

2-3-2011

Faculty Senate Chronicle for February 3, 2011

Frank Bove

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Recommended Citation

Bove, Frank. "Faculty Senate Chronicle for February 3, 2011." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 3 Feb 2011. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/44>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.



SENATE ACTIONS

- **Passed a resolution of appreciation to Robert Huff for his service as Secretary to the Faculty Senate 13**
- **Elected Frank Bove to position of Secretary of the Faculty Senate 13**
- **Elected Senators Marlene Huff and Lin Chyi as representatives to the Graduate Council 13**
- **Approved the referral of CRC's motion on rule language for 3359:20-05.2 to Senate Executive Committee for review 16**
- **Approved resolution to adopt the new electronic curriculum review software at the university-wide level 20**
- **Passed a motion to indefinitely postpone the TK20 resolution 26**

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

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held February 3, 2011 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 3, 2011

- A. APC Meeting Minutes 28
- B. CRC Meeting Minutes 29
- C. Resolution from Curriculum Process Review Committee 30
- D. TK20 Resolution from Senator Li 31

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 3, 2011

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, February 3, 2011 in Room 201 of Buckingham. Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Of the current roster of sixty-eight Senators, 45 were present for this meeting. Senators Barrett, Cheh, Cushing, Elliott, Hamed, C. Miller, J. Miller, Andrew Thomas and Tim Vierheller were absent with notice. Senators DeMarco, Ducharme, Kruse, Marich, Miller-Motley, Neighorn, Newton, Queener, Ritchey, Rostedt, Slusarczyk, Speers, Wilson and Yi were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda - Chair Sterns called for a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was made, seconded and approved.

II. Chairman's Remarks and Announcements -

Chair Sterns – We can make an announcement or two to save us some time. First and foremost we have two tickets left at our table for the Hearts for Humanities event which will take place tomorrow night. As you know this is a fundraiser to support the work of our students going to New Orleans to work in the areas hit by Hurricane Katrina. So we have two seats left, an exciting evening, would you like one? (Senator Ritchey claimed the available tickets.)

Because of the fact that we haven't reached quorum, we're going to show some level of flexibility, I know it's shocking. It has been suggested that we might immediately turn to the remarks from the President. This way everyone will be fresh and attentive.

III. Reports

Remarks of the President - President Proenza: Or not quite ready for it. Well good afternoon colleagues and welcome back from the winter break, it seems like it's been actually several weeks now but yet again you at least enjoyed a break for the last two days. I happened to be elsewhere where it wasn't break time, so I've missed my opportunity to have a snow-in day. It's an exciting spring semester, if we can call it that, and did I get it correct? Puxatawney Phil did not see his shadow therefore we might see an early spring? That's good news. Let me just take a few moments here to comment on national and state events. And let me precede that by saying that because we have a brand new governor, because there isn't a budget proposal on the table, what I'm bringing you is nothing more than an update of what is public and what is seemingly emerging, but you have to understand that I have absolutely no assurances that the budget will reflect any of these in any favorable circumstance. That said; therefore, we continue to expect as a result of the very large budget deficit that Ohio is facing that there will be some cuts to all state expenditures. How much to higher education we have absolutely no idea. We do believe that there isn't a particular focus on hitting higher education more than anybody else. It is reassuring in that regard and there are other indications that suggest that this administration will view higher education positively in some regard. That said, again I would like to emphasize that there's every anticipation that there will be some cuts to higher education, the magnitude of which we can only wait and see. Again, the budget should be introduced sometime in the middle of March, early April at the latest. That said; let me put a couple of other things in perspective. A week ago, Sunday, the New York Times published a chart outlining the

deficits of states as a percentage of each of their budgets. First of all, you might wish to know that there actually are four states in the United States that are not facing a deficit and in fact have a surplus of some sort. I believe one was North Dakota, one was Alaska and I'm sorry I forget what the other two are. When you then plot it, all of the deficits that exist amongst states again as a percentage of state budgets, you found that Nevada's budget was the highest as a percentage of their total budget. Their deficit is about forty-five percent of the total budget. They're going to have some problems, that's a very large percentage of the total budget. California, which is facing a deficit of about thirty billion dollars, I believe that deficit was in the neighborhood of twenty to twenty-three percent something like that. Texas with a deficit of about fifteen billion dollars showed a deficit of somewhere in the eighteen percent range, I believe. Ohio was shown in that chart at eleven percent of budget. So now that puts it into a somewhat more positive framework; although, please do not take that comparison, which was simply published by the New York Times, as my prediction that that's all we're going to cut. Chances are no less than ten percent but probably more.

Some positive things that you might want to know. The governor is very interested, as you have surely learned, in increasing job opportunities in Ohio for Ohioans, improving the economy and removing some measure of regulatory burden on all aspects of doing business in Ohio, including higher education. In fact, he is so committed to that end that he has asked his Lieutenant Governor, Mary Taylor, who as you know is from Green so from Northeast Ohio, to lead the regulatory reform effort. In addition to her role as Lieutenant Governor, she also has been appointed as Director of Department of Insurance. That means that with her background in finance and accounting that she certainly will have an understanding for the value of certain regulatory reforms to the Ohio economy. I think that is a very positive element. You also know, perhaps, that he has asked a longstanding colleague of his, Mark Quame, a venture capitalist from California, to come in and lead a total restructuring of the Ohio Department of Development, moving it towards a privatized endeavor. Again, he's literally been on the job about two weeks so it's too early to tell. He does, as a matter of course of leading the Ohio Department of Development at this time, also chair the Third Frontier Commission and there are some comments in the newspaper about the questions that he was raising about how those monies had been allocated in the past with a look to making some decisions that would move the job formation more rapidly and could perhaps position...Mr. Mallo are you listening?...could perhaps position the state to take equity. I'm sure he means to the privatized Department of Development to take equity in some of these investments. I know you will duly note that in terms of Ohio's appropriate statutory language, that goes back, I believe, to the Constitution. Right?

Mr. Mallo: The Ohio Constitution.

President Proenza: Well, I'm sure they'll figure out a way around it. Anyway, but those are important kinds of indications that he's thinking about ways to reduce some of the cost of doing business in the state. And with regard to higher education, the only other thing that we know at this time is that they are considering a model not unlike what the state of Virginia used a few years ago to create what they call *charter universities*. A charter university is basically an institution that agrees to a contract with the state in exchange for the state to reduce their state funding by a fixed amount. The state will provide them with more autonomy, less regulation in short with the opportunity to take a more ownership of their own future than has previously been the case for state universities. So hopefully some of that will move forward, needless to say it will take some time to bring it to be. As you also know, the Chancellor's position by

statute carries into 2012. It is no secret that he is being pressured to perhaps step down sooner rather than in keeping with the statutory suggestion. But it's too early to tell on that score. In short, there's likely to be some change in the Chancellor's office probably within this calendar year and certainly by 2012.

I have just one other set of comments, are there any questions about the broad state perspective? I'm not sure that I have any other information.

Senator Mancke: You said it would be a minimum of ten percent?

President Proenza: That's our best guess.

Senator Mancke: And that ten percent is of the money that the university receives from the state which is approximately twenty-five percent of the university budget. So that would be approximately a two to three percent reduction in the university budget.

President Proenza: I haven't calculated that but that's in the right corner there.

Senator Mancke: So we're talking two to three percent at the university level.

President Proenza: At minimum.

Senator Mancke: Okay, thank you.

President Proenza: I mean I could be surprised and it would be the first one to be delighted if they choose to do less but the state's deficit is significant.

Senator Mancke: Right, but I'm concerned that what we are hearing is that we don't get the people saying you need to make a ten percent cut when the cut to the university budget is three percent.

President Proenza: Let us make no mistake about it colleagues; the state reduction of their funding which is about twenty-five to thirty percent of our total budget could be much higher than ten percent, it could be fifty percent. So we are asking all of us to explore broadly what we would do under different scenarios. And please don't neglect that, this is not a time to say this is going to go away. Cause it's not going to go away or as I used to say in other places in the country, it ain't goin' away. Alright, any other questions? Thank you for putting it into context; that's absolutely correct.

