

12-4-2018

## Faculty Senate Chronicle for November 1, 2018

Heather Howley

*University of Akron*, [hhowley@uakron.edu](mailto:hhowley@uakron.edu)

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: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

---

### Recommended Citation

Howley, Heather. "Faculty Senate Chronicle for November 1, 2018." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 4 Dec 2018. *IdeaExchange@Uakron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/147>

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](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

November 1, 2018

28 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

1. Adopted a resolution from the Curriculum Review Committee to approve the list of course proposals (Appendix A).
2. Adopted a resolution from the Academic Policies Committee. The APC recommends approval of the proposal by the LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education to merge its two remaining departments, the Department of Curricular and Instructional Studies and the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, into one department. The merged department will work out a new set of merit and RTP guidelines and will remain its own unit in the College of Education (Appendix B).
3. Approved the list of graduates for Fall 2018 Commencement.

## Table of Contents

Minutes of Faculty Senate meeting held November 1, 2018.....	4
Appendices to Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting held on November 1, 2018	
A. The Curriculum Review Committee Report.....	22
B. The Academic Policies Committee Report .....	23
C. The Computing and Communications Technology Committee Report...	28

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

November 1, 2018

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, November 1, 2018 in room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Senate Chair Linda Saliga called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

Of the current roster of 62 senators, 39 attended the meeting. Senators Bean, Broadway, Budd, Elbuluk, Hariots, McKnight, Nofziger, Randby, Schulze, Simms, Thornton and Xi were absent with notice. Senators Adamowicz-Hariasz, Bible, Cargill, Cole, Dey, Espanol, Hreno, Nicholas, Soucek, Walker and Wang were absent without notice.

*I. Adoption of Agenda*

On Senator Roy's motion, the agenda was adopted as amended by Chair Saliga without dissent.

*II. Adoption of Minutes of the October 4th, 2018 Meeting*

On Senator Bennington's motion, the minutes were adopted without dissent.

*III. Remarks of the Chair*

The final report from the Administrative Activities Review was released last week. I found the report informative and, at first, disappointing. As a faculty member, my immediate reaction to the fact that no instantaneous actions were

taken was disappointing. After all, there were instantaneous actions that effected students when APR was reported to the board, which I will come back to in a moment. After taking some time to think about it, I decided that the administration might have learned a lesson from the APR process, and didn't forget the effects of former President Scarborough's layoffs. I'm hopeful that reallocation of resources and budget cuts will be implemented next year, using the three-year plans. Two things I would like the administration to keep in mind, and link, regarding our current financial situation: we are assuming a \$45 million deficit for the next fiscal year with \$37 million from general funds going to auxiliary services; that is, we spend \$37 million on departments that are supposed to be self-sufficient. I believe the majority of the budgetary cuts should be in the auxiliary services, with major scrutiny given to athletics.

As I mentioned before, the actions taken as a result of APR were immediate; if a student wasn't admitted to one of the affected programs as of August 15, 2018, there are not allowed to seek that degree. Last month we passed a resolution to permit degree completion for un-coded students. Interim President Green's response to that resolution was, "Since August 15, 2018, students who had paperwork/clerical issues which interfered with their admission to the now suspended programs have been handled on a case-by-case basis. In each case, the students were admitted retroactively if there was evidence to support such an action." This response misses the point of the resolution; current students who were working towards a degree, but hadn't started the paperwork to officially declare the degree, are not being allowed to receive the degree. These are the

students the resolution referred to. I hope Interim President Green will reconsider his response.

APC is bringing forth two recommendations. The first is to recommend merging the remaining two departments in the LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education into one. I agree with this recommendation, and think they should simply be a college, not a department within a college.

The second recommendation is related to APR. The basis of the rationale for this recommendation is sound – the board rule states that curricular changes must have university approval – but implementation isn't feasible.

As I've stated before, the input the faculty was asked to give throughout the APR process did not include "which programs do you recommend suspending admission to and phasing-out." The report from the APR committee and APC cannot be construed as approval of resulting curricular changes approved by the board – that question was never put before us. I believe the desire of this body was to use the APR report this year to jointly make decisions about how to redistribute resources, which would include eliminating programs.

