49 pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 1, 2005

T he regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, December 1, 2005, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm.

Forty-five of the current roster of sixty-two senators were in attendance at this meeting. Senators Ida, Lillie, Qammar, Rich, Slowiak, and Zingale were absent with notice. Senators Broadway, Cheung , Davis, Gamble, Kelly, Linc, Mann, Sancaktar, Stachowiak, Taylor, and Vijayaraman were absent without notice.

I.   Approval of the Agenda – Chair Fenwick welcomed Senators to the December meeting and asked for a motion to approve the Agenda. (*Senator Steiner made the motion; Senator Stratton made the second.*)

Senator Gerlach questioned what happened to the resolution that the body laid over from the November meeting? Chair Fenwick responded that there were two motions laid over that would be coming up in the Executive Committee report. He asked all those in favor of the Agenda to say 'aye.' (*The body responded unanimously in favor of approving the Agenda.*)

II.   Approval of the Minutes – Chair Fenwick then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of September 1 *Chronicle*. He informed the Senate that the September 15 [issue] had gone to print several weeks earlier but it not yet been distributed. (*Senator Erickson made the motion, Senator Huff seconded it. The body responded unanimously in favor of accepting the September 1 Minutes.*)

III. Special Announcements – The Chair then announced and welcomed Senators who were recently elected. He asked that they stand as they were introduced: Tim Matney, from Classical Studies and Anthropology, representing Humanities from Arts and Sciences; Justin Hastings-Merriman and Jacqueline Maibach representing Part-Time Faculty.

Unfortunately, the Chair also had some deaths to report, all former members of Biology; Richard Amos, former instructor of Biology died on November 20; Dorothy Moses former Associate Professor of Biology died the same week; and Dale Jackson, former Chair of the Department of Biology, passed away on Friday, November 25. A memorial for Dr. Jackson was planned for Monday, December 5 from 4:00 until 6:00 p.m. at the Martin Center. The Chair asked that Senators rise for a moment of silence for our colleagues.

Chair Fenwick moved on to his remarks for the day stating that the Senate had a busy Agenda to cover. "First of all, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, I would like to offer congratulations to the Administration and the AAUP—tentatively—for the new contract. We're looking forward to the ratification by the Board and by the bargaining unit this coming week. At that point—once it's ratified—we'll offer our 'official' congratulations."

The day's agenda included several important motions coming before the body as well as the Provost's presentation of the Academic Plan. Chair Fenwick stated that the Senate would not be voting on the plan at this meeting, but that the vote would instead take place during the February meeting. The intent was for Senators to take the Academic Plan to constituents, collect comments and feedback, and forward those to the Executive Committee by January 17. The Executive Committee will collect the remarks and write a narrative piece in response to the Academic Plan prior to the February meeting. Chair Fenwick concluded his remarks by wishing everyone a happy holiday season.

IV. Reports

a. Executive Committee – Senator Konet announced that the Executive Committee met several times during the month of November to take care of many of the issues that the Chair referenced. The Committee certified the election of the new Senators, prepared a list of agenda items for the meeting with the President and the Provost, and set the agenda for the December Senate meeting. The EC also discussed at length some matters referred to it by the Senate.

The first motion addressed unexcused absences brought to the September meeting by Senator Gerlach. The Executive Committee referred this to the Reference Committee and asked that it [the Reference Committee] prepare recommendations regarding attendance rules and discharge of duties.

The second topic included the resolutions presented at the November meeting referencing the development of a future Well-being Committee. A motion was made at the November meeting to postpone action on the resolutions until the December meeting in order to give the Executive Committee time to refine and clarify those recommendations and resolutions. The EC did so and will present them at the conclusion of this report **(see Appendix A)**.

In meeting with the President and Provost, the Executive Committee members were updated on several subjects. Information on visitors' policies was collected and referred by the Provost's Office to the Academic Policies Committee for review and final development.

The language in the Academic Plan was currently being smoothed out and the Plan would be available shortly; the Provost planned to meet with the Executive Committee later to discuss the implementation phase of the Plan. The President also provided the EC with an update on the football stadium and the Provost discussed the possibility of developing a Katrina Relief Fund event.

Chair Fenwick asked if there were questions. Hearing none, Senator Konet presented the following resolutions **(included in Appendix A)** :

> **WHEREAS, the Senate recommended that a university health insurance committee be set up representing all campus employee groups, and that it be an open and inclusive process as set out in more detail in the September 15 *Chronicle*;**
>
> **WHEREAS, Article XV, Section VI, the tentative AAUP/University of Akron contract calls for "the development of a university-wide benefits committee comprised of representatives from all constituencies at the University," and**

WHEREAS, the University of Akron Faculty Senate is the body of the University of Akron that has the widest representation from the different constituencies;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate charges the Well-being and Reference Committees to work together to establish a framework for the creation of a university-wide Healthcare and Benefits Committee consistent with that called for in the September 15 Senate Resolution;

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED that these committees shall consult and work with the Administration, AAUP, CWA and all non-bargaining constituencies of the University in developing this framework, and shall report to the Senate no later than April 6, 2006.

Chair Fenwick announced that this revised motion came from the Executive Committee so it did not need a second. He asked if there was any discussion on this motion? Hearing none, he called for a vote. The body unanimously approved this motion and the motion carried.

b. Remarks by the President – President Proenza thanked Chair Fenwick and congratulated all who worked together so diligently to arrive at the satisfactory resolution of the matters at the bargaining table. "While I don't know everyone that was involved, I would like to, in particular, thank David Witt who I know was in the background on a lot of things and Provost Stroble who was at the table and did a lot to bring us together on these issues. So, congratulations at this stage and I think congratulations will be formally in order next week."

The President went on by asking the Senate to pardon his "ingrammatical-ness," and asked "how about them Zips?!" The team was traveling to Detroit that evening to compete in the MAC championship in football. On Saturday, the men's soccer team would travel to College Park, Maryland, to compete in the next stage, which would then put them to the 'final four' if they won in Maryland. The team had defeated Maryland once before. "I could go on with all the other achievements for this year, but this has been a very good year athletically." He congratulated our student athletes and hoped our student Senators would convey his expression of thanks. "It is a wonderful testament to the talent that Mike Thomas, our departing Athletic Director brought to us during his tenure here."

He added two other comments. First, he mentioned that a process had been initiated that morning—at which Rudy Fenwick and some other faculty, department chairs and deans were present—of trying to figure out, given the kinds of conditions that we face of higher education throughout the nation in particular in Ohio. He found the conversation and the topic very stimulating. "We have a great deal to do; we'll be exploring some of the ideas that were put on the table in a general way by our facilitator." The facilitator at the gathering was Dr. Steven Portch, the former Chancellor of the University of Georgia system, former Vice President of Academic Affairs at the University of Wisconsin system, noted English scholar, trained in England and the United States, author of a major paper on Ohio higher education and the principle consultant to the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy. The President looked forward to sharing some of the notes from that day's discussion and to engage more broadly with the Senate over the next several months. He added that there were many challenges in the foreseeable future of higher education.

The President apologized that he had to leave in a moment, but added that we were in for a very special presentation by Provost Stroble on our Academic Plan and that he looked forward to hearing the feedback. With that, he offered his best wishes for a happy holiday and New Year. "We've accomplished a great deal this past year and I trust you are as excited as I about many of the accolades that have come to rest on your shoulders and on the shoulders of our students and on all of us at the University as it continues to gain more and more recognition for its excellence and the success of our students, faculty and staff. Thank you very much for a great year. For those of you who are getting those extra holidays, enjoy! Good day."

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any questions for the President? Hearing none, he thanked the President and commented, "I just wanted to note that Dr. Portch, in his opening comments this morning, also said that before he became an administrator, he was a faculty senator and that he caused so much trouble *for* the Administration at the University of Wisconsin that they promoted him *into* the Administration. So, if you were *thinking* about upward mobility, you are in the right place." President Proenza responded "I hope that that's not a *lamentation*, but an *aspiration*, Rudy!"

The Chair announced that the Provost would forego her remarks and talk about the Academic Plan shortly. Before that, a report and two motions were forthcoming from Academic Policies Committee. Senator Ofobike presented the APC report and motions in Nancy Stokes absence.

c. Academic Policies Committee – Senator Ofobike began by stating that the motions from APC were emailed to Senators, but additional copies were available if needed.

The first motion was a change to Rule 3359-42-01 **(Appendix B)** regarding Student Rights and Responsibilities. "This comes partially from the discussions around House Bill 24 in Columbus. As you may recall, House Bill 24 was defeated, but in all the debates there was very strong emotion that was expressed in terms of what had to happen in the classroom, in terms of presentation of curriculum material and students' rights. So all that the APC has done is inserted two extra words in the rules that we already have here in 3359-42-01." To save time, Senator Ofobike, read the relevant part of the rule:

> **… However, the student shall be as free as possible from imposed limitations that have no direct relevance to _curricular content or to_ the student's education. …**

"Curricular content" were the two new words inserted in the Rule. The rationale was stated and follows. He asked if anyone had any comments on the changes.

Chair Fenwick reminded the Senate that this motion came from committee so did not need a second. He then asked for discussion on the motion. Dr. David Witt requested permission to address the Senate. There were no objections.

Dr. Witt stated that he had read the rationale for the motion and thought that it was an effort to solve a problem that didn't exist. "I don't see how it adds anything to the rule. In the discussions at Ohio Faculty Council—Chair Fenwick and I go down there once a month—last November we had some discussion about the IUC resolution. We went around the table and asked all the other representatives from Ohio

universities what their intentions were in terms of changing things and almost everybody had decided that their policies were well in place and that they didn't have to make any changes at all." He added that one person even mentioned that it might not be a bad idea to leave well enough alone rather than start to breathe new life into Senate Bill 24 (the Student's Bill of Rights).

Dr. Witt added that one other item in the IUC resolution itself. He stated that he did not have the first page, but in one of the WHEREAS [clauses] that begins, 'WHEREAS Ohio's four-year public universities welcome intellectual pluralism' further down in that section, there was a sentence that stated "the policies that protect the students' rights should not cast doubt on professors' academic freedom." He emphasized the idea of 'casting doubt,' not making some rule. "The proposed language [of this resolution]—in my mind—muddies the water. It would cast doubt in the minds of professors, perhaps, about what they or may not address in class or, if a question comes up, how they might address it. So I would encourage the Faculty Senate to think long and hard about passing the motion."

Senator Matney supported Dr. Witt's comments saying "My faculty was very relieved when House Bill 24 was no longer a part of binding legislation. We like the IUC wording and language of the intent." He shared that they were also concerned about the phrase 'curricular content.' Senator Matney said that it seemed to him that we were opening up the possibility of students grieving because they did not like the content of a course. As an example, he explained that in his courses he talked about the ancient empires and about the collapse of empires and liked to bring in modern analogies and often used current U.S. politics as an analogy for the collapse of ancient empires. He believed it was a good pedagogical tool and helped students relate to the material, but yet could be misconstrued by a student who did not understand the broader context, that he was not attacking a political position in terms of modern politics and not infringing upon their rights. He added that he would be disinclined to use that example if that were the policy of the University because the student could grieve it. "Then I think we get back to what Dr. Witt is saying, that my academic freedom as a professor is being impinged upon by this. I'm not sure that the students are the right ones to determine what the content of the course should be. I think the wording of the current policy is quite good and we should leave it alone."

Senator Stratton requested clarification, "What specifically does this wording *add* to the rule, in your mind, that was not there prior to the addition of those two words?"

