

University of Akron Faculty Senate Meeting

May 1, 2014 3:00 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The regular May meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Raber, seconded by Senator Clark. Are there any changes to the agenda? All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: All those against, say no. The agenda is adopted. We are without the services of our secretary, Frank Bove today. He has taken ill. We're also without the services of Laura Melby, our transcriber. She's had a death in the family. We send our condolences to her.

What this means is that for the present purposes that this meeting is being recorded instead of transcribed, which is the way we did it before last [inaudible] right? And that means that you all need to, I would request that you be careful about making noise that the sound system will pick up and making it difficult for Laura later to transcribe. That includes rustling papers and being quiet, talking getting picked up. So it really does impede the ability of the transcriber to accurately transcribe the proceedings.

We do not have minutes to adopt because of Frank's illness, so we'll not do that.

Next item is the chairman's remarks. I will keep my remarks short, because we have a full agenda today including the election of representatives to the University Council and the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics, several items of business from the Academic Policies Committee, two items of business from the Part time Faculty Committee, and one large important item of business from the Ad hoc General Education Revision Committee.

I want to thank all of the members of this body and all who serve on Faculty Senate committees for their service to the university this academic year. As I reported to you by electronic mail last Wednesday, the board of trustees adopted all of the recommendations of the Faculty Senate concerning the suspension of academic programs. As a result, 13 of the 55 programs originally proposed for suspension will not be suspended, and 22 will be suspended temporarily rather than permanently so they can be strengthened and restarted.

Senior Vice President and Provost Mike Sherman is out of town attending a conference today. He has submitted his remarks in writing. I distributed those to you by electronic mail earlier today. In those remarks he states, and I quote, "We will begin a new APR" meaning Academic

Program Review, "next year having consulted broadly before implementing the next APR process," end quote.

I trust that this means the Faculty Senate will be consulted about how academic program review will be conducted in the future. I believe there is much that needs to be improved about the process, and I look forward to expressing my views on this subject to the provost in the near future.

I'm glad to report that the University Council Budget and Finance Committee, the Vice President for Finance and Administration David Cummins and Senior Vice President and Provost have agreed to alter the proposed fiscal year 2015 university budget.

Under this agreement, the budget cuts imposed on the academic units will be approximately half of those originally proposed and will not include any cuts that the deans respectively indicated would hurt revenues. To make up the difference, the proposed increase in scholarships and the new funding for the Achieving Distinction Initiatives will be eliminated. Although this does not resolve the problem of recurring deficits, I believe it is the best outcome that could be achieved under the circumstances, and I thank all involved for their work.

I especially want to acknowledge the willingness of CFO David Cummins to consult meaningfully with the Budget and Finance Committee over the last two months, and the support of both the provost and the president for such consultation. I believe that we have finally established the proper role of the Budget and Finance Committee, and I hope and expect that the administration will continue to consult meaningfully with that committee during the next academic year and beyond.

As you all know, this week the three finalists for appointment as president of the university have been on campus interviewing and giving public presentations. On Monday your three representatives and the three representatives of the Akron Chapter of the American Association of University Professors will meet with the board of trustees to offer our views of the three candidates. I encourage faculty members who wish to express their views of the candidates to the faculty representatives.

Finally, this is the last Faculty Senate meeting during Luis Proenza's 15 year tenure as president of the university. There will be a resolution offered later in the meeting as an item of new business, but I want to personally thank President Proenza for providing leadership to the university during his 15 years of service as president and for his accomplishments including strengthening research activities at the university, transforming the campus and enhancing the reputation of the university. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This concludes my remarks. Next item of business is the report of the Executive Committee. In Frank's absence Senator Miller, Vice Chair Miller will read the report.

SENATOR JON MILLER: During the month of April the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met twice as a committee and once with the president provost, and vice provost. On April 17th, the Executive Committee met for regular senate business and to prepare for the meeting later that afternoon with the president.

The Executive Committee appointed Alvaro Rodriguez, Vice President of Graduate Student Government to the Faculty Senate University Libraries Committee.

With the president, provost and vice provost the EC first discussed its concern about the recent budget cuts and the likely negative impact on academic programs. The EC urged the administration to uncover pragmatic reductions without harm to academics and to include faculty in the decision making process.

The EC also raised the issue of the potential consolidation of the Bierce and Science and Technology Libraries. The provost assured the EC that the issue of consolidating the libraries is not a factor in the fiscal year 15 budget, and will be done mindfully by engaging students, the Faculty Senate University Libraries Committee, Faculty Senate and University Council. No decision will be made over the summer, and the constituent groups will be engaged this fall to continue the conversation.

Also discussed was the recommendation from Summit College faculty to rename and reorganize the college. The presidential transition was also discussed. The president reported that the short list of interviews was complete and the Board of Trustees Search Committee will invite finalists to campus the week of April 28th. The committee will confer with constituent groups the week of May 5th to inform their final decision and the transition will occur at the end of May and June.

Also discussed was the merging of the criminal justice programs and the part time faculty recommendation to increase credit hours from eight to nine in order to eliminate the requirement to report hours.

The EC next met on April 24th for regular business and to prepare the agenda for today's meeting. The EC approved the following non CCTC members to the CCTC Subcommittee on Online Course Evaluations. Elizabeth Erickson, [inaudible].

The EC also certified senate elections from several colleges. The College of Health Professions elected Terry Hallett, Lori Kidd and Ron Otterstetter. The Association of UA Retirees reelected Bob Gandee and Neal Raber. The College of Business Administration elected Asoke Dey and Douglas Hausknecht. Congratulations to the new and returning senators. Respectfully submitted, Frank Bove.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions about the Executive Committee report? Next item is remarks of the president. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. I first want to thank you for your kind remarks. I really just came here today to say thank you. It's been a splendid 15, soon to be 15 and a half years, and I thought I would just reflect on a couple of very minor [inaudible].

So tomorrow we celebrate Founder's Day with the retirees, and it's a time to be mindful of those that have gone before us. And indeed as I was telling the chairman a few moments ago, watching the candidates and meeting the candidates during this week put me back on a trip in time as much as a trip forward in time. This was a trip back in time because it was the same process that of course was followed then.

And so I watched the new colleagues who might be my successors and might be your new colleagues, and certainly as we reflected, you can look at each one of them and find great strengths and some weaknesses as is true in all of us.

So in the spirit of Founder's Day, what I wanted to simply say is that it has been a pleasure. It has been tremendous to build on the shoulders of folks who came before us as it will be for you to go forward and make this university even greater and better than it has been.

We have accomplished a great deal as your chairman outlined some of those. It has been quite a remarkable transformation both academically and physically. I am ecstatic about much of what has happened, much of what we built. Some of the new colleagues are superb, some of our old colleagues continue to be superb. So we continue to build a tremendous University of Akron.

I would be remiss if I did not say that the nature of higher education in general and the public higher education in particular continues to be somewhat challenging, both because for some reason everybody right now has decided that it's appropriate to blame the institutions themselves rather than those that either make up the regulations or those that make the individual decisions that create the conditions for either their success, failure, indebtedness or lack thereof.

It is an interesting time, and I guess I might offer to you just the advice that I give our student groups each time that I meet with them. I think we need to be far more vocal in talking with the larger public at large, whether it is our community here in Akron, the legislature in Columbus or of course the Congress and the people of the United States of America.