Finally, I wanted to thank all of you for the engagement that is coming forth out of this Faculty Senate, out of various faculties, for engaging with the suggestion I made a year ago last October, for us to consider how we can optimize the various organizational, relational structures within the university so that we could do our academic purpose better so that we could optimize the value to our students to each other, to external funding agencies, to all of the opportunities that face us. I am very encouraged by the discussions that are taking place with regard to the Fine and Applied Arts and the College of Arts and Sciences which I believe... (inaudible comment) Very good point. Thank you Dr. Fey. In regard to the [previous] question there is another subtlety here and that is that the higher education budget for the past two years, twenty

percent of it was built on one-time federal stimulus money. So another very likely scenario is that they would cut us by at least that much money. Thank you Charlie that's very good. So again I wanted to thank you for the engagement with which many of you are taking on that discussion and I wanted to add just a couple of suggestions. First of all, it may be helpful for us to consider, as a university, what are the problems that we are facing, certainly, our larger community of Akron and Northeast Ohio and to explore ways in which we can consider relationships among ourselves, between ourselves and other faculties, between ourselves and our staff, frankly, between ourselves and various other organizations in the community whether it be the city, the county, the newly merged health departments, the various organizations that exist in various purposes, United Way, any one of the number of hospitals that we have a partnership with, and in short begin to explore what other kinds of collaborations and partnerships may create value both for our partners and for ourselves. What we've found recently with, for example, the University Park Alliance, the Austin BioInnovation Center, etc. is that by joining hands with others, that we might not have thought to join with in the past, we create the opportunity to leverage each other's resources, potentially attract resources that wouldn't have been here. In short, to create opportunities for ourselves that help us to continue the exciting and positive trajectory that we've created for ourselves. So as you think about the specific discussions that are taking place, please begin to explore others. There's no question in my mind that over the next few years there are going to be some very large transformative opportunities for higher education, in a very positive way. If we think about it that way, we ought to be anticipating rather than hoping that we'll just go back to a time that almost certainly will never come back to us. As I think you've heard me say, we were once, maybe, close to being state supported, never quite fully state supported. We were then state assisted, but then somebody said we were state located and then entered this era in which we were just simply state abused. And that ain't gonna change. Any questions about that or any other thing?

Chair Sterns: Are there any questions for the President? If not we may have all lived through the golden age of higher education and it wasn't that great.

President Proenza: There is a new golden age coming up. Lots of good things happening. I have a whole list of accomplishments of your colleagues and of this body and others. I won't recite them, they'll be published in many forms as well. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much. I think even though we have a quorum present we'll move right ahead to ask for remarks from the Provost at this time.

Remarks of the Provost - Provost Sherman: Thank you Chair Sterns. Greetings everybody. I'd like to assure you that we do not take lightly disrupting the academic calendar and deciding to close the university. However, we must consider safety as the number one priority. And from that perspective, I began speaking with the Chief of Police [at] about three o'clock in the morning when it looks like we need to make such or consider such decisions. We take into consideration the snow emergency levels of the surrounding communities in consideration of our faculty, staff, and students driving into the campus from those surrounding communities. We take into consideration the safety of the campus in terms of the ability for the grounds crew to clear the sidewalks and clear the parking lots to a level of safety that's acceptable. And only if it's warranted, make a decision to close. You know the ultimate objective is to minimize any disruptions to the academic calendar; however, I thought you might like to know the perspectives that are considered in making those decisions.

If I can add to the President's comments, I'd like to think that we are in a situation of moments of opportunity. While at the same time we have to consider the challenges that exist from a budget perspective, we also have to consider those as opportunities. Those are our moments of opportunity. We are looking at five, ten, fifteen to twenty-five percent reduction scenarios, with the appropriate triggers related to compensation. But I wanted to make sure that you understand that we're also looking at revenue generation scenarios that link to adding classes during the summer, having more classes in the evenings, and having more classes on the weekends. What will we derive in terms of persistence of enrollment which would increase the revenue stream through our efforts to retain our students from one year to the next? So we are looking at and actually attempting to validate and verify what those numbers might look like. Obviously we're looking for opportunities for efficiency to gain effectiveness and there will be reduction considerations. But I think the point is that there are moments of opportunity in that I have asked for the deans to submit to the Provost's office, to the Office of Academic Affairs, scenarios for faculty hiring in strategic ways to begin the conversation and to begin the type of strategic thinking that is necessary for us to achieve our aspirations. And that is, I've asked them to think in two five-year increments of faculty hiring. So in other words, how would we plan to hire faculty in strategic ways across a ten-year period? And then the next level of exercise will be taking into consideration anticipated turnover in faculty. We'll add that into the scenario so that as they develop the strategic plans to align with the university's strategic plan, we effectively have a strategy for increasing the academic excellence of the academic programs that are invested in above the current level of investment. Along with the moments of opportunity for increasing revenue and planning for faculty hiring, are opportunities that come with considering our organizational structure. So as you know, we have taken the step where Dean Midha is acting to manage the operational and business finances of the College of Creative and Professional Arts while he is also the dean of Arts and Sciences. So that's the first step of a change in the oversight structure of Creative and Professional Arts. That is to be followed by, and it's already started, conversations at the academic level for what an academic convergence might look like. Why, might you ask, should we or would we consider doing this? Well, there are a number of reasons. Leveraging scope, leveraging skill will be important considerations in consideration of implementing a budget system. It creates unique opportunity to revise or recreate a new 21st Century curriculum that truly prepares global citizens in consideration of a liberal arts education. There's a timeframe for those discussion which, if the Chair would like, we'd be happy to review with you at this meeting, but that is the first step in those kinds of discussions related to gaining efficiencies and gaining effectiveness. We also have interacted with Faculty Senate Executive Committee from the perspective of leveraging opportunities that are, as of yet, unrealized in the area of health *blank*. Health *something*. Health sci-

ences. Health *whatever*. In that you're aware that Health Sciences and Human Services and Nursing have been discussing the possibility of a merger in recent years, we think that a greater opportunity exists for transinstitutional conversations if, in fact, we take a step to create a health *something* college into which programs have the opportunity to converge or to move that are not only those programs in Nursing and Health Sciences and Human Services, but potentially other programs across the university. This also would allow the opportunity for programs to consider adjusting their locations that, in a sense, might create a different way the opportunities that the President has outlined in terms of the university rediscovering a different organizational structure. Clearly we can leverage more opportunities in our relationships with Summa, Akron General, Children's, NEOUCOM, and a significant investment this country will have to make in assuring the health and wellness of the society. And that is a great moment of opportunity. ABIA, as you know, is on a wonderful trajectory towards success. We can latch onto that. We're partners in that. We can escalate that. NEOUCOM is on a different trajectory. And certainly Northeast Ohio and our collaboration with them and the BSMD program to help facilitate first generation college attendees who want to stay in the region as general practitioners is a wonderful opportunity that if we develop our strategies appropriately, can benefit from an enhanced collaboration with NEOUCOM.

Finally I'd like to point out that it's been brought to my attention that we have a multitude of centers and institutes that over time have either flourished or in some cases atrophied or the status quo has been maintained. I think that now is a moment of opportunity to review the status of our centers and institutes and really make some decisions about their viability now and in the future and how we might otherwise reconvene or reconsider or re-aggregate different areas of research and teaching focus, as the President has alluded to, that might stimulate enhanced interdisciplinary research and teaching. And so with that, Chairman Sterns, I will end and entertain any questions.

Chair Sterns: Are there any questions for the Provost and Vice President?

Provost Sherman: If you would like Dean Midha to review the timeline we're prepared to do that as well.

Chair Sterns: Dean Midha would you like to quickly share that timeline?

