

University of Akron Faculty Senate Meeting

November 7, 2013 3:00 5:00

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The November meeting of the Faculty Senate will come to order. First item is the adoption of the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as proposed?

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Moved by Senator Hajjafar. Seconded by Senator Clark. Are there any additions to the agenda? 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.

Next item is the adoption of the minutes of the September meeting. We don't have the minutes of October meeting, but we have the minutes of September meeting. Is there a motion to adopt those minutes?

SENATOR DWAYNE JONES: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Jones, seconded by Senator Sterns.

Are there any corrections to the minutes? No corrections to the minutes? All those in favor of adopting the minutes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Minutes are adopted. First of all, there were some college elections, faculty senators that were certified by the Executive Committee between the last meeting and this meeting.

These were by and large if not entirely run off elections. From the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences Charles Beneke was reelected and John Huss and Linda Saliga were newly elected.

From Summit College Kevin Feldt was elected. From the College of Engineering Minel Braun, Shivakumar Sastry, Marnie Saunders and T.S. Srivatsan. The last was reelected. And from the College of Health Professions Carri Scotto who is as I understand it is teaching a class right now.

I want to give special thanks to David Steer, who as a result of the recent runoff election in Buchtel College will not be returning to this body and consequently will no longer be a member of the Executive Committee. Senator Steer, he was an extremely valuable member of the

Executive Committee and of the Senate, and ever thoughtful and to the point. He will be missed. We will later in the meeting be electing someone to replace Senator Steer on the Executive Committee.

Later in this meeting also we'll consider a proposal from the Curriculum Review Committee to streamline somewhat the process for reviewing proposals to change the mode of delivery of existing courses.

The proposed change would retain institutional review by the Distance Learning Review Committee but eliminate review by other institutional reviewing bodies. It would also eliminate the two week period during which objections may be raised by faculty members, a so called university wide review. Instead those proposals would go directly from the DLRC to the Curriculum Review Committee and then on to the senate. Please note that the original proposal from the CRC is superseded by a redrafted one designed to accomplish the same objectives.

As I reviewed the existing university regulation on curricular changes during the course of the redrafting process, I noticed that it provides for curriculum change proposals to be released for university wide review within two weeks of the time they're submitted for institutional review as required. We hope to learn soon whether the curriculum proposal system is programmed to automatically release proposals at the end of the two week period, but I infer from some of the reports I have heard, including in this body last month, that it may not be programmed this way.

If that is the case, it may be possible to remedy parts of the reported problem of proposals being in seemingly perpetual limbo by changing the proposal system so that it purports with the rule in this respect.

One of the items for business in today's meeting is a recommendation from the Academic Policies Committee to approve criteria for direct admissions for undergraduate programs in the various departments and schools of the university. Such approval is required by university regulation.

I learned yesterday, however, that at least one department in the College of Arts and Sciences the faculty was told by the administration of the college that its direct admissions criteria were going to change regardless of the faculty wishes and the departmental faculty did not vote to approve the change.

Under the university's regulation the establishment and modification of direct admission criteria is a matter for the faculty to decide subject to the approval of the faculty senate not for decision by administrative fiat.

Any change made without a vote of the faculty of the relevant department or school should be, in my view, rejected by this body. Accordingly, at the appropriate time the chair will entertain a

motion to refer this matter back to the Academic Policies Committee with the instruction to verify that the recent changes to direct admissions criteria were approved by the faculty.

As you know, starting this academic year part time faculty are limited by the university to teaching eight credit hours per semester to avoid their being covered by the Affordable Care Act mandate of employer provided health insurance. Under that law those who work 30 hours or more per week must be provided with health insurance. In order to document that, part time faculty members who are working less than 30 hours per week, they're now being required to report working hours using a new electronic reporting system.

Department chairs and school directors are required to approve those reports for part time faculty members in their respective schools. I'm told that some part time faculty members spend on average more than 30 hours per week preparing to teach, teaching, grading assignments and examination answers, conferring with students and other activities incidental to teaching.

Those part time faculty members may now have to choose between reducing the amount of time they devote to their teaching assignment to the detriment of students and underreporting the number of hours they work. If such underreporting were to become common, the university would be exposed to enforcement action by the Internal Revenue Service. Underreporting would also put department chairs and school directors in the untenable position of approving reports that they have reason to believe are of questionable accuracy. One can imagine various possible solutions to this problem.

I recently attended a meeting of the senate's Part time Faculty Committee and urged the committee to assess the magnitude of the problem and to recommend a solution for consideration by the faculty senate. I look forward to the committee's report on this issue later in the academic year.

Finally, I trust that by now no one here could be unaware of the university's Retention Summit which is to be held on Wednesday and Thursday of next week.

I urge the members of this body to participate in the summit if possible. Undergraduate student retention is a crucial challenge for this university. It is important to bring to bear the best thinking on this subject which requires active faculty involvement. That concludes my remarks.

Special announcements are next. Senator Huff has one announcement to make concerning the death of our

SENATOR MARLENE HUFF: One of our faculty members died recently, and I would like to read the obituary.

Kathleen Horning, age 64, was a senior instructor in the School of Nursing College of Health Professions. Her employment started in 2005 following graduation from the University of Akron School of Nursing.

She died suddenly and unexpectedly on October 26th, 2013 doing what she enjoyed, walking in Metro Parks with her husband Daniel. She has three children Mark, Joshua and Amanda.

Kathleen was a clinical nurse specialist who volunteered helping the underserved population in the Nursing Center for Community Health. She was active in her and church community activities. The students learning was a priority for her and they've set up a scholarship fund in her name. Her enthusiasm for life and laughter will be remembered by faculty and students.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Huff. I would just add that I had the pleasure and privilege of working with her on the clicker committee, the ad hoc Clicker Committee recently, and I just want to add that she was extremely dedicated to the teaching of her students and all of our teaching of our students. Would you all please rise for a moment of silence. Thank you.

The next item is the report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Bove.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you chairman.

Good afternoon. The Executive Committee met on October 10th for regular senate business. The EC certified senate election results from the College of Health Professions and also made appointments to the University Review Committee and University Libraries Committee.

The EC also reviewed some business matters of the Faculty Research Committee and determined that the FRC can benefit from appointing additional members.

The EC also discussed the Student Success (inaudible) and the role of Student Encouragers. Chair Rich asked the Student Affairs Committee to look into these issues. The EC discussed the curriculum proposal system and reviewed the documentation and (inaudible) less than useful. A small group will be formed to review and update the documents.

The EC next met October 17th for regular senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the president and the provost later that afternoon. With the president and provost the EC discussed budget updates, the general education reform process and the effect of the new EmpCenter time and attendance system on the faculty. The meeting also included updates on the status of hiring an assistant provost for online learning and discussion regarding intellectual property rights for online courses.

The EC most recently met October 31st for regular senate business and to prepare the agenda for today's meeting. The EC was able to certify the senate election results of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering.

Appointments were also made to the Communication and Technology Committee and to the Part time Faculty Committee.

Senators Rich and Sterns also reported on a meeting, on the meeting of the Presidential Search Committee and the committee reported that (inaudible) six faculty representatives from the senate and the AAUP.

One last note. There exists two vacancies on the University Council to be filled by one non senator to serve on the UC Communications Committee and one senator to serve on the UC Talent Development and Human Resources Committee. The committee encourages self nominations through the senate website. The Executive Committee will make these appointments at the next scheduled meeting this month.

Thank you very much. That concludes my report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any questions of Secretary Bove about the report of the Executive Committee? Thank you.

Next item is the remarks of the president.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues.

Let me say that I was pleased to see many of you at the state of the university address yesterday, which I said was my last, and nobody broke out into great applause, so thank you for that. But you can applaud today if you want to.

Let me of course understand that for the benefit of those of you who could not be there I'd like to reiterate a few points, and note that in those remarks I had indicated that today I would bring forth a request of the senate and also call upon all of the university community provide me some feedback on some other points.