I think it is incumbent upon us to try to more clearly delineate, and I have to joke with you a little bit because every time I've tried to talk with my colleagues about these points, it is so very true, everybody says we have such a great story to tell, we just have to tell it a little bit better. And I've heard that for the 40 some odd years I have been in higher education. So I'm not optimistic about that. But I would be optimistic if we all joined together and told that story very vigorously

and actively and made it part, frankly, of a public advocacy agenda that is sadly lacking both in Columbus and in Washington.

So my deep thanks to all of you, my very best wishes. I look forward to being back after the first sabbatical of my career. I've talked to several of you about some of the things we might do together, and I welcome any questions you may have, and I thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR T.S. SRIVATSAN: Deserves a healthy applause. Please give him a healthy applause.

[applause]

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Any parting questions?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Apparently no one wants to take any shots.

SENATOR ROBERT GANDEE: Following up on your recommendation of being more vocal, what would you see higher, folks of the higher education community, how might you see that organized?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Well, Robert, I think first of all we need to recognize the nature of the political process. Higher education has been arguably named in Washington the worst lobby there is for a variety of reasons.

We have six higher education organizations, not one. We often speak with separate voices. The AAU, the Association of American Universities carries probably the largest stick, but it speaks only for only 64 institutions and damned be the rest of it. Forgive my expression there. And anyway, there's too many associations. I think we owe it to ourselves to really let our students speak for themselves and for us. I think we don't often make common [inaudible] appropriately.

This structure, the actual structure of our, if you wish, industry, our business, is very, very similar to that of, you have heard me say this before, health care. And I think we can find ways to leverage what each of us have learned.

There was an article, for example, last week in the Chronicle for example about what Mr. Obama might learn about trying to rate higher education organizations for how the government tried to rate hospitals, for example, and other health care organizations. I think there are some great parallels.

But I think most importantly, to the extent that the students benefit and/or suffer either financially or in terms of quality, the concept of public higher education needs to be more fully understood and promulgated. And more importantly our students need to take that matter themselves.

I have argued, much to the dissatisfaction of some of my colleagues, that that constituency would exist if the state, rather than giving us the money would give money to the students, because by gosh, then they would own exactly the amount of money that they're given and know how much less it is than in other states. Those are just some ideas. Certainly for those in political science and others, I would be delighted to be part of that effort once you give me a little bit of a break. Anybody else?

SENATOR FRANK LOTH: Mr. President, I know you are a big fan of online learning, and a big supporter of that. Given the, well, the difficulties that you just outlined and the budgets and all kinds of stuff, funding higher education, what would you say to the future next president that, would you like to go on the record as saying that the significant investments need to be made to push us in a direction of greater online learning, or should we be more cautious and sort of try to do things on our own? In other words, what would you steer the future president, since it's going to be written down and documented in the minutes, you can give your recommendation.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I will say I think precisely what I said to the senate and to this campus community over the last several years. I think the undeniable press of technology is upon us, and will continue to be upon us, and it's important for us to embrace it, but embrace it intelligently.

What I have suggested both as a means of cost savings, improving the breadth of opportunity for our students and for ourselves is that what is and will emerge I believe and what would suit this university best and our students best is what some are calling a blended model, okay?

In other words, bringing us much of the world's learning resources into the classroom, into the university. I've used the metaphor of creating a campus that is so attractive that it could become the equivalent of an electronic Olympic village where people want to come to gather together to learn with each other and with you the faculty, okay, but to have access to every possible excellent learning resource regardless of who created it or where it was created or when it was created, okay?

If you will accomplish that, because you don't have to create it yourself, although you may be one of those that creates something that everybody else wants to use, okay? But if you are not one of those, there will be 10 or 20 or 30 or 40 or 10,000 potential resources from around the world that you can bring to the classroom or that your students can have access, because they might not learn as well from the way you describe something as they might from how somebody else would, or they may get another nuance or whatever.

So I'm advocating for us as a higher education community, but for us as the University of Akron to embrace it now not later, and to recognize that it's out there right now for the taking, not for the big investment.

We do have important partnerships both with the available resources that are on the web, but with companies that we are supporting with our intellectual ideas and, if you wish, suggestions, and that they're supporting us in another way, the Desire to Learn, D2L Platform, and they have embraced the ideas that we've shared with them. It will be available to us. I don't know necessarily that we need to make a huge investment, but that you must embrace it I think is undeniable in a way that adds value to what you can do, and that expands the resources that are available to your students and in ways that you know what they are and that they are already taking advantage of it, but use it positively and wholeheartedly to bring down costs eventually and expand your relationship as a faculty member with your students and with your colleagues.

I think it's a, I hesitate to use the word brave new world. I would like to say bright new world. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. I would remind the body that we do have a good deal of business to transact so, thank you.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, colleagues.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The next item on the agenda is the election of a University Council representative. Is there a nomination for University Council representative? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I nominate Kristin Koskey and I have consulted with her. She can't be here today, but she has accepted the nomination.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I want to explain that she is absent due to faculty responsibilities. And Senator Lillie, remind me. This is a seat on the University Council that is, for which one must be not a member of the Faculty Senate; is that correct?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Right. And Dr. Koskey's term is expiring on the senate, so she will be a non faculty senator, but she will represent the Faculty Senate on the University Council. She would be one of the three representatives from this body to that. The other two are myself and Dr. Erickson.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Strictly speaking, a representative of the faculty. Are there any other nominations?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Pardon me. Point of order, no. It's a representative of the Faculty Senate. It's a member of the faculty who happens to represent the constituency which is the Faculty Senate. So strictly speaking, it's a member, a representative of the senate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I stand corrected. Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations be closed and Senator Koskey be elected by affirmation? Senator Clark so moves and seconded by Senator Hajjafar. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries and Senator Koskey is [inaudible].

The next item on the agenda is an election of the Faculty Senate's representative to the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics. Is there a nomination? Senator Miller?

SENATOR JON MILLER: I nominate John Nicholas, Chair of the Athletics Committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other nominations? Are there any other nominations? Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations be closed and John Nicholas be elected by acclamation? Moved by Senator Dwayne Jones. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

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

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Academic Policies Committee brings forth two reports today. I will focus first on the lengthy report dated April 22, 2014 with action items for your consideration.

The first action item that we request senate to consider is about transfer students. This would be an amendment or an addition to Rule 3359 60 02. It would add a phrase that would permit or allow students who transfer into the university, once they're here, we would only use their grade point average of the credit hours they earn at the University of Akron in determining their GPA for inter college transfer to a degree granting unit.

Currently the practice has been, although we do not use the GPA with a transfer into the university with on their official transcript here, we have been using that prior GPA from a different institution to determine whether they're eligible to transfer internal to the university. And it's hampering students from getting into degree programs, basically. So this would allow the people that do the transfer process to simply use the university GPA after 15 credit hours here at Akron. So this is a motion from committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there debate on the motion? Hearing no debate, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To number two, Department of Allied Health Technology from the currently named Summit College wishes to move to the College of Health Professions. You will see in the resolution that we have the appropriate level of faculty input both from the College of Health Professions on the receiving end and the college faculty in Summit College. The Academic Policy Committee believes that the mission of Allied Health Technology is much closer aligned to the mission of College of Health Professions, and we respectfully request that you consider this motion to allow that unit to move in total as a unit to the new college.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Questions on the motion to adopt the resolution that was distributed to you in writing that would approve the movement of the Department of Allied Health Technology from Summit College to the College of Health Professions? Is there debate on the motion? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. Item number three, similar move of the Community Services Technology Addictions Program from the Summit College over to the School of Social Work and the College of Health Professions for basically the same reasons.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Questions on the motion to adopt the resolution distributed in writing? And Senator Saliga, may I finish stating the question?