Dean Midha: Sure. Good afternoon everybody. This is the proposed timeline how we plan to proceed with the academic convergence of College of Arts and Sciences and College of Creative and Professional Arts. You'll see in this timeline that, so far, we have met the leadership of the Senate Executive Committee, as well as the AAUP Executive Committee. We have also met the Faculty Senate representatives from both colleges. When combined there will be 23 senators from CP and BCS. We have met all the chairs, directors of both the colleges together, met the staff of both the colleges together. Today we are presenting this timeline to you. Next week John Zipp, representing the College of Arts and Sciences, Neil Sapienza, the interim dean in the College of Creative and Professional Arts, and I plan to meet the faculty of the respective units in CPA; namely, the School of Communications, School of Dance, Myers School of Arts, Dance, Theatre and Art Administration. This will help us know the faculty of each unit and also to find out if there are any issues which need to be addressed in this convergence of two colleges. Thereafter, I plan to call a joint meeting of the faculties of both the colleges of Arts and Sciences and College of Creative and Professional Arts. There we'll discuss the coordinating committees of the two colleges at the college and university levels. At the present time the curriculum will remain the same; weekly offerings will remain the

same. As for RTP issues are concerned, they vary from unit to unit. They will stay the same. However, college-wide committees for example in Arts and Sciences we have curriculum committee for Buchtel College, likewise there is a committee in CPA. Also, there are college wide committees for RTP decisions in both colleges. We'll be learning from each other how the structure is in these two colleges and what will be needed if we have to cut and what the structure of the committees are merged into one. In doing that our plan will be to form ad hoc committees which will have some elected members of both colleges and then we'll have some appointed members to balance the rank, gender, and other demographic statistics for those committees. These ad hoc committees will study commonalities, differences, and what we can learn from each other and how we can be more efficient. At the same time, it's possible that the former College of Fine and Applied Arts, which was split into two units: Creative and Professional Arts and Health Sciences and Human Services, may express their desire to be realigned with some units in Health Sciences and Human Services again. As Provost Sherman has mentioned, once we explore the possibility of a health related college there might be other realignment within the colleges. So, we'll be open to any suggestions or any other realignments or alignments. What we'll be doing rest of the semester is meeting the units, faculty first, then the college level, and then look at the college wide committees. We'll be regularly informing the Senate Executive Committee and we'll update the Senate as a whole on May 5th, which is probably the last meeting of the academic year. Thereafter, our committees will work during the summer and they will come up with a report. Our plan here is, by early October, to give the recommendation. We'll consider those recommendations at the joint faculty meeting and then after we'll follow the procedures and rules and regulations that if it has to go to APC or if it has to come back to the Senate, we'll be going through all those committee structures there. And then by December 2nd, which is the last meeting of the Senate during the [2011] fall semester, we'll bring back the recommendations and get advice and approval here. And the plan is to have all procedural issues resolved during the spring of 2012 with the hope that the convergence of the two colleges can take place in Fall 2012. The issues related to curriculum, degree requirements, and credits will be discussed through the curriculum committees of the two colleges together. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I'd be happy to take any suggestions.

Senator Lazar: Thank you. I'm not exactly sure to whom I should address this question. For clarification, is the academic convergence of these two colleges a foregone conclusion or is that what this process is going to determine?

Chand Midha: This is the process we're following here.

Senator Lazar: To determine that or to make that happen?

Chand Midha: Both. I think we have a target to explore the possibility of the convergence. In the process, if some issues would come up here, we'll be discussing that. If we can answer it in those committees, fine; if we can't answer them, we'll be reporting to the Provost and we'll go from there.

Senator Lazar: Thank you and my second question is I would be very interested as a I think some of my colleagues would be in seeing some of the data that was used in evaluating and coming to some of the efficiencies, especially those that would benefit the performing arts in particular. I understand that the liberal arts will get a great boost from having some of the performing arts there, but especially what benefits would it be for the performing and visual arts as career projectories? What benefits would they gain by this proposed conversion? So there's a location for that. I think we'd be really interested in that.

Chand Midha: Being a statistician, I can assure you I'll bring all the data to the meetings. I've not seen the numbers, but roughly I can tell you Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences generates 43% of the credit hours for the campus and the College of Creative and Professional Arts generates about 10% of the credit hours. If I look at the revenue picture coming from locution and the subsidy, Arts and Sciences generates about 39% of the total revenue while the Creative and Professional Arts generates about 9.5%. And what's the budget we have for the academic side, in terms of expenditures? We have 27% coming to Arts and Sciences and 9.4% coming to College of Creative and Professional Arts. It's neutral as far as the budget is concerned. We'll be pressing the case that our academic budget should be increased for both the colleges, if we are concerned about the global citizenship of our students. And as was mentioned if you were at the meeting two weeks ago, there will be incentives and rewards and no penalties.

Senator Lazar: Thank you.

Chand Midha: You are welcome.

Senator Speers: I was glad to hear your mention of liberal arts, because I haven't heard that term in a long time. And it seems to me that our universities have been going toward specialization with parents saying, "What kind of job will this get my son or my daughter when they get this degree?" So, by having the fine arts absorbed under arts and sciences, it seems we're going away from that specialization into a more generalization of liberal arts and I'm wondering about the timing with the rest of our larger society. I love liberal arts; it teaches problem solving and it does a lot of things for people. I have a similar background, but it also seems like they look at us as a vo-tech school now. What will this degree get me and by not focusing or at least having the creative arts featured, we kind of say they're not all that important.

Chand Midha: That's not our thought at all. I can assure you.

Senator Speers: Oh, I just wonder if that will be the effect. That's all.

Chand Midha: No, I think fine arts will stay where they are. In fact we want to strengthen that. I was looking at the history of the College of Arts and Sciences and not long ago the name of the college was 'liberal arts' and I met a gentleman the other day who said that he got the degree in sciences, yet the name was liberal arts then. That man is here in the room I don't know if you know that. So, I think we are not going to touch the creative and fine arts. It's going to be absorbed. And so, as you ask me, the data will be there. We'll show the data and we want to enhance it.

Senator Wilson: This may be directed to the Provost, but Chand you might be able to answer it, too, or Harvey. I heard you mention that you had met with the Executive Committee about this. Is that correct? At any point, have we been given a sort of formal proposal or rationale that lays out why your office feels this is necessary? We've heard terms of efficiency and other things. But does it exist in a form that we could look at? That's my first question.

Chair Sterns: And we'll have minutes from the Executive Committee coming up. Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I just wanted to say that I was at that meeting and I think we had some opportunity to make some of the points that I'm sensing are being made by some of the senators. The upshot of the meeting was that this particular structure would be much stronger if there was a place in it which specifically indicated that the faculty of the two colleges were saying, "Let's explore this." When the Provost and the Dean came to our meeting, the Dean in particular was very encouraging. He felt that he had talked to enough people, that there were enough people who wanted to do or at least look into it, and to see what would come of it. But I said and we felt that this would be much stronger with that kind of thing there in particular. Otherwise, it might appear to be a top-down imposition with all of the potential resistance that could occur from that. We thought it would be stronger if it had some expressed support from the faculty. Now, in light of all that too, one of the things that I think we're seeing with our new Provost and with things changing as a result of perhaps of what the President said about the budget and so on, is that things may be happening perhaps a little quicker than they used to. We'll be receiving a little more activist kind of leadership coming out of the Office of Academic Affairs, coming out of the Provost for us to look at. I support and I really think it's a great idea to have the leadership, to have the ideas and intellectual challenges, but I do also think it would be important and would strengthen this whole process immensely if there were an opportunity for the faculty to say, "Yes, let's move forward on this." We did ask them to do that and that's why you have some of the explanations here as to what's going on. I think it would be better like that. And finally I am not sure if natural philosophy is part of the quadrivium or trivium but it's in the liberal arts someplace.

Chair Sterns: And I think I can say, as Chair, that I encouraged Dean Midha to be here to fully present to the Senate as a whole so there's an opportunity for us to begin the dialogue. We did raise the point that what happens if there are serious obstacles that would make this a non-opportunity and that we hope that that isn't the case, but that possibility exists.

Chand Midha: We'll address it and we'll go from there.

