33 pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 3, 2005

T he regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held Thursday, March 3, 2005, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm.

Thirty-six of the sixty-two Faculty Senators were in attendance at this meeting. Senators Brooks, Gerlach, Johanyak, John, Kushner Benson, Lillie, Linc, Londraville, Slowiak, Sugarman, and Vollmer were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Covrig, Drummond, Hanna, Hansen, Hixson, Huff, Kelly, Krovi, Lowther, Maringer, Riley, Soucek, Vijayaraman, and Wilkinson were absent without notice.

I.   Approval of the Agenda – Chair Fenwick thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He asked for approval of the Agenda for the meeting. Senator Erickson made the motion and it was seconded by Senator Yousey. The Agenda was voted upon and unanimously approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes – The Chair announced that since the Minutes of February 3 had just been sent out via email and had not yet been printed, we would consider them, along with the minutes of the February 17 special meeting, at our next gathering. **(See Appendix A for submitted corrections.)**

III. Special Announcements – The Chair had a couple of announcements. He congratulated Dr. Karla Mugler, the Associate Provost and Dean of University College, who was selected to participate in the in the Graduate Rate Outcomes Project conducted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and will serve as an Associate Team Leader. Provost Stroble thanked him for recognizing Dr. Mugler.

On a sad note, there were two recent deaths to report. Dr. John Zarski, Professor in the Department of Counseling passed away February 5. He began his career at the University of Akron in 1985 in the Department of Counseling and Special Education and was widely published in the area of family counseling. He is survived by a son and two daughters.

Dr. William Fleming also passed away on February 5. He began his career in the C&T College [now Summit College] at the University of Akron in 1966. He completed his Ph.D. in Modern British Literature at Kent State in 1970 and spent the remainder of his career at the University of Akron teaching English, Technical Report Writing and Western Cultural Traditions. He published several works during the course of his career and retired from the University in Spring 1992. He is survived by his wife, Jean, their children and grandchildren.

The Senate body rose for a moment of silence in memory of the two faculty members. On behalf of the Faculty Senate and the University of Akron community, the Chair extended condolences to the families of these two gentlemen.

IV. <u>**Remarks of the Chair**</u> – The Chair offered a couple of brief comments to update the Senate on the resolution that the body cast on February 17 regarding Senate Bill 24. "We sent our resolution opposing the bill to the members of the Senate and House Education Committees, as well as to local senators and representatives from this area. We have received some responses, especially from our local representatives and senators thanking us for our interest.

They offered their opinion that the Bill is not likely to go anywhere in the Senate. We will keep on top of the situation; the Bill was introduced on January 26, the first hearings were held on February 22." He related that the Senate Education Committee holds their committee hearings on Tuesdays, so the next meeting would be in March, when proponents of the legislation would speak before the Senate Education Committee. He believed that the speakers would include David Horowitz himself. Opponents of the bill would have a chance, possibly by March 15, to speak. The Chair promised to keep the body informed of any developments.

The Chair related that Ohio University had also drafted a resolution opposing Senate Bill 24 the same week we did.

V. <u>**Reports**</u>

    a. <u>**Executive Committee**</u>

Senator Konet reported that the Executive Committee met several times during the month of February. The first meeting, on February 10, was dedicated to an extensive discussion about Senate Bill 24, which was presented to the Faculty Senate at the special meeting on February 17. Following the Senate meeting on February 17, the Executive Committee met again to draft a cover letter to go with that Resolution. That letter was sent to local senators and representatives from this area and there have been numerous responses from them, as reported by the Chair.

The Executive Committee also discussed the topic of Summit College, specifically, questions were raised regarding the Faculty Coordinating Committee, its membership, its role and its responsibilities in the design and development of course materials. The Committee hoped that, at some point, some of these questions would be addressed and answered.

Senator Konet reminded the body that the complete report was available as a handout **(Appendix B).**

At this point, Senator Erickson suggested that Senator Konet include one additional item discussed by the Executive Committee: a request related to problems of determining appropriate policies for getting space for events at the University. This request had been forwarded to the Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee. Senator Erickson related that getting space on campus "is very difficult to do." She related that in one specific case, it took between one and two hours to work out the arrangements. The problem was forwarded to the Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee. Senator Erickson continued by saying that this was clearly one of those communciations problems. "Perhaps we can, in fact, do something to solve it by pulling together all the information and making it available in one specific place."

b. Remarks by the President – Chair Fenwick announced that the President was out of town and would not be meeting with us that day.

c. Remarks by the Provost – The Provost reported that she had returned from Washington DC the previous evening. "We host, along with Ohio State and the University of Cincinnati every year in DC—since 2000, I think—an Ohio birthday party and host the Ohio delegation as well as their staffers. We generally go—a group of us—and spend a day or so going to Congressional offices, telling them about the good things that are going on at the University of Akron and use it as an opportunity to get the story out about the University of Akron and also to advocate for specific projects that we care about as well as broad-based policies." She related that one of the policies she spoke about was the proposed budget from President Bush that would zero out funding for GEAR-UP and TRIO programs. She related that this would have a negative impact on our institution because those kinds of programs—Education Talent Search and a number of others—provided access to young people who otherwise would not see college in their future. This funding had also provided opportunities for those students to be here on our campus, to receive developmental work that would prepare them for skills and content that they needed to be successful in college. "It's been a hugely successful program, not only on this campus but around the nation." Provost Stroble explained that they advocated for restoration of that funding, "it's hard to say how that will turn out. We're seeing the same kind of budget squeeze on higher ed funding on the federal level that we're seeing at the State level."

Provost Stroble went on to explain that this provided a good opportunity to share the story about the University of Akron—one of those places in the country and certainly in the State of Ohio, that is a place of access for young people to a truly excellent education. "You don't want to strip the funding from this kind of an institution that has such a commitment to serving young people who don't see college in their future because it's not been part of their family history." She related that there had been "a lot of head nods and agreements, but we must wait to see if that results in restoration of funding." She went on to urge everyone to subscribe to listserves and networks in order to keep up to date about federal legislation and trends in higher ed funding. "It's a good thing to know about in addition to the Ohio context because it truly does have an impact on us."

The Provost highlighted three topics for the day's meeting; these were topics that she or her staff had written about recently in *Perspectives from the Provost*. In the handout provided, she repeated the text of those particular *Perspectives* sections **(see Appendix C)**.

"We've had a positive initial response to the first one, which is a program that the Council of Deans is launching, in partnership with me. We really believe that it's our obligation as the Deans' group to help develop people who are either already in leadership roles in some capacity in the institution and who need a *community* of people to work with to develop their skills and to develop their capacity and be more effective in their leadership roles. We also know that there are people who are not currently in, perhaps a formal or even an informal leadership role, but who would aspire to do that on this campus. So, we would like to provide some opportunities for people to gain the experience and the skill that they would need in aspiring to those kinds of roles and that's the whole idea. So, we'll launch it this Spring." Provost Stroble mentioned that the University would be hosting Walter Gmelch—many of us are familiar with the opportunities that he provides to develop campus leaders—on March 14 and invited everyone to attend that session, the details of which were included on the handout.

She went on to explain that later this Spring a recurring opportunity would be made available for people to be nominated and selected against a set of prescribed criteria for forming a group of people who will engage in—during the next academic year—a set of community activities to develop their skills and knowledge as leaders. "It's our way, as Council of Deans, of investing in the people that are currently here, to help them to aspire to leadership roles that they would choose for themselves."