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Yes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The question is on the motion to adopt the resolution distributed in writing that would approve the movement of the Community Services Technology Addiction Program from Summit College to the School of Social Work and the College of Health Professions. Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Is this just the program move or are faculty moving with it?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: There's one current full time faculty member. She is present here today, Jill Dickie, she would move with the program into the School of Social Work.

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

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. Item number four will be deferred to the fall semester, as we do not have the contingency met from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Item number five is a motion to change the mission statement of the currently named Summit College to change the name of the college and to reorganize the college into four academic units.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The question is on the motion to change the mission statement of Summit College, change the name of the college and reorganize the college as just described. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: For the reorganization, the last part says that movement of developmental programs from Summit College. Where are they going? Or, I don't recall.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Currently that's not been decided. The faculty approached the Arts and Sciences College, and there wasn't a good fit. So currently we're considering having the developmental programs in some sense be centrally located. Because if you remember, some of the presentations we did for the Pathways model, every single college on this campus have students who need developmental course work. It's not a group of Summit College faculty or students per se, but of the campus. So we are considering having that unit report in some sense, not through a dean, but directly [inaudible] these matters into the Provost's Office. So the unit would be centrally located to provide support like we have advising and tutoring centrally. It would be a centralized unit. That's the current thinking, but it's not been defined yet.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Every college except those that don't teach at the undergraduate level.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I apologize, yes. School of law, and College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering are the exceptions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I seem to recall that the resolution had a couple of different names suggested. Which one are we, because the resolution calls for a new name for Summit, I wonder if you could tell us which one.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Well, the preference of the committee and of the Summit College faculty is the College of Applied Science and Technology. There are other possibilities. The second preference was the College of Technology and Professional Studies. And the Summit College faculty found a third preference in the College of Technology, although the Academic Policies Committee does not recommend that to this body.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: So would I be correct in assuming that one of those names would be the one that would be selected?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. The committee is preferring, as the Summit College faculty did, that the senate approve the College of Applied Science and Technology. However, as we did when we named the College of Health Professions, we feel that it is reasonable to bring forward the three names if they come out of the senate, through this action.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Two names.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Two names to the board of trustees, so that they have at least an option to pick one or the other. But there's a preference that's very clear.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We're approving two alternatives and expressing a preference for one of them if we vote in favor of this.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there debate on the motion? You ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. Item number six, direct admission criteria. You will see an attachment we've compiled from every college or academic unit within a college that wished a set of direct admit, inter college transfer or ICT admit, and transfer student admission criteria for each of the programs listed. We have checked and double checked that the faculty involved in these colleges and departments were involved in these decisions. We would ask that this be approved so that for the fall 15 recruited class we will know what the admission criteria are in advance.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Questions on the motion to adopt the resolution distributed in writing which would approve criteria for direct admissions to the degree granting colleges of the university? Is there debate? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. Item number seven, fall enrollment deadline. We are proposing to adopt an August 1, 2014 deadline for the enrollment of new, first time undergraduate students at the University of Akron for next year. Data indicate that students that enroll late, i.e. after August 1, have a very low chance of academic success. Many times affected by the fact that they don't have their financial aid in order if they enroll at the last minute.

This would give our advisors, it would give the students a better chance to start in the spring, the following spring term once their financial aid has been put in place. So we ask you to consider this for next fall semester.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Questions on the recommendation of the adoption of August 1, 2014 as the deadline for the enrollment of new, first year undergraduate students for the fall semester, 2014 with the exception as noted in the written report? Senator Woods.

SENATOR DOUG WOODS: Two questions. What's the current deadline, and how many students enrolled last year after that deadline?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: The current deadline is the end of the second week of class. So if you have never experienced a student enrolling in your class at the end of the second week, some of us have. And we actually do have the, I thought we had the data attached to the report. It may not have made it into this handout.

Basically, if we looked at, when we looked at last year's data, my recollection is that there were about 200 students that enrolled after August 1 of last year. And of course their retention rates and GPA earned at the university were very, very low. It's about 200 students, roughly.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator [inaudible].

>>: Would this be for graduate students?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: No. This is only for new, first time, undergraduate students. Most graduate students, especially internationals, are not even allowed to enroll until two weeks before class. So we took that into account.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator Scotto?

SENATOR CARRIE SCOTTO: Did I understand you to say that there's exceptions to this rule?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The exception, which is in the written report, let me read it to you. "Except that students may be enrolled after that date, if taking the status of their financial aid, if any, into account, it is determined that their finances are likely to be in order by the beginning of the semester."

SENATOR CARRIE SCOTTO: So the only exception would be a financial aid sort of exception?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: No. It says that would be taken into account.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: There's a reason for this exception. Let me give you an example. There are some students, very few in number each year, that are prepared for college academically, they have their financial aid in order, they might have chosen the University of

Akron as number three or four on their list, and they've decided to go to a different institution. Something happens in the family, something happens in their personal life, they feel a need to stay closer to home. They've already been admitted to another institution, they're ready to go, but they've decided close to the last minute they want to stay in the local area. These students would have been admitted originally, have their financial aid in order, there's no indication that there's anything that's going to hamper them. Those very few, case by case basis would be the exceptions that would be considered.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions or debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. At the very end of our report you will see that we have attached a report from the committee that's reviewing the centers and institutes. This currently is for information only for the senators.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me just add that I recommend that you read the report. This is an opportunity to offer comments and suggestions to the subcommittee, which is going to be continuing its work over the summer and in the fall.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, I would now like to ask permission to present a report dated April 29, 2014 from Academic Policies Committee. We did not make the seven day posting deadline, but I would ask permission to present it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any objection to the consideration of those items? Proceed.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. So referring to the report dated April 29th, 2014, the number one action item in front of this body today is that we would resolve that there be a minimum time interval of 15 minutes between final exam periods rather than the current five minute time period. There are about five percent of students on this campus on average that have back to back exams at some time. We feel that since we have 15 minutes between regular class meetings for walking across our expanding campus that five minutes is too restrictive. Students need to leave exams early or they arrive late, neither of which is good for the student nor for the faculty running the exam.

We've discussed this with the Registrar's Office. They believe they can make it happen, and we will work with them over the summer to make sure that disruption is minimal as far as the normal patterning of final exams that we're all kind of used to, but at the same time we feel this would be in the interest of the students.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Questions on the motion to adopt the resolution that there should be a minimum interval of 15 minutes between the scheduled end of each final examination period and the beginning of the next? Is there debate on the motion? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: [inaudible] of the question, so I am sure I am as clear as possible on it. It would seem to me that what this motion would do if it was approved would be to change the scheduling for final examination week in such a way so that there would always be 15 minutes between every final examination period. Is that correct?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Okay. So that there should never be a situation in which there might be back to back finals without that 15 minute period in between.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: There would never be two finals without a 15 minute interval between. The students may still have back to back finals.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Right. But there would still be that time between the scheduled times of the final.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. The ending of the period prior and the beginning of the next period, that would be 15 minutes rather than five minutes in between.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Right. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Is this going to leave the finals at an hour and 55 minutes?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. The final exam period will remain the same. We're not proposing to change the length of final exam periods. Simply the spacing in between so there will simply be fewer exam periods per day.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. Referring again to the report of April 29th, 2014 number two, we recommend the following resolution, and there is an attachment that comes with this. Hopefully you had a chance to look at it. It refers to a link and website that we've had developed through the Division of Student Success.