Chair Sterns: So, thank you for coming. Other questions?

Provost Sherman: The only thing I could add is that I think we were responsive to those suggestions by indicating by March 11th the ad hoc committee formed to *explore* the convergence. Then on the basis of that exploration, the report would be reviewed by the faculty at the May 6th meeting. So, it very well could be that the ad hoc committees would result in a recommendation to take this no further. In which case, that would be the recommendation, the faculty would hear it, and then we would go from there. But I think we were responsive in that way.

Senator Lillie: The only thing I wanted to say was to thank the Provost for making that clear for me because I think it was an important part that we had spent some time on. I also just want to say quickly that I think the Provost is serious about wanting your input and I would encourage you to take that back to your colleagues.

Chair Sterns: And I would say Senator Wilson that any time that the Executive Committee has a meeting of this nature it was because of the fact that the Senate was not meeting until today and that some decisions had to be made before that time. Otherwise, we try not to assert the power of the whole Senate and of course anything we do is subject to your review.

Senator Wilson: I'm very appreciative as well. I just want to say that. I guess my question was that I've heard it expressed in a general way about efficiency and other kinds of things. I haven't yet seen a very specific rationale for why this is a good thing *or* a bad thing. Are those specifics going to come out of the process of discussions? Is that sort of the idea here? Okay.

Provost Sherman: I think that the other universities who have considered an exercise like this let the process reveal the rationale from the perspective of the collaborations that can emerge, the ways students can move through programs with a better education. From a management perspective, it makes sense to have a shared services approach, so to speak, for the two colleges from a business and operations perspective. We want faculty to have the consideration to explore ways this would work or ways that it may not.

Also to improve the quality of the instructional enterprise such that the faculty and the TAs feel supported in improving the quality of instruction. That is partly why our students will be more satisfied with their experience at The University of Akron.

We're working on scheduling my interactions with the eight constituency groups related to the University Council proposal. I believe we're going to have an initial meeting of the constituency groups as a whole and have kind of a collaborative conversation about that proposal. After that we will have individualized conversations with each of the constituency groups.

Our Higher Learning Commission accreditation visit is scheduled for 2013. It was originally in 2012. We've asked for that to be in 2013 so that we have time to be more responsive to some of the issues that you urged from the previous accreditation interaction. We have time for some of the initiatives that have been underway to realize a greater indication of their support of the academic enterprise. The leadership of the various constituency groups will be contacted very shortly to recommend and nominate individuals who would be willing, available and energized to serve on the different committees that will be required to be appropriately responsive to that accreditation visit.

IV. Approval of Minutes – Chair Sterns called for the approval of the minutes of November 4, 2010. (so moved, seconded and approved)

Chair Sterns: Okay, the minutes of December 2nd. I have one correction, I could not have opened the meeting and then Senator Rich carried it on from that point. If you notice in the minutes, Senator Sterns opens the meeting so if we could make that correction. Are there any others? I appreciate it very much, Vice Chair Rich doing that. Any other corrections?

Chair Sterns called for the approval of the minutes of December 2, 2010 (so moved, seconded and approved)

II. cont'd Chair's Remarks and Announcements -

Chair Sterns: Because of the amount of work we have to do today I'm going to keep my remarks very brief. But I would like to say that since we last met that I have continued to be very pleased at the level of interaction and collaboration and openness that we have been experiencing in working with Provost Sherman and his staff as well a number of very fruitful meetings with both the President and the Provost and that is greatly appreciated. Thank you. I would like to give my personal thanks on behalf of the Executive Committee to Robert Huff in his role as having been Secretary of the Senate this year. During the break Professor Huff was promoted to the role of Acting Director of the School of Art. And if it's possible I would like to have a formal resolution to that effect.

Senator Speers: I recommend that we acknowledge Robert's exceptional service to our organization.

The resolution was seconded and passed without opposition.

Chair Sterns: So that leads us then to the election of a Secretary. Are there any nominations for the position of Secretary?

Senator Rich: I nominate Frank Bove.

With no other nominations, Senator Rich motioned that nominations be closed and that Senator Bove be elected Secretary by acclamation.

The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.

Chair Sterns: We also have another election. We need to officially elect two representatives to the Graduate council. And during the break I asked for individuals who are willing to serve in that capacity. I received two names and I would like to name them and I would like someone to make a motion to make that election. Senator Lin Chyi had agreed and also Senator Marlene Huff. Can we have a motion to that effect?

Senator Lillie: I move that those two be nominated to the post.

The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.

Reports - Executive Committee

Secretary Bove: The Executive Committee held four meetings during the months of December and January. On December 15th the committee met with President Proenza and Provost Sherman. Issues discussed included the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council, the next steps in the University Council approval process, the structure of the Office of Academic Affairs, and college reorganizations. The Provost was very generous with his time and stayed after the scheduled meeting to discuss these issues at length.

On January 6th the committee met with Provost Sherman and Dean Midha to discuss the idea of a convergence between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Creative and Professional Arts. After a lengthy discussion, a motion was brought forth and approved unanimously. The motion reads as follows: “The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate endorses the idea that Dean Chand Midha be appointed Acting Interim Dean of the College of Creative and Professional Arts upon approval of the Board of Trustees. We understand that this is an administrative step only.” At the conclusion of the meeting with the Provost and Dean Midha, the committee continued with regular business. Some of the items discussed included possible representatives for the Higher Learning Commission and the Graduate Council, the Curriculum Proposal Software, and the vacant Senate Secretary position.

On January 27th the committee again met with President Proenza, Provost Sherman, Dean Chand Midha, and Vice Provost Ramsier. The meeting began with the President sharing his views on emerging topics from the state budget and the implications for the university. Next, the Provost reported on the approved resolution by the Board of Trustees – Expectations for a Shared Leadership Consultative Decision Making Process. The Provost will convene the appropriate constituents to start discussing the implementation of the University Council. Dean Midah presented a timeline for the discussions and processes of the CAS & CCPA convergence. Vice Provost Ramsier presented an update on the university’s progress with the USO metrics. The following issues were also discussed in length: the strategic release of faculty positions, the next stages of university strategic planning, Centers and Institutes audit, Graduate school curriculum regarding the elimination of comprehensive exams, and progress identifying a new CFO.

The committee last met on January 28th to prepare the agenda for today’s meeting.

V. Committee Reports

Academic Policies Committee

Assoc Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns. Academic Policies committee is presently meeting on a bi-weekly schedule. We have discussed the charge to the committee from the Faculty Senate to revisit the issue of the TK20 implementation in the College of Education, specifically with the goal of determining the relationship of that policy with respect to academic freedom. You have the minutes of our meeting where we finalized that discussion and took a vote. Second bullet from the bottom reads, “A motion was made by Professor Li [who is also a senator here, in attendance] and seconded by Peggy Richards to move that APC concludes that the College of Education written policy statement suggested by the Dean for inclusion on course syllabi, regarding TK20, does *not* infringe on academic freedom.” A vote was taken, 11 yes and one no. The motion carried. That’s the report from APC to the senate for your consideration.

Senator Lillie: Just a real brief comment, based on the language that you have here. It says that the policy statement suggested by the dean for inclusion. That would mean to me that there might be some leeway as to whether or not if one felt strongly about it one might not put it on the syllabus. Was that the intent of this motion as far as you can recall?

Assoc Provost Ramsier: That was exactly the intent, it was clarified by many committee members that in fact that Senator Li herself made the motion. We had a discussion about requirement versus suggested. She indicated that herself and others in the college who did not want to put it on their syllabi did not and there were no ramifications of any form, no retaliation, no demands. So the committee felt that with that knowledge there was no violation of academic freedom.

Senator Lillie: That's a good precedent, thank you.

Senator Li: For the point of clarification, I reported that I was not charged for insubordination and the Dean did not take any disciplinary actions against me. But I did not conduct any investigation about whether part-time faculty members or not-yet-tenured faculty members received any warning or not. Just a point of clarification.