And I want to ask that you please achieve this as rapidly as possibly and specifically ask that you provide me your feedback by the end of February please, Mr. Chairman.

So let me begin with the direct request that I'd like to make of the senate. It seems to me from a variety of inputs I've received on a regular basis that we need to find a way to encourage everyone in interdisciplinary activities better than we have to date, and to remove structural barriers that seem to inhibit this set of opportunities. So I specifically want to ask for your input as to how we might best explore new opportunities for the creation of appropriate interdisciplinary institutes or centers based on our strengths, opportunities that may exist and certainly the challenges that we seem to face that I hear repeatedly hinder our ability to do so.

The centers and institutes that you might suggest should be focused on those areas of emphasis that we identified in Vision 2020, namely regional solutions, innovative technologies, medicine and health and the human condition, and concurrently I ask that you please review recent activities and how those impact, how these recommendations might impact currently existing centers and institutes.

I suggest for example that the senate's Faculty Research Committee may be one ideal committee to work with you to evaluate current research institutes and centers as well as to evaluate proposals submitted to the Vice President for Research and present any new interdisciplinary centers at the university. However, please do not limit yourself only to those centers and institutes involved in research, but rather review all of the (inaudible) presumed to have interdisciplinary and cross college or school component.

Then after careful review if the centers and institutes are not active or productive, I would ask that you please suggest that we perhaps formally phase some of them out or combine them with others to create greater effectiveness as may be appropriate. Now, as you know, we already have taken the first steps in creating some collaborative enterprises recently.

There are two interdisciplinary projects that were funded through the Achieving Distinction Initiative, one involving (inaudible) and the other related to intellectual property and entrepreneurship. You can also of course think of other things that have emerged in our midst in recent years, for example the National Center for Education and Research on Corrosion and Materials Performance, and or for example the Center for Biostatistics and (inaudible).

But of course let us explore other possibilities. And I mentioned yesterday a couple of them. For example we could find a way to enhance and grow our focus on biomaterials so as to better facilitate our existing collaborations not only across colleges, but which extend into our biomedical partners, the AIBA and the hospitals. Another possibility might be a focus on teaching and learning innovations in urban settings, of course that's where we are, with an emphasis on talent supply chain management approaches to improving the educational and work force attainment of our region.

This could include extending our collaborations with organizations such as the Summit Education Initiative, United Way, social service agencies as well our emerging collaborations with (inaudible) Institute.

But regardless of the interdisciplinary areas that we ultimately choose to fund in the next round of the Achieving Distinction program I think all that we focus on (inaudible) development, joint proposals, shared graduate students and the publications across participating colleges. Each should extend and enhance collaborations also with strategic partners. And in order for appropriately developed and environment to be conducive to interdisciplinary collaboration, I will work with the provost and deans to ensure that faculty hires create clusters of expertise related to these and other areas.

But of course interdisciplinary expertise which is at the core of any interdisciplinary effort will continue to be valued. It's just that we need to be sure that such disciplinary expertise is appropriately linked to interdisciplinary opportunities. So that's the specific charge that I would ask of you.

But in my address yesterday I also asked that university community as a whole help us to address three other equally important issues in order to further facilitate and foster interdisciplinary opportunities. And I would like to briefly reiterate them here with the hope obviously that you also will provide our campus community with leadership, decisive and expeditious action in that regard.

First as I indicated we must assure the successful outcome of our academic program review process. These recommendations, as I trust you are already aware, have been made and shared broadly and include proposals for areas for both disinvestment as well as the new investment opportunities from those savings. We must move now simply to implement them and ask the provost to work rapidly with me and with others to bring that to a successful outcome.

Second, as I did in 2009 in a letter of October 28th I asked that we again revisit the organization of our schools and colleges precisely to ensure the interdisciplinary success being sought by so many of you and other faculty.

And third and finally I ask that we implement the proposed revision of our general education curriculum which we've discussed with recommendations to go to the board of trustees before the end of this academic year. This includes the reduction to 120 credit hours, I believe you've already endorsed that Mr. Chairman, to graduate with baccalaureate degrees for programs not otherwise constrained by accreditation requirements. And I recommend that your Academic Policies Committee of the senate consider an approach that would enhance the throughput of college level changes to their baccalaureate standards. And yes, I agree that if some school didn't manage to get appropriate input that we identify that and get that corrected, Mr. Chairman.

So I encourage you in that context to be pragmatic and creative in adopting approaches that would expedite process and would bring this to its now overdue conclusion. I'm sure all of us agree that that needs to move forward.

Of course we have discussed and underscored time and again that a robust and comprehensive program for the assessment of student learning needs to accompany these efforts in general education.

I know that all of you know how vital it is to have a seamless first two years for students that can be applied to almost any major, that we maintain high completion rates for students admitted directly into majors and colleges, that we assess student learning and facilitate the movement of students from pre major status into their major.

Now, I also asked of them and I would ask you that, keep in mind that we must offer some degrees, and all general education courses not just during the day and not just between 10 and 2 in the day, but also on line in a hybrid format and evenings and/or weekends, because so many of our students have nontraditional schedules, and we must enable them to work effectively and efficiently towards a degree.

So in closing I want to repeat what the chairman says you already know, but it is important that you remember that we're hosting a Summit on Retention which is being co sponsored indeed with the senate, and I simply ask you to please attend as many or as much of that as possible, as I did highlight for you then the direct and indirect effects of recruitment, retention and degree completion have a very direct consequence on each and every one of us, faculty, staff or students, and that is something that we need to remember and find a way for all of us to participate even more actively in the breadth of activities that signifies so.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is all I wanted to say today, so thank you for your attention. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have or get out of your way, whichever is first.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We'll see. I did want to offer one clarification. What the senate did recently was to approve a rule change that would allow colleges to reduce the number of credit hours to 120 although not below. Whether it's advisable for any particular program to be so reduced is not something senate expressed a view on.

Are there questions?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Mr. President, you remember the document that was generated at the time of your first request about interdisciplinary programs. I think that report is still very useful for us and I'm wondering if there was a way we can effectively build off of it.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I believe that's probably the first thing you should pull out and review. I would ask that you maybe start with that, look at the current list of active or at least still on the books centers and institutes and provide me some feedback on that and we can hopefully act upon yet this academic year, please.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. President I wanted to follow up on the 120 credit hour issue, because I think it has a potential for being very confusing unless we're very clear on it. I think we're clear on it here. I think you've made it clear and Chair Rich has also added something that will help us understand where we are.

However, what I heard you say yesterday and what I heard you say again today which was the public utterance people are going to focus on, regardless of the clarification, is something to the effect that you're urging all programs at the University of Akron to attempt to achieve their programs within 120 credit hours unless there are accrediting reasons why that can't be done. Is that what you are asking us to do?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: To the extent possible, indeed. And you know, I recognize that there's sometimes other things like you know, practicums and co ops and so forth that make it longer, but colleagues I think what you are hearing from the public at large is that education takes too long and it's too expensive and we owe them the responsibility to also understand that

globally students are getting through very rigorous courses in two years less than does the United States. I think it's time we tried to emulate the rest of the world.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Okay, thank you. If I can just add to that, would it be possible to characterize this to perhaps the members of my department tomorrow when we're talking about some of these issues that if you are going to have a new program in particular or even I suppose an existing program that you want to change, if there's going to be more than 120 credit hours you need to have a good rationale for why. Would that be fair?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I think it's reasonable, yes.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your dedication.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would add that any such changes have to go through the curriculum review process and be approved by this body.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Certainly. Thank you.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Goes without saying.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I wanted to follow up on Senator Sterns, on the document that we all remember. But I think what is important apart from anything to do with institutes on that was something that now that report was used I think to generate what we're saying I think all of us consider is a very useful exercise in getting on the competitive notion of getting special interdisciplinary programs, but that document also referred to the kind of sort of institutional bureaucratic issues that make interdisciplinary study by students difficult. And I don't think those have been addressed, and I think that would be one of the most important things to look at again.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I couldn't agree more. I think we need to overcome some of those encumbrances that we ourselves seem to create in various aspects and places of our institution. Thank you for that comment.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Chairman Rich, this is more a question maybe to clear up what the role of the faculty senate is in the academic program review.

