Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 6, 2014

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, February 6, 2013 in room 201 of Buckingham. Senate Chair William D. Rich called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

Of the current roster of 66 Senators, 51 were present for this meeting. Senators Arter, Barrett, Gandee, Koskey, Landis, Morath, Moritz and Onita were absent with notice. Senators Beneke, Chronister, Freely, Hamed, Huss and Ramcharran were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda

Senator Raber moved to adopt the proposed agenda. The motion was seconded by Senator Hajjafar.

The motion was adopted without dissent.

II. Approval of the Minutes

Senator Clark moved to adopt the proposed minutes of the November 7, 2013 meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Hajjafar.

The minutes were adopted without dissent.

Senator Hajjafar moved to adopt the proposed minutes of the December 5, 2013 meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Jones.

The minutes were adopted without dissent.

III. Chairman’s Remarks

Chair Rich began his remarks by welcoming the faculty members who are not members of the senate, as well as members of the news media and other guests. Chair Rich stated that the senate is a formal deliberative body and that the meetings are conducted in accordance with the senate’s bylaws and Robert’s Rules of Order.

Chair Rich announced that the day’s business will include four reports from senate committees and one major item on the agenda under new business, the proposed suspension of 55 academic programs. Chair Rich asked the body to refrain from asking questions on the program suspensions following the President’s and Provost’s remarks. It will be difficult to differentiate between questions and debate, and debate belongs with the item under new business. The Provost has indicated his willingness to respond to questions at that time.

Under new business, debate on the merits of the proposals will be in order, but in the end the Senate will need to decide on the process to use to determine its own recommendations regarding the 55 academic programs. There will be an opportunity for concerned faculty members to communicate their concerns to the committee so that those concerns can be taken into consideration by the committee and eventually by the Senate.
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IV. Special Announcements

Chair Rich reported the deaths of three members of the university community:

*Allen Arrington*, Assistant Head Football Coach, died December 23, 2013 in Mississippi. He was 44.

*Henry Stevens*, Senior Lecturer, died January 18, 2014 in Akron. He was 94.

*Annetta Karam*, Honorary Alumna, died January 15, 2014 in Akron. She was 98.

The Senate stood for a moment of silence in memory of our deceased colleagues.

V. Reports

Executive Committee

Senator Bove reported as follows on behalf of the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee met on December 5th and appointed Tim Lillie to the University Review Committee (URC). The committee next met on January 16th for regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the President and Provost later that afternoon. Peter Lavrentyev requested to be removed from the URC and assigned to another committee; he was appointed to the Library Committee.

Later that afternoon, members of the Executive Committee met with the President, Provost, and Vice Provost. The President welcomed the EC and informed us of President Obama’s meeting with 150 private universities and colleges to discuss student access, affordability, and completion. The President also informed the EC that Gov. Kasich is currently working with the IUC regarding the allocation of capital resources for higher education. The President then updated the EC on the recent changes in the senior administrative structure, including reporting lines and allocation of duties. The Provost provided an update on the status of the Assistant Provost for Online Learning position and the online initiative. We also discussed the academic program review and recommendations, summer teaching loads for part-time faculty, the summer course schedule, graduate assistant funding levels, retention specialists, and the reconfiguration of classrooms.

The EC next met on January 30th for regular Senate business and to plan the agenda for today’s meeting. The EC appointed Joan Johns to the Athletic Committee, James Diefendorff to the Faculty Research Committee, and both Forest Smith and William Hazzlett to the Part-time Faculty Committee. The EC is also reviewing the proposed academic calendar for AY 15/16.

Remarks of the President

The President began his remarks by sharing two points of good news with the senators. Spring enrollment was better than predicted, so it should ease budget pressures this semester. Freshman applications are currently 40 percent above this time last year. It is too early to determine if this will yield an increased enrollment, but it is an encouraging sign.
The President then turned his attention to two topics relating to the university’s strategic vision and goals. In December the President launched a series of six initiatives under a rubric of team leaders. The team members were drawn from the administration and faculty and focus on the following areas: academic affairs, innovation, UniverCity, Alumni and development, student success, and finance. The priorities have been set for the teams and they are charged to meet those goals by June 30th. The President also talked of the decade long process of academic program review. The President shared the Provost’s report with the Senate and calls upon the body to provide a recommendation regarding the 55 academic programs proposed for suspension at the April 3rd meeting, so that the recommendations can be ready for consideration by the Board of Trustees at its April 23rd meeting.