Curriculum Review Committee

Assoc Provost Ramsier: Curriculum Review Committee has been meeting and actually had special meetings. We meet bi-weekly but we added a meeting in order to arrive at proposed new rule language for 3359:20-05.2 the curricular changes, part of the Board rule. You have a copy of the committee's final vetted version of the new rule for your consideration. We would in essence rescind the entire rule that currently exists because there were so many changes in formatting it was just too hard to show you a redline version. So the committee brings this forward for your consideration either today or at a future meeting. We tried hard to get it to this body in time to have it in place in parallel with the new actual electronic system that we're implementing that you will decide whether we implement or not, obviously. So I leave this to you as a document for your consideration. If you have any questions I can try to articulate exactly what the language means and where some of the changes are. It's up to you.

Chair Sterns: So this is a recommendation, this document is a recommendation coming from the committee.

Assoc Provost Ramsier: From the committee, for adoption. I'm happy to answer questions.

Senator Lillie: I know that on the Executive committee we received a previous version of this document and after several minutes of discussion on that document we found that what we thought was the report of the committee was actually an interim report of the committee. So we made the decision, at least informally, to wait until we got the formal report of the committee so we would know exactly what it was. I would encourage, I will move that this particular document be referred to the Executive Committee for its review and a report be provided at the next meeting of the Senate as to what it feels would be the appropriate disposition of this particular rule. I would also add to that that this be made available to all of the senators so that they can read it and if they have any questions can then communicate them directly to the Executive Committee and or we can then send them on to the Curriculum Review Committee.

Chair Sterns: It would be your idea then that we would vote on this next meeting?

Senator Lillie: Yes.

Chair Stern: Is there a second to that?

Senator Erickson: I was just going to say the same thing, because is this not the I know it's university rule but is this not the bylaws in which case we have to hold it over anyway? Is that not correct?

Assoc Provost Ramsier: It's not part of the Senate bylaw.

Senator Erickson: No it's part of the university well so it's not required that I would give a second anyway because I think it should be looked at very carefully.

Chair Sterns: This is actually going to be suggested language which will come forward as a recommendation to the Board. This will in the end up being Board language if it is indeed adopted. Do we have a motion to...

Senator Lillie: Excuse me Senator Sterns, there's a motion on the floor to refer it right now.

Chair Sterns: Yes, I was going to repeat the motion. Thank you Dr. Lillie for your help; we appreciate it. What we are basically saying is that this would be sent to Executive Committee for review, would then make a Senate recommendation that would then we would make a recommendation for a vote at the next meeting. Yes.

Senator Lillie: And also that it be made available to the senators for their review electronically so that they can communicate any questions they might have.

Chair Sterns called for a vote on the motion.

The motion to refer the CRC's proposed rule language for 3359:20-05.2 to the Senate Executive Committee for review passed without opposition.

Athletics Committee

Senator Lillie: Very briefly, there's no report of the committee but I did want to point out that at last Saturday's men's basketball game halftime all of the student athletes who were on the Dean's list were honored by a formal recognition. There are more than 200, they actually published a list of it. I think it's always a good idea when we emphasize the student part of the student athlete pair.

Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council

Chair Sterns: Thank you. We'd like to encourage any committees that have not met to please go through the steps of meeting. Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council, Rudy Fenwick was not able to join us. I did attend that meeting as well. Basically, the discussion at the Ohio Faculty Council when they met in

December was really around issues of state teacher's retirement pension and what was happening and what was anticipated and I believe in the follow-up meeting for this month that will be discussed further. There was also continuing discussion regarding the budget as we have had similar discussions in this meeting today. It actually is quite valuable to hear what's happening on other campuses and the issues that they're dealing with and I really commend Professor Fenwick, as you know, he is Chair of Council at the state level. So, as we learn more things we'll be happy to share them with you. We're ready now for the ad hoc Curriculum Process Review Committee. The committee is presenting a resolution and since I chair that committee I will step out of my role as Senate Chair to present this resolution as Chair of the committee.

(Vice Chair Rich assumed meeting)

Ad Hoc Curriculum Process Review Committee

Senator Sterns: The Curriculum Process Review committee is co-chaired by Vice President Jim Sage and myself and you may think this is a strange thing to do but if I'm chairing I cannot present a resolution so that is why I'm stepping out of the role as Chair to do this. Just for those of you who wonder.

Acting Chair Rich: Senator Sterns is now an advocate.

Senator Sterns: I'm now an advocate. So I'd like to present to you, you have a written version of this resolution from the Curriculum Process Review committee. It reads: "The Curriculum Process Review Committee recommends the adoption of the new electronic curriculum review system at the university-wide level. It is recognized that there will be an implementation phase in which training will be conducted and adjustments made. All curriculum proposals will now be entered into the new system. The university rule on curriculum proposal, as may be amended by the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the Senate, shall drive the electronic curriculum training and adjustment processes. The Ad Hoc Committee continues as the college level processes are developed."

Senator Lillie: Just a question. It says "all curriculum proposals will now be entered into the new system." Does that mean that if this passes it will start right now?

Chair Sterns: Yes. And it is set up in such a way so that even at the college level the curriculum process is available. It's just that it's not yet designed at the electronic level to automatically send all the proposals to the individuals. So, what would happen is you would develop your proposal using the new system, but then when it came time to share with colleagues the copies would be made at this point. What will happen in the next phase of the project is each unique college level process will be then set up so that when the things are reviewed internally within the colleges then that will happen automatically. But we can't do that until the programming is done.

Senator Lillie: I believe then that that raises one more question for me. I think we have talked about it before. One of the values of this particular current system is that whether folks are aware of it or not, individual faculty members have always been able to independently enter curriculum proposals into the system. That doesn't mean that they are guaranteed any passage but they are able to independently enter

them into the system. Is that still the case? Will regular faculty members at their own instance be able to enter the curriculum proposals into the curriculum review system or will they have to depend on someone else to do it for them?

Chair Sterns: My answer is that they can do it themselves; however, as Erickson teaches us, normal dependency relationships can be accepted. So, if you wanted to ask someone to enter it for you, that probably would be appropriate as well. This is a serious issue though but what Senator Lillie is asking is, can someone initiate a new course, new curriculum and the answer is yes. So that I think that issue is clear and Senator Lillie probably is raising it in the minutes so it will be clear forever.

Senator Lillie: That's how I made it clear forever.

Senator Hajjafar: Entering proposal, if in the college level which is not approved, yet. So entering the proposals will be on the old system.

Chair Sterns: No.

Senator Hajjafar: Not the old system but whoever was preparing the proposals they would add to the system or someone would add to the system.

Chair Sterns: I hate to disagree with my learned colleagues, but as I understand it we will go onto the new system and when you go on your faculty center webpage you will be able to select curriculum and you can start the process right there.

Senator Hajjafar: Yes but it's in the college level is that right?

Chair Sterns: That's right. And you still have to do everything that you did before.

Senator Hajjafar: Entering the proposal is not the...

Chair Sterns: It would still have to be reviewed by your colleagues. It will still have to be reviewed by your college committee.

Senator Hajjafar: It should be automatically sent electronically to the college council, the curriculum review committee of the college, all those? That's the college level.

Senator Lillie: I was raising this because when we had the presentation a couple of meetings ago, if you recall, and the technician from the firm that's been working with us was showing us how a sample proposal might move forward. There was a point that he got to in his proposal where there was basically a Dean's veto that was put in there. And we had discussed that at the time that we wanted to make sure that that was clarified and what I wanted to do was make sure that before we got into the system moving along and then going back to have to correct something that we assumed would be there but wasn't, we would be as clear as possible that individual faculty can still enter into the system a curriculum proposal. That does not guarantee that it passes; it's just they can enter it if they wish. And that's all that I was trying to make clear

because I wanted to sort of ensure that we maintain the principle that the curriculum belongs to the faculty, it does not belong to the administration. I hope. And so it's real important, it seems to me, to ensure that if a faculty member wants to create a proposal or create a course, that faculty member has the right to start that process without having to go say, "Chair, please may I..." or "Dean, please may I..." That doesn't mean the individual is going to get what they want but they have the opportunity to do that. So, that's where this is coming from and I wanted to make sure that we were as clear on that aspect as anything else.