Using the Curriculum Proposal System to review each of the 80 programs that were cut in the manner APC is requesting isn't feasible. The system is set up to evaluate changes the faculty wish to make to their programs, and proposals have to originate in the unit providing the program. My programs, mathematics BS and MS, were cut (applied math versions stayed) and I don't want to enter a proposal that simply says please don't eliminate this program. I would be willing to enter a proposal that would address the administrations reasons for phasing out

the math program; making changes to the program that would address these issues. Unfortunately, my department has not received any rationale from the administration as to why the math programs were on the list, so I have nothing to address. I'm requesting, again, that the administration provide to each unit complete rationale for suspending admission to and phasing out the unit's program(s).

The administration told us that programs could be reevaluated through the three-year planning process. I know several programs are being presented, at least to the college dean, to be reconsidered.

Programs cannot be eliminated until they have no students. Each unit has time, I think five years (but I don't know when that clock starts), to propose changes to the affected programs before they disappear at the state level. As long as a program is still on the books, the administration has to consider any changes to it that are proposed through the curriculum proposal system/process. Faculty input could be given along the way to make the case for keeping the revised program stronger.

If we are going to survive, we have to look forward. This concludes my remarks.

#### *IV. Special Announcements*

Dr. Isadore Newman, who was recognized with the distinction of Distinguished Professor in 1998, died Oct. 3 in Miami, Fla. He was 75.

Newman joined the University on Sept. 15, 1971, after earning a Ph.D. at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. He held several positions in what is now the LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education, including department chair. Newman retired on July 1, 2006. He then took a position at Florida International University as a visiting scholar.

For generations of University of Akron students and many, many colleagues, friends and community members, the name Dr. George Knepper is as legendary as some of the historical figures he brought to life in the classroom and in the books he wrote.

Knepper, who retired in 1992 as Distinguished Professor Emeritus of History and University Historian Emeritus, died on Oct 20. He was 92.

A native of Akron, Knepper graduated from Buchtel High School in 1943. He then served in the U.S. Navy during World War II before returning home to enroll in classes at UA. He earned a B.A. in History in 1948. Knepper began his career in teaching at UA in 1954 after earning an M.A. and Ph.D. at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and completing a Fulbright Fellowship at the University of London.

During his long career, the prolific scholar wrote eight books, including two histories of the University — “New Lamps for Old” and “Summit’s Glory,” “Akron: City at the Summit” and “Ohio and Its People.”

Knepper also took on administrative roles, including head of the Department of History, dean of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, interim vice



president for academic affairs and director of educational research and development.

Knepper's numerous honors include UA's Outstanding Teacher Award in 1978, Distinguished Teaching Award of the Ohio Academy of History in 1985 and UA's Alumni Honor Award for Excellence in Professional Achievement in 1994. Knepper also received a Newberry Library Fellowship, Award of Merit from the American Association for State and Local History, and the Ohio Academy of History's Distinguished Service Award.

Even in retirement, Knepper continued to teach Ohio History classes on a part-time basis and he was a frequent guest speaker for school groups, civic organizations and historical societies. Over the years, he served as president of the Summit County Historical Society, Ohio Historical Society and the Ohio Academy of History.

In 1994, The George W. Knepper Endowed Lecture Series was established in his honor with a gift by Arnold and Jill Bellowe. Each fall, a guest speaker is brought to campus to deliver a talk on various aspects of American history.

Dr. Michael d'Amico, professor emeritus of marketing, died Oct. 22. He was 75.

The Hoboken, N.J., native, who earned a Ph.D. in Business Administration at Texas Tech University, first taught at Michigan Technological University. He joined our College of Business Administration as an assistant professor on Sept. 15, 1972. In 1977, d'Amico was promoted to associate professor and became a full professor in 1982. Over the course of his career, d'Amico was a prolific

author, publishing many journal and business press articles, and co-authoring several marketing text books. He retired on June 1, 2008.