Senator Ofobike responded that it was clear that if House Bill 24 had never come up, we would not be having this discussion, that it came about because of the spirit and the tone and demeanor of discussions around House Bill 24. "My understanding of this was that what they were mostly talking about was what was discussed in the classroom. To that extent, I do agree that walking down this path might lead us into a position where we question everything that is discussed; that is a possibility, but that it came about as a reaction to the tone and demeanor of House Bill 24." Senator Elman asked if there is there any discussion on how this would be adjudicated if there was an issue about curricular content? If this were enacted, who would decide? Senator Ofobike indicated that this was supposed to be discussed with the instructor.

Senator Wilburn expressed that this was also his question and that he also had a comment. **"**If this change came about as a result of the energy that came behind it, since Bill 24 failed, I think there is energy to change what is already in this issue also in here.

Senator Norfolk moved to postpone discussion of this until the February meeting. Senator Riley seconded the motion.

Senator Lyons rose to speak against the motion to postpone for reasons already stated. "I don't see how this can survive. I think it's just a bad idea. It's a bad idea because it impinges on our academic freedom and that's already been explained. It's a bad idea because state universities in Ohio have all agreed that the policies meet the IUC agreement and we would single ourselves out as the *one* university that *doesn't* meet the IUC agreement standards. Further, it's a bad idea, because we would then be in some sense, at least in the sound-byte-saboteur environment that we live in now, we would be admitting that the sponsors of House Bill 24 were *right* by passing this motion. Finally, it's a bad idea because the IUC agreement doesn't ask us to do this; it simply asks us *to review existing policy*. And it's my understanding that the President has informed the Executive Committee that the review of our existing policy has been done and our policy has been found to be acceptable."

Senator Kreidler requested a clarification on process, asking "if there's a motion to postpone how to do this?" Chair Fenwick answered that the Senate would have to vote down the motion to postpone and then go back to the main motion and vote on that. He reminded everyone that the motion at hand is to postpone.

Senator Gerlach spoke against postponement, stating that he was uncertain if it was a good idea to postpone. "For example, in that language that is underscored—"curricular content or to the student's education"—if that is not put in there, how will it read?

…shall be free as possible from imposed limitations that have no direct relevance to the student's education…

The Senator continued, "Therein lies a great mischief! Of course you can relate *anything* and call it to the student's education, but is it apropos to the course of study? Even *that* can be broadly interpretive. As a teacher of history, I would be given wide latitude to discuss a variety of things that might not be specifically related to the history of the American Revolution. I may veer over into things concerning languages, economics, and god only knows what. But I will tell you one thing; I once had a colleague who, in a major way, used to boast when he came out of some classrooms about how he had taken me to task on a personal basis about my conduct of classes and so on. That has nothing to do with his teaching of English history to discuss a colleague's teaching of another course. That's something that's quite appropriate to be guarding against, that is, any reference that has nothing to do with curricular content. I don't think that we're submitting to any pressure from these ogres in the Legislature who are concerned about the students' bill of rights; I like the idea of relevance to the curricular content."

Regarding the question about how this would be adjudicated, he referenced the note about the student questioning the fairness of the instructor's action (shown at the bottom of the sheet) which explained how the student could appeal to the head of the department, the provisional dean, and so on. He explained that this seemed to be the course of adjudication if the student had a question about curricular content. "I just do not feel the mischief here and I think this business of academic freedom is sometimes much exaggerated and what is called 'academic freedom' is sometimes is licentiousness. So much for 30 years of experience. Vote it up or down."

The Chair asked if there was any further discussion on the postponement. Senator Wilburn stated, "The students could make their claim irrespective of whether we have curricular content. Now they can still voice their concerns; the process is still there for them to express the issue. I would like to vote to continue to discuss and perhaps move to leave it as it is."

Chair Fenwick once again reminded the body of the motion being discussed. "Let me reframe the issue. The issue to speak to: is there a reason that we should postpone the debate and vote on this in February?" He asked if anyone wanted to speak to that motion, which was the motion on the floor. Hearing no further discussion on the motion of postponing until February, he asked that all of those in favor of the motion to postpone the debate on this motion until February, to please say 'aye.' (*Some of the body responded in favor of postponement. The majority of the body responded against postponement of debate.*) The motion failed and the discussion returned to the main motion.

Senator Norfolk offered additional information that more than House Bill 24 was involved. "There is a case in Kansas University right now where the Legislature is getting involved to try and prevent an instructor from offering a topics course next semester based on the title of the course and they are threatening to yank university funding based on the title of the course that they're going to offer. If I remember correctly, the title was 'Scientific Creationism and Other Religious Mythologies,' As I said now the Legislature is getting involved in individual curricular issues that, I believe, is a very, very troubling thing."

Senator Lyons responded to this concern. "First, given Kansas' ongoing effort to produce stupid children, I don't want to take Kansas as any indication of anywhere we might be going. So hopefully we're not going in that direction. Second, to go in that direction, I think to pass this motion would be to invite that kind of scrutiny. So, for that reason, we need to defeat it."

Senator Gehani responded with an example from his experience. "In class not two weeks ago, we were discussing a particular situation. I wanted the students to suggest the business they would like to discuss. One student suggested a quilting business and another student asked, 'why are we talking about this stupid business?' Which student? And doesn't it also marginalize our education and our expertise. I think when we are in the classroom, we are being trusted to educate in the best possible way. There are occasional abuses I understand; occasionally we probably go off on a tangent. But I think the primary owners of teaching in the best possible way rests with our expertise and our experience. I think this is opening a Pandora's box. Which student? And if students disagree, how are we going to decide? We should defeat this."

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any further discussion? Hearing none, he asked for a vote on the main motion. The body unanimously defeated this motion. As a side note, the Chair commented that one of his colleagues was offering a special topics course in Spring entitled 'The Sociology of Love.' He then moved to the next motion from APC.

Senator Ofobike referred everyone to the motion to change the transfer policy. (**Appendix C**) This change came about because of HB [House Bill] 95, almost a mandate from the State actually. Essentially it stated that the grade of D-minus shall be an acceptable grade for transfer credit under the control of the Ohio Board of Regents. He drew our attention to the last paragraph, which needed to be read carefully:

It is important to note that colleges are not required to accept "D-" work, but may implement rules and policies as indicated by the rationale from the Ohio Board of Regents.

He explained that, in other words, what we understood this to mean is that for transfer students, we are supposed to treat transfers exactly the same as we treat native students—a student from here. A D-minus was a passing grade so that ought to be accepted in terms of *transfer*. However, when moving from the University College into the degree-granting colleges, each college was free to set its own rules. We needed to consider this when making a decision about this proposal.

Chair Fenwick reminded everyone that this came from Committee and no second was required.

Senator Stratton asked, "You say that we are supposed to treat transfers as native students. A D-minus grade goes on your grade report and also is calculated into your CUM. Transfer grades are not calculated into your CUM, therefore it seems to me that accepting credit for a course that was transferred in is not treating native students and transfers the same, but is actually giving a transfer student an advantage over a native student. I guess I don't understand the State's point of view to begin with and I don't understand why we should be accepting credit for work that, normally in our own situation as a native, would not be acceptable work inside."

Senator Ofobike responded, "Except that a D-minus is acceptable in this University; it is a passing grade. It might have a point content that is pretty close to zero, but it's not an 'F' and that's what they are saying."

The Senator stated that he was not defending the State and did not fully understand *why*, but this is what we were asked to do, that the point was it went along with the control of the Board of Regents. We could not treat transfer students differently than we treated our own native students in terms of grades that transfer. "Now what you do with those grades in your own colleges, you can give the mandate. I think it's in the interest of the students in their degree-granting colleges. In terms of letting the students in the same, whatever they come with, we should accept."

Senator Lyons asked if it was correct to interpret the rationale to mean that we are *required* by the State to do this. Senator Norfolk concurred with Senator Stratton. "We currently accept transfer credits but we don't transfer a grade with them, regardless whether it goes in a GPA or not. In our department, we have a requirement of C-minus or better for all prerequisite courses. We would have no mechanism to check that. All we would know is that they had taken a course that we had evaluated as the same as one of our courses; we would not know if they had achieved the same level. So if we're going to do this, I would suggest a larger change. If we have to do this, I would like us to transfer the student's *grades* in as well as the courses. So treat them *as if* they had taken equivalent courses here."

Senator Garn-Nunn reported that the reports she receives for undergraduate transfer students do show what undergradate requirements the students have met and not met, and it also lists every course taken at another institution and the grade earned. "So you *do* know with transfer students what they got. It seems to me that if they got a D-minus in a course that you said was acceptable as a pre-req, then you

would have grounds to say that they would have to repeat that course. I don't like a D-minus, but I get the impression that we are being mandated to do it. I also say that, for some transfer students, coming in and giving them a 'fresh start' makes all the difference in the world and I wouldn't want to take that away from them."

Senator Ofobike asked Senator Jorgensen if she knew the grades that the transfer students earned in the classes that transferred? Senatore Jorgensen replied yes, that is in DARWIN.

Senator Norfolk replied that this was true if you were transferring a student to your own department. However, he dealt with hundreds of students a year trying to get into courses in his department, but that we would not pull out an individual, complete transcript on every single student that calls on the phone. This was a problem, although he did know the value of a 'fresh start' and that he believed in fresh starts. He also added that we had a number of students who shop from university to university to avoid bad grades.

Senator Vierhuller requested clarification. "If I transferred to the University of Akron two years ago, I couldn't have gotten my Ds transferred. Could I now go back and say, "I'd like to transfer some more credit?"

Senator Jorgensen responded to his question. "When you transfer in, your whole transcript comes with you. You can't do it in piece and part. So, your whole work would be here. Now if you left the University and went back to the other institution, and then came back here—which is called "swirling"— then you could, indeed, bring forth those other credits. But, no, when you come forth, you are not admitted unless that whole transcript is here, in full. You are admitted in a pending state for one semester while you are waiting for grades, but then it will kick in."

Senator Gerlach wondered why, if the Board of Regents was so concerned about equitable treatments of transfer students compared with native students, why were the out-of-state students charged more tuition than in-state students, commenting that this was not very equitable either. The Senator recommended that we vote this down. "Anyway, if the colleges are not required to accept D-minus work, why accept this? The University is required but the separate college is not? I think this is kind of inconsistent, too, and not equitable. I will vote against this."

Senator Matney asked to clarify if he was correct that the grades transfer in on the transcript but were not calculated at the cumulative GPA. Senator Jorgensen indicated that this was correct.

Senator Matney ask, since this was mandated by the State, what was the point in voting it down. He suggested that maybe we should send it back and ask the Academic Policy Committee to consider amending this, taking into account the fact that this would give a "leg up" for the incoming students because it did not transfer their grades, to see if the APC would be willing to amend their policy to take into account the grade-point average. "So, I guess I'll make that as a motion to send it back to APC for consideration." Senator Steiner seconded the motion.

The Chair stated "The motion is to send it back to Committee. Is there discussion pertaining to the motion to send it back?"

Senator Huff commented that if this went back to Committee, he would be interested in learning how other State universities responded to this and how our rules differed from theirs. Senator Brooks was not opposed to sending it back to Committee, but felt there could be a concern if we begin to import grades and include grade-point averages of students from other institutions. "If the students do really well some-where else and we have to include their grade-point average in ours and if they do not do well here, it will look like they have done really well at the University of Akron." He urged caution with this type of thing. Hearing no further discussion, the Chair called for a vote. The majority of the body responded in favor of sending the motion back to the APC.

Moving on to reports, the Chair asked if there was any objection to Dr. Sterns giving the *Ad hoc* Committee on Facilities Planning report? There were no objections.

Dr. Harvey Sterns greeted the Senate and stated, "It's probably not an accident that a gerontologist is dealing with the facilities because some of the issues really relate to *aging* of our buildings."

He stated that members of the Faculty Senate should have received a report electronically **(Appendix D)** and hoped that everyone had reviewed it. He stressed that what he felt was important in the survey was the chance to look at twenty-six different buildings in terms of meeting instructor needs and identifying areas that needed attention. It should not have been a surprise to anyone that the intention of the survey was to pinpoint areas that could be improved and that there are buildings that clearly needed more atten-tion than others. A lot of the issues related to wanting more installations of IT or LCD projectors, but it was also interesting to note that basic things like screens were missing from some classrooms.