Chair Sterns: Some of you by the way may not find the system as challenging as the old system because it does wonderful things like cut and paste and uses all the latest kind of Word techniques. You don't have to re-enter material as it is self-populating. If you're calling up a course, change, the old version of the course will come up automatically so you don't have to enter it. So I know you'll miss the excitement of the old system.

Senator Mancke: This new system is still not easily accessible. Cause I can't find it. So, once this resolution is passed, the appropriate authorities will be notified so it is effective when the activation happens.

Chair Sterns: I'd like to request permission to speak for Karen Greene. She has been helping with and coordinating the efforts.

Vice Chair Rich; Do you really wish to speak for her or?

Chair Sterns: I'm asking that she may speak.

Vice Chair Rich: without objection, Ms. Greene.

Karen Greene: The system if you agree to the resolution today the plan in IT is to trigger the system to come on on Monday which is the 6th of February. So we did have a couple of snow days, we did get information from IT, there might be a one-day delay. It might be the 7th. But it's scheduled to turn on on Monday.

Chair Sterns: And the reason for that was of course that we wouldn't have the audacity to turn it on until we had permission from the Senate.

Vice Chair Rich: Which is what you are being asked today. Any further debate? Senator Hajjafar.

Senator Hajjafar: I said before, this resolution doesn't mean that the faculty have to enter the proposals into the system. Is that right? They may; they can. But that doesn't mean they have to. But after the college level is also level then faculty can.

Senator Lillie: Or there may be someone else in the college level who does that for them. The faculty will retain the right to do it if they wish.

Senator Steer: So the old system will be turned off when that one's turned on?

Senator Hajjafar: That's the understanding.

Chair Sterns: Well no, it's my understanding - that let's make sure we're clear on this - those proposals that are already in the system.

Senator Steer: They stay in the system. But nobody will be able to enter a proposal under the old system once that triggers, and nobody is trained on the system when it's turned on. None of the faculty are trained.

Karen Greene: There's a handful that have gone through some initial testing and I think they would be qualified to say that they've been trained.

Chair Sterns: Training materials have been developed. We have reviewed them. We also have suggested that key people on the committee and from the colleges who have been in the past people who have processed these. So we've suggested that in each of the colleges a key person be designated who you can go to first before having to call IT. And the materials are from the very beginning of the project a training specialist has been part of the team and has been developing the instructional sequence. I actually have materials sitting on my desk laying out how to operate the system from when we tried it out. The committee did not pass this resolution by the way until they had had a chance to go in and look at the system, try out various features and so forth. And we've been doing that for almost two months. Solving problems. We do not guarantee that there will some unique and creative glitch, some of you are very talented and might be able to find a way to cause the system to perform in less than optimal ways.

Senator Lillie: And if there are any problems senators can rely on you to help us sort those out.

Chair Sterns: I once again have Harvey dolls and pins for sale.

Vice Chair Rich called for a vote on the resolution.

The resolution to adopt the new electronic curriculum review system at the university-wide level passed without opposition.

(Chair Sterns assumed meeting)

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much. Senator Lillie wanted to make a brief statement regarding the ad hoc committee on Accessibility.

Ad Hoc Committee on Accessibility

Senator Lillie: Simply that we had discussed some time ago to refer to the Senate EC whether or not the role of this particular ad hoc committee should be folded into an existing committee or should be the task of it's own standing committee. And at this point the EC has asked that I continue to move forward with this as the interim chair of this committee to meet with the folks who are on it to see if we can develop a rule that might create a standing committee of the Senate on issue of disability and also accessibility policy. And that's where we are.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much. Before we move to New Business I would like to ask a question to Attorney General Mallo if he would clarify something for me. We typically include in course outlines a statement about sexual harassment and plagiarism. Are those required by university rules to be included in course outlines or is that at the option of the departments, colleges and so forth?

Ted Mallo: Both of those issues are covered by separate rules and I'm not familiar with those rules off the top of my head that would require that. But I could certainly report back to you on that.

Chair Sterns: Well, the reason I asked that question is because the next item of business that we're going to take up is germane to that. Because it speaks to the question of what is mandated versus what is chosen to be in course outlines.

Ted Mallo: For example with regard to sexual harassment we have a rule that addresses that in regard to all employees of the institution including faculty. As to whether or not that rule requires faculty to notify their students regarding the policy and what their redress is I'm not sure that's actually in the policy.

Chair Sterns: I just wanted to ask that question as background. Most of us also put some kind of plagiarism statement stating university rules in it as well. So that being the case I just wanted to have that as a piece of background. I'd like to call on Senator Li to present her resolution. Does everybody have a copy of the resolution?

New Business

Senator Li: Happy Chinese New Year. Okay, everyone has a copy?

Chair Sterns: There should be a background on one side and a resolution on the other.

Senator Li: I'm trying to verify my position. And my concern is that academic freedom is a complicated concept. It could mean different things to different people and I want to thank the Academic Policies Committee. The APC had thoroughly reviewed the case and I'm also serving on Academic Policies Committee. I might appear to be a double agent because the minutes of the APC you know that I actually made a motion and the motion indeed reflect the majority of the APC members perspective on this TK20 issue. But I sincerely believe that I am the representative of College of Education and not an agent. Many of my colleagues share my concern and that's the reason, under their advisement, that I drafted this resolution. And I hope the Faculty Senate can support the resolution so we can make it very clear about the non-administrative faculty's professional responsibilities in constructing the course syllabus. And we can also make clear the administration's responsibility that should be separate from the faculty's responsibility. Thank you.

(Senator Li moved that the aforementioned resolution be approved by the Faculty Senate.)

The motion was seconded and Chair Stern opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Steer: I'm not familiar with the TK20 thing but I have a couple comments about this. I'm really uncomfortable with this particular resolution for two main points. First point is if you look at academic freedom, it's really a stretch to suggest that policies within the syllabus, which are clearly administrative

components of a course, deal with academic freedom. Even if you disagree with this, my biggest issue with this resolution is that the subject says the Senate resolution supporting shared governance and academic freedom and the last line says that effectively we're going to eliminate shared governance because we don't want anyone in the administration discussing this with us. So, I really have problems with the way this is worded.

Senator Hajjafar: There are some budgetary issues required to be in the syllabus that do not come from faculty. For example, we in Math department know that the state gives money to the university according to the 14-day count. We want to encourage students not to register after the 14th day because we wouldn't get money from the state. So it's feasible to put such a statement in the syllabus that no addition is allowed after 14 days. So this something which is a budgetary issue and it makes sense. So, there are some statements which are OK and some which are not.

Senator Rich: The statement was made earlier during the academic policies committee report to the effect that this was not something that was mandatory to include there at least that there were no sanctions for failing to include it or declining to include it. The way the resolution is worded, "any member of the university administration shall refrain from preparing course syllabus statements for the faculty." That would seem to include suggestions of language to include and I don't see how it could possibly violate academic freedom for the administration to suggest language. I think it's probably well taken that there are some respects in which the administration could even require certain language to be included but certainly I don't see a problem with the administration suggesting language. I also think that there has been perhaps a failure to distinguish properly between academic freedom and faculty governance. It is the faculty that as a body that determines the curriculum, not the individual faculty member. So that in the courses that I teach, the faculty of the Law School does require - I happen to teach some required courses - that I cover certain subjects. Now, of course, I have a lot of leeway about exactly how I do that. But I think if I were to omit, for example, a separation of powers and federalism from Constitutional Law I, the administration would legitimately have a beef with me and to that extent it is the faculty that is dictating to a certain extent that I include certain things in the syllabus. Now that is not an administrative decision, that's a collective faculty decision, it does not violate my academic freedom for the faculty to make that determination and I think this resolution fails to distinguish properly between issues of faculty governance and issues of academic freedom.