We ask that the Faculty Senate recommend that faculty members inform students of the availability of this information at the certain link that is in your handout. This information concerns the Code of Student Conduct and the requirement of academic honesty, the availability of accommodations for students with disabilities, and the add/drop/withdrawal and tuition refund policies. And they're all put on one landing page with one link. And then the actual policies are linkable through that link. So all students can be made aware of the things that we hope that they're already aware of, but we would ask that the senate recommend that faculty members do inform students of the availability of this site.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Questions on the motion to adopt the resolution just described? Are there questions or is there debate? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries. Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the report of the Curriculum Review Committee.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Curriculum Review Committee brings forward the substantially long list of curriculum proposals. Hopefully you've had a chance to look them over. These came through the system without pending comment or any objections. We ask that you approve these, so we can get these changes made in the system.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there debate on the motion to approve the curriculum changes just mentioned? Senator Kemp.

SENATOR SUKANYA KEMP: I just need a quick clarification. Does this include the, also the courses that are in the additional courses document? There were two documents given to us. One is the CRC for the Faculty Senate and one additional courses document.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. The additional were added after our last Curriculum Review Committee meeting, but in time for the submission to the Faculty Senate.

SENATOR SUKANYA KEMP: Thank you.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator Srviatsan.

SENATOR T.S. SRIVATSAN: I just wish to add to each and every one of you Senator Lillie and Senator Erickson have done tremendous work in getting these course proposals approved. We as a team have worked very, very, very hard. And I would like to let each and every one of you know those two in particular deserve a very energetic and enthusiastic applause.

[applause]

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Is there a certificate with this?

>>: We'll work something out.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions or debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Again, the next item is the report of the computing and communications, Computing and Telecommunications is what it should say right, Committee, CCTC. There's a T in there somewhere, I know. I believe this is just, this is just an informational report. I don't think we have an oral report, do we? Okay.

Next we have a report of the Faculty Research Committee. This is a written report. It is merely informational. I don't think there's an oral report, is there one? No.

The next item is the report of the Part time Faculty Committee. Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Chairman Rich, the Part time Faculty Committee has two proposals for the Faculty Senate to consider. The first one, resolved that the Faculty Senate request that the administration consult with the Faculty Senate about any proposed changes to the university rule governing the appointment of part time faculty.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If you are following along in your documentation, the aforementioned first one is actually the second one. Is there debate on the motion? Ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: The first one. Then we have one more too, for the consideration of the Faculty Senate. Whereas the Internal Revenue Service has promulgated a final regulation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing a safe harbor allowing an adjunct faculty member not to be considered a full time employee if the number of credit hours taught in a semester multiplied by 2.25 plus the number of hours of service required of the faculty member outside of the classroom excluding teaching related tasks such as class preparation and grading of papers and examinations is less than 30, and whereas part time faculty members at the University of Akron teaching nine or fewer credit hours per semester would fall well within said safe harbor, whereas an increase in the number of credit hours part time faculty

members are allowed to teach would serve the interests of both the university and said part time faculty members, now therefore be it resolved that the maximum number of credits part time faculty members may teach in a semester be increased from eight to nine, and resolved that part time faculty should no longer be required to report to the university the hours they work.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You've heard the motion. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Klein.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: I would just like to point out that with the gen ed reform I can't imagine that with some classes going to three credits instead of four or two, which many gen ed classes are, that they would be impossible for part time faculty in many cases to teach less than [inaudible] eight. So I would see them teaching nine, unless they're only going to teach six [inaudible].

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Effectively the current eight hour limit in many areas is a six hour limit already, because courses are three credits.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: Right.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: This is a question for Senator Osorio. Help me understand, is it beneficial to have both the hours and the non reporting of the, the hour limitation increase and the request to not enter hours, are they things that might be done better separately, or are they one package?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is the senator moving to divide the question? The only reason to do so would be to provide for the possibility that someone might be in favor of one and against the other in voting in this body.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: I was looking for clarification on that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe I've just provided clarification. To divide the question would be if you were in favor of one and opposed to the other. And anyone who is should so move.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: And I would say that both resolutions follow from the whereas, that they both follow from that IRS ruling, which is why they're both on the same page.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: This again is more in the order of clarification. The way this has been presented at least generically has been that it would make good sense for a variety of

reasons to go back to nine hours for a part timer. Given the formula that was quoted in there, and again, this is why I'm asking because I'm not sure, would it be possible to say we're going to have you teach 12 hours but it won't come out to 30 because of the formula, or teach 15 hours? Are any of those things possible?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Do you want me to answer that? The answer is it could actually go up to 11 pretty safely. Twelve would be dicey as far as the safe harbor condition is concerned. This is a modest increase and extremely conservative. Other questions or debate? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Just a quick follow up that we had heard from one of our presidential candidates just yesterday, Dr. Scarborough, that a full time faculty member at the University of Toledo starts with a notion of a 12 hour load full time. So if we're talking about 11 or maybe a dicey 12 hour load for a part timer under this formula, I would suspect that we might be running into some issues that we didn't foresee. And I would, for that reason, ask that we postpone consideration of this until we've had a chance to get these questions resolved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I understand Senator Lillie's concern, but I ask people also to consider that by passing it now we have at least put our voice in for making sure that we have some part time, situation for part timers next fall, it will be very different. If we don't, then it cannot affect what happens in the fall because we're not meeting until September.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: If I may, typically in this body we do charge Executive Committee with making important decisions on behalf of the senate over the summer. That's a typical way of dealing with things, so I'm not sure that that's a barrier in this case. However, I propose to postpone consideration of it until these questions have been answered. If there's no second to that proposal, then we can go forward.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There is no second, apparently. Is there further debate on the motion? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries. Thank you. Next item is the report of the Athletics Committee. This is an informational report. It's been submitted in writing. I don't believe we have an oral report.

Next item is the report of the University Libraries Committee. Do we have a committee report, Senator Lazar?

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: It was the very late written report. I would be happy to read it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If you wish.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: There's two issues on this report. One is from the possible library, Science Library and Bierce consolidation as mentioned by, in the report from Secretary Bove that we did receive assurance from the Executive Committee that the provost and higher administration was, were not going to move on a decision in the possible consolidation of Bierce and the Science Library. So we now do have, over the summer as they said, they were not going to make any decisions until the fall. So as a result a subcommittee of the University Libraries Committee was created to continue to gather and analyze appropriate information, report its finding to the ULC in the fall. ULC will then present a final report to the Faculty Senate. The subcommittee will meet Interim Dean Phyllis O'Connor after the first meeting in late May.

The committee is grateful for the extended deadline needed to properly consider this potential move as well as the continued support of Dean O'Connor.

The second part reads as a general statement of [inaudible] funding of the library. The state of funding for the teaching portion of the academic side of the house has been a deservedly significant topic of discussion recently. University Libraries, also an academic unit have also been cut to the bone.

Consider the following. During the last budgeting process, during last budget process the libraries were asking approximately \$900,000 from their budget. This time the figure was slightly under 500,000. The two major library expenditure categories are materials, the acquisitions and subscriptions, and in personnel.

Prior to asking for either of those two cuts, in fiscal year 2012 UA ranked last, 13 out of 13 of the Inter University Council of Ohio reporting institutions in number of librarians per full time equivalent student. We have one librarian for every 1157 students. In fiscal year 2012 UA ranked ninth of 13 reporting IUC institutions Inter University Council of Ohio in materials expenditure per student. We spent \$112.97 per student. If the library fee that we charge to the student, if that money was included, if the figure was excluded, the figure would drop to \$67.61 per student putting us at 12th out of 13.