*V. Report of the Executive Committee*

The Executive Committee met 3 times since the last regular meeting.

On Oct. 18, we discussed open seats on the University Council and certified elections. We also prepared for the meeting with the Interim President and Provost on the subject of shared governance.

On Oct. 18th, the EC met with the Provost, Interim President Green, and CFO Nathan Mortimer, to discuss the subject of shared governance. We discussed definitions and differing expectations with regard to what constitutes shared governance, specifically the difference between shared decision-making and consultation. The EC used the recent program review process to highlight differences in interpretations of effective consultation. CFO Mortimer was asked by Interim President Green to discuss the University Council's Budget Committee as an example of effective governance. Discussions about shared governance will be ongoing.

On Oct. 25th, the EC met to prepare the agenda for the faculty senate meeting. We also discussed open seats on the University Council, AAR, athletics, the special Senate meeting to discuss the strategic action plan on Nov. 29th, formative cyclical program review, and posting a synopsis of Senate actions and discussion topics in a digest report.

This concludes my report.

*VI. Remarks of the President*

Interim President Green expressed optimism with regard to the presidential search, the strategic action plan, and the discussions of shared governance. He discussed the need to find good candidates that are passionate about the University of Akron. He highlighted the important role of the action plan in The presidential search. The plan is expected to have an immediate effect on the budget and the kind of candidate that is attracted to UA. He explained the need for the plan to be comprehensive and tied to the budget.

On Nov 12<sup>th</sup>, Deans and VP's will present their plans. The draft plan will be shared with the governance bodies over Thanksgiving. The plan will be discussed by the UC on the 27<sup>th</sup> and Senate on the 29<sup>th</sup>. Revisions will be made. UC will endorse the plan on their regular meeting on December 4<sup>th</sup>, and the plan will be presented to the Board of Trustees on December 5<sup>th</sup>.

Interim President Green expected the plan to drive the search and the budget process. The timeline is following what was set out by the action committee. The action plan originated in the colleges, and while it is easy to be cynical, the president intends to abide by the process and plan as the budget will allow. The plan and the process will impact the allocation the resources for the 2020 budget. Interim President Green intends to hand the new president a plan and a process and the hope is that the new president will allow things to continue while they learn the institution.

Interim President Green described the strategic action planning process as a positive step forward in shared governance. He summed up the meetings with the EC as productive and expressed a need to develop some operational terms and consensus on the meaning of governance. He asserted that since many people were occupying new roles, some governance problems may have been created due to lack of practice in exercising shared governance within the context of new responsibility.

Interim President Green moved on to discuss the implications of AAR. He promised that all units will be asked to make budget adjustments including auxiliary units, unlike in past budget reductions which placed a heavier burden on departments and administrative support.

Interim President Green referenced two items discussed by Chair Saliga. He misunderstood the intention behind the resolution on un-coded students and committed to fixing the problem for those students. He also referenced the APC's resolution on the APR process and reiterated Chair Saliga's remarks that the APC proposal was unworkable. Since the programs cannot be phased out until all of the students can be taught out, the three year action plan offers a better pathway for decision-making on those programs. He was in discussion with faculty until the issue was taken up by AAUP and then there needed to be a new process.

Questions for the President:

Senator Shott asked about the timeline for the search in relation to the action plan.

Interim President Green asserted that the presidential search team will have the action plan posted upon which to act.

Senator Sahl asked about the timeline for the search.

Interim President Green committed to serve as interim president until a new president has been found but was hopeful that the search would be well underway by February of next year and would conclude with a new President on campus by Fall of 2019.

#### *VII. Remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost*

Provost Ramsier remarked that the AAR report showed that the campus is efficient and thinly staffed. He has yet to decide if certain areas will be reconsolidated in central units or if it would be better to leave them dispersed. He stated that the three year action plan would determine these decisions.

Monetization of some assets was mentioned and the administration is looking for a mechanism to have some facilities managed by outside entities with perhaps a leased buy-back plan. The Provost mentioned that some auxiliaries have a big debt load and outside management is being considered.