What, since that is obviously an academic issue and is important for our body to address, can you quickly summarize how we are worked into that process of enacting and putting forward the academic program review?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar, that's an excellent question to which I'm afraid I have no exact, concise answer at all. It's complicated, I think, because of course there are important budgetary considerations and the senate's role in budget making was eliminated some years ago.

For that reason I think our role in that process has become small and unclear, but I think it's an important question that you raise, especially in light of the fact that such decisions, you know, obviously will have significant implications for the academic programs of this university. And I'm glad you raised the question and I am unable to answer it.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Perhaps the Provost's Office, since the provost is here, will provide you some more detail when he comes up for his report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions for the president?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: As I said yesterday, I will have many opportunities this year to thank all of you for the great service and contributions that you make to the university and its success. Allow me to say that now. Thank you. And I will do so many times later this year. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Mr. President.

Next item is the remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Chairman Rich and colleagues, good afternoon. Perhaps I'll start with addressing the question related to academic program review.

As everybody knows, we've undertaken a pretty extensive process to assure there have been multiple opportunities for faculty involvement over the last 18 months or so in that process.

The most recent actions were those where I met with each dean, each dean having met with their departments to respond to the recommendations of the academic program review committee.

I think I mentioned at the last faculty senate meeting that, or I noted at the last faculty senate meeting that independent of that process, the dean of the graduate school and vice president for research had also made observations with regard to academic programs.

As you would expect, similarly the Office of Academic Affairs is considering all of those recommendations and developing a point of view with regard to the recommendations of the academic program review.

The next step is quite frankly for myself to sit down with the president and sit down with the vice president for research and sit down with the respective deans in particular where programs have been advocated for disinvestment to reconcile those recommendations. And having had those discussions and reconciled those recommendations we would then take the appropriate steps for engaging the university community and faculty senate in whatever the next steps might be. I

think I'll point out that maybe three colleges out of the number of colleges we have have programs recommended for disinvestment. The other programs, the other colleges primarily have recommendations to maintain investment or to invest.

I think I should emphasize that this was one component of Vision 2020 implementation, and the idea there or the notion there is to use the results of academic program review and any savings resulting from implementing those reviews to redistribute across the institution in strategic ways and the academic program review process accompanied by the achieving distinction process, were the two primary initiatives that would move us towards achieving many of the goals of Vision 2020.

So if I might, I'll just make a couple of other comments and entertain questions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Sure.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Everybody received a Council of Deans update and thanks to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee's recommendations we're making sure that those debriefs are not only sent out to the deans, the department chair school directors but also concurrently shared with the faculty as a whole. So I know you appreciate being in the know as much as our school directors, department chairs and deans are in the know.

I'll just point out that at the last meeting Vice President Cummins updated the group on recent interactions with the board of trustees that resulted in their endorsing a revised fiscal year 14 balanced budget.

I will be meeting with deans in the next week to reconcile questions and outstanding issues that relate to faculty positions.

I will note that the board of trustees has asked for us to come up with different ways for their engagement with faculty. The two initial steps in that regard, besides inviting them to many things that the faculty are involved in, is as you know the board of trustees at every meeting has previously recognized two students nominated by the colleges. In consideration of their request to be more connected with faculty, it was decided that they'll recognize one student at each board meeting and that student will self identify a faculty member significantly engaged in their positive experience at the University of Akron.

The first one of those interactions happened at the last board of trustees meeting and the board found that to be very effective.

Also we're going to rotate across the colleges the opportunity for the dean to nominate a faculty member to do a presentation at the board of trustees meeting to the board of trustees about their

activities and teaching, research, and service and how those activities enrich the student experience and contribute to our mutual success.

Finally, I will note that the State of Ohio gave us about two weeks to submit preliminary capital recommendations. Those, the submission that was made was made in such a way to provide the greatest flexibility to the institution and the actual use of the funds.

There's really two steps to that process. One step is to actually propose the use of the funds, and the next step is actually to say we need the funds to do certain things.

So the first step of the process you submit the materials in such a way you optimize the opportunity to receive as much money as possible. So, two biennia ago we got about 12, I think it was \$13 million.

A biennia ago we received \$16 million. We're hoping for that much or more in this cycle of requests. And we've submitted requests of a total of \$25 million. Hopefully the areas within which we've requested those dollars will resonate with the committee that will make those decisions.

Broadly speaking those areas were essential infrastructure related to safety, security and basic functions, renovation and restoration, research and STEM instructional laboratories with a focus on function and safety upgrades, and the governor's favorite criterion for the distribution of resources, economic development.

So about 25 million dollars' worth of requests were spread across those four areas, and now we'll wait for the governor and the chancellor's committee to make recommendations, after which and during which the University Council and Physical Facilities Council will be engaged in consultation and discussion about the actual use of those funds as they become available.

With that Mr. Chair, I will conclude my remarks. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. I do want to express my appreciation for your sharing the debrief with the rest of the campus. I think it's extremely helpful. There were one or two items in the last one that I thought I would ask for some clarification on.

One has to do with the time keeping and reporting item that your memo says there was much discussion about the meaning of improving time reporting and why different groups would be required to report time and effort. Given that input adjustments were made and communicated to the campus, I wonder if you could be a bit more clear and specific about the input adjustment or at least give us some idea.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: If I make a mistake I will call on Vice Provost Ramsier to jump in there, but initially in a sense all categories of workers would have been required to report their time, and there was a lot of discussion about whether graduate associates would be required to

report their time as well as residence hall advisors and part time faculty. Were there any other categories, Rex? So those were the three.

After deliberation and consideration of the input about the concern about reporting by those individuals, it was determined that a rationale could be developed that would eliminate the need for graduate associates to submit those hours to eliminate the need for residence hall advisors to submit those hours.

An adjustment was made to the criteria around which part time faculty would be required to submit those hours, and I believe, Rex, correct me if I'm wrong, if they're teaching four credits or less part time they're not required to report hours, but five credits or more would be required to report hours. So as a result of that discussion at the Council of Deans meeting we asked the group that had been working on this to reconsider these issues and as a result of that conversation those were the adjustments that were made.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. The other item had to do with the Spring 2014 schedule. There's a statement here to the effect of this process will also include minimizing the number of small class offerings and increasing the availability of flexible class offerings. I was wondering about the meaning of the phrase flexible class offerings.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I think that has more to do with the notion the president referred to earlier. When there's opportunities to offer courses in the evenings or weekends for individuals that require courses to complete and those are the only times they're available to take courses to give every due consideration to flexibly offering those courses, you know, times of the day and days of the week.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So it has to do with offering them at times when the students can take them.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Absolutely, yeah. And we'll use a little clearer language next time instead of flexible class offerings.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there questions of the provost? Senator Clark. Not so fast.

SENATOR KATHLEEN CLARK: I just wondered to what extent the current financial challenges are impacting disinvesting programs.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Really, the criteria that have been used have nothing to do with the current financial challenges. The criteria that were used were clearly related to the data that was provided through the process.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions for the provost? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Mr. Chair, I'd like to raise the question, you know, we talk about innovation in terms of scheduling classes. But clearly one of the areas where we've had

some difference of approach has been in the summer. In the summer it could be a period of even more intensive study and scheduling of classes.

So I'm wondering, in facilities planning we've had discussions about even closing buildings, mothballing. It seems to me that's the wrong approach. We don't want to mothball or close down anything. We want to use our facilities to the full extent.

I'm wondering how you are thinking about that, because the impression we had last summer was they were trying to cut back and not have as much of a budget or focus. In view of what you are saying, are we going to change direction then?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yes. Great question. I think the discussion about mothballing or shutting down buildings has more to do with if such circumstances exist, do that. Not create circumstances that make that happen. I think everybody would agree that we want to activate the summer to the greatest extent possible, and certainly recommendations for the faculty senate would be given every consideration.

