hard to not even talk about specific courses until the end because we wanted to stay true to the learning outcomes. I think that left some fuzziness in our system because we, at some point you do have to start talking about it, and we did in the late spring. But yeah, so that was our thought anyway. But that, we assume that's not our call.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Cerrone?

SENATOR KATHRYN CERRONE: I had a few more questions. I will comment that I think this is also very exciting and I am curious to see how it all plays out. The other question I have is related to the assessment piece. It seems like we're taking assessment out of the department and putting it in this general group. What do you see as the consequences of removing it from the department level?

LINDA SUBICH: I don't know that I see it as taking anything away from the department because I think there are multiple levels of assessment that are critical. I think the idea of institutional assessment for these learning outcomes, it's a model we see across many campuses, and it's one that quite frankly we couldn't write as much about as we would have liked on the HLC report. We put together what we could, but we had some real limitations.

So for the general education we wanted to be able to talk about the campus, and to collect these learning artifacts, which is what people call it in the literature, and have them evaluated according to like, a standardized rubric. American Association of Colleges and Universities has rubrics. Usually campuses adapt them to fit with their learning outcomes. But then you've got a sense of the picture of the campus, about, so especially if you have got courses that are offered for learning outcomes in a variety of colleges and departments, you have a way to, and I was talking with someone about this today, you have a way to take that broad picture rather than snapshots from department, you know, many, many different departments.

Now, what that means is we'll have to think carefully about how we collect the artifacts. Some campuses have a series, for example, if the artifact is going to be a paper or project or speech or whatever, and they might have a series of five or six very generic prompts that they would ask that one of these be used to generate the artifact. Not to intrude on the classroom, but if it's possible, that's one model.

We're not suggesting any particular model. I think we want to have conversation, if we go down this path and if we get there we would want to be having that conversation as a campus about how to approach this institutional level assessment because there are many models.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Steer.

SENATOR DAVID STEER: I am certainly in favor of the revision of the general education program, but I did, I want to drill down to the document itself and the idea of learning outcomes, because to me this conversation can't take place about what courses are going to meet it or aren't going to meet it when we have learning outcomes that are not measurable.

So in the assessment literature it's pretty clear that you can't really measure understanding. And I know your committee had a lot of conversations on this. So my question to the, for this particular forum is where are we going to get down to the layer where someone specifies what it means for a particular outcome, provided that language survives, to understand something? And this goes through the whole document. About 75 percent of the outcomes here the literature would suggest are not measurable. So where is that going to be specified?

LINDA SUBICH: Part of it, and I got some of your feedback so I am very aware of your thoughts. I think that kind of feedback is really important. 75 percent feels very high, because we had quite a number of people on the committee who felt like they were operating, so I think we have to work this out. We have to rewrite things that need to be rewritten. We have to be more specific. This is what we need to be doing right now. Your feedback, your suggestions, conversations, this is what we're looking for. I mean, there are clearly, I completely agree with some of the points that you made. We talked about it as the committee.

And people, you know, we're very appreciative of some of the things that you pointed out at the Executive Committee meeting that I was able to bring back to them.

That's part of the process. Those learning outcomes are a proposal. They're a draft. And if they need to be revised and made more measurable, then that is what we need to do.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson?

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I'm just making comments within what people have said. And indeed I think we need to look, in fact last year when I saw the pyramid it seemed like a very good idea that we were trying to integrate the general education with each of the degrees and we would get to this end of the capstone and the whole deal here. But what I've heard so far is something, and I'm glad to



see the pyramid is still there, but it seems to me in what I do understand is a very fluid situation at the moment. That part is even more fluid.

In fact, I didn't see any way or any mention of how maybe the assessment of learning outcomes might be tied to how you are getting up there through your, how they tie in in some way to something that makes a difference in your own degree program.

How you're integrating this, it just seems to me as separate as it always was. All we seem to have done is to make it, instead of having a small number of specific courses, a wider range of courses, and maybe some more ways of trying to decide which are the ones people will do. But I don't see any of that integrative, yeah, I mean, I'm sorry, there's no integrative system or even encouragement to be integrative. So you know, you will have a better chance of getting your course in if, in gen ed background if you can show that it is step one in steps two and three within your discipline that will get you to something even better. I don't see any of that in there. It sort of seems missing. That's number one.

Number two, when, and I passed this on from my department but from me, too. When we looked at these things in the general citizenship and you have financial literacy and no economic literacy? If there's one thing that I think all folk, and in my department we go across the board politically, that is we all agree on is the lack of economic literacy is a serious, serious issue in this society at the moment. And at this point in the political cycle even more so. And for some reason it's only financial literacy? I think I could put a very strong argument that it should be financial and economic literacy at the very least.

And finally, what is the timeline? What kind of timeline are we talking about this in terms of feedback?

LINDA SUBICH: Okay. Let me see if I can address them. The economic literacy, because we've had conversations about this a couple times. This is, I think this is open. You know, we made some choices and we made some decisions, and those decisions are the, I mean, that was the view of the committee. It may not be where we end up. So I think that is, economic literacy, I mean, I do agree, I have been swayed by your points. And I think that that is a reasonable possibility. But, so I think I encourage you to talk to colleagues and I would like feedback from all of you and your colleagues about this. That would be helpful.