He reiterated that the three year action plan was significant and that the results of the plan are not predetermined. He appreciated all the serious effort that has been put into the plan on such a short timeline.

The Provost commended Karl Kaltenthaler's efforts on helping students apply for prestigious fellowships. He will also host a number of workshops

through ITL on the application process. The Provost asked faculty to contact him if they would like to participate in either a committee on this issue or participate in the workshops.

The Provost shared his frustration with the current curriculum proposal system. He summarized the work of Chair Saliga and the CRC committee to develop a better system and a much more streamlined process by modifying the rules and processes.

Provost Ramsier noted that enrollment has a positive outlook even though it is very early in the process. The number of applications are at 6800 versus 5300 last year. He mentioned a new enrollment plan for in state and out of state students. The number of admitted students is up and 136 students have confirmed up from 37. He ended by encouraging everyone to participate in visit days.

Senator Sahl asked if the new admittance requirements will remain in effect.

Provost Ramsier confirmed that the requirements remain in place.

Senator Sterns inquired about the return of McNair program, and commented that it was particularly helpful for recruiting minority students.

Provost Ramsier stated that it was a grant funded program that is in that unit's three year action plan.

#### *VIII. Approval of the List of Graduates for Fall 2018*

On Senator Bennington's motion, the list of graduates was approved for Fall 2018. The motion was approved without dissent.

#### *IX. Committee Reports*

A. Curriculum Review Committee

Provost Ramsier presented a motion to approve the curriculum proposals (Appendix A) sent with the agenda. The motion carries.

B. Academic Policies Committee

Senator Howley presented the first resolution of Academic Policies Committee: The APC recommends approval of the proposal by the LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education to merge its two remaining departments, the Department of Curricular and Instructional Studies and the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, into one department. The merged department will work out a new set of merit and RTP guidelines and will remain its own unit in the College of Education.

The motion was approved without dissent. (See Appendix B for the full APC report).

Senator Howley presented the second resolution of the Academic Policies Committee: The APC recommends that proposals for the program eliminations of August 15, 2018 be referred to CRC and APC, who will properly vet the proposals and will gather feedback from faculty in the affected programs.

Senator Brown echoed Chair Saliga's remarks from earlier in the meeting.

Senator Makki asked for clarification on how reinstating the suspended programs would work if they have gone to the state.

Provost Ramsier confirmed the suspensions have already gone to the state and were sent just days after the board's decision.

Chair Saliga noted that the Provost could send a follow-up letter asking the state to remove the suspension. Provost Ramsier responded that although it may be possible it would be an inefficient process and he expressed support for the Chair's remarks.

Senator Kandray asked if there was any other mechanism for these units to bring these programs back.

Chair Saliga reaffirmed that the three year action plan was the mechanism for bringing the programs back by submitting them through the Curriculum Proposal System.

Senator Howley explained that the resolution was designed to correct a critical error in the 2018 program review, namely that the affected program faculty had no opportunity to submit a rebuttal or correct incorrect information. In 2014, the administration followed a process that was deemed acceptable by multiple governance bodies including the Faculty Senate. This process allowed for the appropriate review of the programs. The APC believed that by passing this resolution, a violation of the process could be corrected.



Senator Scotto sought to confirm that the program cuts should have been reviewed by the faculty prior to the cuts, but since they were already sent to the state it may not be possible to bring back programs even if they were reviewed positively.

Chair Saliga confirmed that the programs could not simply be reinstated. Changes would need to be made.

Senator Sterns commented on the fact that there was no opportunity or process to correct factual errors or misunderstanding. He lamented that he had yet to understand how programs could be closed and reported to the Ohio Department of Education without going to the shared governance process. Cleveland State was a part of a program that was eliminated and they did not plan to simply drop the program. They are going through their processes properly.

Cahir Saliga explained that the motion would not undo the program suspensions since they have already gone to the state and were suspended.

Senator Shott asked why the procedure was followed in 2014 but not this time.