The President also announced that the Ohio Higher Education Funding Commission has completed it work and that the university’s share will be $18.5 million. The President also congratulated the efforts of the annual rethinking Race campus initiatives and the Black Male Summit. The National Advanced Manufacturing Partnership, of which the President serves on the steering committee, held its first regional meeting at the Georgia Institute of Technology. The University of Akron will host the second regional meeting on April 2nd.

Remarks of the Provost
The Provost began his remarks by thanking all parties involved in the decade long academic program review, especially the Academic Program Review Committee chaired by Dean Midha. The Provost thanked the Senate for its role in the review and promised the cooperation of the chairs, directors, and deans while the Senate carries out its work. The provost then talked at length about what the academic program is and is not and provided a summary timeline of the activities to date. The review was completed in 2010 without action due to the leadership transitions. The committee then updated the review materials and data, and responded to the observations and recommendations from the previous review. The committee submitted its findings to the Office of Academic Affairs in April 2013. The materials were made available to the campus and the Provost solicited written responses from those departments and schools impacted. The remaining steps in the process include receiving the recommendations from Faculty Senate and the presentation of final recommendations to the Board of trustees at its April 23rd meeting.

VI. Committee Reports

University Libraries Committee
The University Libraries Committee submitted a written report (Appendix A).

Ad hoc Subcommittee on Academic Centers and Institutes and Faculty Research Policy
The Ad hoc Subcommittee on Academic Centers and Institutes and Faculty Research Policy submitted a written report (Appendix B).

Part-time Faculty Committee
The Part-time Faculty Committee submitted a written report (Appendix C).
Faculty Research Committee
The Faculty Research Committee submitted a written report (Appendix D).

VII. Report from University Council Representatives

Senator Erickson reported that the committees of the University Council have been asked to develop planning goals to present at the next UC meeting. Senator Erickson also reported that the Board of Trustees’ consideration of the 2012 UC bylaws has been put on hold until the new university president is selected. Senator Erickson also requested the support of the Faculty Senate in asking for information regarding the budget and moved that:

*The Faculty Senate requests that its representatives on University Council ask that the University Council Budget and Finance Committee present their analysis and recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 budget to UC as soon as possible so that they can report back to Faculty Senate before the summer.*

Senator Lillie seconded the motion.

The motion was adopted without dissent.

VIII. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

IX. New Business

Chair Rich introduced one item of new business, the President’s proposal to suspend 55 academic programs, and informed the senators that the body will need to determine a process for reviewing the proposals and providing a recommendation for each proposed program suspension. The President has requested the Senate report by the April meeting so the President can consider the Faculty Senate recommendations before the Board of Trustees meeting on April 23rd.

Chair Rich opened the floor for discussion. A vigorous discussion ensued (the verbatim transcript is available at [http://www.uakron.edu/facultysenate/docs/chronicle/2014/F-S_2014-02_VerbatimTranscript.pdf](http://www.uakron.edu/facultysenate/docs/chronicle/2014/F-S_2014-02_VerbatimTranscript.pdf)). The Senators had several concerns. Although some departments have agreed to suspend admissions to certain programs in order to further evaluate the effectiveness and to possibly enhance the program, this was considered a first step in program review by those faculty. This first step was not an indication to close the program. Program review began over nine years ago, and the sudden push through Faculty Senate with an abbreviated timeline seems unreasonable for such an important review. The rationales for proposing the suspension of specific programs is not evident from the data presented at the time of the meeting.

Senator Miller moved that:
The President’s proposal to suspend 55 academic programs be referred to the Academic Policies Committee, and that the Curriculum Review Committee be directed to advise the Academic Policies Committee on the effects of the proposed suspensions on other academic programs.

Senator Allen seconded the motion.

The motion was adopted without dissent.

X. Adjournment

Senator Sterns moved to adjourn the meeting. Senator Lazar seconded the motion.

The motion was adopted without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 pm.

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Frank J. Bove (x5104).

facultysenate@uakron.edu
APPENDIX A

University Library Committee Meeting
November 19, 2013
Minutes

Attending: Lisa Lazar (chair), Joe Salem (guest – Head of Research and Learning Services), Jon Miller, Kris English, Alvaro Rodriguez (guest - vice president of Graduate Student Government, in place of member Marissa Blewitt, president of Graduate Student Government), Sabine Gerhardt, Phyllis O’Connor, Laura Monroe

1: Updates from the Committee Chair:

Lisa Lazar updated the committee on the fall construction projects.