Senator Li: I do think that if you talk about shared governance it is very critical very important for the dean's office to work with the faculty member in developing the policy statement. And so if you talk about the statements that ought to be included in the syllabus, we are talking about a policy statement. It's not a suggestion. And so to respond to the two comments, again we have to be aware of the fact that faculty was not involved in writing this policy statement. And then second, it's not just a simple suggestion because the title of the document clearly indicates it's a policy. And it's true that no disciplinary action was taken against any faculty member who did not comply with the policy but does that mean that from now on any mandate, any policy must include specific language about a certain disciplinary action that the administration will take? And I don't think we want to go that route.

Senator Newton: Hi my name's Evangeline Newton, I'm in the college of Education and I just want to express my concern and the concern of some of the faculty there who do teach courses where this is a recommended statement. If you'll go to the second page where it says background and it explains that in the final paragraph this statement asks us or says to our students that we may consider their not uploading this assignment in TK20 as not having completed the assignment. And we see those as two different things. We view the TK20 as data management system and the students turn the assignment into us and we grade the assignment and then they're responsible for the data management portion to upload that into TK20. Some of us are concerned that this has a sort of implied threat that failure to upload it means that we would give them an incomplete or we would consider the assignment as not having been finished when in fact it was finished and it was handed to us and we did grade it. I also want to say that we weren't consulted with this. Now there have been no repercussions. I did not include this in my course statement but we did receive an e-mail at the beginning of the semester saying that this was going to go into our syllabi. A lot of the courses that require TK20 are taught by the adjunct faculty who of course receive those communications in a different way from those of us who've been around for awhile and are full-time. So, I think that those are some of the concerns that are shared by many of us in the College of Education who teach the courses that require these TK20 assignments. Now I am not arguing the academic freedom aspect, I see all those arguments as you presented them, but I do want to at least say that there is a real concern here on the part of many faculty and I believe that Li is trying to express that.

Senator Lillie: I just wanted to indicate that in the last sentence of the final resolution, I also agree that I don't see any problem with anyone, administrators student or anyone, recommending language or suggesting language and I think that should be part of any kind of opportunity to cooperate between the faculty and other bodies. The way the language is now I can't support it, but if it did have language in it that was indicating that for instance to add to the end of that sentence “, without the consent of the faculty” would indicate that that would be an opportunity for the faculty wished to add their consent to add things.

Senator Rich: I think what's been said since my last remarks confirms that this is probably more of faculty governance issue than a academic freedom issue. And you know it may be that there's a need to pursue that aspect of it. There is something that strikes me as peculiar about this and that is, that if I understand correctly and I hope someone will correct me if I'm wrong, but there's actually not a requirement that faculty members in the college require their students to use this system. The statement makes it clear that none of this is mandatory right? The faculty may do this but it doesn't say they must do this.

Senator Newton: The students are required to use this, this is a requirement. They are required to buy it and to use it. It is very controversial. I mean in our college.

Senator Rich: Let me try to make my question more precise. May a faculty member accept work from the student that is not submitted using this system and award them ultimately course credit for having satisfied the requirements of their course?

Senator Newton: They turn it in to us before they upload it into the system. So this is something that happens after we've already graded it and returned it to them. What this statement implies, I believe that last paragraph, is that we can withhold the grade from them if they don't upload it into the system.

Senator Rich: You're also free not to.

Senator Newton: Not to withhold grades? Yeah.

Senator Rich: So the odd part is that a faculty member who chooses, as they may, not to require any of this of their students in order to earn credits for the course is mandated to or is at least strongly encouraged if not mandated to include this in the syllabus where it gives a false impression to the student about what the faculty member requires. Although a student who reads it carefully should see the may's and distinguish them from must's.

Senator Newton: Right but even so.

Senator Rich: In that respect it strikes me as odd.

Chair Sterns: Okay permission for Vice Provost Ramsier to speak.

Vice Provost Ramsier: Just to refresh the memory of some senators or to inform the newer senators. When APC looked at this issue last year, we came back with a report that in essence we studied all the documents. The college faculty unanimously voted in 2007 to pick TK20 as the mechanism through which they collected the information for the already required portfolios of their students. Their students have to take courses and they also have to do a portfolio in order to graduate. The only decision that was made by the college faculty in 2007 was to stop doing the paper portfolios and use TK20. So, that's the background the way I remember it, at least. And we have College of Ed faculty here who can correct me, but TK20 was implemented as a tool to collect the information from students that was required for them to graduate. Okay and also is useful for the NK accreditation of the college. So, it wasn't the dean or the administration forcing students to use TK20. The college faculty vetted different tools and picked this one. Yes, it costs the students \$100. That's now a fee. College of Education students know when they sign up to be a major there's a hundred dollar fee that's good for the lifetime of their tenure here as a student through which they are paying for access to TK20. And now the second revisit of TK20 issue, you'll see in the background section of this resolution, says, "which requires inclusion," but APC was not provided with any information, and actually to the counter, that the dean didn't require anyone to put this in their syllabus. The statement does not require the faculty to do anything. It's simply an indication that some faculty may, and they do have the right to, withhold their grade until the student has performed the added effort of putting this information on TK20. The value of this statement and I'm not suggesting that the way it was communicated is necessarily the best, with respect to governance, but with respect to the students this is a way to inform students that they have to remember to fulfill this obligation or they will pass all their classes and they still cannot graduate. Because they didn't fulfill portfolio requirements. So this would be, could be one mechanism in which to inform students of the need for them to go and do that work. So, I think I've said enough for APC, but you need to be informed about the full picture, that we as a committee of the Senate actually review. Thank you.

Senator Lillie: Just to add to that, the recollection that I have is that the faculty vote was to recommend the use of TK20 solely as an electronic portfolio, as you say, to replace the paper portfolio and the sanction was intended to be if students did not have all of the items in the portfolio submitted, and this was true of the paper portfolio as well as the electronic portfolio, they were supposedly forbidden from student teaching.

Not from graduation, from student teaching. That's a very different thing. Secondly, it was and I'm not sure I can come up with any names on the floor of the Senate but it's my recollection that there were many students who for one reason or another had paper portfolios that were not completed, were not given back to them by an instructor who perhaps was part-time and left or whatever and we never the less made the exception and approved them for student teaching. So this represents, this kind of draconian view that some of us have, represents a change from what the faculty thought we had in place. And as I've said, the faculty wanted to do this and consistent with what Senator Rich has said, the faculty went through the appropriate process and said we want you to put this on your syllabus. I might grumble, but I'd do it because the faculty said so. What I am concerned about and what I think perhaps is to some extent helping explain why this particular issue won't go away is that there seems to be different ways of using it than some of us that were around recollect. So I think this particular resolution I suspect, I won't speak for Dr. Li, but my view is that it comes forward out of that kind of ferment that kind of lack of closure.

Senator Hajjafar: This resolution may solve the problem of TK20, but there are some other situations where it is problematic. Some courses are twenty sections of a course, for uniformity of that course a coordinator is assigned for that. And the coordinator decides, I'll give an example in the Math department. For example, I decide that there is a technology component for this course which requires the use of a calculator. Now here yes, it comes from the faculty and the other faculty may accept it, but what if half of the faculty say, "No, I'm not going to do that." So, here on one hand we want all the courses to be uniform, to be the same and on the other hand this resolution gives the power to some other to say no I'm not going to use that. That's creates some contradiction for other situations.

Senator Li: Can I just respond to the Vice Provost's statement about the faculty of the College of Education unanimously supporting the adoption of TK20. I think that is inaccurate. I distinctly remember I did not vote for the adoption of the TK20, so it was not a unanimous vote. Second, because the implementation of TK20 was very problematic in 2007 and 2008, so that the faculty of College of Education actually support the moratorium of the implementation of TK20. And then the dean in 2008 actually told us that because the university already signed a contract with TK20 and because of the university's concern about financial loses, so we cannot afford to cancel the contract. That's just a point of clarification. And in response to your concern, I think that part-time faculty member are members of our university community and in light of what Dr. Lillie says, if this statement had been reviewed by part-time faculty members, representative part-time faculty members, we are still concerned as faculty members collectively. To a certain degree an individual faculty member shall be limited, so the resolution is not to maximize individual faculty member's academic freedom. It is to make it clear that the construction of course syllabus should be the faculty, not administrative faculty's responsibility. And it's very critical, it's very important, because we as faculty members have to see ourselves as professionals, individually and collectively. So, by no means is this resolution to suggest that individual faculty members shall have absolute academic power. So, I probably should ammend the resolution to make it clear.