He went on to suggest is that the *Ad hoc* Facilities Planning Committee is available to serve as a resource. "This report has been sent to Provost Stroble and the committee stands ready to provide infor-mation, right down to the room level, to share in any way that would be helpful to improving the teaching and learning situation on campus. I would be very interested if those of you from the Faculty Senate would have reactions or if you would like more details of the analysis. We tried to present it in the most concise fashion possible." He concluded his comments by saying that the report had been completed and asked if there were any questions.

Senator Kushner Benson stated that she had read the report and appreciated its organization, but did not find the overall response rate or the response rate by college which at least would help her judge how representative the survey was of the campus.

Dr. Sterns replied that there were 188 responses in the final analysis. "So one way to look at it is that it is a very select group of individuals who chose to respond. I would assume that those who responded are those with the greatest concerns. All we can do is go with the group who responded. If we do it again, we might be able to get a larger sample."

Senator Kushner Benson asked how many surveys were distributed and how many people had ac-cess. Dr. Sterns replied that the opportunity was extended electronically to all full-time and part-time faculty at the University of Akron, sent to all Deans for distribution to all faculty within their college.

Senator Riley stated that she did not feel it was necessary to repeat the survey. She felt that the survey was an attempt to document that sub-standard rooms exist in certain buildings and that certain buildings are sub-standard. She questioned the benefit of repeating the survey and instead felt that people wanted to know what would be done about the situation.

There were no further comments or questions for Dr. Sterns. The Chair expressed his appreciation to Dr. Sterns for his work on the survey.

Chair Fenwick then moved to the last report on the Agenda, the Faculty Research Committee report, however, no representatives were present to give the report.

V. New Business – Provost Stroble came forward for presentation of the Academic Plan. First, however, she explained that Associate Provost Stokes was out of town because her daughter was having surgery, "so she regrets not being here today." She went on to state that the Associate Provost would return the following week. Next the Provost commented on the *Ad hoc* Facilities report and had assured Harvey Sterns that she would follow up with Facilities Planning and see what could be done. Since there were a number of responses about Zook Hall, a place she had spent several years, she certainly resonated with the comments about Zook Hall. "I tend to believe the kinds of comments that were written in the report and will do what I can to remedy those."

She stated that she would hand out hard copies of the current version of the Academic Plan **(see Appendix E)** and would follow up with an electronic copy that could be distributed to the entire Faculty Senate List Serve. She also intended to post it on her website. Today she wanted the opportunity to do a face-to-face, talk-it-through to remind us where we've been and how we've gotten to this point.

She explained that she had talked with Chair Fenwick about this the previous day and had asked if this made sense as an approach. She said they had agreed and that certainly, from her previous meetings with the Executive Committee, had wanted to frame this in as positive a way as possible for the Senate's consideration. "Just as I indicated at the October meeting, I really welcome your validation and your engagement with the draft that is presented to you at this point." She intended to go through some talking points, give the Senate a hard copy of the plan, and together—with the Senate Chair—discuss what the next steps in the process might be in order to move this on to the next phase.

The Provost shared that she was glad to have this opportunity today in the 'New Business' section to talk about what I think is a very important foundation document for the University, calling it now 'Design for our Future.' "It really is designed to tell us something about how we can imagine our academic future as a community. Of course, we have had a number of foundation documents and plans on this campus, but none of the previous ones has really taken the exact focus on what this would mean for us in the future as an academic community."

She felt that the process that had brought us to this point had been engagement of all segments of our campus, multiple opportunities for feedback and numerous revisions. Every segment of our community contributed, sometimes to designing it, sometimes to writing it, sometimes reviewing it—at all stages. This process had begun some time ago with three all-campus forums. "Many of you were present at one, or

two, or three, as well as many people outside this room. Hundreds of people participated in those forums and certainly faculty members took a central role in every part of this process, as it should be since we are talking about a design for our academic future. The feedback has been invaluable—great input and great feedback—at both the initial stages and focus groups, in the writing process, all the departmental meetings. We went college to college, we sometimes went to individual departments as we had drafting groups try to fine-tune the design principles; all of that has been valuable and, of course, many of the participants have been members of Faculty Senate. As I went back and did a count of the people that I could track in the years that we've been working on this in the Faculty Senate, there have been at least forty-eight members of Faculty Senate who had some active role in the development of the Plan."

The Provost asked for our response to this, as the Faculty Senate body. "I hope that, as you read this version of the Plan, you will be proud of it. I know that the versions that we have looked at up to this point have been *drafts* and I think that this is *still a draft*." She shared that there were still a few little things she wanted to check on such as consistent use of commas in series, mostly stylistic issues. There could also be a case or two of disagreement on word choices. She indicated that she was expecting that and was open to suggestions.

She commented that, as hard as we have all worked, she wanted to make sure that the content reflects what we're about as an academic community. She added that real diligence was given to the drafting of the wording, the order, the sequence, the outline, efforts to give a common voice to what she wanted to share with you today made her really proud of it, and she hoped that the Senate would be as well.

"I know that at some point you have to put pride of authorship aside." She said that this had been one of the strangest writing processes she had ever been through. "I think of all the public writing that I've had to do in the past, even doing a dissertation where you knew you had to defend the content and wording of it to a committee that really had the power to say "up or down," "degree or not;" this feels a bit like that although the work that I've been writing about really hasn't been my work. In many ways, I'm the conduit and sort of the medium for a message that's campus-wide and I'm trying to capture it in a document that you will believe reflects *you.* So it's a unique position to be in."

As Provost Stroble reflected on the comparisons, she thought it seemed a bit like doing a case study or a qualitative study where participants were interviewed and then would review what had been said about them to determine if they had been represented correctly or not. Yet she recognized that, at the end of the day, the document needed to reflect all of us. It also had to exist in the way a foundation document would—at a level of diction and voice and attention to audience that's appropriate for a foundation document for a great university. "I've tried to meld the content, meld the ideas, include as much as I could from the exact wording given to me by the design groups this summer, but put it together so that it sounds like one person wrote it. This has not been an easy task, but I asked—last month—for another month to get the job done and it has taken me that. I believe that what I have given you now is the best I can do."

She related how she had worked to teach students about writing and how to write correctly.   "You can ask them to draft, and draft, and draft, and finally you have to ask, 'is this the best you can give me?' If the answer is yes, then, at that point, I wouldn't ask somebody to do another draft. So I'm telling you, I think I've given you my best with the hope that you will *not* say, 'go back and do another version.'"

The Provost pointed out that the document she gave us today (and would be sending out electronically) was quite a bit shorter now. She felt the previous version was "plenty wordy." The present document had been pared down to eight pages. She had gone through the document and did the kind of editing that can be done after letting the document sit for several weeks without looking at it; by then "you aren't quite as married to it as you once were. Prepositional phrases—gone! Redundancies—gone! I really chopped out sections where it felt like we had gone on and on, beating a dead horse. I got rid of anything that I saw as needlessly redundant."

Another part that she had not worked with much was the introduction since most of the feedback had been about the design principles. Therefore, the introduction remained largely untouched. She determined that most of the introduction could go. "There's not much left of the introduction, so for the people that really loved the sections about how we developed the plan, that's gone now. I suppose, at some point, if we want that as a reference on the website as a background piece, they can refer to it, but I didn't see it as critical to the Plan."

Even through a lot is now gone, she thought the essence of the document—what we really cared about—was still intact. "We vetted this again and again through those forums, through the website, through going out group to group." Even before the Fall Convocation, they were still meeting with constituent groups such as ASG and CPAC and other groups, so she believed there had been broad opportunity for everyone to engage with the document as much as they wanted or cared to. "Now we are at the point where we need to close the loop on it."

The Provost addressed the present document that and how it differed from the previous version. She stated that she tried to make it more consistent with the other foundation document for the University, Charting the Course, adding that there was a bit more reference to Charting the Course in this version than in the previous ones. She addressed this since there had been many questions about that. Regarding its relationship to Charting the Courst, she tried to put some common diction in place so that it would be consistent and not as though five different committees had written it. She tried to bring a unifying voice to it, meaning that some of the phrasing was now different. "It means that sometimes in a section—like Leadership—most of the same content is there, but I may have flipped the order. I may have, because one section in Design Principle went from general to specific, another went to specific to general, I tried to make it the same pattern all the way through."

The Provost likewise addressed problems with verb tenses, where at times they used past tense, sometimes present, and sometimes future tense. "I've tried to shift that much more to *future* because I thought instead of lauding ourselves for how great we are now about engagement and inclusiveness and innovation, it was more important for us to establish a challenge for ourselves about how we need to be better about that in the future. So I really gave it more of a *future* look."

One other issue involved resolving vocabulary issues. The Provost related that there was discussion on campus, particularly about the phrase 'inclusive excellence,' and whether they should use that or 'inclusion for excellence.' (The newer vocabulary is using 'inclusion for excellence.') Ultimately the decision was made to maintain 'inclusive excellence' since we had become familiar with it and it would have involved introduction of a whole new conversation if the terms had been switched.

Finally, the Provost shortened the document and made stronger transitions so it was not so choppy from principle to principle. She reestablished concepts that came out of the summer 2005 drafting groups. "I went back and read afresh what each of the drafting groups wrote for me this summer and made sure that phrases, concepts and ideas were preserved in the version I'm giving you today."

Finally, the big question that was asked by many: 'how can this be an academic plan when it deals with things that are principled or at a conceptual level?' To address this, she decided to write a new paragraph that answers that question. The new paragraph, which follows, also established a bit of the relationship among and between the five design principles:

The University of Akron aspires to leadership characterized by engagement, innovation, and inclusiveness. The architecture by which we will assure the leadership of the institution rests on a foundation of assessment—the benchmarking by which we document the impact of our leadership and the degree to which all that we do is marked by the principles of engagement, innovation, and inclusiveness. It is through the transformative power of engaging, innovating, and including—in the content of our curriculum, creation of comprehensive learning environments, expectations for our graduates, structure of our buildings, collaboration with local and global communities, and pursuit of programs of research—that we will define a new performance standard, while also honoring our legacies of access and excellence.

She explained that this new paragraph laid out how we went from principles to something that defined us as an academic community.

"Our plan at this point is to ask you to give us the reflection; only you now can really say if this document does the best possible job for giving us a design for our future. Does it take us from where we've been, which has been wonderful, to what we know we want to do in the future as a faculty, as a staff, as contract professionals, as a campus community, on behalf of and in partnership with our students and great community partners? Are these the right principles, do they give us the right direction? Again, I will say to you clearly that we have built this document on a foundation of great input and feedback. It is *not* an administratively-driven document, although ultimately—in the end—somebody in the Administration had to try to put the document together and give us something that we can react to, so that's what I've done. I'm proud of it and I hope you will be, too."

The Provost added that the next step in the process would be getting the response from the Senate constituencies to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. She shared how she recently visited the UC-Berkeley website and had been cruising a lot of institutional websites about their academic plans. UC-Berkeley had their academic plan and then, much like our own process, had a formal response to the plan by their Faculty Senate. They also had the Provost's response to the Faculty Senate response, which she found interesting. "At least it felt to me a little fuller as a response rather than the way that we had cast it at our last meeting, which was 'vote one way or the other.'"

She related that, as they had talked yesterday, it would help the Executive Committee to know what kind of response we would be working with at the February meeting if they had the benefit of hearing from you on behalf of your constituencies when they met on January 18. "Because I am planning to meet with

the Executive Committee on January 18, we'll look at the feedback that they are getting, then I'm thinking that the Executive Committee will probably write a rather formal response to the Plan that can be part of what gets posted alongside the Plan. I know that you're going to want to have a vote in February and I've welcomed that. I hope that it's a 'yes' vote."