Banned Books Week was celebrated with readings from a wide variety of banned/challenged books.

The 3-D printer is available on a limited basis until some fixes can be made, but is receiving frequent use without external promotion. Students who want to use the printer can either submit their projects for printing in person or via email. The service is free with a Zip Card. The 3-D printer was demonstrated at UA on Display. The UA Formula SAE Racing Team from the College of Engineering is using the printer for prototype parts.

Mediascape stations on the ground floor are now available and are designed for group studying and presentations.

Lisa Lazar was re-elected committee chair for the 2013-14 academic year.

2: Report from Interim Dean Phyllis O’Connor

Interim Dean O’Connor shared the 2014 Library Action Plan, which is based on the library’s 5-year plan. The library is down seven positions and will not receive new money. Funding has been cut 14%.

This year’s focus is on student success. Some areas in the library that are underutilized will be repurposed. There will also be expanded efforts to inform students and faculty about the technologies available in the library.

This past summer, a graduate assistant supplied by ITL studied how the space and services of the Learning Commons are being used. The information in the report will be used to inform the library’s choices. Lisa Lazar will forward the PowerPoint used in the presentation to committee members.

Efforts continue to provide a single sign-in for all major library services.

The library adjusting its spending profile on acquisitions to meet curriculum updates. The library needs to support for on-line, distance-learning, and blended classes.

Library services are being marketed strategically and targeting faculty.
Attention this year is also being focused on archival services. The primary source materials available through UA archives would be useful in many classrooms including history, psychology, and engineering. The strategy is to integrate these resources into the classroom. Lisa Lazar suggested that the archivist speak with the committee at a future meeting.

The library is partnering with New Student Orientation and Student Success Seminar for Fall 2014.

Four University Library departments have experienced mergers. Research and Learning Services has been merged with Access Services. Acquisitions has been merged with Electronic Services.

Alvaro Rodriguez from Graduate Student Government reported that incoming graduate students would appreciate orientation on research options. It was suggested that programming like that would best be done through ITL.

The committee received an update on the UL dean search. Dr. Mark Winston was given an offer, which he initially accepted, but then changed his mind.

BePress is on hold.

3: General Education Updates (Joe Salem)

Beate Gersch is integrating information literacy into general education courses. She is working with Composition and Communications to bring access to students in these courses.

6: Support of On-Line Courses

UL is working with the design team at ITS to embed librarianship into on-line courses. The librarian will have a new role in Springboard!, using discussion boards and synchronous and asynchronous access to librarians. The designs can also include Libguides and tutorials.

4: Report on Libguides

Libguides provide a template to organize resources. A Libguide can be used to organize resources by subject or for a specific course and can be integrated into Springboard!

5: Introduction to Search-a-Roo

Search-a-Roo is currently a generic tutorial provided through EBSCO. Joe Salem will meet with concerned faculty about how the service can be used. Default settings are still being refined.

Submitted by Laura Monroe, Secretary
APPENDIX B

Evaluating UA Centers and Institutes

_Draft Plan Recommended by Faculty Research Policy (FRP) Committee_

**Members:** Shivakumar Sastry (Co-Chair, Engineering), Rob Schwartz (Co-Chair, Summit), Lisa Lenhart (Education), Carolyn Murrock (Health Professions), Timothy Matney (BCAS), Ray Gehani (Business), and William Landis (CPSPE)

In November 2013, President Proenza charged the Faculty Senate to evaluate Centers and Institutes in UA. In order to respond to this charge in the short-term, and to empower faculty to have a more important role in the strategic research planning at UA in the long-term, the Faculty Senate established this committee in December 2013. To address the short-term objective of evaluating Centers and Institutes, this committee has organized itself to:

1. Gather, Compile and Evaluate Data related to Centers and Institutes,
2. Formulate recommendations related to Centers and Institutes based on these data, and
3. Report these recommendations to the Faculty Senate via the Academic Policies Committee.

![Evaluation Plan Diagram]

We propose a three-phase plan to evaluate centers and institutes in UA as illustrated in the figure above. These phases overlap in time. This committee (FRP) is responsible for Phase 1 (Data Gathering), Phase 3 (Analysis) and preparation of the Final Report. Directors of Centers and Institutes that currently appear on the University Research Website (approved prior to the visit by Higher Learning Commission in 2012) are expected to support the FRP in Phase 1 Data Gathering. Directors of Centers and Institutes that have been approved by the Academic Policies Committee, or otherwise operational on campus, must provide the data requested in appropriate formats during Phase 2; thus, _the Directors of such Centers and Institutes are responsible for Phase 2._

The committee has deliberated and agreed on an Excel Worksheet (displayed in Appendix A) that will be used to assemble data for Phase 1 and Phase 2. Various members of the university leadership team and functional units have been consulted during the preparation of the Excel Worksheet.