The second issue the Provost addressed was the *Update* regarding the Academic Plan and the next version being "up and running." She related her belief that "we'll see at least two, three or four more revisions, but it seemed to us to make sense in the Provost's office to keep putting out incremental visions and versions as we go along. So the big changes in this one from the one you saw in the previous one is a lot more detail in two sections: engaging campus and community and innovating for success. Again there's a web-based template for gathering feedback; we had a lot of feedback on the first version." She encouraged comments on this and stated that this will be open for another week to get feedback on this version. "Based on that feedback, we'll make the next set of revisions and start scheduling more forums that are more college-VP-unit-program-constituency-based to get as much rich discussion about this as we can."

The final update the Provost discussed was the budget hearing process. "Roy Ray, Amy Gilliland, Brian Davis and I have started a series of meetings to try to figure out where the numbers actually are now and to put some numbers to the priorities and the information that we gained from the budget hearing." She related that although budget figures were due the April Board of Trustees meeting, "we will *not* know all of the numbers that we will need to know by that time to put together a fully informed budget because we won't know what our funding is going to be from Columbus." She again mentioned the uncertainty about program funding for GEAR-UP and TRIO being cut and that, if things like that go away, we must develop various alternate scenarios. "As I said in this *Perspectives from the Provost*, as more information is known about that and more specifics can be shared about it, I will use this forum again to do that. So I've given the update about where we are in the process, but there's truly no factual information about numbers to share with you at this point, but there will be later." She invited questions.

Senator Qammar asked about a question she had posed a few months ago regarding student fee monies. In particular, the Senator inquired about the Career Advantage fee that students in her college are especially interested in. The Provost addressed the senator's question, "I had a meeting this week that gave me part of it, but not all of it. Let me finish up that process with Sharon Johnson then I will be prepared to do that at the next Faculty Senate meeting. So it's a good reminder—I've started but I'm not finished."

Senator Siebert mentioned that one of his constituents raised the subject of some of the thefts that had been occurring in some of the campus buildings. He produced a list of incidents and asked if she might be able to look into the matter. The Provost accepted the list and said she would be glad to look at it.

Senator Erickson thanked the Provost for the information updates and discussion of the budget process. The Senator then asked how that information could be used to fashion a final budget. "As I understand it, there is data that's been coming in and, in light of the notions of transparency, is there any information on what criteria the committee will use in developing the scenarios that they're going to use?

How will the committee use the information and what criteria will be involved?" The Provost responded that this would be an appropriate topic for her next message to the Faculty Senate. No other questions or discussion were raised.

d. University Well-Being Committee Report – Senator Erickson presented an oral report from the Committee. She stated that, "It is informational and informational only, and everything is in process." What will be in thereport is a description of the maeterial that is going out for bid, the "ones that we as a Senate put through plus the AAUP alternatives." She emphasized that although those were out for bid, this "does not determine what the end result will be, it just means that we have to get estimates of costs; that's why they are going to bid. They should have gone out already, and it should be mid-April when things come back."

The Well-Being Committee would continue to look at issues related to childcare. The Senator urged everyone to look at the information, because people were perhaps unaware of it, that in the Fall the employee assistance goes out for bid." She reminded us that there are counseling services available for all employees of the University, with seven free sessions per person and for family members as well. "They are *not* using University employees—as you know there are a number of University counseling services, but these are independent to make it more comfortable and more private." Senator Erickson stated that the Committee is continuing to work on wellness and nutrition service issues related to the campus Recreation and Wellness Center.

No questions were forthcoming for the Senator.

e. Academic Policies Committee – Senator Qammar announced that she would be making the committee presentation in Nancy Stokes' absence. "We have two motions that come from the APC Committee." She mentioned that the motions were sent out via email over a week ago and that handouts were also available

The first motion was regarding formation of a center: Center for Advanced Vehicles and Energy Systems [CAVES] **(see Appendix D)**. This center would be formed by a group of faculty that had funding in this area. They wanted to start a center to "continue with funding sources and extend their collaborations beyond the University of Akron. APC recommends the creation of this center."

Chair Fenwick interjected that the motion came from committee and no second was required. He invited discussion of the motion. Senator Steiner mentioned that the motion suggested that no additional cost would be required of the University for development of the center. "Are we really sure of that? It sounds like a great idea, especially if it could be paid for by the funding, but if you could answer that."

Senator Qammar confirmed that there would be no additional cost to the University. "Currently the faculty who would initiate this center, their prior research falls quite in line with moving into this area of vehicles and energy systems. A lot of the instrumentation and equipment have already been purchased from prior years' worth of research; the new research and facilities come with the more recent grants so it doesn't involve any additional funding."

Hearing no further discussion or questions, the Chair instructed all those in favor of the motion to say 'aye.' The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Qammar continued with the second motion from the APC; this one dealt with Summit College **(see Appendix E)**. "We heard a little bit from the Executive Committee and there are a number of questions to be answered about Summit College and how it is going to be integrated within the main campus. This is really the initial step for these motions." The Senator presented the following four points from APC:

1) The first was that provisional admits would be admitted to Summit College versus their current status through University College. This would affect about 500 students.

2) Secondly, APC recommended that Developmental Programs, currently located on the main campus, be moved from University College to Summit College.

3) The Orientation would then be handled through Summit College for provisional admits. The committee emphasized that the orientation and the advising would involve a very intrusive advising system, a philosophy already in place within Summit College. The APC, therefore, felt that, since they had "more expertise in this that it would, in fact, help with retention and student success for these provisionally admitted students."

4) The fourth point dealt with some general education courses that would be set aside specifically for provisional admits and that those would be assigned by the home department, but would essentially be offered through Summit College where these students would now reside.

Chair Fenwick mentioned that this motion came from Committee so no second would be required. He invited discussion of the motion.

Senator Steiner expressed concern over point number four (4). "You just mentioned that selected sections would be assigned by home departments to Summit College. It seems to me that this could, in effect, result in us having two departments of Math, two departments of English, etc., one in Buchtel College or whatever the home unit is and the other in Summit College." He stated that this sort of duplication of effort was not the direction we wanted to go and, in fact, it flies in the face of what the Board of Regents is trying to do in the State." He therefore offered the following amendment to the proposal, to add a point number five (5), to read as follows: 'Design, content and staffing of the curriculum rests with the home department. Student outcome assessment and course implementation will be coordinated between the home department and Summit College.' Senator Stratton seconded the amendment.

Chair Fenwick invited discussion of the amendment to add the fifth point.

Senator Schantz commented that he did not believe there would be any duplication as the senator had suggested. "The courses would be taught by instructors that are already in Summit College. For example, I may be one of those instructors who teaches a section of one of the English Department's sections of 111 English, so it doesn't seem to me that it would really involve duplication. To me, it's more a matter of having faculty perform a different role rather than an additional role."

Senator Matney spoke in favor of the amendment to the motion. "It seems to me that most of our departments spend a great deal of time working specifically on the design and content of their courses. I know that our department meets every month to discuss curriculum. We've gone to great lengths to ensure that our Intro classes have a certain curriculum which is set and established and guaranteed so that when students move into the upper division classes they're prepared. It seems that the amendment that was offered will ensure that the curriculum remains in place so that we don't reinvent the wheel."

Senator Schantz added that he did not think that Summit College was trying to reinvent or totally reorganize these courses. He expressed belief that they wished to put pieces into place that would help provisional students to succeed. He thought this could be accomplished by offering additional tutoring, or perhaps the addition of some learning communities or even smaller class sizes. He emphasized that, "we're not looking to completely reinvent these courses or restructure these courses. I think people are afraid that any courses that would be taught by people in Summit College—that we would want to usurp them or completely rearrange them. We're not looking to do that at all, we're just looking for a better way to serve the provisional students."