Chair Saliga commented that CRC was involved in the process but the curriculum proposal process was not involved four years ago.

Provost Ramsier contended that the two processes were not comparable. There was not an APR committee. In 2014, the administration handed to

the committee the suspensions and the Senate made the decision on how to handle it. He argued that the 2018 process was not a violation, rather a different process. Senate referred The APR report to APC. He didn't believe that there was not a violation of the board rule since the Senate made the referral.

Senator Shott said the question was how the two processes differed.

Senator Howley suggested that the two processes were very different. In 2014, the Senate and the faculty had the opportunity to vet the specific proposed program cuts. In 2018, there was not opportunity to discuss the actual cuts because these were not made public prior to sending them to the Board of Trustees. There was no chance for faculty to give feedback. The APC was given very little direction with regard to how to approach the APR report. In fact, we were told to look for strategic investments rather than cuts and that was reflected in our report that was approved by the Senate.

Senator Scotto stated that the 80 programs did not have the opportunity to give feedback. She noted that the resolution would give the programs the opportunity to redress factual errors and possibly bring the programs back.

Chair Saliga said the state would not consider would any reinstatement without significant changes to the programs.

Senator Sterns referenced that Interim President Green said that he would entertain appeals.

Senator Seher noted that deans may not have clearly explained that the three year planning process was the mechanism for changing the program suspensions and that it needed to be clearly communicated.

Senator Kandray asked how many programs were saved that were flagged for elimination in 2014.

Chair Saliga did not have specific numbers but knew that some were saved.

Senator Makki asked for clarification about whether or not programs can be reinstated without substantial changes and Interim President Green's comments that he could reinstate programs on an individual level. She noted that these statements appeared contradictory.

Provost Ramsier clarified that programs that were suspended could be not reinstated because they were eliminated for strategic reasons such as duplicative programs or substantial flaws. Those reasons would need to be addressed in the three year action plan. He described reinstatement as the wrong word, since some change in the program would be required. He reiterated the President's point of view that the process was now in labor management with the AAUP.

Senator Foster clarified that these programs would be treated as new programs proposed under the curriculum proposal system, and treated as such by the state.

Chair Saliga confirmed this and reread the resolution under consideration.

Senator Bennington discussed his role as the student Senate representative and discussed confusion among the students about the program closures. He argued for a no vote on the resolution in order to move forward.

Senator Li spoke in favor of the resolution, in order to publically examine the criteria used for program closures as well as the learning opportunity that such an examination would afford.

Senator Shott asked to reconsider the motion next month. He noted that the resolution has two different elements, the proposal and governance issues. He stated his support for the resolution in relation to governance even if the first part of the resolution cannot be undertaken.

Parliamentarian Rich stated that Senator Schott could move to recommit the motion with instructions to the APC to focus on governance.

Senator Shott moved to recommit the motion to the APC with the request that the motion focus on the governance issue rather than on the curricular changes.

Senator Sterns seconds.

Senator Hajifar objected to the motion on the grounds that it will be too late to make any changes prior to the end of the term.

Senator Sterns commented that following the governance procedures are important. He summarized the various sites for governance discussions that should have been included in the program cuts including Faculty Senate, UC, and grad council. He reminded the body that we are still under watch by the HLC regarding shared governance.

Senator Barrett reflected that based on the report of the EC, the resolution may be redundant.

Senator Shott disagreed and noted that while the discussions in EC are geared toward future issues, the resolution is meant to illustrate that the program suspensions were not made in good faith.

Chair Saliga called for a vote.

25 yeas. 14 opposed on the motion to recommit. The motion carried and was recommitted to the APC.

#### C. Computing and Communications Technology Committee

Written Report only. (Appendix C)

#### *IX. Report of the University Council Representatives - Senators Evans*

Chair Evans reported on retention initiatives, university achievement awards, and quality child care for children of students, faculty and staff.

*X. Report of the Graduate Council Representatives—Senators Soucek and Tessier*

Chair Tessier reported that the implementation of the new grad faculty status has been a major discussion topic.