The detailed activities for each phase are outlined next. All the proposed activities will be carried out by the FRP with support from the Office of Academic Affairs.
1. Phase 1
   a. Initiate requests for data from various functional units on campus. These include (and not limited to) budget office, controllers office, facilities, and services.
   b. Request the Director of each Center and Institute to quickly respond to the attached request Appendix B - Request to Directors of Centers and Institutes.
   c. Request the Chair or Director of each Academic Unit (Department or School) in UA to respond to the attached request in Appendix C - Request to Chairs and Directors of Academic Units.

2. Phase 2
   a. Send a campus-wide announcement that requests any and all Directors of Centers and Institutes that do not appear on the Phase 1 list to prepare data in the format required to populate the Excel Worksheet in Appendix A.
   b. All concerned Directors above must return the data to FRP before 5:00 PM, 28 February 2014, if they wish to be included in the Final Report of this committee.

3. Phase 3
   a. Evaluate data gathered in Phase 1 and Phase 2 and document the "Value" of each Center and Institute. This metrics for this Value will depend on the mission of the Center/Institute and the level of activity demonstrated by the data.
   b. In order to steer the strategic role of Centers and Institutes in UA, the FRP aims to articulate the following:
      i. Metrics or methods to evaluate the five missions of centers and institutes - i.e., Research, Teaching, Scholarship, Service Facility, and Community.
      ii. Overlaps and Differences between an Academic Unit (Department or School) and Centers.
      iii. Overlaps and Differences between Centers and Institutes.
   c. In order to establish a sustainable framework for transparent management of Centers and Institutes, the FRP aims to recommend a low-overhead, private web-based portal, with UANET authentication, for Faculty to access details as depicted the Excel Worksheet in Appendix A on a real-time basis.

Based on the data gathered in Phase 1 and Phase 2, and the analysis method designed in Phase 3, the FRP will prepare a Final Report with recommendations related to Centers and Institutes in UA.

*Our Final Report will be submitted to the Academic Policies Committee for deliberation, comment and further actions.*
From: "Rich, William D" <rich@uakron.edu>
Subject: Subcommittee
Date: November 15, 2013 5:26:10 PM EST
To: "Schwartz, Robert M" <rms73@uakron.edu>
Cc: "Matney, Timothy" <matney@uakron.edu>, "Gehani, R. Ray" <rgehani@uakron.edu>, "Sastry, Shivakumar" <ssasstry@uakron.edu>, 
"Murrock, Carolyn J" <cjm4@uakron.edu>, "Landis, William J" <wlandis@uakron.edu>, "Lenhart, Lisa A" <lenhart1@uakron.edu>

Rob,

I understand that the Faculty Research Committee (FRC) appointed a subcommittee to advise the Vice President for Research on the creation, re-organization, and elimination of academic centers and institutes, and on university policy pertaining to faculty research. I further understand that the FRC appointed the following faculty members to that subcommittee: Tim Matney, Ray Gehani, Shiva Sastry, Carolyn Murrock, Bill Landis, Lisa Lenhart, and yourself.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee supports the creation of a subcommittee for this purpose, but wishes to remind those involved of the following points:

1. Under the Faculty Senate bylaws, only the Executive Committee can appoint members of a subcommittee who are not members of the parent committee. As you know, Ray Gehani and Lisa Lenhart are not members of FRC.

2. Under the Faculty Senate bylaws, the creation, re-organization, and elimination of academic centers and institutes is within the purview of the Senate’s Academic Policies Committee (APC), not that of FRC.

3. Recommendations concerning the creation, re-organization, and elimination of academic centers and institutes, as well as recommendations concerning changes in university policy related to faculty research, must be presented to the Faculty Senate for legislative action.
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Accordingly, the Executive Committee yesterday created an ad hoc subcommittee on academic centers and institutes and faculty research policy and appointed to it Tim Matney, Ray Gehani, Shiva Sastry, Carolyn Murrock, Bill Landis, Lisa Lenhart, and you. The subcommittee is to report to APC on those matters that fall within APC’s purview, and to FRC on those matters that fall within FRC’s purview. In particular, any recommendations concerning the creation, re-organization, and elimination of academic centers and institutes must be reported to APC. The subcommittee is a Faculty Senate body, reporting (indirectly) to the Senate. Subject to these requirements, the subcommittee may advise the Vice President for Research, exercising its independent judgment.