I'm not quite sure how to respond to the notion that we were trying to reduce offerings other than to say that

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: You were.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Order, please.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Other than to say that across two years the same spend on summer courses happened with sequential reductions in the number of students and total credit hours taught. So the deans were given the same budget as the previous year and asked to at minimum try to provide the same number of credit hours and head count as the previous year.

So however that got communicated, I can't control that, but the idea was to you know, use the dollars that have been available as effectively as they had been used in the previous year.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Kline.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: Thank you. Do you think that any of that might have to do with that bizarre new schedule with the intersession and then Summer 1 which is kind of really kind of Summer 2 and 3? It doesn't seem to work for many students.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: So if I might, that was really outside of my frame of reference. And if Vice Provost Ramsier can address that question that would be appropriate.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Basically our current academic calendar is synchronized with that of Kent State University main campus. It's basically the reason that we went there with the intersession and the new five and eight week. So that's the answer is we tried to synchronize

with Kent because we have joint programs with Kent State. And since our academic calendars were always out of sync, it caused a lot of problems for current students.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: It seems to have brought enrollment down though here.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I don't know if there's any causality between summer enrollment being down and the schedule since enrollment has been down fall and spring for the last several years. I think we're seeing of course that summer enrollment will also be down. So there's competing effects to cause enrollment to go up or down.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I think Senator Kline would agree that it was, it's the notion that the (inaudible) flexibility by making it three weeks intersession, I suppose I would like to ask the question couldn't we do something for the programs that we do with Kent so that's possible? But as the president is saying flexible time is a very good idea. Shouldn't we be thinking, at least review and talk to students and see where in fact flexibility could be brought in for the summer?

I just think if we're asked to do it for the rest of the year that it makes sense to allow flexibility in the summer as well, and it, I understand what you are saying about Kent State, but that's only a few programs. And I think we need to, we need to re look at this because I think I know for our college there's been, the number, it's not just our department but there's so many times that we can't, that I know we're losing students certainly in our department that say oh well, if I can't do it early on then I will take that job that will essentially take me out to the summer. And I'm you know, I just think that we need to look at it again especially as I said under the president's specific request to look at flexibility.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: If I might, I would be more than pleased to entertain suggestions for how to do just that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions for the provost? Senator Lashbrook.

SENATOR LAURIE LASHBROOK: Provost Sherman, when can we expect to have the searches released, particularly music. We have six searches that are being held up and it's getting late in the year to find the best candidates for those.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I mentioned that we'll be meeting with the deans in the next week to go over the disposition on positions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So that hasn't already occurred?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, the meetings with deans previously have been related to budget reductions, contingency planning for balancing fiscal year 14. So now that we've got a fiscal year 14 budget we now need to consider the disposition of positions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So when can it be expected that those positions will be disposed of?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: We'll be meeting with the deans during the next week at which time we'll agree or release positions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Searches will be able to proceed at that point?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yep.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I've got a slightly different question. I think it's really good that we're doing this Summit on Retention. In some ways it seems like it's about time, and I'm signed up for one of the events.

I think though that with my powers of prophecy I can see what is going to be suggested coming out of this. And according to my powers of prophecy, this is things that I think that have been determined over the years. It's not like a big surprise. The most important things for keeping students are engagement with full time tenure track faculty who are committed to the university. And we keep shrinking. And I noticed in that debriefing it was talking about now four years after Vision 2020 got off the ground we're actually gonna start trying to do something and seeing if we're getting anywhere. And you know as well as I do that we've not been hiring more faculty, so I've given up on that. I don't think it's gonna happen. But that would be the single biggest thing that we could do.

And the second biggest thing we could do if we're not going to hire more faculty for the kind of close personal faculty student interaction which all research indicates helps retention, is to have our part timers be the dedicated long term semi full time part timers that we used to have until this fall when their hours were slashed. And an awful lot of the best ones were cut, told okay, you have been teaching 12 hours. You deal with six. And a lot of them just left. A lot of new ones have to be hired.

I know in College of Arts and Sciences where English and math have enormous numbers of part timers teaching freshmen courses they were scrambling to find any person who was qualified. And certainly they did their best.

But that kind of scrambling to get the part timers in is not going to help student retention. You will have brand new people who don't know the university who aren't committed to the university. It's not going to be like these people who have been here longer than I have who have been teaching at the university and committed to student success. And what essentially these part timers have been told is that the few million dollars that it would cost to give them health insurance is more important than student retention. And I think having a student retention event doesn't cover that up.

I think it's a great idea, but I think we need to step back and consider that either we're gonna need a lot more real faculty or we're gonna need to reward and keep our part timers.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you for your statement, many parts of which I agree with, some parts of which we have to have considered for additional discussion.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions for the provost? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I wanted to ask for a clarification on one comment that I thought I heard and I want to make sure I was clear on it.

When we were talking about the way in which the Office of Academic Affairs communicated last summer's approach to the deans, you mentioned something about being unable to communicate, control the communication. So I wanted to make sure I didn't mishear that. Who should be controlling the communication between the Office of Academic Affairs, deans, faculty and so on? Did I misunderstand what you said?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, I think then we hadn't been doing the debriefs, and that confusion was part of the recommendations to send the debriefs to all faculty.

Had we done that, then it would have been clear that colleges got the same dollars the colleges had received the previous year with the expectation that the greatest extent possible the same credit hours of instruction would be offered as had been offered the previous year. So that's the fact and that's what happened. I'm not sure how that translated into what happened at the college level to decide what to offer is what I was saying.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And again, I would say the distribution of the debriefs should help in the future and seem to be helping.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Great idea, and we're going to continue to do that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions for the provost? Thank you, Mr. Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item is the election of an Executive Committee member to serve the remainder of Senator Steers' unexpired term on the Executive Committee which runs until September of 2014. Are there any nominations for Executive Committee?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Yes. I would like to nominate Elizabeth Erickson.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any others?

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I would like to nominate Senator Lazar.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar, do you accept the nomination? Senator Lazar respectfully declines the nomination. Are there any other nominations? Any other nominations? One more time. Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations be closed and that Senator Erickson be elected by acclamation?

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Moved by Senator Hajjafar and seconded by Senator Clark. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries. Senator Erickson is elected to Executive Committee. Congratulations, Senator Erickson.

(applause)

Next we have committee reports. First the Academic Policies Committee. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Academic Policies Committee has two resolutions for consideration today.

First I would like to bring to your attention is the resolution already described in the chair's remarks concerning the direct transfer and APC admission criteria to academic departments and colleges. I think you've seen the resolution. I don't know if I need to read it into the record.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: No. It's been distributed.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: So the resolution comes from the committee for your consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Is there a motion to refer this back to the Academic Policies Committee for the committee to verify that the appropriate faculty considered and voted on each of these direct admission criteria? Moved by Senator Clark and seconded by Senator Sastry. Is there any debate on the motion? 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.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. The second resolution concerns the movement of the Department of Sports Science and Wellness Education from the current College of Education to the College of Health Professions. This comes as a motion from the committee. I think you've seen the resolution, for your consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And we should add, I think, that the proposal has the support of the faculty and the department, the faculties of the two colleges, the college from which it is moving and to which it is moving.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: And also the college, the receiving college and the department that wishes to move have also reconciled how they will handle retention, tenure, promotion and all of the other types of issues that need to be resolved before they move. So that's already been done in advance.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any discussion of this resolution?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Simply a clarification if I may, Mr. Chair. The resolution says that the department, the current department of Sports Science and Wellness Education will then become the School of Sports Science and Wellness Education. So there's gonna be a slight name change as well?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. The current College of Health Professions has only schools. So the recommendation is to change the name from department to school to be consistent with that college.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other, yes, Senator Blewitt.

SENATOR MARISSA BLEWITT: I wanted to know if there's any foreseeable effect on students from that move, for the students in the Sport Management

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: The curriculum is the same. Everything is the same except which dean the department or school reports to and of course the governance of the college will be slightly different. But the programs are the same, students shouldn't be affected.