ULC wonders how we can speak of being a world class research university or even an institution where student success comes first when we aren't anywhere near the average in the support of our libraries in the two major expenditure categories among public universities in our own state.

We do acknowledge the board of trustees' passage of the increase to the student library fee and the administration's efforts to work with the libraries regarding the possible consolidation of the Science Library. The University Libraries Committee must, however, unequivocally state that further erosion of the financial support will seriously impair the library's ability to provide

faculty, staff and students with the resources, research support, staff and services needed to best fulfill the core obligations of the university's mission. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there questions of Senator Lazar about the report? Thank you. The next item of business is the report of the General Education Revision Committee. Chair Subich, welcome back.

LINDA SUBICH: Thank you. Okay. I just have, I have just a few Power Point slides. I will be very brief. They're more for your reference information. We offered, our committee offered a very extensive report about a month ago, three weeks to a month ago, something like that, that everyone should have seen, and I want to just kind of recap our work.

The work that we did as a committee was to take a look, and we spent three years on this, and I have been back a couple of times. If you could advance the, maybe hit the slide show. Well, let me, I will talk. So our charge was to examine and revise the current general education program.

That committee was constituted. It was broadly representative of the campus. We began in 2011 working on this, and we started with learning outcomes. We presented that to you in the spring of 2012, last spring. We had an initial implementation plan that we shared. And this, today I bring the final report, actually.

Okay. So, to recap, this was a research based iterative process. We came back and took feedback and revised and took input from faculty and from constituents across the campus, and we're quite proud of that process. There are members of the committee who are here in the senate. We had faculty from across all of the various colleges. I spent time in every college, multiple meetings in many cases, talking about our work, getting feedback, responding to it.

Our drafts have reflected that feedback. We've tried to come up with what we believe is a good, solid program based in learning outcomes grounded with assessment as a way to back it up. And the most recent request from senate was to be very clear and specific about the implementation process.

So our assumptions, we have, it aligns with best practices. It is, as I said, based in learning outcomes and it supports and integrates with the re programs. We wanted to make, one of the concerns that we had with the current general education program is that it has come to be seen over the years as a very separate part of the curriculum. And we would like to see general education restored to being seen as the foundation.

You might remember our pyramid, our triangle from our very beginning where we actually started thinking about the end result and then worked back from it. And we had input from some of our colleagues and other colleges to approach it this way: That what we hope we graduate from the University of Akron our alums who have a strong foundation, broad skills and knowledge and deep skills and knowledge in their degree program, and that there is some kind of

a capstone, which is part of not general education but degree programs that pulls it all together for them before they leave. And that varies by discipline.

We focused on those broad skills, broad knowledge and the beginning integration of those pieces with the majors and degree programs.

Our learning outcomes we refined over time and with feedback to four. These have not changed. We got very good feedback from the campus. They were changed initially, but we got very good feedback from the campus, positive feedback that these resonated with people. Again, they aligned well with the Ohio Transfer Module. They aligned with our other sister institutions in the state and across the country. And Learning Outcome Number 4 is really the more innovative piece of it. Looking at responsible citizenship in the connected world, and we drew this from some of the more current research and programs in general education.

The implementation plan, which the initial phase was looking at courses as was referred to a few minutes ago, we assumed a three hour credit foundation. It doesn't mean those are built in stone. We are talking about courses, so we assumed there would be two courses in writing for students that would address those learning outcomes that are very fully spelled out in our report. One course in speaking, one in quantitative reasoning, courses spread across the disciplinary areas, natural sciences social sciences, humanities and arts and then addressed with a new concept for our campus, not a new concept across the country, the idea of tagged courses, that courses possibly within majors, if the programs so desire and if they meet the learning outcomes that would address critical thinking, reasoning, U.S. diversity, global diversity and more interdisciplinary course work addressing complex systems.

And then finally the assessment piece is absolutely essential to this, to the fruition of what we have proposed. It will keep us all honest, it will keep us on track, and it aligns with our current campus efforts to make sure we have assessment at all levels.

So any course that is approved for general education in this new program would commit up front that they will be part of the assessment, they will identify an artifact and we will have a regular schedule of assessment that will also be reported back to the campus so the campus can have that feedback and know where we stand on a regular basis. So each year there should be a report on one of the learning outcomes, is our proposal.

And then finally the, just, and again, there's way too many details to summarize, but I just thought I would highlight a few things. We have never wavered from the moment this process started three years ago to looking at this as a faculty driven process. So consequently, implementation must be faculty driven as well. And that is how we wrote it up. We wrote it up specifically around faculty and faculty disciplinary expertise.

We have a three phase plan. We think we should do this in a staged process starting with our communication and quantitative reasoning, moving towards the disciplinary areas in funding, doing the tags which are the newest part of our program for our campus.

We tried and we had a number of faculty on the committee who were in senate or had been on senate. We tried to integrate it based on their knowledge of senate, senate workings, so that the special process that we are proposing, and this is again standard across the country, no one goes through a standard curriculum review process that we could see, when they do a real overhaul of their general education.

So clearly there needs to be good documentation and very clear procedures, and we tried to spell that out and we hope that they are clear and are deemed useful. But we do need a special process that is driven by faculty, and that is essentially directed by the Executive Committee, and there's a lot of responsibility on Executive Committee of Senate to kind of coordinate the selection of faculty and set up the committees that will actually do the curriculum review.

Let's see. The approval criteria, we talked at length about concerns that courses, that curriculum, again given that this is driven by learning outcomes, courses delivered at various campuses need to be meeting the same learning outcomes. And that is, with the assessment piece we believe we can manage that. We also have set up the implementation process to make sure that individuals from other campuses, the main campus are involved in that so it's very clear what is expected in these courses. There needs to be that consistency across the many locations, and that was driven by concerns that that is not always the case.

And then finally, this cannot happen without the resources from the campus. I understand that it's a difficult budget time and we don't really have dramatic resources that we request, but we do need someone to manage this program. There needs to be a person who has the time dedicated to managing the general education program. Again, this is not a new concept across campuses across the country. So there does need to be that resource.

Faculty who would be doing the assessment, which this is university based assessment, not department or school based assessment. They need to be compensated for their time, because that is going to be a cost for this program, but it is an essential cost, because without this assessment the program really, we can't guarantee its value.

So that is the report. We believe we have addressed all of the feedback we've received as best we could, and tried to be as complete as possible, and we hope the senate finds the report valuable.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. You have before you the report of the Ad hoc General Education Revision Committee which proposes a major change, to say the least, in the general education requirement, and also a set of procedures for effecting that change. Is there a debate on the motion? I trust there will be. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I was first asked to be part of the General Education Review Committee that was formed to report jointly to the senate and the provost as a member, as a representative of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and then somewhere over time I became a representative of the College of Education, and I'm sure that may have happened to others as well. So I've been involved in the process from that perspective since it began.

And I also want to point out that I think it's been a thorough process that has included a lot of people. You know, the word iterative covers a lot of stuff. That includes discussions, debates, arguments, all the rest. So I think that was a positive part of this. One of the things that sometimes happens in these processes, at least in my mind, folks that are part of the process may be thinking about where we started and not as clear about where we ended up.

So, the concern that I've had over time is that the message be clear that the purpose of the assessment aspect of this is institutional assessment. The reason I say that is because I know that at least one, maybe more members of the committee who themselves have been previous chairs of departments, were pushing very hard for the use of these artifacts for individual assessment of individual faculty members teaching courses. And that would be a very different model than what we have.