Senator Erickson replied, "Certainly in our department, there are courses in Economics that are taught in Summit College and they come across as one of our courses—equivalent to our courses in our department, but they have Summit College numbers." She emphasized that if their course was taught in Summit College, it was very important to make the process different. "I know I have students that I would love to have in your program, that would get the kind of tutoring and help that they need. In general education, for example, one of ours is a 'gen ed' course, but it's one of two courses that, if you were going into business, you would have to take. So the standard that they have to reach by the end of all that effort has to be the same. As far as we're concerned, that goes for content. Then, the second part, given that it has our number on it and is part of our departmental materials, that we would have some input into who gets to teach this course; that's why we want to make sure that it stays within the home department." Senator Erickson agreed that the assessment should be coordinated between the two departments to circumvent problems that might occur later in the process.

Senator Qammar asked if Dean Stan Silverman would be permitted to speak to that particular issue and explain how Summit College "would envision the courses working with these particular issues." Dean Silverman thanked everyone for the opportunity to speak on these issues. He announced that he brought along two visitors to address some of the issues as well: Dr. Elizabeth Kennedy, who had been chairing the faculty committee on General Education courses and Michael Morsches, from Developmental Programs.

Dean Silverman stated that the original motion brought to the body encompassed everything covered in the discussion. "No one is looking to touch content; content rests with the home department. We're also talking about a relatively few number of courses. The largest section would be English Comp, and we're talking about probably less than six percent of the sections. Out of 196 sections—eighty-seven percent of them, which are taught by part-timers—we're talking about maybe twelve or fourteen of those sections. We're talking about collaboratively working with the English Department in determining—not what the content is—for English Department courses, the content *is* what the content *is*; the objectives *are* what the objectives *are*. We have to meet the exact same standards at Summit College because it's their course. Where the collaboration comes in is determining *who* will staff the courses; that's where the collaboration has to be." He reiterated his belief that the four points of the original motion covered that sufficiently.

Senator Erickson directed a question to Senator Qammar, regarding the rationale for the motion. "It says that the Faculty Coordinating Committee for each curricular area will do the following: monitor academic integrity, determine content so that it's consistent (methodology may differ), discuss any changes to be made, develop a structure to ensure consistent learning outcomes." Senator Erickson's concern was with the *staffing* aspect of that, since "it is not at all clear in any of this material as to *who* the Faculty Coordinating Committee *is*." She also emphasized that, "for an interdisciplinary group—I would feel uncomfortable with an interdisciplinary group working in this area. So, one of the problems is that this aspect is still unclear."

Dean Silverman addressed the issue, with the permission of the Senate body. "You're right, it should be the English folks talking to English folks…in Psychology we would be talking to Psychology." He went on to explain that he and Dean Creel decided that there would be three individuals—"three of our English folks meeting with three of Arts and Sciences English folks"—to talk collaboratively about the staffing. He again emphasized that content was not an issue because that already exists, as do the outcomes and that the students will be held to the same standards. "The collaboration would be discussion so that everybody knows what everybody else is doing; we would work closely with one another so that everybody is on board with what we're doing. We're not looking to change content and that's very important."

Senator Clark expressed an interest in knowing how those objectives would be met—regarding content—with students who might not be as well prepared with courses that are analogous to a regular course.

Dean Silverman was again given permission to address the body. He replied to the Senator that they are looking at retention. He also related that they are committed to helping the students at Summit College by doing everything possible to help them succeed, both in and outside the classroom. "Whether it's policies within the classroom, whether it's wraparound services for advising and faculty mentoring, etc., we will do whatever we can possibly do" meanwhile explaining to the students their responsibility and what *they* must do for that to happen. "Now in some cases we're going to be successful and we're going to increase retention a bit. In some cases, it's not going to work and we're going to part ways with those students. There's no question about it, but it has nothing to do with content. They will be held to the exact same standards, no matter where the course is taught."

Dean Silverman continued by stating that there seemed to be "some concern that there's not going to be enough collaboration. I can tell you from my perspective, you have my commitment that there will be as much collaboration as we can possibly have."

Senator Hajjafar commented that some of those students would eventually come to the home department. His concern was consistency between the two groups—Summit College and the home department—especially in terms of final exams. The Senator asked, "how do you guarantee that the retention does not create a problem later on in other courses?"

Dean Silverman commented that the Senator was likely speaking to learning outcomes. Senator Hajjafar responded that, with learning outcome, if Summit College could do a better job in teaching to bring these students up to their full capability—in line with regular students in home departments—then the same final exam and same assessment should be used for both groups. Dean Silverman replied that it was

his own perspective that this is most likely to happen. "I'm not an English professor, but I want English professors to agree upon that. But my hunch is this is the way it should be. There should not be a different final exam with a lesser level. It should be the exact same thing." Senator Hajjafar asked if there would then be the same final exam. Dean Silverman replied, "My field is Psychology, not English so I don't want to answer for the English folks, but I would hope that that would be the case."

Senator Stratton expressed confidence that Dean Silverman would try to do that. The Senator added, "And I think that is the intent of the motion, but I do not understand why there would be an objection to the amendment in that the amendment simply puts into writing what you expect to happen and provides the home departments with some assurance that they will, in fact, have that, even if you don't continue in your current position for awhile." Dean Silverman stated that he had no problem with the word 'content'—"that's fine with me; that can stay." The Dean's issue was with 'staffing' since that "really has to be collaborative" between Summit College and the home department.

Senator Steiner commented that he fully supported the intent of the general motion. "I think that through Summit College, with your expertise in helping students with difficulties—these provisional students—that this deals with the implementation of the courses and not the design and content of them."

Senator Garn-Nunn asked to speak to the issue from the perspective of the students involved. "I think that the faculty and Summit College have the best ideas about how to help the provisional students get where they need to go. Instead of having students scattered—one or two—across a number of general education courses, they can be grouped together. They could have 'one-stop-shopping.' They would have one set of people that could advise them, who could help them get through things." She voiced her concern about staffing of the program. "If it's staffed by the home faculty, are there home faculty who are going to want to teach a classroom full of provisional students? I think that's something that we need to ask each faculty, if we're going to say that it has to be this way." The Senator added that, from the perspective of the University of Akron being valuable to the community and trying to assist people within the community, "the more we can do to help provisional students, the more we're playing a productive role within the community." She was perplexed about why there had to be a home faculty member teaching the course in Summit College, especially if the contact was the same. "I don't see why those who are uniquely used to, ready for, teaching provisional students shouldn't be the ones to teach the courses."

Dr. Elizabeth Kennedy requested to speak to the body. No one objected. Dr. Kennedy shifted our focus slightly, to look at the general education issue. "What we are really talking about is the creation of a new initiative within Summit College. In addition to the general education piece, we're also talking about advising, which Senator Qammar mentioned, as well as the developmental piece in terms of tutoring and external issues to the classroom. So what we're really doing is looking at provisionally admitted students to the University of Akron—the whole number roughly around 500. We're looking at their retention rate, which up to this point has been roughly forty-six percent and we're saying, of those students, what could we possibly do within Summit College to increase their success in terms of academic learning and their persistence from year one to year two so that we have more people entering upper colleges as sophomores and so forth."