At that point, the Provost and the Executive Committee would work to finalize the graphic. Senator Jim Lenavitt was taking the lead on that and would provide some graphic designs to look at for the plan. "And [we will] also be figuring out what that 'next steps' piece is like. It's my intent that we will—together—bring to you what we think is the right 'next step' document, not something that I bring here independent of the Executive Committee. I want this to be a partnership, because academics need to be a partnership and that's my way of expressing that."

She expressed her gratitude to the Senate for the time allotted for her presentation that day. She remained hopeful that the Senate body would really like the plan and reminded everyone to make sure that they took a hard-copy of it before leaving and that an electronic copy would be sent out in the days following the meeting.

Chair Fenwick thanked the Provost and asked for questions or comments.

Senator Kreidler questioned if it was possible to get responses from the faculty by the end of December since they would be gone. Chair Fenwick asked if the Senator was referring to the end of December or January? Senator Riley interjected that the concern was in reference to the date the feedback was due.

Provost Stroble clarified that this request came from the Executive Committee. Chair Fenwick stated that if the vote was going to be conducted at the February Faculty [Senate] meeting, the feedback would need to get back to the EC by January 18. Senator Riley then pointed out that this was a tight schedule, as this was the end of the term, most faculty would then be gone and with the semester set to begin on January 17; the Senator felt this was not ample time. Provost Stroble replied that this was up to the Executive Committee to manage the timeframe. Her objective was moving toward a February vote.

Chair Fenwick responded saying, "If we vote in February, I think it's necessary that the Faculty Senate has a narrative response and rather than the whole body writing the narrative response, the Executive Committee will construct that. We have to have time to write a narrative response. How long do we need? Our thinking is that if we meet on February 2, that we would like to have a few days to post the response back to you so that you could read it. We would like to have a week before that to write the response. That puts us back to the middle of January. Again, this is something we've talked about with the Executive Committee and with the Provost." The Chair added that although two months seems like a long time, most of that time would be taken up with finals followed by the holiday break. He then suggested that once the Senators received an electronic copy of the plan, that they circulate it as widely as possible to their constituents, asking for their feedback. "If you have department meetings or unit meetings before the end of the semester then you would bring it up at those meetings. We need to circulate this document as widely as we can."

He emphasized that the important thing was to funnel those responses to the Executive Committee in order to provide a coherent response. The important thing is that we funnel the responses so that we get

a coherent response, that constituencies bring their feedback to you and that you bring the feedback to the Executive Committee. "If it doesn't get done by January 17 or 18, but still in time for us to write a response, we'll accept that."

Senator Gerlach made a recommendation that to allow the extra time needed, perhaps an extra session of Senate was in order, or else perhaps moving the meeting to the middle of the month and asked the Provost if that was allowable. She responded that she would be willing to meet when schedules coincided. Senator Lyons suggested moving the regular meeting to a date later in the month. The Chair responded that it could be scheduled for February 16. "The Bylaws only require that we meet as a body twice a semester; I haven't told people that before because the other Bylaw just says that it's an attempt to meet at a regularly scheduled time. So I would ask for a motion to postpone the February meeting to either February 9 or 16, if you feel that gives us more time."

Senator Matney questioned if there was something magical about the February deadline or could it be pushed back more? Provost Stroble explained that when she met with the Executive Committee, the committee wanted to move into implementing the plan in the Spring semester. "And you can see that if we delay until March, then we're going to be well into mid-terms and then we can't do anything with this until Fall. You can see what begins to happen when our semesters are only fifteen or sixteen weeks. We're already losing half of January just by the time when the semester starts. I'm going to feel better, myself, about meeting again in February or moving that meeting to another day as opposed to waiting until March, but that's just my understanding of how quickly we need to move on with figuring out what we do with this Plan."

Chair Fenwick reminded everyone that there was another piece to the plan also—the implementation of our Balanced Scorecard, which would also be brought before this body.

Senator Steiner, after hearing this discussion, recommended that Senators get the feedback from their constituencies to the Executive Committee by the end of January and that the Senate meeting be scheduled for February 16. He felt that this would provide enough time for the constituencies to look at it and still allow the Executive Committee a couple of weeks to write the report. He thought that Senator Lyons was suggesting that moving the regular meeting to a later date would accomplish what needed to be done.

Chair Fenwick asked for a motion. Senator Steiner made the motion. Chair Fenwick stated that the motion on the floor was to move the regular February meeting from the 2nd until the 16th and asked for a second. The motion was seconded by Senator Hajjafar.

The Chair asked if there was any discussion about this and, in particular, asked Senators Kreidler and Riley, if postponing the deadline to the beginning of February would give them enough time. Senator Kreidler responded that she felt that the document could be presented to the faculty and that a response could be sent very quickly in order to do what would be best for the Executive Committee. She understood the concern about being off schedule by changing the meeting from its usual date.

Chair Fenwick responded that, "The only thing in the Bylaws is that we have to meet twice a semester and that it has to be a regularly scheduled time, but that's time of *day*, not of month. If this time works on a Thursday afternoon for people here, then it should work on the 16th as well as the 2nd of February." The Provost and the Chair both indicated that the date was clear on their calendars.

Senator Siebert requested clarification. "Will there be a vote on the Academic Plan itself by the Faculty Senate on whatever day we decide?" Provost Stroble responded, "That's right."

Senator Siebert followed with another question, "Then we'll deal with the implementation issues?" Provost Stroble replied, "I believe that, in our meeting on January 18 and whatever meetings we have to have at that point, we'll see whether we can together agree on the implementation plan and bring it. I just don't know how quickly we can work on that. We've got a lot of work to do between us and so we'll see." The Senator then asked if there would be a Faculty Senate vote on the implementation at that time as well. Chair Fenwick confirmed that there would be. Senator Siebert asked if there would be enough time for voting as well as the presentation and Provost Stroble confirmed that this was correct.

Hearing no further discussion on the motion to postpone the February Senate meeting to February 16, the Chair called for a vote. The motion passed and the meeting was postponed until February 16. The Chair assured that an email message would go out to Senators about the date that feedback was expected. In the meantime, he encouraged everybody to share the plan as broadly as possible.

Senator Gehani asked the Provost if this would be sent to *all* of the faculty members? Provost Stroble answered, "Of course, I will, but this is the request from your body Chair that you will do this as the representatives of Faculty Senate. But of course I am going to send it out to the entire campus community."

Chair Fenwick commented that it would probably be more efficient to send it to the faculty and staff list serves. He again encouraged the Senators to organize some kind of response, whether they held a caucus with their college or unit, or went department to department or had an email debate on the issue. "This is really the last day for this. We are the representatives of our constituencies and we need to get back to them and make sure that their voices are heard and that we represent them when we make a decision on this. The best way, I think, to do this is for you to collect the responses as senators and then send them to the Executive Committee as a way of funneling the responses. To my mind, it reduces the chaos that goes on with these responses and enables us to put together a more coherent, narrative response to the Academic Plan. I'm thinking that the EC will discuss this, but I'm thinking probably now a response to the Executive Committee by the beginning of February, but we will formally let you know by the Senate List Serve."

No further discussion was raised about the Academic Plan.

VIII. Good of the Order – Senator Gerlach raised a question. "Mr. Chairman, you reported to us that the matter of that proposed rule change on attendance has been taken up by the Executive Committee and is to be taken up also by the Reference Committee?" Chair Fenwick confirmed that it had been forwarded to the Reference Committee.

Senator Gerlach replied that he was a member of that committee but had forgotten who the chairman was. Chair Fenwick responded that the tentative Chair, the person who would organize the committee, was Senator Rich. "There were issues raised that we heard in the debate over the motion of what constitutes 'unexcused' and 'excused' absence or whether we just want to do absences and not be concerned with 'excused' or 'unexcused.' So they were charged by the Executive Committee to look at other university rules."

Senator Gerlach asked, "What is your pleasure, sir, is the Reference Committee to do its work on its own and then refer its business to the Executive Committee or consult the Executive Committee at some stage?"

Chair Fenwick responded that the Reference Committee was to evaluate rules of other faculty senates, report back to the Executive Committee, and then EC would report out.

Senator Gerlach stated, "The reason I am asking is that I would like some direction for the future. We were told, when this motion was referred to Committee, that one of the questions about it or objections to it was that my proposed amendment wasn't necessary, that we could handle things as they stood with the language that reads:

Should a member of the Senate be unable to discharge the duties of the office, the Senate may declare that seat vacant.

"That's the rule as it stands *now*. I have a good notion to test the mettle of the Senate by making a motion at this point and see what they will do with *this* one. We may 'declare the seat vacant.' I submit to you that the attendance record, given to us in the September 1 *Chronicle*, I believe it was, and the May 5 *Chronicle* of this past year, about whose members and what the attendance record was, that we have three notable offenders, that is, of Senators who had a high rate of absenteeism *without notice*: Sarah Kelly (9), Robert Stachowiak (5), Vijayaraman from Business Administration (6). I should like to move that the Senate declare these seats vacant because of excessive absenteeism without notice duly given."

Chair Fenwick replied that, first of all, that would need a second, and that according to the rules of the Seante, such business must be brought to the Executive Committee two weeks before the Senate meeting in order to be put on the Agenda. Senator Gerlach stated that he thought there was no prohibition against a late introduction if it had the permission of the Senate. Chair Fenwick stated that it could be debated the next time the Senate met; Senator Gerlach agreed.

Chair Fenwick asked for a second, adding that "We won't debate it today, but we will debate it at the February meeting." Senator Gandee seconded the motion.

The Chair then stated that another reason that it was referred to the Reference Committee was the phrase 'failure to discharge their duties' or their inability to do so. Senator Gerlach stated that "then you don't know what that 'unable' means. If the Senate decides that 'inability' is shown by a lackadaisical attendance or failure to even give notice, it seems to me that Senate is in perfect right to say, "your seat is empty, you haven't been discharging your duty because for one reason or another, you haven't been able to do it."

Chair Fenwick said in the meantime we would consult with the Reference Committee because one of their duties was to look at that. He added that our rules were fairly vague as to what constituted 'failure to discharge duties.'

He then asked for any other business for the Good of the Order?

Senator Matney asked if it would be appropriate and polite to inform the Senators that this is coming up for discussion. Senator Gerlach indicated that since none of the named Senators were present, he thought that the Executive Committee or the Secretary ought to send a notice out.

Senator Norfolk addressed an earlier question regarding the issue of uploads coming during class times. He stated that he had explored this and had been given a recommendation [by IT]. "One solution proposed is that they turn off their wireless card during class; they said it's a little inconvenient but then they dock it later. Herb Matheny in the IT shop says that, when there's an intrusive push—one that requires a reboot or specific user intervention—it has a voluntary window seven days prior to the date in which it is required. So the only way that it happens at the instance when you don't want it to happen, you haven't done it for an entire week—you've left it turned off for an entire week—and then it does it. So the easy way is to pay attention to the E-mail Digest."

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any other business for the Good of the Order? Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adjourn? (*Senator Lyons made the motion; it was seconded by Senator John.*)

"Thank you and have a very happy holiday and you'll be hearing from us."

The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Transcript draft prepared by Linda Bussey
Transcript edited by Rose Marie Konet

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 1, 2005

APPENDIX A

Executive Committee Report
December 1, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Executive Committee met several times during the month of November.

The committee certified the election of Tim Matney to the Senate to fill one of two open positions in the Humanities division of Arts and Sciences, prepared a list of agenda items in preparation for the meeting with the President and Provost, set the agenda for the December Senate meeting and discussed at some length several items referred to it by the Senate.

The first item was a motion on unexcused absences brought to the September meeting by Senator Gerlach. EC has referred this to the Reference Committee and has asked that the Reference Committee prepare recommendations regarding attendance rules and the discharge of duties.