The only thing I could see affecting them would be which commencement you go to.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And which dean signs the diploma.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: And which dean signs the diploma.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other discussion of the resolution? All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without debate.

That concludes the APC report. And next is the Curriculum Review Committee report.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Curriculum Review Committee brings two recommendations for your consideration.

The first is a list of curricular proposals that was previously circulated. It's a short list this month.

These are the proposals that have come through the curriculum proposal system without objection. We bring them to you for your consideration and approval.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any discussion of these proposals, curriculum change proposals? I take it you are ready to vote.

All those in favor of the curriculum change proposals as recommended by the Curriculum Review Committee, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: One point of clarification about process maybe. Let's suppose we get to that stage where things have been reviewed, and at some point there's an objection to one of the proposals that have been approved all the way through. Is it now too late to do anything about that or have a hearing in this meeting?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me address that.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Sure.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This body has the power to approve or disapprove any such change. Now, this is not a very good body to conduct a hearing. That's really a function for our committees. So were that to eventually, I think there would probably be and should probably be a motion to refer back to the committee where they would hold the hearing. But it is within the discretion of this body to withhold approval from any curriculum change proposal that's before it.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Great. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Next item.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: The next resolution from the Curriculum Review Committee concerns the method to expedite the mode change only function in the current curriculum proposal system.

With the help of Chair Rich you have hopefully in your possession the updated version of the rule, the changes that were made from the previous version of the rule were simply made for clarity purposes. The intent is the same.

In essence as the chair mentioned in his remarks, after college level review for a mode change only curriculum proposal, i.e. a course that's currently being taught, now that the faculty want to teach it in hybrid or online method, those college level reviews once complete, submitted into the system, would go to the Distance Learning Review Committee. And if they approve it or if it's been modified based on their feedback, if it is brought to the senate, this would then basically eliminate many of the issues we've had with proposals being slowed down in the system by avoiding review by other bodies, and in particular also the university wide two week window, okay? So that's the proposal.

The rule has been red lined for your consideration. So again a motion from the committee for your consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there discussion of the resolution? Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: I wanted to bring two concerns that I had, well, yes, two concerns I had.

The first is that if a program goes on to an online mode, that had been in a traditional mode, if the traditional mode is no longer offered, would that still go through the regular channels?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. Change of mode of delivery, independent of whether we ever offer the original face to face again is a change of mode of delivery.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe Senator Lazar means would the discontinuation of an in class, course

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Right.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: No. Change of mode of delivery adds modes of delivery. So you continue to teach face to face and potentially on line or hybrid.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The decision to offer or not offer a course is not a curriculum change in itself.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Okay.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: The department has the right to offer a course in whatever mode of delivery has been approved by this body through this process. But they don't have to offer every mode of delivery of the same course every semester.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Or even offer a particular course every semester.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: The reason behind my questioning is if something would cease to be offered as a traditional delivery mode, if it is required to go through any process as it is now to

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: No. We have courses on our books that have not been offered for many, many, many years. They're still on the books. They're just never offered.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Which means they could be offered again without a curriculum change.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Right. Okay. My second question is more specifically related to this proposal.

At the library, our main concern is in our function in participating in the review is to ensure that there are adequate resources for whatever is being taught. And whereas we really, I don't want to speak on behalf of all of my colleagues, we would rarely not approve a course unless there were a serious concern that hey, you want to start a brand new program and we want to make sure we get the funds to support a program.

I have a little concern with being left out of the change of mode process. We would be one of the reviews that would be eliminated, and the concern would be that if a class would move to an online delivery, some of the resources we would have to get online materials we may only have in print currently.

That would not be a problem if small amounts of changes went through a class here and there. But if large numbers of classes will go rapidly on line, we have two different budgeting systems for purchasing one time materials and purchasing subscriptions.

A lot I could see change to subscriptions. And if we're not able to respond with the budgets quickly enough that could be a problem. And what I would like to do is to ask that we wait on the vote for one, until next month and then I will go back and I will make sure you know, speak with everybody and make sure that they would be comfortable with being out of the official approval process no matter the number of classes, I want to ensure that we have the flexibility to respond in a budget, with our budgets in the right places if there are a high number of changes going through.

If we can respond I would be fine, just with a notification that would be outside of the actual chain. But if we would not be able to respond, I would still like the ability to say I'm sorry, we can't support this number of changes this quickly.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, I think this point is valid. One possible solution to this problem would be to ask the Senate Executive Committee to make sure that they appoint members of the library faculty to the Distance Learning Review Committee so at the time of review those issues can be raised. If significant resources are required from the library budget, that could be referred back to the originator at that time. And if it cannot be supported financially, that would be the time when DLRC could reject the proposal.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: That could be an option. I think that maybe a one time issue though, I think if my, the administration is confident in their ability to make these changes, that would only need to be done once. And something like that might be other than just the notification to make sure the individual bibliographers are on the same page. But I think that would be my preference. My original suggestion would still be my preference, if it would not be too onerous a recommendation.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Hajjafar.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Actually, DLRC is responsible to determine if additional resources is needed or not. So that automatically will be checked over. If the course exists, that means no resources are needed up to date.

Now if it goes to DLRC, DLRC checks. One of their responsibilities to determine if additional funds are needed. If it is needed then they send it to the library board to (inaudible).

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would add that I think it's an excellent suggestion that the Executive Committee make it a point to appoint someone from the library to DLRC to make sure there's always someone from the libraries on DLRC.

I think that's well taken. I also think that it would not require a change in the rule to have the curriculum proposal system automatically notify the library when there's a mode change only proposal. That I understand may not satisfy Senator Lazar who may wish the opportunity for the library to withhold approval of such a change.

Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. It does raise the question I was going to ask, which is that if the intent of this was to simply make it easier to change the mode of delivery of a course, and we've had a lot of discussion about all we're doing is changing whether it's online or not, you know, isn't it reasonable and simple to say let's make that change easier since we're not really making other changes? My question was why do we need DLRC if it's only a mode, whether or not it's being offered on line as well as in the additional sense, it's not like it's a different course, it doesn't have different content. It may be delivered differently. So I don't understand why we would need DLRC, if that's the only change? Seems like dropping that could also streamline the entire process.

Now, if what you have raised, a really excellent point, Mr. Chairman if I may, that perhaps DLRC could be used for other purposes, that sort of opens up again the whole notion of whether or not we should be fiddling with the admittedly less than perfect current curriculum review process if we're going to end up creating more questions than we answer. So I would unite with my colleague Senator Lazar to ask if there's a way that this can be, the consideration on this can

be postponed until some of these issues have been clarified. Because if we wait one more month and have it done right, that will be better than if we implement it and have to go back and fix it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If I may before I give Vice Provost Ramsier a chance to respond, I do know that the involvement of DLRC was a matter that was discussed extensively by the Curriculum Review Committee, unlike I think the point about the library perhaps.

So with that, Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. Senator Lillie makes again another good point. The original proposal that I made as chair of the CRC to the Curriculum Review Committee was to eliminate all reviews for mode change.

The committee rightfully in my opinion agreed the DLRC is an essential body to review mode change deliveries, and I will give you a specific example that I remember when I served on the role of DLRC.

We received a course for change of mode to fully online, 100 percent online. The course syllabus required students to come to campus to take the exams in Memorial Hall. At the time Memorial Hall no longer existed. The current DLRC at that time sent the proposal back as having not been well thought out by the originator. So we do believe that DLRC serves a critical function in making sure we have quality online and hybrid course offerings.

It's a simple review by a group of faculty experts that doesn't take very long if the proposals are well crafted. Poorly crafted proposals obviously get held up and need substantive change.

So speaking for myself as well as for CRC we feel that DLRC serves a significant and important role in making sure the University of Akron only offers online and hybrid courses that are of quality.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: So if I may, the course proposal change that the DLRC approved had been previously approved by the department faculty and by the college faculty?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Obviously.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Okay. So, wouldn't the consideration for doing it correctly then lie most properly in the hands of the departmental and college faculty themselves, is I guess a rhetorical question I'm going to put out there.