Dr. Kennedy addressed the concern over duplication of resources—against what the State recommends—adding that, "what I would propose to you is that the State is looking for—as the Provost mentioned earlier—greater access and student success. So, we're actually moving this initiative in the State's direction." In terms of the general education core, Summit College planned to look at, within the first thirty-two credits of the student's experience here at the University of Akron—their freshman year—developing a structured sequence of courses for those provisionally admitted students to take, "during which we will focus intensive efforts on their success, both in terms of *what* they're learning and *how* they are learning it." Dr. Kennedy confirmed that Dean Silverman was exactly correct in stating that Summit College was not looking to change curriculum content or to take over courses. "We're simply looking at what can be done to a core set of general education courses to improve the odds that these students will succeed."

She continued that some have spoken in terms of their [department] general education courses, but pointed out that the initiative from Summit College was similar to what University College has focused upon—the idea that students—freshmen—should begin their academic careers focused on completion of English, Math and Speech requirements. "We are in no way holding these students hostage within Summit College; they will have opportunities to expand and will take other general education courses, which are currently housed where they are, but what we're doing in conjunction with their developmental work, we're focusing on some structured pathways during which our efforts can be focused on them like a laser beam to improve success. Is collaboration part of our model? You better believe it because that's what the idea of the Faculty Coordinating Committee is all about. Do we have all the answers in terms of exactly how that Committee is going to function? Not at this juncture. Will we be contacting you? We will be contacting your department chairs, the faculty, the full-time faculty who teach these courses, and/or design curriculum—because in some cases that's not the same. We will be contacting you to work with you and develop the content of the curriculum committee and also what we're going to do about this." Dr. Kennedy expressed her personal view that there seems to be a lot of fear about this initiative "because people are afraid we're going to be taking things from them." She reiterated that this was not the plan, but that rather they would seek collaboration with other colleges, other units, other departments because the bottom line is increasing student success and retention.

Chair Fenwick again reminded the body that they were debating the amendment to the motion, not the entire motion. Senator Witt asked if it was necessary that the resolution be voted upon that same day. He asked, "if you're not ready to explain how the coordinating committee will be staffed, why can't you wait until you have a definition of that committee and then bring the whole complete package to us?" Dr. Kennedy responded that, if nothing else, Summit College has been trying to inform everyone of each step in their process because one of the major complaints is that people say they have not been told what is happening. She added, "Dean Silverman went to APC, talked about what's going on, talked to the Executive Committee of the Senate, people are asking questions and it is bringing this out. I would suggest, very humbly, of course, that point number five (5) has been added because of a lack of information about what we're doing."

Senator Stratton agreed with Dr. Kennedy's assessment. "I think the amendment was made, at least in part, from fear, but it's fear based on experience. Many of us have the experience of Wayne College, where they have our course numbers, they have our courses and we have no say over the curriculum, the

outcome, the assessment or who teaches them. Therefore, I think it's a valid fear in the sense that we don't want that repeated." The Senator then asked, in an attempt to be sensitive to everyone present, if he could—as the "seconder" to the motion, move for an amendment to the amendment. The Chair confirmed that anyone could do that as long as it was not a friendly amendment. Senator Stratton asked if the following would be acceptable. "I move that the amendment be amended to say the following: 'Design and content of the curriculum rests with the home department. Assessment of learning outcomes, staffing, and course implementation will be coordinated between the home department and Summit College.'" The amendment to the amendment was seconded by Senator Schantz.

Chair Fenwick invited discussion of this. One of the senators moved to call the question. The Chair first clarified that everyone understood the amendment to the amendment (*they did*), then asked that all those in favor of it to please say 'aye.' (*The majority of the body responded with 'aye.' There was one dissenting vote.*) The amendment to the amendment passed.

The Chair asked Senator Stratton to read the new amendment, which he did:

'Design and content of the curriculum rests with the home department. Assessment of learning outcomes, staffing and course implementation will be coordinated between the home department and Summit College.'

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any discussion of the amendment. Hearing none, all those in favor of it were instructed to say 'aye.' The amendment carried with a unanimous vote. The Chair announced that we were back to the main motion dealing with the proposed additional point number five (5).

Senator Matney asked to return to Senator Witt's idea of dealing with "an exceedingly vague motion in terms of how it's actually going to work. We don't know who is on the Faculty Coordinating Committee, we don't know exactly what it's going to do, and we don't know how this coordination between Summit College and the home department is going to work in terms of staffing. We've been told that this is a program which is designed to offer a broad spectrum of Math, English and social science courses, but we have no idea what those courses are going to be in the future." The Senator confirmed that this seemed to be an idea worth pursuing, but felt it was nowhere close to a vote. "I feel that voting for it, at this point—in its current form—is writing a "blank check" and we don't know what's going to happen with it." He made a motion to send this back to committee. "I would like to move that, given the amendment and the discussion, that this proposal be sent back to committee for further elaboration on the points that were raised by the Senate." Senator Kushner seconded it.

Chair Fenwick opened the issue for discussion. Senator Qammar made one brief comment that there were some points within the recommendation from APC that really addressed the idea that "we have to do something for these provisionally admitted students." This recommendation would move them into a situation where they would get that "'laser focus' in order to increase their retention and provide them services that they, themselves, uniquely need."

She emphasized that timing was of the essence. "If you send it back to *us*—and we're more than willing to work on it—we meet every single week to work on things, but if you send it back to us, then it

happens in April, and a very critical planning stage really gets by-passed. If your problem now is with this fifth point, which we have now inserted here, I would at least like to see the first four passed so that people can begin to understand that if we have a consensus of moving people and generating the planning stages for these individual bits, that we know where they are going to go."

Senator Matney said he understood the desire to move forward and commented that he did not think anyone would argue about the spirit of what APC was trying to do. He added, however, that it seemed "a wrong way to approach this to move this point, by point, by point and coming back again and again. We need to have a plan that is full and implementable. If you've got students that need to get into the planning stage, need to get their academic careers going, then we need to get the full text. It's just not appropriate to send us bits and pieces at a time and expect us to pass them serially as opposed to a full motion. Usually motions are brought before the Senate that are complete and ready to go."

Senator Lee interjected that this was a battle which he did not understand. He asked a procedural question in light of it coming out of Committee and yet raising a fair amount of protest. "I am wondering whether this issue was raised in Committee; if not, why not? Is there representation on the Committee? I would just like to know if this was discussed and decided by the duly appointed members of the Committee and if we're getting a second byte?" Senator Qammar addressed his question that the fifth point was added here [in session] and not by the committee. "We did talk about the idea that content had to remain the same so that the courses were equivalent. There was an idea that a coordinating committee must be created for these courses to ensure content so that these students would not be disadvantaged when they move forward through the program. Much of the discussion centered around advantages to the students in terms of the intrusive advising, the role of Developmental Programs and what services would remain the same." Senator Lee again suggested that the motion be sent back to committee and that "the members of the Committee try to resolve those issues prior to the report."

Chair Fenwick asked if there was further discussion of this. Senator Steiner expressed his appreciation about expediting implementation in order to help the students as soon as possible, but stated that he would be in favor of passing forward the first three points. "But I have to agree with Senator Matney that—especially with the way that point number five (5) has been amended—the particulars of the coordination of staffing, implementation and assessment of the courses really need to be given careful consideration and decided on before it is actually put in place. So, I would speak in favor of the Senator's motion."

Senator Norfolk then commented, "I can't speak to the English and I won't speak to the Social Studies, but I can speak to the Math. It doesn't matter what policies people pass, what matters is who implements those things. I do the staffing in the Math Department; Ali and others do the curricular development. I would be more than surprised if they *wouldn't* contact us on coordination, regardless of what we pass. It's going to happen, because if every student that left Summit College turned out to flunk coming into our department, then at some point somebody would figure that out. These are non-issues in some ways. I know the people in Summit College; I work with them now. I don't see that there's going to be a huge problem provided we have some agreed upon coordination in advance." The Senator expressed his belief that this did not need to go back to committee.