The second topic included the two resolutions presented at the November meeting in reference to the development of a future well-being committee. A motion was made at the November meeting to postpone action on the proposed resolutions until the December meeting in order to give the Executive Committee time to refine and clarify those resolutions. The Executive Committee has done so and will present them at the conclusion of this report.

In meeting with the President and Provost, the Executive Committee members were updated on several subjects.
- Information on visitors policies has been collected and is being referred by the Provost's Office to the Academic Policies Committee for review and final development.
- The language in the Academic Plan is currently being smoothed out. The plan will be available shortly. The Provost plans to meet with the Executive Committee later to discuss the implementation phase of the plan.
- The President provided an update on the football stadium, and
- The Provost discussed the possibility of developing a Katrina Relief Event.

Resolution from Executive Committee:

WHEREAS the Senate recommended that a University health insurance committee be setup representing all campus employee groups and that it be an open and inclusive process as set out in more detail in the September 15 Chronicle;

WHEREAS Article 15 Section 6 of the tentative AAUP-University of Akron contract calls for "...the development of a university-wide benefits committee comprised of representatives from all constituencies of the university…"; and

WHEREAS the University of Akron Faculty Senate is the body of the University of Akron that has the widest representation from the different constituencies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Senate charges the Well-Being and Reference Committees to work together to establish a framework for the creation of a university-wide health care and benefits committee consistent with that called for in the September 15 Senate resolution.

Be it further resolved that these committees shall consult and work with the administration, AAUP, CWA, and all non-bargaining constituencies of the university in developing this framework and shall report to the Senate no later than April 6, 2006.

Report submitted by Rose Marie Konet, Senate Secretary

APPENDIX B

Motion from the Academic Policy Committee
to be presented at the
December 1, 2005 meeting of Faculty Senate

Change to Rule 3359-42-01 Student Rights and Responsibilities

Motion: Academic Policy Committee voted unanimously at its 18 November meeting to make the following change to Section B of the above mentioned rule:

> Access to education. With the limits of its facilities, the University of Akron shall be open to all applicants who meet its admission requirements. No applicant will be denied admission on the basis of age, race, creed, sex, national origin or political beliefs. The University of Akron and its colleges shall publish and make available their admission, enrollment, retention, transfer and degree requirements. By enrolling at the University of Akron, the student signifies willingness to adhere to university rules and regulations pertinent to the student's status as a student at the university. However, the student shall be as free as possible from imposed limitations that have no direct relevance to **curricular content or to** the student's education. The university has an obligation to promote the welfare of each of its students and each student has an obligation to promote the welfare of the university.

Rationale:
With the defeat of HB 24, institutions are required to ensure that faculty do not introduce material in the classroom that is not relevant to the course being taught. Further, institutions are required to provide a process by which students can voice concerns about classroom instruction. The proposed change to the rule addresses the issue of relevance. Section C-2 of the same rule already addresses the process by which students can voice concerns. It is quoted below.

> Students have the right to expect effective instruction and to have their performance evaluated solely on an academic basis. Students should be informed by each instructor at the beginning of each course of the procedures and standards, including class attendance requirements, etc., by which they will be graded. Any student who believes unfair treatment has been received in the classroom has the right to seek and receive from the instructor the reason for the instructor's action. If the student still questions the fairness of the instructor's action, the student has the right to appeal in turn to the head of the department or division, the dean of the college in which the course is given, and the senior vice president and provost.

<u>**APPENDIX C**</u>

**Academic Policy Committee Motion
to be presented at the
December 1, 2005 meeting of Faculty Senate**

Change to Tranfer Policy

Academic Policy Committee voted unanimously at its 18 November meeting to recommend the following change to the Transfer Credit Policy and rule so that grades of "D-" and above are accepted from transfer credit. The current policy is to accept grades of "C-" or above.

Rationale: This change in Transfer Credit policy and rule will conform with recent legislative changes stimulated by HB 95. The Ohio Board of Regents has made significant changes to the Articulation and Transfer Policy. The "D-" policy was adopted to ensure that equitable treatments of transfer students with native students across Ohio's public institutions of higher education. Receiving institutions, as of Fall 2005, should now accept and apply all transfer coursework with a letter grade of "D-" as it would for a native student under the business rules and academic policies of said receiving institutions. These rules and policies may include, but are not limited to, such areas, as effective course dates, ages of coursework, requirements of a particular major of program, and eligibility.

It is important to note that colleges are not required to accept "D-" work, but may implement rules and policies as indicated by the rationale from the Ohio Board of Regents.

This change will be made in the Undergraduate Bulletin and to rule 3359-60-03.1.

APPENDIX D

Ad Hoc Facilities Planning Committee
Faculty Senate of The University of Akron

Classroom Facility Evaluation Report

I. Introduction

The web-based survey was conducted through the UA 2way system from April to June, 2005 during spring semester. We sent an introductory email that included a web-survey link to the Dean of each college at The University of Akron. This email was forwarded to the instructors in each college by their deans. In total, one hundred and ninety one responses were collected. Three responses were eliminated due to failure to respond. One hundred and eighty eight responses were used in our final analyses. They evaluated 114 classrooms that were used during spring semester in 26 different buildings on the UA campus.

The questionnaire consisted of general evaluation (e.g. noise level, size, ventilation, basic equipments, meeting instructor's needs, and ADA compliance), physical aspects of classrooms (e.g. light level, painting conditions, cleanness, & general room condition), the condition of classroom furniture (e.g. desk, chair, lectern & boards), and technical support (e.g. screen, electric outlets, overhead projector, microphone, VCR, LCD projector, wireless internet or hard-wired internet access). Participants used a 5-point Likert scale, where an endorsement of "1" represents *strongly agree*, and an endorsement of "5" represents *strongly disagree,* in response to 43 items (see Attached A).

II. Overall

Twenty-one percent of the total responses consisted of evaluations of the Polsky building. Then the next highest percentage was for rooms in Schrank Hall South. The frequency of responses for each building is indicated in Table 1.

Across the buildings and classrooms, overall evaluation seemed slightly positive. Instructors reported that their classrooms met their needs in terms of overall standards, physical aspects, technical support and furniture (*M* = 2.31 to 3.01). The result of individual building evaluation is provided in the next section.

III. Buildings

1. Auburn Science and Engineering Building (ASEC)

Three responses were collected regarding two classrooms (120 and 122). Results indicated that the student desks and chairs need to be improved to meet students' needs, especially for room 122. One participant commented that Room122 needs to be repainted.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.23	.21
Physical aspects	2.54	.80
Furniture	3.50	.90
Technical support	2.42	1.23

2. Carroll Hall (CH)

Seven participants evaluated seven classrooms in CH, including 154, 158, 202, 218, 219, 226, & 50A. Results indicated that they were not happy with the condition of their classroom. They also commented on the overall conditions of the building. Overall, the maintenance and cleanliness of the building was a major concern. There was also concern regarding technical support.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	3.13	.77
Physical aspects	3.36	.60
Furniture	2.96	.97
Technical support	3.40	1.46

3. College of Arts and Sciences Buildings (CAS)

Ten participants evaluated classrooms in CAS, including 130, 134, 135, 138, 139, 143, 144, 335, and 409. They were satisfied with the technical support (multimedia features) in CAS.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	2.16	.44
Physical aspects	1.80	.52
Furniture	2.00	.55
Technical support	1.75	.53

4. College of Business and Administration Buildings (CBA)

Six responses were collected for CBA, including 131, 132, 139 and 148. Overall, the faculty was satisfied, but one respondent indicated that Room 139 needs to be repainted due to chips and scuffs on the wall.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	2.65	.59
Physical aspects	2.27	.76
Furniture	2.58	.52
Technical support	1.54	.71

5. Crouse Hall (CRH)

Nine responses were collected for CRH, which includes 107, 127, 207, 209, 210,311, and 312. Results indicated that repainting needs to be done for many of classrooms in CRH. Respondents commented that paint is falling off the ceiling (R207), and the classrooms walls were very dirty. Also, the auditorium (R107) had been reported as needing new seating.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	2.98	.80
Physical aspects	3.28	.39
Furniture	2.75	.98
Technical support	2.66	1.11

6. Folk Hall (FOLK)

Two participants evaluated two classrooms, 137 & 196, in FOLK. They reported that the screen in R196 was old and damaged. Also, they mentioned that the desks and chairs for students did not meet students' needs.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	2.00	.71
Physical aspects	2.44	.27
Furniture	3.13	.17
Technical support	2.58	.12

7. Gladwin Hall (MGH)

Six responses were collected for four rooms in MGH, which was 201, 302, 304, and 314. Some rooms needs to be repainted (R204 & 302) and the need for better ventilation was noted.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	3.30	.81
Physical aspects	3.23	.55
Furniture	2.83	.58
Technical support	2.71	1.40

8.   Goodyear Polymer Center (GDYR)

Only one participant evaluated the auditorium (R229) in GDYR and reported that the room had heating and cooling problems, especially on cold days.

	Rating
General evaluation	2.70
Physical aspects	3.00
Furniture	2.50
Technical support	3.60

9.   Guzzetta Hall (GH)

Seven responses were collected resulting in the evaluation of 6 rooms in GH (135, 137, 141, 149, 355, and 5). Overall, most of the rooms were reported to need repainting as well as needing screens. As indicated in table below, instructors were not satisfied with classroom furniture including desks, chairs, and boards. Some respondents expressed their frustration in teaching due to the poor classroom conditions.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	3.50	.45
Physical aspects	3.39	.76
Furniture	4.00	.76
Technical support	2.83	1.08

10.   Knight Chemical Laboratory (KNCL)

Only one participant evaluated one classroom (R314) in KNCL. The room was evaluated as quite satisfactory.

	Rating
General evaluation	1.80
Physical aspects	2.88
Furniture	2.50
Technical support	1.50

11.   Kolbe Hall (KO)

Seventeen responses were collected for 9 rooms in KO, which includes 51, 81, 103, 203, 205, 214, 236, theatre and PC lab. They reported that some of the rooms in KO need to have better ventilation or temperature adjustment systems.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	2.66	.49
Physical aspects	2.47	.66
Furniture	2.63	.95
Technical support	1.63	.73

12.   Leigh Hall (LH)

Twelve responses were collected for LH in order to evaluate 9 rooms (207, 208, 215, 306, 308, 312, 408, and 410). Overall satisfaction was quite high across four criteria.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	1.92	.44
Physical aspects	1.39	.39
Furniture	1.71	.45
Technical support	1.46	.63

13. McDowell Law Center (LAW)

Four participants evaluated four classrooms in LAW, including 152, 167, 210, and 215. Overall satisfaction was high but one respondent commented that they had some difficulties because of the classroom being too hot during winter and spring, especially in room 210.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.18	.21
Physical aspects	2.16	.50
Furniture	1.56	.52
Technical support	1.52	.36

14. Memorial Hall (MH)

Seven participants evaluated 6 classrooms, which are 80, 81, 127, 202, 203, and 204. Overall evaluation was satisfactory, however, rooms 80 and 203 need to be repainted due to being in bad condition. In addition, some rooms lack technical equipment, such as overhead projector, LCD projector and internet access.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.86	.87
Physical aspects	3.13	.95
Furniture	2.46	.77
Technical support	2.19	1.47

15. Ocasek Natatorium (ONAT)

Two evaluators rated the pool in ONAT. Only three dimensions were evaluated. They were satisfied with overall condition.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.38	.25
Physical aspects	2.63	1.24
Overall Condition	1.88	.53

16. Olin Hall (OLIN)

Six responses rated 6 rooms in OLIN. Three rooms (111, 127, and 169) need to be repainted. Room 169, which is a computer lab, was reported as having non-adjustable temperature and lack of maintenance of technical equipment.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.78	.87
Physical aspects	2.69	1.21
Furniture	2.79	1.35
Technical support	2.30	1.20

17. The Polsky Building (POL)

Twenty-eight classrooms in POL were evaluated by 39 participants. Most of the evaluated rooms seriously need to be repainted and cleaned. And some of the equipment was not well maintained, such as broken screens, overhead projectors and chairs. In addition, some of the participants pointed out that they need LCD projectors for effective teaching and wireless internet access is unstable in this building.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.89	.74
Physical aspects	2.93	.64
Furniture	2.62	.80
Technical support	2.37	.70

18. Polymer Engineering Academic Center (PEAC)

Only one participant evaluated the room 130 in PEAC. Overall ratings across the criteria were quite satisfactory.