And I really, I really have no, you know, serious objection if that's what this body wants to do to interpolate the DLRC in there.

I just think the DLRC as I've seen recently has some rules apparently or some suggestions for how curriculum proposals should be created that have not gone through this body. And so I'm always concerned when I see those kinds of things happen, because once we start to have a

custom of well, this is reasonable and there's no reason why we can't, custom becomes not just if you feel like it. It becomes what you must do.

So I'm concerned about making sure that to the extent we can we are making the system and the process as simple as possible, as close to the faculty as possible, and if the, if it's the sense of this body that this is gonna improve you know, the outcome and that's what happens, great. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I wanted to say as somebody who has just been appointed to the committee that's now being taken out, the University Review Committee, the subcommittee of CRC, the first set of courses that we had to look at this year were precisely this lot. They were all change in mode.

And Senator Hajjafar will corroborate that I called him up and said boy, well, the first thing I did was say oh, this is a change in mode. And I realized that as somebody who has been many years on Buchtel College Council for our college, that I really didn't know for a change in mode what in fact we really needed to be looking for.

And this was sort of a bit mysterious, and I talked to somebody in my department. This is the first time somebody in my department had done that. They said Liz, you've got to realize it is not that easy. It is a big change if you are making it on line. And you've got to be careful. And there are things you must do. So I said okay. And he sent me some materials about it, and I said, okay. Good. But that's, you've sort of got to ask around.

Okay. So I looked and of the four or five proposals that we were looking at I was looking for all of the things, and in a couple of cases they weren't as bad as Memorial Hall or whatever, but they were things that were clearly not appropriate. There was something left out that the person who was doing it really had left out an important aspect of it. And I thought, so I asked to see where the, when the first version of this came out. I called Ali and I said, but you are not keeping the distance learning part of it out, because the distance learning part of it you need to give feedback. Because frankly I wished I could say that the people in my college could evaluate that. But a great many proposals on content to look at, and frankly many of us don't have that expertise. And I feel much, much more comfortable that it goes to a committee of experts in the process. I think the feedback that they give is really important, and I agree entirely that it's, we only want to put quality stuff on line.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: To follow up on Senator Erickson's comments there, I would like to have this considered if it's a change of delivery only to bypass the colleges even, just go straight to the Distance Learning Committee. You know, we're looking at content in the

colleges. As she said, we don't have the expertise. So that should be where, my suggestion, that should be the only review that would need to be done.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, this was also discussed by the Curriculum Review Committee at some length.

We felt that, I will paraphrase the discussion in my own words. With the expectation that faculty own, if you will, the curriculum, the faculty of the departments, schools and colleges in our opinion, in my opinion in particular, need to take ownership and responsibility for these reviews.

Some of the, the example I gave should have been flagged in my opinion by the department before it left the department. By the college before it left the college. So we felt that it would be inappropriate for individual faculty to submit curriculum proposals directly to DLRC without their colleagues knowing about it. And we would expect that departments, schools and colleges that have and they all should have, presumably all have curriculum review committees actually take it upon themselves to be responsible and not let proposals that are clearly not well thought out, outside the unit.

But if that happens, CRC believes we need one group of experts that are expert in these types of modes of delivery to make sure that when things come to this body we can all be hopefully guaranteed that they have been well vetted. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other discussion? Senator Sterns?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I saw that Senator Witt was very anxious to

SENATOR DAVID WITT: My ardor has been beaten back somehow.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It seems to have abated.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Then I will, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a more general point, and this is more informational and it may even be out of order, but Senator Lazar, I am very curious to know what our library resource analysis looks like in 2013 with OhioLINK and access to electronic journals, you know the way we used to talk about collections when we were launching new academic programs could be very different today.

I would like to have more of an understanding of what it means, what library resources today mean as opposed to an earlier time period.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, I hesitate to devote too much time to the subject.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I said it may be out of order.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It's not quite out of order, but I would ask for a reasonably succinct answer.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: I will attempt to, Chair Rich.

A large difference is with the proliferation of online resources, it's a licensing nightmare. Many things such as ejournal and ebooks we're able to have joint licenses through OhioLINK allowing to us share in the costs and the accessibility throughout a large pool.

Others are much more difficult data bases that OhioLINK doesn't cover are ones that we would need that OhioLINK in general would need, we would have to pay on our own.

It is a complicated answer. In some ways the online world makes it easier to share resources. And in some ways it's all about licensing and making sure every single person that touches that, that they get a revenue from it. So in many ways it's more restrictive. So it's something we have to deal with. And our current budgeting systems sometimes make it harder to transfer money that would have gone to print or online materials we can't grab and throw into online resources, and that's my concern.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Lazar. Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Speaking to that point, whether it's an online class or a traditional class you may or may not have these kinds of issues, right? Just because it's a change in delivery doesn't mean that suddenly there will be much more use of library resources. It doesn't necessarily mean that. It could, but it may not.

And the other thing I wanted to say is that Senator Saliga there has spent more than a little bit of time looking at proposals that come through and the Memorial Hall example is more the rule than the exception in a lot of cases. And I think that one of the things that's happening at our institution is that people are taking it upon themselves, because they have access to the system, to just put in proposals, all right, because nobody else in the department wants to do it, right?

And the reason they don't want to do it is because they have other committee work and we have a shrinking faculty base to perform these duties in the first place, right? And so what we're seeing here, I really think what we're seeing here is, the problems with the curriculum proposal system isn't the people in the committee. It's sort of the system itself and the way it allows access without restriction. Anybody can put a course into the proposal system.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, that's, if I may correct you a little bit

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I can put one in.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Yes. You might have a good idea, Dave. You may have to convince your colleagues you may have a good idea.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie, please come to order.

If the course is to be offered within your department, Senator Witt, you could propose it. There are restrictions on who can propose courses based on in what units the courses are to be offered. But in all events they then have to be approved by the department or school or faculty and then by the college and on up the line. So although it's possible for any faculty member to propose a course to be offered within their unit, that doesn't mean that the course is going to be approved for offer.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Before we make sure that that's exactly true, maybe some of our leadership ought to come to a faculty meeting and watch this process happen on the ground in the faculty meeting, and you would see what I mean by there's sort of perfunctory permissions given. Oh, go right ahead and offer it. This happens a lot.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt, I have heard similar reports about your college in particular, and I have some concern about that. I think that is something that needs to be examined.

Senator Lazar, I think there might be other aspects you might wish to respond to.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Yes, thank you. One more statement, to give a blatant example. If a history of opera course is taught traditionally right now, we've got a collection of over a hundred DVDs of very high quality that would more than adequately cover that class. If it's to be entirely taught on line I would have to be able to ask for a subscription based opera data base and I would be asked because of the cuts to the state as well as the cuts to OhioLINK we get a double whammy because not only are we as a university receiving less state money, OhioLINK is receiving less state money, so we are asked to kick more in. I would have to negotiate how we would get an online data base, and I would be asked what I want to cut. And there's nothing left to cut.

We're looking at, I'm asking for one more month so that we can ensure that we can adequately support all of these, you know, new online classes that we would love to see go through. We just want to make sure we can give it the best shot, because the other shot is, go ahead kids, it's on YouTube. I am sure that you can find it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Anybody who wishes to say something that hasn't already been said?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: If I might, in response to Senator Lazar's comments, and I do believe they're well placed, that we need to be mindful of the resources required to offer anything in a different mode. I honestly am not sure how another month is going to help, because you won't be able to project how many courses are going to come forward as mode change, how many resources will be required, and also unfortunately in today's climate none of us can project what our budget's gonna look like. So I'm not sure that delaying this motion from committee is going to help resolve the issues that have been raised. I think they're valid issues.

If an institution wishes to move materials, courses on line, I think the institution is going to have to provide the resources to do that. Otherwise obviously they won't be approved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar, did you wish to respond to a question of what the additional month would allow you to do?