Senator Pelz raised two points, the first addressed point number five (5) and its origins, something that Senator Lee brought up, which came out of the meeting of the Arts and Sciences Department Chairs when looking at the proposal. The second issue dealt with timing—potentially 14 or 15 sections of English Composition—that would need to be designated for provisional students in time for Fall enrollment, which would soon begin. "Something would have to be done relatively quickly in order for those students to know what sections to enroll in for the Fall semester."

Chair Fenwick asked if there was further discussion on referring the motion back to committee. Hearing none, he asked all those in favor of referring the motion from APC back to Committee raised their hands. (Final hand count: *In favor* – 10; *Opposed* – 16)

The Chair announced that the motion failed with ten 'yes' votes and sixteen 'no' votes, so we returned to consideration of the main motion.

The question was called. Senator Hajjafar stated that he had raised his hand before the question was called. "I think this amendment—just the 'content' is not enough. I think the content and the level of instruction, the level of presentation is also very important. I would like to add to the amendment the words: "content and level of presentation" because the two courses may have the same content, but be taught in two different levels. At the end, the students are not equally prepared for the next course." Senator Norfolk seconded it. Chair Fenwick explained that, "we're going with a new amendment to point number five (5), which would insert 'and level of presentation' after content."

Senator Qammar then asked Senator Hajjafar to clarify what he meant by 'level of presentation.' Senator Hajjar explained that, in college algebra—one of the general education courses—algorithm was taught, but could be presented in different ways, such as giving the definition and the formula. "The content is that we have taught the algorithm but how detailed, what type of problem—that's very important—and the level of instruction is very important. We want—at the end—the students to have the same knowledge because if somebody completes college algebra, they have to go to pre-calculus and they have to have—we start in the home department with some things known—we assume some certain material is known. If the content and level have not been the same for the two groups, then we have a problem."

At this point, Provost Stroble added a comment for our consideration. "I think I understand what your goal is. My humble suggestion would be that what you care more about is that what they've learned is the same. Because my experience is, I've taught a lot over the years, and not all of it was ever learned. We can control for the input, but that will never control for the outcome. And what we really care about is that the outcome is consistent. I would suggest that the language about 'consistency of assessment and outcomes' maybe accomplishes your goal more than controlling core level of presentation.

Senator Boal added that 'level of presentation' spoke to a hiring issue. "Persons not capable of teaching the course probably shouldn't have been here anyway. Going back to what the Provost said, it's the same thing—it's the content. If the student gets the content, then at the end can pass the test, no matter if the teacher presents it in a different way, as long as it gets across, we accomplished what we wanted."

Senator Norfolk pointed out that there seemed to be a fundamental misunderstanding of the issue. "When you're talking about 'level of presentation' in a Math course, it is not simply a function of *how* we present the material, it is a function of assessment and a whole list of other things." He used an example of our close rival, Kent State. "On the books there are courses which, by their description, are identical to ours. We have had *lots* of students who have gotten straight 'A-s' through certain sequences from Kent State, who walk onto the Akron Campus and flunk everything. That's what we're talking about. Now how you want to word it is another issue, but just on paper having the same syllabus means nothing. 'Control' is a bad word, what we're trying to do is give some form of guarantee."

Senator Stratton said that he would support the comments of the Provost. His interpretation when reading the amendment was that it seemed that the assessment of learning outcomes would assure that the students coming out of one course would have outcomes consistent with and necessary for completing the next course. "It was my understanding that the sentence—'the assessment of learning outcomes'—would do that. By coordinating between Summit College and the home department you could make that assured. I, therefore, speak against the amendment."

The Chair asked for further discussion. Hearing none, he instructed all those in favor of the new amendment to add 'and level of presentation' to please say 'aye.' (*Some of the body responded with 'aye.'*) Those opposed responded with 'nay.' (*The majority of the body responded with 'nay.'*) The motion failed and discussion returned to the main motion. There was no additional discussion on the main motion, so the Chair stated that all of those in favor of the main motion should say 'aye.' (*The body responded with 'aye.'*) There was a small number of those who opposed this and who had responded with 'nay.' The Chair announced that, "Either you are very quiet, or the motion passes. The Chair will rule that it passes."

Senator Kushner asked if there was a quorum. The Chair assured him that we were okay.

Senator Matney then made a friendly request, since we have to meet this April deadline, that we get some details and a sense of when the Faculty Coordinating Committee and staffing issues will be handled. He commented that, "presumably they will start handling them within a month." Chair Fenwick stated that the Chair would consider that a question for Senator Qammar, as part of the report from the APC, but asked the senator if she would prefer to have ex-Senator Kennedy address the issue since she raised her hand.

Dr. Kennedy confirmed that some initial discussion with departments had begun. She added that "our courses are also taught at Wayne, often without our collaboration, although we have made some strides to improve that, and we don't wish that either. Also, it's not a broad spectrum of courses, it's actually a very limited number of courses: two English, two Social Science, and perhaps two Math. It's a very small number, so it's not the entire spectrum in general education, but we will update the APC and Executive Committee as necessary."

The Chair asked if there were any other questions concerning the motion from APC; there were not. **(See Appendix E for final, approved motion.)**

f.   <u>**Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee Report**</u> – Dr. Harvey Sterns announced that this would be a brief oral report. "I'd just like to say that the classroom survey is now up and ready to run." It had been suggested to him in committee that the survey go through a pilot test, so he first asked the Intro to Psychology instructors to take it. He will then ask the Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee to fill out the survey, then distribute it to the entire campus.

Since there were no questions for Dr. Sterns, this concluded the committee reports. The Chair asked if there was any other business to come before the body. (*None indicated*.)

There was a motion to adjourn by Senator Yousey and seconded by Senator Erickson.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Linda Bussey

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FOR
MARCH 3, 2005

APPENDIX A

Corrections to the February 3, 2005 issue of *The Chronicle*

The following correction was reported for the February 3, 2005 issue of *The Chronicle*.

September 2004 –

p. 12 – **Remarks by the Provost:** (In the section of comments offered by Dr. Chand Midha regarding the Program Review process.)

Revision in third full paragraph of page 12; amended text highlighted as follows:
Senator Steiner asked Provost Stoble for clarification of whether there were essentially two prongs to the Program Review process: 1) the centralized data that would be collected and was, in fact, **well on its way in the template Dr. Midha presented** and, 2) forthcoming sometime in the next month, guidelines and templates for individual units to conduct their own self-study— **"along the lines of telling the story that the Senator was talking about."** Dr. Midha addressed this, "Absolutely. That's what I intend."

<u>**APPENDIX B**</u>

**Executive Committee Report
March 3, 2005
Faculty Senate Meeting**

The Executive Committee met on February 10 and February 24.

The February 10 meeting was dedicated to an extensive discussion regarding Senate Bill No. 24, also known as the academic bill of rights for higher education. This bill has been introduced into the 126th Ohio General Assembly and is currently being discussed in Committee.

During the meeting executive committee members reviewed the bill and offered the following reactions and concerns:

1) that many of the tenets included in the bill protecting student's rights are already covered by the AAUP statements and guidelines, and are also covered by University of Akron codes and rules;
2) that some of the wording in the bill appears to be ambiguous and contradictory;
3) and that enforcement of the bill would be difficult and could lead to unwarranted challenges.

Immediately following this discussion it was decided that the committee would draft a resolution in opposition to the bill, and then present the resolution to the full Senate body for further discussion and approval. The resolution was drafted, distributed to all Senators and a special meeting of Senate was scheduled for February 17. During this meeting, the resolution was amended and approved for distribution. This was followed by a recommendation that the resolution be sent with a cover letter to the appropriate institutions and legislators asking them to oppose SB 24.