So I want to make sure that everybody's clear that the issue of the assessment, the use of the data is for institutional assessment as to whether or not the learning outcomes have been met, not to be used on evaluating an individual or in some other way; is that correct?

LINDA SUBICH: Absolutely. I mean, it is an institutional assessment process. That's why I think it falls outside of any of the other assessments, the program assessments we've been talking about. The institution needs to support it. We want to know that every student, I mean, general education, this is a general education program that's proposed for the entire campus, so it's not proposed that there be separate programs for separate students.

It is, I mean, this is what I think opened, my colleagues on the committee thought this is a general education program for the University of Akron. And that means that we want to know that every student who goes through our University of Akron and gets their degree has met their learning outcomes that we've specified in the general education program.

So that's what it's about. So whether the course is offered at Lakewood, or it's offered at main campus, or it's offered at Wayne, or it's offered wherever else, Medina, we want to know that those students are all served well by their University of Akron experience. So it's definitely not about faculty.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: For the record, I believe you mean undergraduate students.

LINDA SUBICH: Undergraduates, yes, I'm sorry.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I also wanted to make sure that I, I do support this, but I also want to make sure that we're clear that even though many of what we would call the, I'm going to call traditional general education courses, might be talking arts and sciences, because they would have those foundational literacy and all kind of aspects to it, it's really important for everybody in every college to understand that there are aspects of these general education requirements that they can be systematically and effectively involved with, tags being an example, and that anybody in any college may propose a general education course that they believe meets these requirements.

So it's not simply limited to a particular college, even though there will be an effort to make sure that people with the appropriate disciplinary expertise will be the majority of the committees doing the work.

The reason I mention that is because sometimes people feel that they're isolated from it, and we worked hard, I thought, to make sure that everybody was at least officially made part of the process if they wanted to be.

LINDA SUBICH: Yes, we did. There are, if you look at the implementation, the specification of the committee membership, representatives from all colleges are invited if they want to be a part of the process.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

LINDA SUBICH: Yeah.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you. This is an incredible document, and I would like to really commend Chair Subich and the rest of the committee.

LINDA SUBICH: The committee. It's a wonderful committee.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: But I did have a question, and maybe she could help me understand. I do see that the only place where library faculty can be on a committee is for, in the DLO for letter A.

LINDA SUBICH: The literacy, the information literacy.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: And I was wondering if the library faculty were kind of consciously eliminated from the others. I am very proud of my faculty status and feel as though a lot of us could make contributions. Like as to the performing arts, I could probably do as good a job as someone from the College of Engineering in evaluating the fine arts.

LINDA SUBICH: Well, I will also ask my colleagues who are here to speak to this. But I believe when we set up the, we talked about the college representation in terms of the colleges

where faculty were teaching courses, and we were particularly identifying, and this is where we wanted to specifically make sure that the library and Joe Salem from the library was on our committee, and we particularly wanted to make sure that the information literacy learning outcomes were going to be, have input and evaluation from someone from the library.

I don't recall any conversation about either excluding or we should, you know, include the library on the disciplinary. We were really looking for disciplinary expertise and then we had some, we had the invitations to the other colleges. I don't have a feeling, I guess I don't have an opinion at this point because it never came up.

>>: It was an oversight.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: We certainly, that would be the one that makes sense for us to be required is certainly there, but I feel as if it's open to all of the other colleges as another academic unit with faculty that are involved in some classroom activity, and as these get implemented we probably will be involved in some course design. I know I am, with some of my faculty that I think some people would have liked that opportunity to serve in that capacity.

LINDA SUBICH: Can I clarify? As a liaison or as evaluating curriculum? Because the committees are evaluating curriculum, but we also speak about having liaisons to all parts of the campus.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: I was speaking directly about the committee that

LINDA SUBICH: The committees that are evaluating curriculum?

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Correct.

LINDA SUBICH: I don't have an opinion. It's not something that I recall having come up in the committee at all.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Let me ask another question. By reading this, I couldn't tell if membership was limited to only those listed.

LINDA SUBICH: I think that's what we intended. We were trying to give the Senate Executive Committee a road map and try to give some suggestions to the Senate Executive Committee. But realizing that they would make the final choices, but these were the areas of expertise that we felt were important for the areas of informational awareness.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe the language of the report is clear that these are exclusive. Other questions or debate? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Just a clarification. This set of general education outcomes, and as I evaluated and read the report, and I did read it front to back, relates best of

course to four year degree students. But we have a good many, in fact we talked about them today, two year programs. So this is exactly the same with them; is that correct?

LINDA SUBICH: That is the committee's, we present this as a general education program.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Which is the same number of credits, same number of everything for [inaudible].

LINDA SUBICH: Yes. Yes. Should there be discussion after adopting it about adapting it, which I think is what's happened in the past, but our sense is this is the reasonable and possible way. And we had members on our committee who had expertise in the associate degree programs, and they did not share objections. We discussed it. We absolutely discussed it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator Freely.

SENATOR APRIL FREELY: Thanks so much for your report. I thought it was fantastic. I did want to ask though, about whether or not there were part time faculty consulted that you know of.

LINDA SUBICH: Through college meetings, I'm sure. But we did not consult with the part time faculty, any particular formal group. We did not do that.

SENATOR APRIL FREELY: I was just interested in the rubric assessment part because I know that part time faculty here teach the majority of the first and second year courses which tend to be the general education. And I think it would be really cool to have the opportunity for collaboration, and I'm not sure that that relates to the reality of how the [inaudible].

LINDA SUBICH: Yeah, I can, and I had a couple of comments recently or questions from folks about the assessment piece. The committee developed examples, exemplars of rubrics that might be used by the faculty who do the assessment, but we realized that without knowing what the exact courses will be, what will be approved by the committees ultimately, that it was premature to really do much other than to try to do some advanced ground work for the people who would come after us.

So we did do that, but the rubrics are not set at this point. The determination would be made by the department that put forward, for example, a course, what artifact they felt from the course would need to be collected as evidence for the learning outcomes being met. I know we talked a lot about the importance of conversation and discussion in the collaborative process as departments put those proposals together. So I mean, we talked about conversations. I don't know that we talked about conversations specifically about part time and full time faculty, but we talked about kind of in the context of multiple sites where courses are delivered, the importance of individuals who teach across sites. And I would see that as the same thing, that individuals who teach however their, whatever their diverse roles might be, there should be conversation of collaboration so that everybody knows what's being [inaudible].

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Just from something that you mentioned, there was the point that the departments will be putting forward possible artifacts. It's my understanding that in order for there to be effective and reliable evaluation those artifacts will of course have to be approved up through the curriculum review process and may only be changed through the curriculum review process.

In other words, if you use artifact A one year, the department says we want to do this and it's all approved, then if you are gonna use it for effective institutional assessment, you can't change the artifact every year because you feel like it. You've got to go through the process; is that correct?

LINDA SUBICH: Again, I don't think that's something we specifically spoke to, changes over time. But the assumption is that what is approved, what is proposed by a department for a general education course is information about the course, how it meets the learning outcomes, and what artifact or artifacts will be collected to provide evidence. So that would be all part of the package.

So in the absence of discussion otherwise, I would say that is what we are assuming is that those artifacts, you know, would be part of the entire package.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator Woods.

SENATOR DOUG WOODS: If we vote this today will it be effective for the fall?