Chair Sterns: Okay I think we have a number of issues that are mixed in here.

Senator Rich: In light of the fact that at best the resolution needs some rewording,

Senator Lillie: As Senator Rich made the point to postpone indefinitely I would point out that's parliamentary way of saying basically kill it at this point. Just so people are aware what it means.

Senator Rich: But it does not preclude a reworded version being introduced anew.

Senator Lillie: Right.

The motion to indefinitely postpone the TK20 resolution was seconded and passed with one dissenting vote.

Chair Sterns: As you heard, a reworded resolution could be brought forward. Is there any other business to come before the Senate today?

VI. Adjournment:

Chair Sterns called for a motion to adjourn.

The motion was made, seconded and passed without opposition.

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 3, 2011

APPENDIX A

APC Meeting Minutes

January 14, 2011

3:30-4:30 / LH 416

In attendance: Linda Barrett, Deb Hayes, Gwendolyn Jones, Debra Keller, John Lanshe, Huey Li Li, Chuck Monroe, Ruth Montz, Rex Ramsier, Peggy Richards, Nancy Roadruck, and Ethel Wheland.

Meeting Agenda: Approved

Meeting Minutes (12/3/2010): Approved as corrected (see below)

- Potential impact statement distributed and reviewed. Committee did not see any inconsistency.

Withdraw/Drop Policy

The revised language has not yet been made available.

Tk20

- APC reviewed the charge from Faculty Senate as well as the supporting documentation from the College of Education.
- Discussion ensued.
- Key issue- can the dean ask faculty to include statement on syllabus? If college faculty voted does this give the dean the right to say what is necessary for syllabus? Professor Li indicated no repercussions have been noted for failure to include dean's suggested written statement on course syllabi.
- What is the objection to having the statement on the syllabus if the college voted to use Tk20? How does this hurt the student? Students can receive a grade without Tk20 submissions.
- Does the college have minimum guidelines/policies regarding what should be included on course syllabi? COE has NCATE templates.
- A motion was made by Professor Li and seconded by Peggy Richards to move that APC concludes that the COE written policy statement suggested by the dean for inclusion on course syllabi regarding Tk20 does not infringe on academic freedom. By a vote of 11 yes, 1 no, the vote carried.
- A motion was put forward and seconded that APC will return the minutes reflecting this Tk20 discussion and vote to Faculty Senate for its next meeting. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Greene

APPENDIX B

Curriculum Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
January 24, 2011

In attendance: Steve Brooks, Kathleen Clark, Ali Hajjafar, Mike Jalbert, Sharalyn Laster, Elizabeth Mancke, Evangeline Newton, Rex Ramsier, James Steiger, and Michele Thornton.

Guests: John Savery, Deb Hayes, and Karen Greene,

Meeting agenda: Approved
Meeting minutes (1/21/2010): Approved

DL Curriculum Proposals

Committee members will review the outstanding DL curriculum proposals and send comments.

- § SC-11-01
- § SC-11-02
- § SC-11-06
- § AS-11-022
- § ED-11-03
- § ED-11-04
- § ED-11-07
- § ED-11-12
- § ED-11-13
- § ED-11-14
- § ED-11-15
- § ED-11-19
- § ED-11-21
- § ED-11-23

Zero credit hour courses will be added to future committee discussions.

Curriculum Process Rule Language Discussion

CRC continued to review and revise the board rule language for curriculum changes. When the BOT rule language is complete, the Committee will begin to work on the Faculty Senate bylaws language for GEAC, DLRC, and URC.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Greene

Resolution from Curriculum Process Review Committee – January 28, 2011

The Curriculum Process Review Committee recommends the adoption of the new electronic curriculum review system at the university-wide level. It is recognized that there will be an implementation phase in which training will be conducted and adjustments made. All curriculum proposals will now be entered into the new system. The university rule on curriculum proposals, as may be amended by the BOT on the recommendation of the Senate, shall drive the electronic curriculum review training and adjustment processes. The Ad Hoc Committee continues as the college level processes are developed.

APPENDIX D

Background

On February 4, 2010, the Faculty Senate designated the Academic Policies Committee (APC) to conduct a preliminary investigation of the adoption and implementation of TK-20 in the College of Education. The primary purpose of the investigation was to examine whether implementation of the policy has infringed upon the faculty's academic freedom.

The Academic Policies Committee, led by Associate Provost Rex Ramsier, carefully reviewed documents and policy statements concerning the adoption and implementation of TK-20 in the College Education. After careful deliberation, the Committee concluded that the adoption of TK-20 in the College of Education was beyond the purview of APC.

On May 6, 2010, the Faculty Senate referred the TK-20 issue back to the Academic Policies Committee to fully consider whether the TK-20 policy infringes on the faculty's academic freedom.

On January 14, 2011, the Academic Policies Committee re-examined TK-20 policy. The Committee focused on the *TK-20 Administration Implementation and Fee Structure Policy Document*, which requires the inclusion of the following statement in all course syllabi with key assessments in initial and advanced programs:

Electronic Submission:

*Your requirements in this course also include the electronic submission of specific key assignment artifacts using the TK-20 system. All students enrolled in teacher preparation licensure programs at the undergraduate (BA/BS) or graduate levels (MS in Curriculum and Instruction licensure options) and in post bac licensure only) are required to submit artifacts electronically using the TK20 system. **Effective Spring 2010, all students enrolled in the Master of Arts (Elementary, Secondary and Special Education including Literacy Options); the Master of Arts in Educational Foundations - Instructional Technology Specialized Option; the Computer Technology Endorsement; the Master of Arts or Master of Science in Educational Administration: Principalship; Principalship Licensure (Post-University of Akron/College of Education Master's); and the Principalship Licensure Only are also required to submit key artifacts using TK20.***

You can obtain your subscription to TK-20 at <https://uakron.tk20.com>.

Please note that failure to submit key assignment artifacts using the Tk20 system will be considered in the same manner as failure to comply with other course requirements. Specifically, your instructor may consider the assignment as not completed which will impact your final grade. The instructor also has the option of giving you an Incomplete grade ("I"). Should you receive an Incomplete, please be aware that failure to submit the artifact as required by the end of exam week of the following term, not including summer sessions, converts the "I" to an "F."

(Source: *TK-20 Administration Implementation and Fee Structure Policy Document*)

**UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
FACULTY SENATE
RESOLUTION [DRAFT]**

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolution in Supporting Shared Governance and Academic Freedom
[* Filter does not support this file format | In-line.TIF *]

WHEREAS academic freedom is the cornerstone of higher education institutions that continue to play a key role in advancing knowledge and pursuing public interest; and

WHEREAS the faculty at the University of Akron are entitled to academic freedom in research and teaching within their academic units and the University (AAUP: 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure); and

WHEREAS the faculty, guided by the pursuit of academic freedom, shall recognize their professional responsibilities in teaching, research, and service; and

WHEREAS the faculty's fulfilling their teaching responsibilities shall include, but not be limited, to developing and implementing well-constructed course syllabi that facilitate students' higher learning, foster academic honesty, and ensure fair evaluations of students' performance; and

WHEREAS academic freedom and shared governance are inextricably linked and mutually supportive; and

WHEREAS Faculty Senate is "the legislative body of the faculty regarding its academic mission" (*University Rules* 3359-10-02); and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University administration recognizes that syllabus construction is the faculty's professional responsibility;

And be it further resolved that any member of the University administration shall refrain from preparing course syllabus statements for the faculty.