In terms of the integration, it is there. And it's hard to represent. And it's hard to represent for the same reason that it's hard for me to explain these responsible citizenship attributes. Because for some students it might look like that. The students who take 15 hours, none of this fits very well with their major. And you know, these classes aren't, the attributes aren't there. And if the major, well, let me stick with that one piece, then I will do the second part of it.

So for other students, some of those responsible citizenship pieces may move into the yellow, because they are a part of moving towards their major and their building. And maybe, I mean, at some universities those kinds of tagged attributes are 300 level courses. I mean, they are not introductory.

Some could be, but they don't have to be. So, it really depends, I think, a bit on the students and the program in terms of how they embrace this. That is also the reason I think, if we embrace these learning outcomes for general education, and this is the same thing I said about the capstone, it is then up to programs and departments and schools and colleges to embrace them for their degree programs. People don't have to. It would be nice if they would.

You know, I think it would make for a strong, coherent degree program if the principles we're promoting in terms of critical thinking and reasoning in an introductory course are deepened and embedded and culminated in the capstone. That's, to me, is the ideal way to structure programs. And maybe many are structured that way right now. But that's the kind of incorporation.

I do think that we tried to stay within our purview and our mission, and we talk about this kind of in a conceptual way, but are very aware that it is not our role to suggest to departments or programs how they should do their degree programs. I mean, that's not our call.

But we would see these themes, the learning outcomes as being important, and that's where if we have a campus conversation and people embrace them, then I would hope it would work its way up, and there would be ongoing encouragement to do that.

And finally, the time frame, I think it depends on how much feedback and what we get. I know that our intention at this point is that we will be taking feedback through the end of the semester and maybe, you know, as long as it needs to be taken. I will do presentations. And I mean, I think, at this point I can't give you specific dates, but I know that I'm planning on spending the next month or two embedded in this.

At some point, the committee needs to come together and be considering the feedback and discussing it, and then hopefully in the spring at some point a proposal comes back to the senate that can be formally debated. But that would have to be a proposal that's in form. This is my understanding of the timeline, anyway. And again, that I think is not our call.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: At the moment you are saying four weeks; is that correct?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson, did you wish to ask a question?

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: You mean four weeks is what you are talking about at this point? Because at the end of the semester is about four weeks.

LINDA SUBICH: Or as long as it takes. We need to proceed in a timely manner. But my understanding is not that there is a drop dead cut off date at this point, but I would defer to the

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: May I make a comment that may clarify one of Senator Erickson's questions? We at the library have talked a lot about the literacy component and how we discussed that, putting it through up to the majors isn't as clear as, now I've taken Algebra 1, now I can take Algebra 2.

It's that we encounter students who come with a very complex research project that don't know how to look up a book in a catalogue. So we feel if we work with, you know, whoever would be teaching these classes where the information literacy would be embedded, if they can get the basic concepts of searching, once they get to that major it frees them up to be able to be doing subject specific searching, and not keep them up in those little details that will slow them down. It enables them to really have the skills that match their subject knowledge level and be able to take off from there.

So some of those might be a little bit more transparent or maybe a little bit more hidden than a direct, well, this benefits my major. But I also understand that one of the learning functions is to be able to transfer skills that you learn throughout subjects. So hopefully when they reach their junior level, they'll be able to take what they learned in basic writing and apply it and build on it when they reach their more subject intensive courses. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other, Senator Loth.

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: Mr. Chairman, I apologize if I missed this, but why are we under the assumption that we're going from 128 to 120 credit hours? Is there a reason for that? Is there motivation?

LINDA SUBICH: It's under, I'm not suggesting that it's gone through. It was one of the, I guess conditions, not conditions but parameters for us to consider that there was a desire on the part of the Provost that we should move to bring our degree in line with the rest of the state in terms of 120 credit hours. So we considered that and really tried not to add credit hours really is what we've ended up doing. We tried not to expand, knowing that there is the possibility that we might head there. So that was what that was based on.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If I may add, the question of whether to change the number of credits required, the minimum number of credits required is one that's, that ultimately is for this body to make, and is not part of the charge of this committee. But the committee was asked to consider how to make this compatible with the possible change to 120 credit hours, and so that, I think, is why they have done what they've done.

In light of the hour, I would suggest that only the most urgent questions be asked at this point or comments be made. Anything fitting that description? Senator Osorio?

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Can I just ask about that website?

LINDA SUBICH: It is on the Provost's page. And as soon as, well, I might, might I ask the opinion of the body about this? About whether the website should go live before the feedback mechanism is active, or is that inappropriate? Maybe not.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Whether the web site should

LINDA SUBICH: The assumption I'm operating under is I didn't want to put the website live, they bring it on line, until we had the feedback mechanism so people could click and put in feedback. But maybe I don't need to wait for that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Present the documents on the website before there's a mechanism for people to present feedback?

LINDA SUBICH: Sure. We want to make sure that was there from the start. But at this point that's the only thing that's holding us up.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I don't know that you need the guidance of this body at this point. I trust that you are capable with any advice that you may seek. Anything else? Thank you.

Next item of business is new business. Is there any new business? Hearing none, anything for the good of the order? Hearing nothing, I take it you are ready to adjourn. Is there a motion to adjourn? Senator Hajjafar. Is there a second? Senator Lazar. All those in favor say aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:50 p.m.)