LINDA SUBICH: No. Another year minimum, perhaps more. [inaudible] two years to begin with, and it's taken three. So the timeline in the report says a year plus.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? [inaudible] I understand. I want to make sure everybody has had a chance to have their say before it's all over. Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I was on the committee, and I can certainly agree with Linda that we worked really hard and got a lot of really good ideas. What I'd like to do today would be to move that we postpone formal consideration by the senate of the gen ed change until the October meeting of the senate. And the reason that I'm proposing this is that we all got the final document, as Linda was saying, about three weeks ago or right at the end of the semester when everybody is sand bagged.

And I know from talking to a lot of my colleagues that a lot of them are confused and worried about it, and we just need more time to understand it, to read it, to probably have a discussion about it.

In Arts and Sciences the last time that we as a college really dealt with this we actually voted it down. And I think it would be really nice if we as a college had the opportunity to vote again. The reason we voted it down is that the implementation was extremely sketchy at that point.

And now that we have a full and complete and detailed implementation plan, I would hope that we would be able to come together, have a nice, big college discussion [indiscernible] things so that people would understand what was going on.

And I'm not planning to have like, Arts and Sciences hold this hostage, but we would be providing as we do now the majority of the gen ed classes, and it would just be very helpful to have the Arts and Sciences faculty on board before the senate as a whole started to move forward.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There's a motion to postpone until October, the October regular Faculty Senate meeting for further consideration of this proposal. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Ducharme. Debate on the motion?

LINDA SUBICH: We did have a college meeting on Tuesday and this was on the, this was presented and discussed, and there were no serious concerns. I mean, I would not characterize the questions, there were a couple of questions about clarification. Some faculty clarified for other faculty what the report was suggesting, but there were no concerns. So I just offer that for the record.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I was just going to say that I've had people contact me personally knowing that I was on the committee, who couldn't make the meeting. It was a good meeting, but we were talking about 18 other things, so it was quite brief, that portion of it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I am going to rise to oppose the motion to postpone. I want to explain that I believe that it's important for all of us to understand, I believe, that the motion to postpone comes from the idea that we need to be sure that we're careful and considerate as we move forward. However, I think we've done that.

I think there have been many opportunities for people to be involved. I think as well that what we're doing is we are proposing a coherent general education plan that has a little bit of momentum behind it, that over the course of the summer people will be able to review and to think about it, and that there's no reason why in the fall if there are clarifying or helpful amendments, that those clarifying or helpful amendments could not be made at that point in time.

So for those reasons, and because of, I think we have gotten to a point where, including the maker of the motion, that there is a helpful and detailed implementation plan in place, that we should move forward. And I would certainly, certainly promise to carefully consider any recommendations that might be made in the fall to amend whatever the procedure is now. So for those reasons, I speak in opposition to postponing the consideration of this motion.

SENATOR LEANN SCHAFFER: I concur with Senator Lillie.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Schaffer that was, for the record. Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: A question as to several of these comments. Does that mean amendments would be made and it would come back to the senate for re approval?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: No. The report has been presented. The motion to adopt the report is before the body. The motion, if the motion to postpone is passed, then in October we would again consider this proposal. And that would be open to amendment in that meeting. But it won't be amended outside of a Faculty Senate meeting.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Could Senator Lillie clarify to what he was speaking of in terms of amendments would be made in the fall?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If I may, Senator Lillie, I think Senator Lillie is advocating adoption of the proposal now and the possibility of amending the proposal later. Changing the proposal later.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Which, if I may, is certainly the kind of thing we do anyhow now as we change the curriculum rules or whatever. This is not unusual or anything that I'm suggesting as anything other than a recognition of the work that's been done and let's move forward, and if there are things that need to be changed or fixed, then we can do that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I'm rising in support of my own motion. I think that what concerns me about Senator Lillie's point is the idea that we push it through now and fix it later. We've been working on this for three years. There's no instant reason that we must do it at once. And I think if we wanted to make emendations, the best time to make them would be before rather than after it was adopted. So I really do believe that enormous numbers of faculty have not had time to consider this yet.

I think part of it is not even that they're looking for amendments or changes, but they just don't understand it yet. They haven't had time to process what is, I say this having helped write it, a pretty complex document. And at the end of the semester, we don't need to race to do it. If we consider this at the first meeting in October, which is what I'm proposing, the semester will only be a month long at that point, and we can still get started right away on the literacy and the quantitative reasoning portions of it and still be on track to a year, year and a half to get the different pieces proposed and through.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Before I recognize Senator Ducharme, I'm going to give Chair Subich a chance to respond.

LINDA SUBICH: I will say two things. One is I want to just reiterate what I had said earlier, that the implementation of this, and I don't know [inaudible] so I'm not exactly sure of the normal processes that were just mentioned, but the implementation of this is squarely in the hands of the Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate and the departments. So it is squarely in the hands of faculty, and can be adjusted and recognized if there are issues as it goes along.

The second thing I will note is that what I have learned, optimist though I am, is that everything takes much longer than one ever expects. And a month seems like not much, but one possibility, if the senate deemed this acceptable, I think if we really wanted to stick with the timetable, there is ground work and planning and thinking through that needs to happen over the summer to be ready to hit the ground in the fall. I mean, just the nuts and bolts of things. And so that, knowing that this was accepted would be very valuable in that regard.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Ducharme.

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: I do believe that people who have been members of the committee working at this for years understand it completely and don't have objections or problems with it. In our own department, this was presented a week ago, because you asked the department chairs to be sure they've talked with the faculty about it. That was our first discussion, one week ago. It was brand new stuff. Well, almost. Okay. It had just been ideas floating around in discussions on campus. So it was a week ago that the first time this was talked about in our department with the faculty. So it's not had time to seep in. And so that would be my main reason. I understand that people on the committee thoroughly understand it, have been working on it, they understand it, have no problems. General faculty, I think, would be more represented by my example of our department, and that would be why I would support the motion to [inaudible].

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Just to point out that I certainly would not claim to fully understand all the implications of this particular plan, I don't think anybody does or will until we actually get it started. If we wait until October, it is now May, June, July, August, September. That's four months, plus October whenever the first Thursday of October is, and that even if it is approved at that point in essence as it is now, which is again something that the maker of this motion to postpone has supported, then we would be in a situation where it would be October or November before the Executive Committee would begin to issue the call for people who would be parts of the committees that would begin to work on this.

The Executive Committee as well would not be sure until that point what its role would be. So for those reasons again, I believe that it is unwise to postpone consideration of this motion.

If this body feels that it does not want to adopt this motion, that's different than postponing consideration. So I'm arguing against postponing consideration of it at this point, because I think if we do adopt it, we do need to spend some time clarifying what the day to day processes are, where the problems are. And we have been known from time to time in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee when we do these things, to come back and say, here's something we didn't think about. Is it all right if we change it? So again, I think we have a process in place. I think we have a good report, and I think we ought to begin the process.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: As a College of Arts and Sciences senator, but you asked also about our department, and so it was brought to our department also. And indeed people didn't understand that much. The generalities, I mean, it wasn't that they couldn't understand the general idea. It was well, how is this going to work was the issue.

And it was looking, which we had, because after all, it had come to Arts and Sciences before and we discussed it in the department. And it was well, it wasn't the idea that was the deal. It was how the process would go. And so now people came and they said well, wait a minute. How are we going to do the, these committees are going to be important, and what they come up with are going to be important, and we need to think what we should put up, and we should need to be thinking of what courses to do. And everybody agreed that we all have to start thinking about this over the summer.