Each of the individual members of the new subcommittee will soon receive letters of appointment from me.

The first item of business of the new subcommittee should be the election of a chair. I would appreciate it if you would convene the first meeting of the subcommittee.

Bill Rich
Faculty Senate Chairman
APPENDIX B – REQUESTS FROM DIRECTORS OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

1. The primary mission of a Centers or Institute can be
   a. Research  ($$, Patents, Paying Industry Partnerships)
   b. Teaching  (Utilization, Student FTE)
   c. Scholarship  (Papers, Academic Collaborations)
   d. Community  (Value to end users)
   e. Service Facility  (Utilization, Revenue)

2. Ask each Director of every center and institute to
   a. Identify primary mission of their center (only choose one or more of the above five)
   b. Suggest weights for each of the above types in their evaluation (all weights must add up to 100)
   c. Identify active faculty (five years)
   d. Identify staff and source of funding (five years)
   e. Identify Location, Office Space, Lab space, Assets, and UA shared facilities used by all active faculty and staff in the Center (five years)

3. In addition, ask Directors
   a. For each entity with Service Facility Mission to:
      i. Identify their primary population of users
      ii. List accounts used to track revenues
      iii. List utilization of the facilities (e.g. number of hours/week used)
      iv. State value of your center to UA.
   b. For each entity with Community Mission to:
      i. Identify activities and user population impacted by each activity
      ii. List surveys or methods used to evaluate the impact
      iii. State value of your center to UA.
   c. For each entity with Scholarship Mission to:
      i. Identify seminars, workshops, conferences, and academic visitors hosted and account numbers used to support these visits (five years)
      ii. List Publications in National or International Conferences and account numbers used to support travel (five years)
      iii. List publications in peer reviewed/ indexed Journals (five years)
   d. For each entity with Teaching Mission to:
      i. Identify courses supported,
      ii. List utilization of the facilities (e.g., number of hours/week used)
   e. For each entity with Research Mission to:
      i. Identify external awards received from state, federal and industry sources, IDC rate on each award, and UA cost-share committed for each award (five years)
      ii. Identify postdocs/students supported and funding source
APPENDIX C – REQUESTS FROM CHAIRS AND DIRECTORS OF ACADEMIC UNITS

1. Identify all Centers and/or Institutes in which your faculty actively participate

2. Identify Department accounts and resources used to support Center and/or Institutes Activity. In what ways do you support the Centers and/or Institutes?

3. Identify Department space assigned for use by Center and/or Institute staff

4. List benefits to Department faculty and students for (provide concrete examples over last five years for each):
   a. Research
   b. Teaching
   c. Scholarship
   d. Community Outreach
   e. Technical Services (e.g., fabrication, machining, imaging, analysis, etc.)

5. Identify impact on Department if the Center or Institute ceases to operate
APPENDIX C

PTFC (Part Time Faculty Committee) Report to Faculty Senate, February 6, 2014

The PTFC met on January 23. Attending: April Freely, Michelle Byrne, Bill Hazlett, Parizad Dejbord-Sawan, Shannon Osorio, Heather Loughney

1. The resolution regarding hybrid classes is in progress.
2. The resolution for the Faculty Senate to propose a method of time accounting for accelerated courses is also in progress.
3. The resolution to request that any changes to rules affecting Part time Faculty be directed to the PTFC in a timely fashion is in progress.
4. University Rule 3359-20-06.1. The committee continues the process of clarifying and updating aspects of the Rule.

Next meeting February 20, 2014

Respectfully submitted by Shannon Osorio, Chair
APPENDIX D

Faculty Research Committee
Report for Faculty Senate
January, 2014

The Faculty Research Committee has not met in the Spring 2014 semester. However, members will be reviewing proposals that were submitted by January 24. At this time proposal reviewers are being assigned by the Chair.

Training sessions for applicants were conducted on December 3 and 4, 2013. They were taught by Katie Watkins-Wendell, Assistant Vice President, Office of Research Administration.

Dates were established at the September business meeting for various due dates. Proposals were due on January 24, 2014. Other dates set are deadlines for the Committee with the FRC meeting on March 14, 2014 to make award decisions.

Submitted by Robert M. Schwartz, FRC Chair