	Rating
General evaluation	1.40
Physical aspects	1.75
Furniture	2.00
Technical support	1.40

19. James A. Rhodes Health and Physical Education Building (JAR)

Four evaluations were collected for three rooms in JAR, which are rooms 29, 43, and 150. They said that room 39 needs to be repainted. Also, they need working LCD projectors and stable wireless internet access in JAR (In addition, committee members have concerns about classrooms in lower level such as Rooms 50 and 51 as a problem area).

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.63	.35
Physical aspects	2.75	.57
Furniture	2.63	.92
Technical support	1.67	.88

20. Schrank Hall North (SHN)

Ten participants evaluated nine classrooms (45, 56B, 222, 354, 359, 362, 453, 460, and 462). They reported that they need more technical equipment, such as overhead projectors, LCD projectors, screens and wireless internet access in this building.

	M	*S.D.*
General evaluation	2.65	.56
Physical aspects	2.91	.73
Furniture	2.78	.78
Technical support	2.54	.98

21. Schrank Hall South (SHS)

Twenty-one participants evaluated 13 classrooms in SHS. Even though the overall quantitative ratings are neutral, the written comments from participants indicated that SHS needs equipment and IT improvements, such as more working overhead projectors, LCD projectors. In addition, the electrical outlets in some rooms are too far away to use in teaching situations. Also, rooms 129, 145 and 222 need to be repainted. One participant pointed out that SHS was not ADA compliant even though there was an ADA accessible sticker outside the door. This person questioned whether accommodations for persons with disability had been made.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	2.93	.55
Physical aspects	3.13	.58
Furniture	2.98	.61
Technical support	2.77	.90

22. Student Union (STUD)

Only one participant evaluated the game room in STUD.

	Rating
General evaluation	2.20
Physical aspects	2.50
Furniture	3.00
Technical support	2.00

23. West Hall (WEST)

Only one response was collected for WEST.

	Rating
General evaluation	3.10
Physical aspects	2.25
Furniture	2.25
Technical support	3.00

24. Whitby Hall (WHIT)

Two responses were collected to evaluate room 210 in WHIT.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	2.20	.28
Physical aspects	2.63	.18
Furniture	2.63	.88
Technical support	2.50	.71

25. Zook Hall (ZOOK)

Ten participants evaluated nine classrooms in ZOOK. Half of the evaluated classrooms need to be repainted. In addition, instructors in ZOOK need more equipment and IT, such as screens, LCD projectors, and internet connections. Compared to the ratings with other buildings, these overall ratings were worse and the written comments indicated that there were some frustrations in teaching in this building.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	3.14	.56
Physical aspects	3.46	.73
Furniture	3.35	.93
Technical support	2.59	.86

26. Gallucci Residence Hall (GALL)

Two responses were gathered to evaluate room 154 in GALL. And it needs to be repainted. Also, some of the equipment, like overhead projectors, VCR, and wireless connections, seemed to be required in order to support effective teaching.

	M	S.D.
General evaluation	3.69	.27

Physical aspects	3.44	.80
Furniture	2.63	1.59
Technical support	2.33	1.41

IV. Conclusions

Overall satisfaction across buildings was acceptable; however, there were variations depending on the individual building. In other words, some of the buildings at the UA seriously need to be improved in terms of technical equipment as well as physical aspects. Many of participants pointed out that the teaching/learning environments in ZOOK, SHS, and POLSKY were very frustrating. These buildings require immediate attentions. Additionally, some of the instructors suggested that it would be helpful to have clocks in the classrooms.

Please see Attachment B for comments by participants.

Table 1. Frequency of responses for each building

Building	Frequency	Percent		Cumulative Percent
POL	39	20.7	20.7	
SHS	21	11.2	31.9	
KO	14	7.4	39.4	
LH	12	6.4	45.7	
CAS	10	5.3	51.1	
SHN	10	5.3	56.4	
ZOOK	10	5.3	61.7	
CRH	9	4.8	66.5	
CH	7	3.7	70.2	
GH	7	3.7	73.9	
MH	7	3.7	77.7	
CBA	6	3.2	80.9	
MGH	6	3.2	84.0	
OLIN	6	3.2	87.2	
LAW	4	2.1	89.4	
JAR	4	2.1	91.5	
ASEC	3	1.6	93.1	
FOLK	2	1.1	94.1	
ONAT	2	1.1	95.2	
WHIT	2	1.1	96.3	
GALL	2	1.1	91.3	
GDYR	1	.5	97.9	
KNCL	1	.5	98.4	
PEAC	1	.5	98.9	
STUD	1	.5	99.5	
WEST	1	.5		100.0
Total	188	100		100.0

Ad hoc Facililities Planning Report - Appendix A - Questionnaire

Classroom Evaluation Form
Ad Hoc Facilities Planning Committee
Faculty Senate of The University of Akron

Please fill out this form based on your current Spring 2005 experience. Please complete for each classroom that you use.

Building name :_____
Room number:_____
Course number. _____
Course name:_____

Use the following response categories to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement below. Circle the number corresponding to your answer.

1	2	3	4	5 Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Strongly Agree (No)				Disagree(Yes)			

General Evaluation (ge1-ge10)

ge1   This classroom met my needs as an instructor.
ge2   I would be happy to be in this classroom again.
ge3   Technical support is always available when necessary.
ge4   Noise from outside the classroom interferes with instruction in this room. (R)
ge5   The size of this classroom was appropriate for my class.

Physical Aspects of the Classroom (ph1-ph8)

ph1   Classroom is in good condition.
ph2   Classroom is clean.
ph3   The temperature in this classroom is conducive for teaching.
ph4   I am able to adjust electric lights in this classroom to meet my instructional needs.
ph5   Light levels from windows can be controlled by drapes/shades/blinds.
ph6   Drapes/shades/blinds are in good condition.
ph7   This classroom needs to be repainted.(R)
ph7a   Because _____.
ph8   This classroom has good visibility of boards/screen or instructor.

Classroom furniture (f1-f4)

f1   The desk and chair provided for the instructor meet my needs.
f2   A lectern is available for my use.
f3   Student desks and seats appear to meet students' needs.
f4   The blackboard or whiteboard meets my needs.

Instructional Support and Technology (Technical support: it1- it10)

it1   I must rely on Audio Visual Services to meets my technology needs when necessary.
it2a   A permanent screen of appropriate size is available in this classroom.
it2b   Have you used the screen in this classroom?
       Yes (1)
it2c   Are you satisfied with the screen in this classroom?
       No (5)
it2d   Is one needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it3a   There are an adequate number of working electrical outlets for equipment.
it3b   Have you used the electrical outlets for equipment in this classroom?

Yes (1)

it3c   Are you satisfied with the electrical outlets for equipment in this classroom?
        No (5)
it3d   Are more needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it4a   There is an overhead projector in this room.
it4b   Have you used the overhead projector in this classroom?
        Yes (1)
it4c   Are you satisfied with the overhead projector in this classroom?
        No (5)
it4d   Is there one needed in the room? Yes (1) No (5)
it5a   The room is equipped so that a microphone can be used.
it5b   Have you used the microphone in this classroom?
        Yes (1)
it5c   Are you satisfied with the equipment for microphone in this classroom?
        No (5)
it5d   Is one needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it6a   The room has a VCR that is in good working order.
it6b   Have you used the VCR in this classroom?
        Yes (1)
it6c   Are you satisfied with the VCR in this classroom?
        No (5)
it6d   Is one needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it7a   The room has a LCD projector that produces a high quality images.
it7b   Have you used the LCD projector in this classroom?
        Yes (1)
it7c   Are you satisfied with the LCD projector in this classroom?
        No (5)
it7d   Is one needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it8a   A laptop computer can be easily connected.
it8b   Have you connected your laptop computer in this classroom?
        Yes (1)
it8c   Are you satisfied with the feature for connecting laptop in this classroom?
        No (5)
it8d   Is a connection needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it9a   Wireless Internet access is available in this classroom.
it9b   Have you used wireless Internet access in this classroom?
        Yes (1)
it9c   Are you satisfied with the wireless Internet access in this classroom?
        No (5)
it9d   Is this capability needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it10a   A hard-wired Internet access is available in this classroom.
it10b   Have you used the hard-wired Internet access in this classroom?
        Yes (1)
it10c   Are you satisfied with the hard-wired Internet access in this classroom?
        No (5)

it10d   Is this capability needed? Yes (1) No (5)
it11   Please provide any enhanced technology that might improve learning environments in this classroom.
_____
ot1   Is this room used for lab/studio work? **(Lab/other conditions: ot1a-ot1d)**
        Yes (1)
        (if yes)
                ot1a   Space is adequate for lab/studio work.

ot1b   Equipment is in good working order.
ot1c   Equipment is appropriate (needed items and number) for instruction.
ot1d   Ventilation and/or hoods meet requirements.

No (5)

ge6   A campus phone is available near this classroom to report problems or emergencies.
ge7   This classroom has poor ventilation. (R)
ge8   This classroom should not be used until significant renovations are made. (R)
ge9   This classroom is ADA compliant (e.g. wheel-chair accessibility)
ge10   This classroom needs to be equipped with a clock.

* (R) indicates reverse coded item.

Ad hoc Facililities Planning Report - Appendix B - Comments from participants

<u>**Repaint Needs**</u>

SHS 222 - smudges and dents in wall
CRH 207 - Paint is falling off ceiling
CRH 127 - Still has puke green tile from 1949
CRH 107 - puke-green tiles from 1949 and peeling paint on plaster parts.
CRH 311 - outdated color and dirty walls
OLIN 127   - wall scrapes, chips, general dirtiness...looks crappy
     169   - The walls are filthy and covered with old posters, cartoons and so on.
     111   - gashes in the walls, large marks
SHS 145 - general dirtiness- was last repainted in the 1700"s!
     129 - shabby
SHN 362 - Dingy/old looking
GH 141   - Paint is chipping, multicolored
              - walls multicolored and marred
              - overall bldg: wear & tear
    137   - This room is where we audition ALL prospective high school recruits
                (brass). Not only does the room need a freshening up, but it sure would be
                nice to have a room where all the chairs and/or desks matched and were
                not broken. It does NOT make a good impression.
  355/135   - Here is peeling paint, writing marks and general disrepair
CBA 139 - chips and scuffs on wall
POL 406 - Marks on walls, dirty appearance
POL 416 - Marks on walls, unclean appearance
POL 455 - scuffs, tears and marks on the walls
POL 211 - Walls are marked up and it's an ugly color!
POL 484 - walls seem dirty/old paint
POL 486 - it needs to be touched up, refreshed
POL 219/296   - desk marks, dirt from hands
POL 225 - walls are marked
POL 294 - ugly
POL 422 - It is dirty and the yellow color makes people anxious
POL M167   - There are marks on the walls
POL M169   - Improve appearance
POL M153   - It's turning yellow
POL 493 - dingy
POL 419 - worn out paint
ZOOK 328   - Normal wear and tear on walls

310	- chipped and old paint
407	- chipped, dented, marked up, dingy
201	- dingy
101	- Chips, marks
JAR 39	- scuffing on walls
CH 219	- color is dingy
CH 50A	- the paint is no longer white
CH 226	- wall, floor
ASEC 122	- dirt
KO 103	- old and dreary, there are no windows in this room
MGH 302	- looks dirty
204	- wear and tear
GALL 154	- dirty
MH 80	- It is extremely old, in bad condition and lacking in any kind of inviting to learn appearance.
MH 203	- Old paint is not conducive to learning and is dirty

IT experience - Screen

GH 141	- screen has fallen off the wall
GH overall	- There are no screens in many rooms.
OLIN 169	- Screen is a WALL & projector is out of focus & crooked.
POL M169	- broken
WHIT 210	- No permanent screen, portable screen is difficult to position to full class to view.
FOLK 196	- The screen is old and damaged
SHN 56B	- There is no screen — I used a piece of foam board taped to the blackboard to project my power point slides

IT experience - connection/overall

- No LCD projector (POL, SHS), too far way from the outlet (SHS, ZOOK, LH), wireless not working (POL), broken outlet (CRH 210, 209)
- SHS, SHN, & POL needs IT improvements (need working OHP, LCD projector etc)

General suggestions

LAW 210   - This classroom is consistently overheated (between 74 and 78 degrees in winter/80-87 degrees in spring. This is not exactly ideal for an evening class when students are tired to begin with.