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Yes. I have no knowledge as to whether or not my administrator is aware, our interim dean is aware. My understanding of the budgeting is that we have a separation by board rule as to how we can spend the money. And my extra month, I would be happy to give you two days. I could give you an answer tomorrow but (inaudible) is that I would like to approach my, our dean and say this is what's going on in senate. If suddenly we fast track 30 classes through and the only way we can adequately get funds to get the online resources for what we need is can we shuffle that money quickly enough, and she says sure, I would be more than happy. If she says wow, that could be a problem, then I would ask her what we should do in that case.

I don't pretend to predict. I would hope to consult with someone who may have a better understanding of whether or not

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The chair would assert that this proposal was distributed last week. Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SHIVAKUMAR SASTRY: I wish to say that I think there's a (inaudible) for the Executive Committee to appoint somebody to DLRC. I think the issue has been resolved. I don't think we should delay it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any further debate?

Senator Lazar, did you wish to make a motion?

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Yes. I'd like to make a motion to

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Postpone consideration of this motion until next senate meeting?

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Sounds great.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Second.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It's been moved and seconded to postpone to the next meeting. Technically this is a debatable motion. I am hoping this requires no further debate.

All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

>>: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The ayes have it. The motion is postponed until the December meeting.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

And I have actually one further update for the senate based on the chairman's remarks about the issue he detected actually in the rule. The way the rule currently reads for the curriculum proposal system, once released from college level review, after I'm sure a very thorough review by the college level curriculum review committees, all of the other institutional reviewing bodies, the institutional review level, which includes currently the institutional research, the library, Distance Learning Review, General Education and University Review Committee among others have two weeks to do their reviews. They can recommend change or approve.

Two weeks from that time that the college puts the proposal in the system the proposals are to be released by rule for university wide review, which means anybody who walks in, any faculty member can go in and review proposals.

After that second two week period, proposals are to be forwarded to the Curriculum Review Committee. Currently, and I verified today in meetings with people and institutional information technology the system holdup has been that if committees such as DLRC did not act on a proposal within their two week window, the proposal was after two weeks put back in their bin continually.

Monday there will be a memo sent to all of the committee members since I'm the chair of the Curriculum Review Committee, and all of these committees we're speaking about or subcommittees, as of Monday the window will be enforced.

So from college release to CRC is going to be one month. Maximum. Unless a committee were to send a proposal back for recommended change to the originator.

So the holdup has finally been identified because of Chair Rich's keen eye in reviewing the rule that you just decided to postpone for a month. We are going to fix the problem Monday, okay? So I will be happy to entertain any questions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Let me just clarify. I have one major, clarify and perhaps a comment depending on the result.

In other words, you are saying that when it's released, when it is released from the college and goes to URC, URC has four weeks to get it out of there or what then?

If they don't deal with it in four weeks, no, it's not two, because it's open for the other part as well, and they would have to get the review back, wouldn't they? It's not two to deal with it, because there's the comment period as well, right?

There's the comment period and then the two weeks and it has to be done, right? Got to be, and what happens if it's not done?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There's a two week period for so called institutional review, and then there's a two week period during which any faculty member can raise an objection.

Excuse me, Senator Erickson, I'm speaking at the moment. And that results in if there is an objection raised, the Curriculum Review Committee actually reviewing it substantively as opposed to proforma, okay. Just trying to clarify for everyone what the rule says.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: You mentioned URC. That's why I was confused.

Once it comes up after that four week period it goes down to URC, when does URC see this then and if they have to have their position, the comments from anybody during that period, obviously if somebody wants to comment on it, you are saying that's not part URC's job, it's only CRC's job? Where is it?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I think Senator Erickson is confused.

After the college level review, which is substantive by college level faculty of course, or supposed to be, proposals are released for institution wide review by all reviewing bodies except CRC.

URC is one of them. GEAC is one of them. DLRC is one of them. Libraries is one of them. Graduate school is one of them. Okay. Two weeks.

Currently if committees do not act within those two weeks, the proposal is being put back in their window to keep it open. Therefore, they're not moving forward.

Beginning Monday those proposals will be opened up for university wide review after two weeks. URC still has the opportunity to review. URC or any member of any committee can file an objection during the university wide period. But after the four weeks, it comes to the Curriculum Review Committee.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: And the Curriculum Review Committee therefore, and if it hadn't been reviewed by URC would just send it on.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: The Curriculum Review Committee then has the authority to request URC, did you really look at this? Do you need to look at this? Or to bring them to this body for your consideration.

Curriculum Review Committee is the committee to which the URC, DLRC and GEAC reports. CRC is taking it upon itself to exercise its authority to have its committees do their work in a timely manner or CRC will make the decision for them.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I understand that. And the comment I would make is somebody who is newly appointed to URC and therefore comes in from the outside at the beginning, and I'm saying this to everyone in the senate because I, what I would say, my comment after having been to a meeting of this committee, it was quite clear that the people who came to that committee had really, really worked hard. They had gone through over 500 proposals last year.

And frankly, and the chair after having been a chair for two years said, I'm just, I just can't cope. The amount of time involved in this is huge.

There are members of the committee, there are only five of us there. Five. There were supposed to be at least another three, I think it was four who have never been there, most of them. At least two had not ever been there. This is a committee that we need to be thinking about more carefully because, and we need people who will put some time and effort into it. Not to mention maybe it is something we should be asking CRC, we as the senate, to see how best to organize URC because my look at this is they couldn't find a chair. There wasn't anybody they could see would be a replacement chair that had any experience.

You are sending now committee report proposals, I'm collecting them, that in fact in my box, which are going to have two weeks and then will go to CRC. And CRC probably won't, I don't know what they'll do with it. But I'm just saying that we need to be looking at the role, effective role of CRC, and I really do think that's necessary.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There being no motion present before the body, and there being a class scheduled in this room, I think we need to move on.

If there is time at the end this could be taken up again under good of the order.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Was there a motion that you were bringing from that one?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: It was simply an update for this body in particular based on the chair's remarks. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next is the report of the part time faculty committee. We have a written report. Is there an oral reports? Okay.

Athletics Committee, we have a written report. Is there an oral report? CCTC likewise? Student Affairs Committee, Senator Ex officio Biddle.

STACIA BIDDLE: Is it all right if I stand up here?

The Student Affairs Committee met on October 30th, and I have a brief report. No motions, just a brief report about what happened at that meeting.

We did have a guest speaker. We had Miss Stacey Moore, Dr. Stacey Moore come and speak to us from Student Success. She spoke to us about two things that I wanted to share with you.

There have been some whisperings of this out there, however we needed some enlightenment, so I invited Stacey Moore to come to our committee, and she talked to us about the Academic Encouragers that you may have heard of, as well as the Help a Zip support line that is available on our University of Akron web page. And both of these are great assets to us as well as to our fellow colleagues, and so I just wanted to share a little bit about this for you.

The Academic Encouragers Program is a program that pulls in currently 18 experienced professionals to come in here to the university to help guide and direct students that may have, may be falling behind or we see as being considered high risk students, if you will.

These Academic Encouragers come in with 10 years or more experience in education or counseling or social work or something like that, and currently each one of these 18 academic encouragers is assigned to approximately 20 students that they help about an average of 20 hours a week. They put about an average of 20 hours a week helping these students out, guiding them. They check up on them to make sure they're attending classes, some of them wait outside classrooms to see if the students are in fact attending classes.

So these are just like Stacy called them, almost surrogate parents, if you will, here on the site of the university making sure these students are going to classes and that they're performing as best as they possibly can.

They look at attendance and punctuality and report any warning signs they see to the academic advisors. So they bridge the gap between the emergent students and the academic advising departments. And they also offer guidance to faculty members who have these students in their classes. So this is a really good thing and they're hoping that the program will grow.

Currently they're in like the study aspect of this. They're researching this to see how this is gonna work out.

Most of the students that are recommended for these Academic Encouragers are students that are either emergent or they come in as a pre major student, not direct admit to majors, they have not attended the Student Success Seminar and they're not in any learning communities. So that's a little bit about the Academic Encouragers.