The Executive Committee met again on February 24 to draft a cover letter to go out with the resolution. This was completed by the Chair and the letter and the resolution were mailed out shortly after.

The next topic on the agenda was Summit College, specifically, questions were raised regarding the Faculty Coordinating Committee, its membership, its role and its responsibilities in the design and development of course materials. There were also questions regarding whether or not the Coordinating Committee needed to work through the Curriculum Review Committee when proposing changes to courses. It is hoped that these questions will be addressed in the near future.

Due to unexpected conflicts the committee was unable to meet with the President and Provost this month.

*Submitted by
Rose Marie Konet
Secretary, Faculty Senate*

APPENDIX C

Report of Senior Vice President and Provost
Faculty Senate
March 3, 2005

I.   Provost's Perspectives on the Leadership Initiative
Exhibit A

II. Academic Plan
Exhibit B

III. Budget Process
Exhibit C

Exhibit A

PERSPECTIVES FROM THE PROVOST - February 24, 2005
DEVELOPING THE FUTURE LEADERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
By Dr. Karla Mugler, Associate Provost and Dean of the University College
Under the premise that many of UA's future leaders are already on campus, the Provost and the Council of Deans will launch an Academic Leadership Forum next year to broaden and strengthen the University's pool of talent.
This spring, the deans and vice presidents will nominate faculty and staff members who together will form a cohort of "leadership fellows" and will participate in the yearlong forum, starting in the fall. Subjects to be explored include career mapping, team building, personnel management, legal issues, the budget process and government relations, to name a few. For noteworthy activities, such as a visit by a prominent speaker, the campus community will be invited to participate. The forum will be modeled after Leadership Akron and similar programs at major universities across the country. Funding will come from the Provost's office.
The first campus-wide event will be on Monday, March 14, when Dr. Walter H. Gmelch, dean of the school of education at the University of San Francisco, will be on campus to conduct a leadership and team-building workshop for individuals in leadership positions. Gmelch has conducted research and written extensively on topics of leadership, team development, conflict, stress and time management. His biography is at http://www.soe.usfca.edu/about_us/administration.html.

Exhibit B

UA E-MAIL SPECIAL EDITION March 01, 2005
REVISED DRAFT OF ACADEMIC PLAN IS READY FOR REVIEW
The next draft of the Academic Plan is now available on the Provost's Web site. This new version incorporates suggestions received during the Feb. 3 campus forum and over the Internet via the Provost's Web site.
Provost Elizabeth Stroble is requesting that you review the new draft and provide further suggestions via the Web-based survey that is on her page.
Reactions will be collected until March 8, at which time the Provost's office will revise the plan, repost it and begin to meet with various units on campus. Those meetings will take place from March 21 to April 25. Please contact Yvonne Brooks at ybrooks@uakron.edu or call ext. 5144 to schedule a meeting with your group and a representative from the Provost's office. The next campus-wide forum on the Academic Plan will be held from 8 a.m. to noon on Wednesday, May 11.
With regard to the new draft, most of the revisions have been made on pages 6-9:

- engaging campus and community; and

- innovating for success.

Your feedback on those two sections will be particularly helpful.

Work continues on:

- a glossary with definitions of programs, services, operations and other appropriate terms, and

- a graphic that better illustrates the relationships of the plan components.

A main purpose of the Academic Plan is to define the criteria to be used to identify the programs, services and operations that will receive priority attention. When the plan is final, a database of information gathered for Program Review will used to distinguish those programs, services and operations that fall within each of the three priority criteria or spheres of the plan:

- engage the campus and community;

- innovate for success; and

- assess for improvement and accountability. Only when the plan is final will it be possible to define the specific programs, services and operations that meet the criteria. For that reason, no programs, services or operations are named in this revision.

Exhibit C

PERSPECTIVES FROM THE PROVOST - March 02, 2005
UPDATE ON THE BUDGET PROCESS
by Dr. Elizabeth Stroble, Senior Vice President and Provost
In April, we will present to the Board of Trustees a budget recommendation for fiscal year 2006 that reflects the collective work and input of each college and division. The priorities that will be expressed in the proposed budget have been developed over the last nine months using a process that was reworked in 2004 to be more inclusive and transparent. Today, we are about three-fourths of the way through the process — a good point to pause to answer some of the questions you may have about the process and where we go from here.

What has happened in the last few months?
A series of budget hearings was held in January before the Budget Hearing Committee, at which time each dean and vice president presented a unit plan for his or her area. Some of the questions asked of the deans and VPs were:

- What are the main objectives of your unit, and how do you measure success? How do you prioritize these objectives?

- What programs have received priority for enhanced resources or funding in the last two fiscal years? What are your priority academic programs? Why are they priority programs?

- What are the services that your unit provides and to which populations (students, faculty, staff, etc.)? How do you prioritize these services?

- Do you see needs and demands for services that your unit cannot currently meet? If so, what are they, and how do they relate to the university's mission? What one thing do you wish you could do differently to improve your effectiveness but have not had the opportunity, time or resources to do?

- How do you review and evaluate your department's yearly performance? Please share data you have that measure success.

- What will you do to increase revenue? How do you support increased enrollment and retention of students?

- How will you reallocate current resources in strategic ways? What programs have you eliminated or reduced in size in the last two fiscal years and what have been your actual realized savings? Indicate which, if any, of your programs are underproductive, inactive or unnecessarily duplicative of other programs in northeast Ohio?

- In the last three to five fiscal years, what three factors have determined the expenditures, or changes in expenditures, in your unit? What has been the impact?

Who were the members of the Budget Hearing Committee?
I served on the committee, as did:

- Dr. Luis Proenza, president;

- Mr. Roy Ray, vice president for business and finance;

- Dr. Chand Midha, associate provost for academic and financial affairs;

- Ms. Sabrina Andrews, director of institutional research;

- Ms. Candace Campbell Jackson, assistant to the president;

- Mr. Brian Davis, associate vice president for business and finance;

- Ms. Amy Gilliland, director, office of resource analysis and budget;

- Mrs. Rose Marie Konet, manager, computer-based assessment and evaluation;

- Mr. Brett Riebau, interim controller; and

- Dr. Daniel Sheffer, associate professor, biomedical engineering

Andrews, Davis, Gilliland, Konet, Midha, Sheffer and I are members of the Operations Advisory Committee, which devised the budget process with input from vice presidents, the Council of Deans and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. (A diagram of the budget process is online.)

How will the committee use the information it has compiled to fashion a final budget recommendation for the Board?
In recent days, the Budget Hearing Committee has been working with the deans and vice presidents to clarify points in the unit plans and to gather supporting information.
This information will be considered by members of the Budget Hearing Committee, and they will provide input to Stroble and Ray who will then consider with the president various scenarios that can be presented to the Board of Trustees for their review and approval.

What are some of the challenges the committee is facing?
The Ohio Board of Regents has set an April 30 deadline for university budgets to be submitted. This will require budget committees here and across Ohio to make assumptions regarding state share of instruction and health care costs. As a result, the scenarios that will be developed must pose different assumptions about various percentages that campus units can be assured of in their approved operational budgets for FY2006, with the balance dependent on state funding, health care costs and institutional reallocations to take advantage of opportunities and any unforeseen contingencies.
When the budget is final, the committee will step back and take measure of the new budget process, asking campus groups whether we have succeeded in making it more inclusive and transparent. When more specific information is available about this review process and other aspects of the budget process, that information will be shared as a follow-up to this message.
****

APPENDIX D

Recommendation from Academic Policies Committee re: CAVES

Motion:
Academic Policies Committee voted unanimously at its 16 February meeting to recommend the creation of a Center for Advance Vehicles and Energy Systems (CAVES).