CRH 107 - The auditorium seating is ancient and made of fiber class. The seats periodically break off and are replaced by nonmatching seats. There is a big nonmatching desk problem in many buildings on campus. Some rooms have 6 different styles. This does not create a good impression on prospective students. The rooms look like they were outfitted by Goodwill.

SHS 145 - row panels where student feet go are pulling apart- sharp screws stick up- we'll have blook sometime!
GH 141   - Most of the teaching rooms in Guzzetta are in terrible shape.
POL 416 - Too many chairs in classroom for classroom size; insufficient size for number of students
MGH 314   - The room is so crowded that the overhead projector must be place so close to the screen that students can barely see the projected images. The screen is placed over the left side of the available blackboard, thereby making the board unavailable. Furthermore the students on the right of the class room can not see the projected images.
Zook 328   - needs to be renovated to improve the learning and teaching environment.

CAS 143 - There are two main problems with this room. First, the screen when lowered obscures the white board. This means that I can't do a multimedia presentation - whiteboard + PowerPoint at the same time. Many classrooms on campus have the same problem and it badly needs to be addressed on a systematic basis. Second, the room has a corner cut out of it that allows the doorway to be inset from the Hallway. This gives a small classroom like this a rather awkward shape that cramps the presentation space at the front of the room. It would be better to use a side wall as the front to allow room for a screen that does not obscure the white board. I get the feeling that the architect that desgined the building knew all about HVAC and fire codes (as he must) but had no concept of what it is like to teach. Otherwise the multimedia features are great!

All of the class rooms in Guzzetta Hall are in bad condition. Chairs don't match or are beat up. Sound systems are poor and/or don't work at all. Frankly it's difficult for the students and teachers to works in these condtions. It's also difficult to sell incoming students that we have fine facilites wehn compared to other universities (and even their high schools!).

OLIN 169   - While this room is a computer lab, it is frequently over 85 degrees in there, with no windows. Heat makes instructor and students ill with no ventilation & fans do little to help. Calling help desk to fix tech problems is not working when WebCT is down or computers do not work. Lab Tech can fix some problems but not all. Tech problems interrupt learning too much.Room is too crowded for wheelchair access or safety in a fire or other emergency. Students facing walls do NOT make for best instruction or interaction but no one asked TEACHERS to help plan lab! I am leaving the lab after teaching 7 courses PER YEAR in them for years.

The ADA question on the last page reminds me that there are entrance doors to SHS that have stickers indicating that they are ADA accessible, but they have no special treatment at all. What's with that? For disabled person to have access to the classroom section of the building, they will have to be high functioning or rely on someone to open the doors.

GH 149   - More blackboard space is needed. The clock in this room is not working. The classroom pianos need more regular servicing

CAS 139 - The classroooms in CAS which have one light on in the back of the room are difficult for viewing projected images. In the rooms with windows this is worse because not all the light is blocked by the blinds. To use technology effectively we MUST be aboe to dimm the rooms better.

KO214   - No Windows open in this room and it becomes so hot in the Spring that it is impossible to teach in this room.

POL 423 - The biggest problem with this class is that there is little space to move around. There are too many desks. The class should be restricted to 17 students so that overhead technology may be utilized without fear that the machine will slide off the small desk needed to support it. When I place it on my desk, there is no room to move about for teaching purposes. Students bump into each other coming into the room and out. Rolling carts, crutches, knock into bookbags on the floor. It's overall too crowded for so many students.

MGH 204   - extreme temperature fluctuations in this room

In general, the condition of most classrooms in the Polsky Building is unacceptable. There are very few classroom adapted for technology. The building is filthy in many places, especially in the stairwells. The entire building needs repainted and cleaned. I have taught in many classrooms with broken/unmatched furniture. In many classrooms, it is very difficult to use the overhead projector and the chalkboard at the same time. They overlap (unlike at CBA or many other buildings). When compared to the facilities available at other community colleges in the area, the facilities in the Polsky building cannot even remotely compete.

GDYR 229   - These same remarks apply to the physical properties of polymers course that I teach in the auditorium on Tuesday evening from 6:00 to 8:00. The ventilation problem is the accumulation of very cold air near the bottom of the auditorium up to about the level of the third row of chairs. Sometimes cold air spews out of the ventilating ducts and aggravates this situation on the coldest days.

CH 218   - my biggest concern other than enhancements for technology is the lack of cleanliness in the entire building — every classroom I have ever used is filthy.

CLOCK needs to be equipped & maintained

zook and crouse and carrol classrooms need attention
CRH 311 - Technologically, the room is old-fashioned. The overhead must be aimed at the side wall for best viewing, but then is skewed. The overhead projector cart is so high, that it is an obstacle for viewing the projections in the front of the classroom. I find that in every room I teach in, the cart is so tall that in small rooms, becomes an obstacle for viewing projections.

In general, Zook is user hostile for teaching

SHS 113 - Improvements for instruction such as white boards, clock, high spped internet connection, useable projection screen, lcd projector, and cart for overhead & projector, & extension cords were ALL made at departmental expense

SHN 56B   - The chairs used are suitable for the lecture portion of the course and can be folded to make room for the lab work but they are not conducive for taking exams. That saids theymeet the needs of the classroom 99% of the time — but having access to a room more comfortable for taking exams would have been appreciated by the students. Ther poor kid's backs were breaking by the time they finished their mid-term. A screen would have been helpful for the presentations. There was a compressor being used during the last few weeks of class for an experiment. Trying to lecture over it was annoying — but we managed. (not a big problem — after all it is a lab). The blackboard issue was the biggest problem. I tried to teach mix design and ran out of board space — erasing etc. I wound up making up a hand out and going over the material on an overhead which probably worked out better. But I had to cancel a class as I was unprepared to teach it that way. Knowing now what I do — the overhead was a much better way to present the material — but a screen to project onto would have been nice.   The other issue was the laptop. It was shared and on two occassions I had power point presentations prepared and it was not available. Admittedly, this could have been remedied had I communicated better with the lab tech, that I would be needing it that week. It was never an issue when I asked for it. And assuming that it would be there was probably presumptuous of me. The only other issue was materials. I was short of sand two weeks and had to track down a key for the materials' store room. There was one week that I had to dismiss a lab group, becuase we ran out of sand. Fortunately, I was able to get the key and bring in extra sand for the evening class to mix up the morning group's project so that we had the data to analyze. A key to the materials store would have been helpful. The ventillation was inadequate at times. An (quiet) exhaust fan would have been apprecited.

Submitted by Dr. Harvey Sterns
Chair, Ad Hoc Facilities Planning Committee

<u>**APPENDIX E**</u>

CHRONOLOGY: DEVELOPMENT OF
DESIGN FOR OUR FUTURE
THE ACADEMIC PLAN FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

April 2004	All Campus Forum
Summer 2004	Review and content analysis of 1998 Master Academic Plan, College and VP Unit Documents, and Updates and SWOT Analyses from Deans and VPS
Fall 2004	Council of Deans Retreat
February 2005	All Campus Forum
February 2005	Version 1 posting on website for feedback
March 2005	Version 2 posting on website for feedback
April 2005	Version 3 posting on website for feedback
Spring 2005	Focus Groups: Colleges, Individual Departments, Faculty Senate, VP Units, CPAC, SEAC, ASG, Diversity, Human Resources, Part-time faculty, and Assistant and Associate Deans
May 2005	All Campus Forum
June 27, 2005	Kickoff Academic Plan meeting for design principle drafting groups
July 13, 2005	Second meeting for design principle drafting groups
July, August 2005	Design principle drafting groups meet on own
August 17, 2005	Third meeting for design principle drafting groups
September 2005	Discussion with stakeholders such as CPAC and ASG for feedback
September 2005	Presentation on *Design for the Future* at University Convocation
November 2005	Final draft of *Design for Our Future* completed
December 2005	Present to Faculty Senate for their response at February meeting
December 2005	Share Design for Our Future with campus community
January 2006	Collaborate with Faculty Senate Executive Committee about most effective means for implementing plan.

Design for Our Future
The Academic Plan for The University of Akron

Introduction

Design for Our Future is the Academic Plan for The University of Akron and serves as the compass to navigate *Charting the Course*, our University's strategic plan. *Design for Our Future* also serves as a bridge document to link the strategic plan and the Academic Scorecard, a foundation document that establishes institutional and unit goals and metrics to allow assessment for the purposes of improvement and accountability. The design principles of our Academic Plan and the metrics of the Academic Scorecard are the operational tools by which we continue to realize the vision and strategic intent that we first envisioned in *Charting the Course.* Taken together, these three documents and the actions that flow from them illustrate how our collective work over the past year, as we sought to define operational excellence and academic primacy, has come together and continues to build momentum for our success as a university. The University of Akron's *Mission Statement* unifies all three strategic documents. Collectively, these documents demonstrate The University of Akron's unique commitment to the threefold mission of higher education in society: teaching, research and service.

In our quest for a prosperous, 21st Century future, The University of Akron seeks to define a new genre of a great American university – a new results-based model defined by new performance standards.

In contrast to yesterday's model of higher education, where institutional "excellence" was defined largely by selectivity and expense – by how many students were excluded and by how much money was spent per student, regardless of outcomes, we seek to be measured by our effectiveness – by outcomes and achievements and the efficiency of our investments. In short, we seek to be known by the actual results that we achieve and by the success of the communities that we serve.

- Unlike others, we shall not be measured by how many students we exclude, but rather by how much value we add in enabling the success of our students.
- Unlike others, we shall not be measured by the barriers we erect between ourselves and our communities, but by the collaborative impact that we create for each other and for our common future.
- Unlike others, we shall not be measured by the isolation of our disciplines, but by their integration as applied in solving the problems of today.

We seek to provide access to excellence for all students - not exclusion. We seek collaboration with community partners to create new knowledge, to expand human and business capital, and to increase our role in the new global economy. We seek collaboration among our faculty members and with our students and with our staff and

contract professionals to enable a brighter tomorrow for all. In so doing, we remain committed to discovery and innovation for the betterment of our students and the community through our teaching and research excellence– we seek to advance our common good.

A History of Access and Excellence

While pursuing our path for the rest of this century, we are grateful to our founders, mindful of our traditions and enthusiastic about our future. A guiding legacy has nurtured and preserved this institution for more than 130 years: to provide students with access to high-quality, postsecondary education, while at the same time partnering in research needed to fuel the industrial and economic growth of the region.