The Help a Zip is a new referral service that's here. I don't know how new it is actually, but it's a referral service that we have here at the University of Akron, throughout our University of Akron web page. So if you do a search for Help a Zip it comes up and it's a referral page which you can simply, this is open to anyone.

You can go in, if you have a student having trouble accessing text books or having trouble attending class regularly if you see signs they're having trouble in their personal lives even, you can refer this particular student using this method, refer a Zip. And these, this Zip referral system, these students that you refer then get kind of I guess separated into different categories depending upon what the nature of their need is. So if they need a care team referral they'll be forwarded to the care team referral center.

If they need more of a counselling situation that's not as desperate as a care team referral they'll be referred for counseling. If they need to be referred to academic services they will be. But this is an excellent resource.

Currently there have been over 160 referrals on this site, and 60+ faculty have actually submitted a referral for students. So this is really good, and I just wanted to get the word out that this exists, and that these are some really good programs that we have here to help aid in student success and help them benefit from a better Akron experience.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions for Senator Ex officio Biddle? Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Chairman Rich, I had a question about the 18 outside people. What, are they trained to do this or, I didn't understand.

STACIA BIDDLE: They are.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Because that's a little bit of a concern.

STACIA BIDDLE: These 18 outside people are people that have 10 years, they're not actually outside people. They're hired in here at the university as part time professionals functioning as part time staff members. Their experience stems from education or in elementary education or high school education as well as counseling and social work. So they do have experience working with students or working with counseling.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I was just wondering whether or not, I think, I wonder if you could answer Senator Allen's question. Do they get training above and beyond that? Because it would seem to me that indeed somebody who is an elementary school teacher might be helpful but they're not going to necessarily, it would seem to me, have, necessarily have the kind of training that you might also want for a university level situation. And I certainly as a faculty member, if somebody came to me who was an elementary school teacher and asked me about a student in my class, I would want to know that those people had gone through some actual training at the University of Akron to what a university student, do they have training?

STACIA BIDDLE: I cannot answer that directly. I don't remember if Stacey Moore brought any of that up. It is not in the information that she gave me regarding any extra training that they get here. I'm sure they go through some kind of brief training, and I'm sure that there's something there, but I'm not sure exactly what.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I was in that meeting. I believe I recall, Senator Ducharme might be able to help with this. I thought I recalled it was more talking about the training, do you recall?

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: She said it started three weeks into the semester and it's already going. It seemed like she was saying it was going by the fourth week, so whatever amount of training, it would have been real slight.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Right. Depending on when they were hired. Senator Hajjafar.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Surrogate mother reminded me of something, that we are not even allowed to provide information to mothers.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: But mothers are not university employees.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: That's my point.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: These are university employees. If your concern is FERPA, let me allay your concern, that because they are university employees hired for this purpose, they are among the people with whom this information can be shared, unlike mothers, unless the mothers happen to be employed by the university in this capacity.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Then I think we have to look into more.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Anderson.

SENATOR TURNER ANDERSON: I don't know if Senator Hajjafar was getting at this point, it almost makes them better than parents for keeping students engaged, because you can let them know what's going on in the students' lives particularly. As a student observer I've seen throughout at least tonight's meeting, it sounds like faculty are already overburdened with the load of teaching classes, the administrative work of approving curricula, all that kind of nonsense, but we also said at the very beginning of this meeting that one of the keys to retention is contact with a faculty member on campus.

And I think the goal of this program, correct me if I'm wrong, is to give students some kind of, I guess what they call it, I forget, touches with some person on campus that's going to lead them along a path. Because right now I can understand where the load of the faculty of having to do a million other things, sometimes that can get lost. And not to say anyone is doing it on purpose, but maybe it isn't a bad thing to have specialists that are here particularly for one purpose, rather than having a hundred people trying to do a hundred things.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: I was one of those 60 faculty members, and I had tried on three attempts to get a student to come take an exam with no response from them at all. And I was getting worried, and I actually contacted Dr. Moore.

One concern I had though was I never heard back from anyone. And the student did come and finally make up the exam. He had had an accident, but had not gotten in touch with me.

What I was hoping for is that maybe if Dr. Moore could come discuss this, we could find a better interface between this group and faculty members so that it doesn't stop there.

I don't think they're getting in touch with us, so if we could then have another feedback loop I think this would, I really like this idea, but I think we need that other feedback loop, and I don't think it's happening right.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Biddle, I think you would be willing to share that suggestion with the committee?

STACIA BIDDLE: Absolutely.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And I would hesitate to try to discuss this in depth in a body this size, but what you might do as chair is to let the members of this body know when you are going to have a meeting so if there are people who are interested who are not on Student Affairs they could come to talk and to listen. Is there anything else on this?

Thank you. And let me say that I appreciate very much your willingness to step up and chair this committee. And this is a committee that had been inactive for years, and under Senator Biddle's leadership it is now I think quite active. Thank you.

Report from the UC representatives. University Council representatives. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. As you may know, we have three representatives to the University Council; myself, Senator Witt and Senator Erickson.

In addition to that, because of the role of chairs of respective committees there are a couple of other senators who are here and also members of University Council; Senator Sterns and Senator Hajjafar. Have I missed anybody? Okay.

One of the concerns we had earlier this semester had to do with the massive, apparently from some perspectives, difficult to understand division of the bylaws that had been passed by the University Council in February, 2013.

As a result of a lot of people working together and also as a result of this body supporting us, I can report that we have been able to successfully return to the consideration of the bylaws that

were passed, as I recall unanimously eventually by the University Council itself in February, 2013 as a basis on which to consider the feedback that we had received from a Strategic Issues Committee of the board of trustees.

It turned out upon, to make a long story as short as I possibly can, it turned out that we had essentially had a set of bylaws as passed February, 2013, that on three of the four concerns expressed by that body the Strategic Issues Committee of the board, were pleased. They felt that those bylaws had actually met those criteria.

The fourth which had to do with nimbleness and quickness of response, was one in which a lot of people felt we needed to work on it to some further extent.

So a number of folks were selected from among the University Council representatives of their constituents. We have actually the majority of the committee is here today. Myself, Senator Blewitt and Senator Anderson are representing the Graduate Student Government and the Undergraduate Student Government. We also have a representative from SEAC, the staff, and I believe that's Mary Hardin, thank you, and then also the representative from CPAC is the chair of the committee.

We met several times, talked at some length, and realized that the concerns that we had raised that had been based on the bylaws that had been proposed unilaterally through the Steering Committee of the University Council were not the ones that we had to really consider in front of us.

So we found that a lot of the work that we had dreaded would need to be done would take a long time didn't have to be done, because we were relying on a document that had already received the appropriate approval, and we were approving that document not trying to fix an impossible newer one.

So we have done that. We have made some changes, recommended them. In the past couple of days, Matt Bungard who is the chair of the committee had forwarded them on to the members of the University Council.

You have available on the University Council website to you the, a number of documents including the February I am doing it as quickly as I can. I can't do it in 140 characters.

You have available on University Council website a copy of the 2010 bylaws, a copy of the board of trustees concern and some other materials. The one document, it has everything that you need if you are interested in looking at that.

What you don't have is a copy of the February, 2010, I'm sorry, September, 2010 bylaws on which these were based.

What I'm trying to report to this body at this point is that it does appear that we do have a set of bylaws that would be, in our view the five of us who are on this bylaw committee, representative of as close to shared governance as we can get on this campus at this time. So I think that's a positive point to make at this time.

It's not exactly what I would have liked. I don't think it's exactly what we need, but it's where we are and it's what we have, and I think it's going to be able to be something that we can work with. So I wanted to make sure that that was reported to you.

If you want to make suggestions, copies of those should be on the University Council website. Please feel free to do that to Matt Bungard and those will be considered at some point.

The bylaws should be voted on next week at the University Council meeting on November 12 which is again a public meeting.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Lillie.

Is there any new business? I hope not. Anything for the good of the order that can't wait until next month? If not, I declare us adjourned.