Rationale:
The College of Engineering and the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering support the establishment of CAVES. The Center will allow faculty who have already received considerable research funding to further develop collaborative efforts with other universities and industry to make the Center a leader in these emerging technologies. The establishment of a Center is necessary for participating faculty to use as a base to increase federal, state and industrial support for their research – in particular, application for funding from the Wright Center for Innovation.

The Center will require NO extra personnel, funding, or space allocation from the University. It will be staffed by existing faculty and be supported by income from the research projects.

Submitted by Nancy Stokes
Associate Provost

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

Recommendation from Academic Policies Committee re Summit College

Motion:
Academic Policies Committee unanimously voted to recommend the following four activities be implemented for Summit College beginning Fall 2005.

1. All Provisional Admits will be admitted to Summit College rather than University College (approximately 500 students/year)
2. Developmental Programs will move from University College to Summit College
3. Orientation advising for provisional admits will be done through Summit College rather than University College
4. Selected sections of general education courses for the provisional admits will be assigned by the home departments to Summit College. (similar to sections assigned to the learning communities) Sections will be offered across campus, not just in the Polsky building.

Rationale:
Dean Silverman visited with the committee 9 February and presented the attached overview concerning the on-going activities in Summit College. He requested that APC consider for recommendation the above four activities. APC discussed the request at both the 9 February and 16 February meeting. Dean Silverman has met with Deans Auburn and Creel concerning the gen ed changes. Both Deans support the action. Dean Silverman has had several retreats with the faculty and staff of Summit College to vet these changes and they support the changes.

Important points concerning this implementation include these overall parameters:
*   Faculty from all colleges may participate in the delivery of the curriculum
*   Assessment will be coordinated to meet the needs of the parent department and all other colleges
*   The 4 deans involved – Auburn, Creel, Kristofco, Silverman – will continue working together to ensure curriculum is consistent
*   Faculty Coordinating Committees for each curricular area will do the following:
    o   Monitor academic integrity
    o   Determine content so that it is consistent (methodology may differ)
    o   Discuss any changes to be made
    o   Develop a structure to ensure consistent learning outcomes

Expected outcome:
Higher retention of the provisional admits
        Methodology: contracts, intrusive advising

Future: Rather than completely overhauling Summit College, this change, like future changes, is being taken in incremental steps. Decisions – like this one – are and will continue to be data driven. The success and retention rates of the provisional admits will be recorded and assessed.

Submitted by
Nancy Stokes, Associate Provost

<u>**APPENDIX F**</u>

Amended Resolution from Academic Policies Committee re: Summit College

Motion:
Academic Policies Committee unanimously voted to recommend the following four activities be implemented for Summit College beginning Fall 2005.

1. All Provisional Admits will be admitted to Summit College rather than University College (approximately 500 students/year)

2. Developmental Programs will move from University College to Summit College

3. Orientation advising for provisional admits will be done through Summit College rather than University College

4. Selected sections of general education courses for the provisional admits will be assigned by the home departments to Summit College. (similar to sections assigned to the learning communities) Sections will be offered across campus, not just in the Polsky building.

5. **Design and content of the curriculum rests with the home department. Assessment of learning outcomes, staffing and course implementation will be coordinated between the home department and Summit College.** (Item #5: added and approved at March 3, 2005, Faculty Senate Meeting)

Rationale:
Dean Silverman visited with the committee 9 February and presented the attached overview concerning the on-going activities in Summit College. He requested that APC consider for recommendation the above four activities. APC discussed the request at both the 9 February and 16 February meeting. Dean Silverman has met with Deans Auburn and Creel concerning the gen ed changes. Both Deans support the action. Dean Silverman has had several retreats with the faculty and staff of Summit College to vet these changes and they support the changes.

Important points concerning this implementation include these overall parameters:
- Faculty from all colleges may participate in the delivery of the curriculum
- Assessment will be coordinated to meet the needs of the parent department and all other colleges
- The 4 deans involved – Auburn, Creel, Kristofco, Silverman – will continue working together to ensure curriculum is consistent
- Faculty Coordinating Committees for each curricular area will do the following:
    - Monitor academic integrity
    - Determine content so that it is consistent (methodology may differ)
    - Discuss any changes to be made
    - Develop a structure to ensure consistent learning outcomes

Amended Resolution from Academic Policies Committee re: Summit College (*continued*)

Expected outcome:
Higher retention of the provisional admits
      Methodology: contracts, intrusive advising

Future: Rather than completely overhauling Summit College, this change, like future changes, is being taken in incremental steps. Decisions – like this one – are and will continue to be data driven. The success and retention rates of the provisional admits will be recorded and assessed.

Submitted by Nancy Stokes
Associate Provost

<u>**APPENDIX G-1**</u>

**Proposals Approved By Provost
To Faculty Senate February 2005
From the 2005 Curriculum database**

<u>**Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences**</u>

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-05-04	Philosophy	Change pre-reqs for 3600:490
AS-05-05	ELI	2 new courses, 3030:041 ESL Writing; 3030:042 ESL Reading; 3030:043 ESL Grammar; 3030:044 ESL Listening
AS-05-06	Psychology	Course number change in a pre-req
AS-05-07	Psychology	Course number change in a pre-req
AS-05-10	Biology	Add required course to Zoology Specialization; Delete 3100:474 from tag electives
AS-05-14	Math	Delete 3450:138 Mathematics of Finance
AS-05-15	Math	Delete 3450:216 Concepts of Calculus II
AS-05-16	Math	Title change 3450:215
AS-05-17	Math	Delete 3450:127 Trigonometry
AS-05-33	ELI	Course number changes from 3030:081-084 to 3030:031-034
AS-05-39	Geology	New course 3370:491 Internship in Geology
AS-05-43	Modern Languages	Oral Proficiency Exit Interview: French
AS-05-44	Modern Languages	Oral Proficiency Exit Interview: Spanish
AS-05-48	Biology	Change bulletin description 3100:295
AS-05-51	Geography	Change degree requirements BA Geography: Geography Track
AS-05-52	Geography	Change degree requirements BA Geography: Planning Track
AS-05-53	Geography	Change degree requirements BS Geography:/Geographic Information Sciences
AS-05-54	Geography	New course 3350:499 Career Assessment Seminar
AS-05-57	Geography	Delete 3350:330
AS-05-65	Modern Languages	Two new courses 3580:211 and 3580:212
AS-05-67	Computer Science	Change prerequisites for 3460:210 Data Structures and Algorithms I
AS-05-68	Computer Science	Course title change 3460:306
AS-05-69	Computer Science	Course title change 3460:307
AS-05-71	Computer Science	Change pre-reqs for 3460:498
AS-05-75	Computer Science	Change direct admission requirements for undergrad program
AS-05-77	Deans Office	Clarification of college admission requirements
AS-05-81	CSAA	Delete 3240:330
AS-05-82	CSAA	Delete 3240:356
AS-05-101	Modern Languages	Activation of automatic pre-req check for advance Spanish courses