*XI. New Business*

Senator Sahl wished that the athletic director would be invited to speak to the body regarding that auxiliary units challenges.

Chair Saliga committed to exploring it in the new year.

*XII. Good of the Order*

Senator Roy reminded the body that tomorrow is First Friday at the Lockview at 5:00pm.

Senator Bennington noted a historic occasion at the University of Akron. The Center for Advocacy and Student Equity will be launched at a kickoff event on Thursday at 3:00 pm in Quaker Square.

*XIII. Adjournment*

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25pm.

—Heather Howley, Secretary.

Questions and comments about the minutes can be emailed to [hhowley@uakron.edu](mailto:hhowley@uakron.edu) or called in to x8958.

## APPENDIX A

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Proposal Title</b>
SUMM-BUSTECH-17-21390	Essentials of Management Technology
A&S-COMMUN-18-23753	Communication Pedagogy
A&S-COMMUN-18-23489	Freedom of Speech
SUMM-PUBSVCTECH-17-22224	Emergency Mgmt & Homeland Sec
EDUC-CURR-17-21958	Techniques of Teaching English as a Second Language
SUMM-ENGRSCI-18-23670	Introductory Chemistry

APPENDIX B

**Report of the Academic Policies Committee to Faculty Senate  
November 1, 2018**

1. APC recommends approval of the proposal by the LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education to merge its two remaining departments, the Department of Curricular and Instructional Studies and the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, into one department. The merged department will work out a new set of merit and RTP guidelines and will remain its own unit in the College of Education.

Rationale: See the attached memo drafted by Interim Dean Jarrod Tudor. The name of the new department has not yet been determined by faculty.

2. APC recommends that proposals for the program eliminations of August 15, 2018 be referred to CRC and APC, who will properly vet the proposals and will gather feedback from faculty in the affected programs.

Rationale:

The Academic Policies Committee objects to the program cuts made by the Board of Trustees on Aug. 15, 2018 on the basis of the fact that these cuts were not [in compliance with University Board Rules 3359-20-05.2 or 3359-10-02 \(F\)\(4\)](#).

University Board Rule 3359-20-05.2 *Curricular changes* states that certain curriculum-related actions require University approval, and that among these actions are the deletion of courses and changes in the bulletin description. Any action preventing students from entering a program is a de facto deletion of courses and programs, at least temporarily, and would require a change to the bulletin description. Therefore, the prohibiting of admissions to a program requires University approval, which was not obtained in the case of the recent program cuts. Given that the current curriculum changes have not been submitted through the appropriate process, it is our contention that the changes currently proposed should be submitted to the Curriculum Proposal System (CPS). Each program on the list of programs to be cut should be given the opportunity to submit corrected information through the CRC and to meet with the CRC in order to address the expressed concerns about the program, having first been given the criteria used



for eliminating programs. The CRC would then vote and send that result to the Faculty Senate, who would submit their recommendation to the President and the Board.

Additionally, University Board Rule [3359-10-02 \(F\) \(4\)](#) states that the [Academic Policies Committee is a permanent committee of the Faculty Senate and that it](#) “Recommends and interprets academic policy on university-wide matters such as admission, retention, graduation, and dismissal requirements.” In May, the APC strongly recommended that the APR report be used as a “starting point for a far more regularized, faculty-driven, thorough, and less hasty program review process” (May APC APR Report, 1). The APC also recommended that no program cuts or suspensions be made on the basis of the APR report due to a variety of factors, one of which was that the APR process differed sharply from what the University publicly said it would do in the 12/22/16 Assurance Argument to the HLC and in subsequent correspondence. This consultation with the APC in the fact-finding phase of the APR process is not a replacement for a seat at the final decision-making table that APC and CRC, by the University’s own standard, and by its commitment to HLC, should have had when the upper administration met behind closed doors to arbitrarily, and based upon faulty information, make the final decisions about program admissions.