And I think that supports Senator Lillie's position. That is, that we need to get this general document passed, so that then the faculty will know that they need to work on this over the summer and find out what the details, the problems of the details are.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Pass it first and get the details

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: That's the part that we need to, the details as they work with them. That's the only way that, frankly, the faculty are going to get involved. Otherwise, they'll say, oh, let's put it off until the fall. And I'm sorry, but that's not in this case. I think we've done the work for the general part. We've done what they're supposed to do, which is to come up with a process. And now we pass that and see if it works. That's what we're up to, I think. And I think that I would [inaudible] pass this so that we can go to the next phase. I really do. That's where I think the faculty get involved. That's where I think they can make changes, and that's when you can bring that back to the senate, we can bring that back to the senate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: First I just had a clarification. Are the, are the credit numbers in the divisions, are they set in stone or is this something

LINDA SUBICH: The credits for a course, and we assumed for the ease of the document that a course that was a standard three credit course. There's no reason that a course that was four credits, because it's really about the learning outcomes. It's really about the learning outcomes. That's very different than our current general education and how it came about where it was a course, X number of credits. So the issue is can you meet the learning outcomes? And they are in many cases pretty challenging to meet those learning outcomes.

So you know, it could be a three credit course. It could be a four credit course. We were specifying a course in this, two courses in this. That was what was provided.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: In the history department, as you know, we have thousands of students in the gen ed. And I direct one of them, the World Civ program. I'm actually happy at the thought that that could be a [inaudible] program.

However, personally, I, we just had our department meeting about this yesterday and there are so many things on the agenda we couldn't even process it. And I, therefore I support Senator Bouchard's motion, not because I think that we as a department who runs so many, you know, student credit hours of gen ed, because I think that we'll oppose it in the end, but really I think that we, as Director of the Humanities World Civ and you know, [inaudible] sound great to us, too. But I think we need some more time to figure this out.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are we at the point yet in the words of the great Mo Udall, where everything that needs to be said has been said but not everyone has said it? Are you ready to vote on the motion to postpone further consideration of the adoption of the gen ed reform until October? All those in favor of the motion to postpone, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

MANY SENATORS: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let's have a division of the house. All those in favor of the motion, please indicate by rising. I figure you need the blood circulation going anyway. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10. We'll do it one more time. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11. Opposed please indicate by rising. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. The motion is defeated.

We're back to the main motion, which is to adopt the General Education Reform proposal. Further debate on that motion? Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: If the chair has no opinion on the issue, and the other member of the committee voiced it as an oversight, I would propose to amend the plan to add the option of selecting at least one member to the three disciplinary learning outcome committees and the

three tag, the CLO and TLO, to give the option of choosing at least one of the members from the University Libraries should anyone [inaudible] the name. Did that make sense?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Yes. But the motion needs to be insert certain words.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: It would be inserting the words, so we are at the detailed implementation process, which is on Page 9, I believe. Under Number 3 or Section A.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe that's Page 10.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Yes. I was going from the top of the order. On Page 10, Number 3, Sections A, B, C, and D and Number 4 Sections A, B, C, and D after the last, do you want me to go through each one or try to summarize it?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: No. You can

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: In each section there is the statement that says if they choose the forward nomination, prior to that insert University Libraries in each instance.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think you mean all of the ones you just mentioned except for 3A.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Except for 3A, which already has. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: All right. Is there a second on the motion? Senator Clark seconds. Debate on the motion? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion to amend, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

>>: No.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Motion carries. Further debate on the main motion, which is adoption of the General Education Reform proposal or motions to amend? Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: I would just ask the question here, as I look at this document I see in the appendix one of the issues brought up, I believe it was in the College of Business Administration, was a concern that there's no foreign language requirement.

Was that dealt with? I'm not understanding exactly, especially hearing about the College of Arts and Sciences, how did these colleges that didn't initially approve come through this again? Have they gone through and approved, or what happened?

LINDA SUBICH: My understanding of the initial vote was that prior to this coming to the senate it was important that all colleges have discussed it and it was to be signified by a vote and that was

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Had the opportunity to vote.

LINDA SUBICH: Yeah, had the opportunity to vote. But it was not a condition that every college had to have a positive vote before it became so.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That's correct.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: And so, sorry, so was the issue of the foreign language requirement addressed?

LINDA SUBICH: Foreign language has never been part of the general education program. Well, I shouldn't say never. In my time here at the University of Akron it has not been part of the general education. There's a college requirement in the College of Arts and Sciences for a foreign language and there are certain programs across the campus that have a requirement for foreign language to some degree, but that has never been part of the general education program.

I will say, most of the information in the appendices were summarized by the colleges. From the College of Business I got just the raw comments. So that was one comment that was made at a meeting. It was just a straight narrative. I didn't feel comfortable editing their comments. And the request was made on the committee to include an appendix of the fact that we received. So it was included as raw data. Frankly, that was not discussed on the General Education Committee.

And like I say, it was one comment made, I think, at the College of Business meeting was the question. And I think it was a misunderstanding of the current system.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: To address that a little further, I find it interesting that it was the College of Business making that, considering they have an international business program that does not require a foreign language.

But on top of that, one place where the languages were considered was with the global diversity, that that would be a place that students could be taking courses potentially to meet some global diversity instead of having to do the courses out of the history department with the civilizations. Not that they couldn't, well, two versus three credits and back adding again that we did not talk about how many credits these should be. It was are the outcomes met? So if the outcomes are met by two credit courses, then we have two credit courses.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: So to clarify, you are saying some colleges currently require the foreign language, others don't. So if this is adopted that requirement

LINDA SUBICH: It's a college requirement. It's not connected to general education at all. It's a separate college requirement. So we have a college requirement for a certain number of upper level credits for [inaudible] program. And we have a college requirement for a proficiency of the second year of foreign language for almost all of our programs. So that's a separate issue from general education.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any further debate? Any questions? Are you ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion to adopt the general education reform proposed by the Ad hoc General Education Revision Committee, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

>>: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Motion carries. Congratulations.

LINDA SUBICH: Thank you. Thank you all.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The next item of business, is there objection within the body? I'm concerned about one item of new business. Any objection to skipping over for the time being the report of the University Council representatives? We'll return to it.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Certainly not from University Council.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let's proceed then to new business. Senator Miller.

SENATOR JON MILLER: We have a resolution to propose here. Resolved that the Faculty Senate thanks Luis Proenza for providing leadership to the University of Akron during his 15 years of service as its president, and for his many accomplishments including the strengthening of the university's research activities, the transformation of the campus, and the enhancement of the reputation of the university, and wishes him well in the next phase of his career and his life.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there a second to the motion?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Second.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Seconded by Senator Lillie. Any debate? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Motion carries without dissent. Is there any other new business? Any other new business? All right. I will return to the report of the University Council representatives. Is there such a report?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: We will have a meeting next week I believe, and at that point the recommendations of the Budget Committee should be considered by the University Council itself and forwarded. That's my understanding.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: And the only other comment that I would make is that indeed I would thank the members, Senator Hajjafar as chair of that committee, and CFO Cummins for their work on that, and that we feel very good that it is coming as a report that people, that there was a real input, that there was a real, this is a budget that has been accepted by the subcommittee, and I think it would be brought to the council and the council itself will accept it. And that is a tremendous step that we have a budget process like this.

It is, I guess as somebody who's been involved with this whole process of University Council for 10 years, is this is a really positive outcome, and we should thank [inaudible] and Matt Lee who represents, the chair of Sociology that represents, that represents us as faculty, too, because he is the chair of the Sociology Department. And I think these two people have specifically been a tremendous help in getting this whole process going. We as council [inaudible].

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Is there anything for the good of the order? I take it you are ready to adjourn. Meeting is adjourned.