Founded on May 3, 1870, our predecessor, Buchtel College, was a sectarian liberal arts college associated with the Ohio Universalist Convention and named for its benefactor, Akron industrialist John R. Buchtel. During 1913 in the midst of the rubber boom, the assets of Buchtel College were transferred to the City of Akron, and the institution became the non-sectarian, Municipal University of Akron. Subsequently in 1967, the University transitioned to a state-supported institution.

Throughout its history, the University has achieved distinction and recognition for knowledge creation and teaching excellence in collaboration with our community. Today, as a mature, comprehensive metropolitan institution, The University of Akron includes 13 academic units that serve over 24,000 students. It operates on a budget of over $325 million and offers more than 350 degree programs from the associate to the doctoral level.

To meet the demands of a global 21st Century knowledge economy, Design for Our Future articulates the design principles that will be used to establish academic priorities within the clusters of excellence outlined in Charting the Course. We see The University of Akron as consisting of this set of four related clusters of excellence that interweave to comprise the tapestry of who we are: (1) discovery and innovation; (2) cultural enrichment, (3) community well being, and (4) economic development.

The Five Design Principles

Drawing on the resources of our community through a series of retreats, forums and other feedback opportunities, we now advance the five principles by which we will design the new University of Akron – an exceptional place for students to learn, grow and succeed in today's knowledge economy. The five design principles are:
- Leadership
- Engagement
- Innovation
- Inclusive Excellence
- Assessment

These visionary principles express our collective university culture. As an interrelated, interdependent set of principles, they function synergistically to create a dynamic and flexible framework for the University to build its future.

The University of Akron aspires to leadership characterized by engagement, innovation, and inclusiveness. The architecture by which we will assure the leadership of the institution rests on a foundation of assessment—the benchmarking by which we document the impact of our leadership and the degree to which all that we do is marked by the principles of engagement, innovation, and inclusiveness. It is through the transformative power of engaging, innovating, and including—in the content of our curriculum, creation of comprehensive learning environments, expectations for our graduates, structure of our buildings, collaboration with local and global communities, and pursuit of programs of research—that we will define a new performance standard, while also honoring our legacies of access and excellence.

Design Principle 1 – Leadership

To build a better university requires that we establish leadership in the areas in which we have chosen to excel. Institutional leadership requires leading among peer institutions. We are globally or nationally ranked in a number of fields, many of which continue to function as the foundation for economic growth and development and civic and cultural transformation in Northeast Ohio. By systematically investing in selected academic fields, we will maintain a position of national leadership. As we asserted in Charting the Course, we seek to lead in all that we do to create and to protect new knowledge and technologies. We seek to lead in all that we do to define the cultural well being of the greater Akron region. We seek to lead as we enhance the general well being of our community, and we seek to lead in the enhancement of the economy of Akron, the state of Ohio, the nation, and the world.

Achieving institutional leadership requires that we create a culture of leadership at all levels in the institution. Through this plan, the University recommits itself to identifying and rewarding operational excellence and leadership that benefits the entire University community. Individual leaders may be students, staff, contract professionals, or faculty members who have demonstrated special distinction in service to the University. We must seek innovative ways to maximize the participatory environment, identify and foster leadership potential, and provide leadership opportunities. As Harvey S. Firestone said, "The growth and development of people is the highest calling of leadership." The leadership capacity of The University of Akron springs from the leadership of its people and its programs; enabling leadership of employees and students through the expansion of community building, leadership development programs, mentoring support, and innovative partnerships that create teamwork and accomplishment ensures the success of the individual and of the community.

To do this requires a climate of shared leadership that flourishes in a creative climate where people are self-motivated to master long-term goals. As expressed by President Proenza, shared leadership is a process that derives its strength from a community working together toward a common vision, not from vested authority. With shared leadership, we learn from mistakes and welcome change as the challenge of opportunity. Communication is crucial. Shared leadership is inclusive of all; it values diversity, and it recognizes that complex organizations require resources of expertise and creativity. Shared leadership is a process wherein values are integral to the vision and where commitment is embraced because shared dreams challenge and inspire. (May 10, 1999, Looking Forward, comments to the University Community)

Design Principle 2 – Engagement

Engagement unites intellectual, cultural, economic, social, political and physical resources and capacities for a common purpose while transforming people and institutions for the betterment of all. At The University of Akron, our engagement must be designed to function for the public good—for our students, the institution and the communities that we serve.

Engagement contributes to student success. We will design our work with students to incorporate appropriate levels of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning opportunities, dynamic student-faculty interactions, enriching educational experiences and a supportive campus environment. We will enrich our students' education through their participation in a variety of experiential learning opportunities, including service learning and community service, cooperative education, internships and externships, study abroad and international exchange and partnerships, as well as varied opportunities for campus and civic leadership.

Engagement among units and disciplines is fundamental to this design principle. As we focus on engagement, we must foster innovative collaborations across disciplines and between administrative units and academic disciplines that bring to bear the multiple perspectives and varied expertise within this University to provide solutions for complex problems.

Engagement finds expression in community service and collaborations between university and community that are designed to enable the civic and cultural transformation of our local communities, region and state. The increasingly global economy broadens our definition of community to the world, and The University of Akron must extend our own and our students' engagement as citizens of our school, local, state and world communities. Engagement that helps us recognize our place as citizens of the globe with responsibility for the international impact of our actions will transcend the artificial barriers that separate and isolate within and across these communities.

Design Principle 3 – Innovation

A university dedicated to the education and success of its students must depend on a culture of innovation. Optimizing our students' opportunities for success requires an innovative perspective in all services and instructional experiences that touch our students. Developing new and creative ways to meet the ever-changing needs of students challenges our creativity, imaginations and diligence. For our students' benefit, we must, in the words of the Council on Competitiveness "create the conditions that will stimulate individuals and enterprises to innovate and take the lead in the next generation."

The individuals who make up The University of Akron community are the focal point for our innovation. We challenge ourselves to discover, develop and employ emerging technologies in support of teaching, research and excellence in operations. Moreover, through collaborations across disciplines and units, we will innovate with thoughts, discovery, discourse and service to assure success for ourselves and for our world. Indeed, as innovators, we will develop and apply new knowledge to create new products and yield enterprising collaborations of campus and community partners for cultural enrichment, community well-being and economic development.

Innovation yields value in teaching, research and service. Innovation leads to new program offerings and creative instructional delivery mechanisms. Repositioning ourselves in an increasingly competitive postsecondary environment requires new approaches to recruitment and retention. Challenging fiscal times and demographic changes, coupled with an increasing need to provide quality education, provoke paradigm shifts in lifelong learning opportunities and the means by which they are funded. Traditional processes and practices require review and renewal for the most strategic actions and investments in a time of increased accountability.

In our global economy, the University's commitment to the design principle of innovation must increase. Knowledge communities of faculty, students and community partners must generate new perspectives that bridge disciplines and institutions. An entrepreneurial spirit should infuse all that we do academically and operationally. Innovation as an underlying principle challenges us to approach our work with the freedom to create new ideas and new solutions, seeking ways to effect the changes that transform and differentiate.

Design Principle 4 – Inclusive Excellence

Inclusive excellence at The University of Akron is defined as valuing differences with the intention of promoting learning, critical thinking, and personal enrichment of students that enables them to contribute to an increasingly diverse society and world as graduates of the University. Inclusive excellence builds a welcoming campus community that promotes learning for all students, administrators, faculty, contract professionals and staff. As we design a university that embraces inclusive excellence, our policies and protocols will reflect equity and educational quality for all. With respect to a diverse student body, equitable outcomes are about access, retention and graduation rates; for our employees … access and promotion of a diverse, culturally and professionally competent employee population.

As articulated by American Association of Colleges and Universities' Alma R. Clayton-Pederson, Inclusive Excellence in education is characterized by:

- Focusing on student intellectual and social development.
- Developing and utilizing organizational resources to enhance student learning and knowledge development—organizationally by challenging each student to high academic achievement and each organization member to contribute to learning and knowledge development.
- Being attentive to and drawing on the cultural diversity that learners bring to the educational experience to enhance teaching and learning.
- Building a welcoming community that engages all of its diversity in the service of student and organizational learning.

Designing living, learning and working environments for inclusive excellence will enable us to engage in civil conversation and reasoned debate with those who hold views that differ from our own and to interact with persons who have had different life experiences. The environments we design should provide ample opportunities to learn about diverse cultures locally and globally. They will support scholarship, professional development and pedagogy that is culturally responsive, facilitating inter-cultural interaction and a systematic approach to linking co-curricular experiences with academic programs.

The University of Akron realizes that, to be a great American university, to achieve and maintain academic and research excellence, we must expand and learn from the diverse talents of all members of the University community. Indeed, rather than defining ourselves by the numbers and types of individuals we exclude, we shall measure our efforts by the value we add in enabling the success of the diverse community of students we include.

Design Principle 5 – Assessment

The design principle of assessment identifies and creates shared values for the use and implementation of data in support of every design principle and its application to our programs, services and operations. Absent assessment, we will not know if we have reached our goal of institutional leadership characterized by engagement, innovation and inclusiveness. Rigorous and meaningful assessment across all areas of the University depends upon broad and active campus engagement and shared leadership. Assessment is a principle The University of Akron will employ to distinguish and leverage itself as an optimum learning environment ensuring student success.

Assessment promotes sound decision-making by providing a structured system by which data are collected, analyzed and translated into a comprehensive action plan. It provides for continuous improvement through the establishment of benchmarks and incremental targets. Finally, it provides transparency for those calling for greater accountability from higher education.

An increasingly robust assessment culture at The University of Akron will require the collective appraisal of our internal stakeholders, including students, faculty, administration, academic units and staff and support-service professionals. It increasingly includes internal mechanisms such as program reviews, personnel performance appraisals and assessments of student learning. Accreditation studies, audits and benchmarking studies will respond to external assessment demands. Through the collection and analysis of data, the assessment process will assure compliance with recognized/prescribed standards while addressing best practices in programs, service and operations in higher education institutions. Assessment allows us to quantify our excellence, contributing to improved recruitment and retention, service quality and scholarly productivity. It also provides data to ensure the wise allocation of resources for the consolidation of our successes in engagement, innovation and inclusive excellence.

Charting Our Course to the Future

As we move into the 21st Century, we are cognizant of two historical legacies important to The University of Akron: First, providing students with access to a high-quality university education and, second, creating the new knowledge that has, in partnership with our community, sparked economic growth and enhanced the civic and cultural well being of the region.

We honor those legacies today, as we now seek to chart a course to a prosperous future and our rightful destiny. We are a university dedicated to student success and to the production, integration, and dissemination of knowledge for the public good. To fulfill these legacies, we must advance with a powerful vision and with strategic intent. This academic plan, Design for Our Future, delineates the five design principles we will honor as we navigate the course we have charted for ourselves. These are: (1) Leadership, (2) Engagement, (3) Innovation, (4) Inclusive Excellence and (5) Assessment.

These five design principles will illuminate our course to the future. We will strengthen our ties on campus and in the community; we will innovate to improve the effectiveness of everything we do; we will be inclusive to create excellence for all; we will demonstrate leadership as we educate future generations and make discoveries that improve life around the world; and we will continuously and relentlessly assess our efforts so we can sustain improvement and demonstrate accountability in all that we do.

With the vision, principles and goals set forth in the University's defining documents – the Mission Statement, Charting the Course, the Academic Scorecard and this Academic Plan, Design for Our Future - we are poised to capture our destiny and become a great new American University – The New University of Akron.

2005 FALL GRANTS
AWARDED OCTOBER 28, 2005

(information from Mary Dingler, Grants Coordinator)

ACCOUNT #	FRG#	NAME	TITLE OF PROJECT	AMOUNT
2-07590	1627	Dr. Brian Bagatto	Metabolic Ramifications of Infectious Disease: A Case Study of Leprosy in Armadillos	$4,000.00