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
BA-05-03	Management	Change pre-reqs for 6500:341
BA-05-05	Accounting	Change pre-req for 6200:440
BA-05-06	Accounting	Change pre-req for 6200:470
BA-05-10	General Business	Change direct admit requirements to ACT of 22 or SAT of 1010 effective Fall 2006
BA-05-11	Marketing	Add 6500:426 as required course for E-Marketing and Advertising degree
BA-05-12	General Business	Raise minimum GPA for CBA admittance and graduation; add minimum GPA for all CBA classes
BA-05-13	Management	Change in pre-reqs and correct course number for 6500:490
BA-05-14	General Business	Delete 50% requirement of courses taken outside of CBA
BA-05-16	Accounting	Change pre-req to 6200:460

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-05-01	Curricular & Instr Studies	Change field hours for 5200:420 from 50-25; change clinical hours from 10 to 35
ED-05-02	Curricular & Instr Studies	Change field hours for 5200:425 from 50 t0 25; change clinical hours from 10 to 35
ED-05-15	Curricular & Instr Studies	New course 5500:450/550 Nature, History and Philosophy of Science
ED-05-30	Curricular & Instr Studies	Change field hours for 5200:325 from 53 to 33

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-05-03	Theatre	Suspend admission to Theatre-Musical Theatre program
FAA-05-04	Dance	Suspend admission to Dance-Musical Theatre program
FAA-05-05	Theatre	Course additions to theatre core for BA Theatre Arts
FAA-05-06	Theatre	Course additions to theatre core for BA Theatre
FAA-05-07	FCS	Change pre-reqs for 7400:439
FAA-05-08	Social Work	Delete 7750:410
FAA-05-09	Social Work	Change title 7750:270
FAA-05-10	Social Work	Change course number for Social Work Practice with Large Systems to be consistent with numbering change made by CSU School of Social Work in corresponding course in the Joint MSW
FAA-05-11	Social Work	Change course number for Social Work Practice with Small Systems to be consistent with numbering change made by CSU School of Social Work in corresponding course in the Joint MSW
FAA-05-12	Social Work	Change course number for Strategies of Community Organization to be consistent with numbering change made by CSU School of Social Work in corresponding course in the Joint MSW

FAA-05-13	Social Work	Change course number for Community Organization and Planning to be consistent with numbering change made by CSU School of Social Work in corresponding course in the Joint MSW
FAA-05-14	Social Work	New course 7750:405 Practice Skills Lab
FAA-05-15	Communications	New course 7600:475/575 Political Communication
FAA-05-21	Music	Change course description 7510:128
FAA-05-22	Music	Change course description 7510:628
FAA-05-24	SLPA	Change credit hour requirement for 7700:750
FAA-05-26	SLPA	Change repeatable credits for 7700:747, 748 and 749
FAA-05-27	SLPA	Change repeatable credits for 7700:743 and 744
FAA-05-28	SLPA	Change repeatable credits for 7700:745 and 746
FAA-05-30	Dance	New course 7910:201 Freshman Jury and Interview
FAA-05-31	Dance	Restructure of BFA program; require "B" or better in all technique classes and GPA of 2.875 in all dance classes
FAA-05-32	Dance	Restructure of BA program; require "B" or better in all technique classes and GPA of 2.875 in all dance classes
FAA-05-33	Communications	Change in electives; addition of electives

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
NU-05-05	Nursing	Change in course outcomes to reflect two credit hour course

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
SC-05-01	Engnrng & Survg Tech	Reduce credit hours from 3 to 2 for 2980:100 and 2980:355; change pre-reqs for 2980:222, 2980:228 and 2980:225; add co-req to 2940:210; delete elective; change bulletin description
SC-05-02	Engnrng & Survg Tech	Delete course 2980:320; Add new course 2980:330; change pre-reqs for 2980:415 and 2980:421
SC-05-03	Public Service Tech	Mode of delivery change 2220:255
SC-05-05	Public Service Tech	New course 2220:225
SC-05-12	Public Service Technology	

Delete 6 hours block credit for completion of the Ohio Basic Police Academy. Six credit hours of technical electives

SC-05-13	Business Technology	Change in required courses for Hospitality Management, Hotel

Marketing and Sales Option

SC-05-14	Business Technology	Change in pre-reqs and name change for 2540:263
SC-05-15	Business Technology	Change in admission requirements for all option Associate in Business Management Technology

SC-05-16	Business Technology	Change in admission requirements for all options Associate in Hospitality Management
SC-05-17	Business Technology	Change in admission requirements for all options Associate in Marketing and Sales Technology
SC-05-18	Business Technology	Change in admission requirements for all options Associate in Office Administration
SC-05-19	Business Technology	Change in admission requirements for all options Associate in Computer Information Systems
SC-05-20	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:345; change pre-reqs
SC-05-21	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:356; change pre-reqs
SC-05-22	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:255 ; change pre-reqs
SC-05-23	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:151; change pre-reqs
SC-05-24	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:152; change pre-reqs
SC-05-25	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:153; change in pre-reqs
SC-05-26	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:154; change pre-reqs
SC-05-27	Associate Studies	Course name change for 2030:130; change pre-reqs

University College

Proposal No.	**Department**	**Title**

Wayne College

Proposal No.	**Department**	**Title**
WC-05-02	Wayne	Restructure Office Technology-Administrative Professional Option to make it more transferable to the baccalaureate program
WC-05-03	Wayne	Restructure Office Technology-Business Office Manager Option to make it more transferable to the baccalaureate program
WC-05-04	Wayne	Restructure Office Technology- Legal Administrative Assistant Option to make it more transferable to the baccalaureate program
WC-05-05	Wayne	Change in program requirements Office Technology – Legal Office Assistant Certificate
WC-05-10	Wayne	Change in program admission requirements Office Software Specialist
WC-05-12	Wayne	Restructure Computer and Network Technology program to maximize flexibility of course offerings

APPENDIX G-2

Proposals Approved By Provost
New Programs and Program Name Changes to Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees
February 2005

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
BA-05-02	Management	Degree name change from BS Industrial Management to BS Management

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-05-31	Curricular & Instr Studies	New degree program AYA Earth Science Licensure Program
ED-05-33	Curricular & Instr Studies	New degree program AYA Life Science Licensure Program
ED-05-34	Curricular & Instr Studies	New degree program AYA Physics Licensure Program
ED-05-47	Curricular & Instr Studies	Delete Computer/Technology endorsement

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
WC-05-01	Wayne	New AAS degree in Paraprofessional Education

APPENDIX H

2005 Spring Grant Awards
Awarded February 25, 2005)
(omitted from February 3, 2005 Chronicle)

ACCT.#	FRG#	NAME	TITLE OF PROJECT	AMOUNT
2-07583	1620	Drs. Fred Choy and Minel Braun, Mechanical Engineering	The Development of a Self-lubricated Bearing Using Nano-Graphite Platelets	$3,917.50
2-07584	1621	Mr. Adel Migid-Hamzza, Dance, Theatre and Arts Admin.	From Scenic Design to Scenographic Art	$4,000.00
2-07585	1622	Dr. Arthur Palacas, English	A Discourse Approach to African American English Crossovers into Standard English	$3,171.00
2-07586	1623	Dr. Ping Wang, Chemical Engineering	Enzyme Electrode for Biofuel Cells	$4,000.00
2-07587	1624	Ms. Donna Webb, Art	Understanding Floors: A View of Turkish Mosaic Pavements and Carpets	$2,915.00
2-07588	1625	Dr. Shing-Chung (Josh) Wong, Mechanical Engineering	Development of Fracture-Resistant Biocomposites for Tissue Scaffolds at The University of Akron	$4,000.00
2-07589	1626	Dr. Jiang Zhe, Mechanical Engineering	A Hubrid Electrokinetic-Magnetic Rapid Micromixer for Lab-on-a-chip Applications	$4,000.00

TOTAL FUNDED: $26,003.50