**Note:** On February 2, 2014, President Proenza forwarded Provost Sherman’s request that faculty evaluate and discuss the proposal to suspend and eliminate a number of programs. Faculty Senate referred the proposal to APC and CRC, who carefully reviewed the proposals and gathered feedback from faculty in the affected programs. APC and CRC approved many of the proposed suspensions and eliminations, but not all of them. Senate then adopted APC’s recommendations and forwarded the result to the President. The process followed in 2014 was acceptable to APC, CRC, and Senate. The recent program eliminations (2018), however, were the result of a substantively different process. The CRC did not review any proposals for program eliminations or suspensions;

nor did the APC receive a list of the proposed program suspensions or eliminations. The affected faculty did not have the opportunity to respond to program suspensions prior to their passage by the Board of Trustees. Therefore, the decision made by the Board of Trustees on Aug. 15, 2018 to suspend programs was in violation of their own rules and of shared governance.

**University of Akron**  
**Wayne College**

To: Dr. Janet Klein, Chair, Academic Policies Committee  
 From: Dr. Jarrod Tudor, Interim Dean, LeBron James Family Foundation  
 College of Education  
 Date: October 22, 2018  
 Subject: Consolidation of two academic departments within the LeBron  
 James Family Foundation College of Education

---

Dear Dr. Klein;

This memo serves as a request from the LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education (“LJFFCOE”) for the approval of a consolidation of two academic departments into one academic department.

I.) Background.

During the 2017-2018 academic year, the LJFFCOE enjoyed much success. The LJFFCOE was reaccredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (“CAEP”), the college completed an academic program review, and successfully negotiated an agreement with the Akron Public Schools and the LeBron James Family Foundation to form the I Promise School.

In June of 2018, after receiving notice of renewed accreditation from CAEP, Provost Ramsier met with the LJFFCOE in a meeting that included faculty, staff, and contract professionals. Provost Ramsier directed the two academic departments, the Department of Curriculum and Instructional Studies and the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, to form one academic department and to later work on a new set of guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (“RTP”) and merit. Provost Ramsier stated that if the faculty of the LJFFCOE were able to accomplish this, the college would maintain its status as a unit.

College Council Chair Dr. Lynne Pachnowski and Interim Dean/Acting Chair Dr. Jarrod Tudor realized that a vote, on the record, by the faculty of the two academic departments of the LJFFCOE should take place before moving forward with a consolidation. This suggestion was supported by Provost Ramsier who also suggested that the staff and contract professionals also discuss the matter and vote as constituencies to which the Council Chair and Interim Dean/Acting Department Chair agreed realizing that, although the faculty of the two departments would have the greatest stake in the consolidation, the failure to consolidate would have a significant impact on the status of the contract professionals and staff.

During the course of the month of September, the staff and contract professionals voted unanimously, 6-0 and 5-0 respectively, for the two academic departments to consolidate. On September 28, the Department of Educational Foundations and

Leadership voted 8-1 to consolidate into one department. On October 19, the Department of Curricular and Instructional Studies voted unanimously, 10-0, to consolidate with the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership as encouraged by the Office of Academic Affairs, and work to integrate the roles of faculty members within existing program functions with the vision that we remain a College of Education within the greater University of Akron administrative system.

II.) The future.

The two academic departments desire approval from the Academic Policies Committee of the consolidation. If approval of the consolidation is granted by the Academic Policies Committee and the Faculty Senate, the united academic department will work to develop a new set of guidelines and RTP. The new academic department will also continue to meet separately from greater LJFFCOE legislative body, the College Council, in order to discuss purely academic matters and other serious issues.

## APPENDIX C

## Computing & Communications Technologies Committee

Subject: Computing & Communications Technologies Committee meeting report  
The CCTC met on Friday, September 28, 2018.

Scott Randby was elected to serve as chair of the CCTC.

The goal is to have the new curriculum proposal system in place by fall 2019.  
The CCTC will meet with IT to discuss the following issues: Alteration of email links in uakron.edu email, MyAnalytics reports, the elimination of Zipspace.

Scott Randby  
CCTC Chair