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SENATE ACTIONS

1. Approved a motion from the Academic Policies Committee to amend the Transient Credit policy. (Appendix A)

2. Approved the proposals brought forward by the Curriculum Review Committee. (Appendix C)

3. Approved the changes to the bylaws of the Graduate Council (Appendix E).
Table of Contents

Minutes of Faculty Senate meeting held October 7, 2021........................................3

Appendices to Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting held on October 7, 2021

A. Academic Policies Committee report…………………………………..18
B. Computing and Communications Technology Committee report……23
C. Curriculum Review Committee report ........................................24
D. Program Review Committee reports........................................25
E. Graduate Council bylaws.....................................................57
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

October 7, 2021

The meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, October 7, 2021 in Teams. Senate Chair Kathryn Budd called the meeting to order at 3:02pm.

Of the current roster of 44 senators, 35 attended the meeting. Senator Frey was absent with notice. Senators Beneke, Buldum, Gandee, Mudrey-Camino, Nicholas, Palmer, Rochester and Sahl were absent without notice.

I. Adoption of Agenda

Chair Budd asked for changes to the agenda; none were voiced. Chair Budd asked for objections to adopting the agenda; none were voiced. The agenda was adopted as written.

II. Adoption of minutes of September 2, 2021 meeting

Chair Budd asked for changes to the minutes; none were voiced. Chair Budd asked for objections to adopting the minutes; none were voiced. The minutes were adopted as written.

III. Remarks of the Chair

Welcome to the October meeting of faculty senate. I’d like to remind everyone that the Faculty Senate is the legislative body of the faculty at the University level. Its meetings are relatively formal and are conducted according to Robert’s Rules of Order. Senators who wish to be recognized should type “request” into the chat window and wait for me to recognize you. I know that you
will keep debate civil and respectful; if it helps, address comments to the chair to
de-personalize contentious issues. If I mispronounce your name, let me know the
correct pronunciation so I can do better next time. To preserve bandwidth for all,
turn off your mics and cameras until you are called on to speak.

As you will hear from Senator Hartsock, Board Chair Gingo met with the
Executive Committee in September. It was an opportunity to share our
perspectives of the institution we all care deeply about, and I appreciate the time
Chair Gingo spent with us.

President Miller has consulted with faculty senate, University Council and
Akron-AAUP on House Bill 327 and campus safety improvements; it’s good to
know he shares the faculty’s concerns, and that we can work together on such
critical issues.

I trust you are all enjoying the return to being face to face with students, in
spite of the continuing pandemic. The Coronavirus information page on UA’s
website is updated frequently and now includes “what to do if…” scenarios for
faculty and students. I’ve been included in the meetings for the team working on
the University’s Covid response and I’m surprised to hear that there are some
faculty who do not always enforce the university’s mask wearing policy in their
classrooms. While many remain unvaccinated, masks are still the most effective
way to keep us all safe. And, if you haven’t already done so, please create seating
charts for your classes to help with contact tracing should you or any of your
students test positive.

Enrollment continues to be a priority, colleges are forming and implementing
action plans for recruitment and retention, and I urge you all to get involved to the
best of your ability. As I mentioned in my remarks last month, prospective
students need to connect with you to appreciate what UA has to offer.

On the agenda today is the report of the Program Review Committee which
includes the program reviews for Sociology, Counselling, and Social Work. I am
impressed by how responsive to the individual programs the reviews are. They
highlight their strengths while making suggestions for dealing with challenges that are tailored to each program.

The 2018 Academic Program Review process and the way it was used to make decisions to de-invest in programs that hadn’t been previously identified as at risk caused most if not all of us to question the entire process. It also made it extremely difficult for faculty in programs being reviewed to be open and transparent with the PRC.

Thanks to the work of the Program Review Committee, program review is again a valuable asset to the university. If you didn’t read the report, I urge you to; I hope that we faculty can rethink our perceptions of the review process to see it as a positive and constructive way to help us continuously improve what we do and to identify needs for investment.

The report from the PRC also defines the problem with making the current program review process fit the requirements of Section C of the MOU on Shared Governance between the Akron-AAUP and the administration. I appreciate the difficulty, and the PRC, Faculty Senate EC and the Akron-AAUP are working to revise the MOU in a way that will keep the spirit of the MOU - making program review a faculty driven process that gets programs in difficulty the support they need - without inhibiting the committee’s ability to engage in an open and transparent process with each program.

Of note, in its report, the PRC underscores the urgent need for faculty in the Counseling program. As we are still in the process of implementing the MOU on Shared Governance, I hope the Administration will take note of this recommendation and consider the needs of the Counseling program in relation to the needs of other programs.

Co-chair Saunders has informed me that three of the current committee have served for three years and should be allowed to step down, and Co-chair Calderone has retired. We especially need faculty from the colleges of Law,
Engineering and Polymer Science, Business, and Arts and Sciences. Please send nominations and self-nominations to me.

Finally, a note about the role of senate. I’ve heard senators say that once a report or proposal reaches senate, it’s too late to raise questions. The assumption is that any concerns will have already been cleared at the committee level. I’ve also heard committee chairs say that because the committee had reservations, they brought it to faculty senate to have this group with its wider knowledge and experience review the proposal more intensively. You see the problem. Know that faculty senate should not serve merely as a rubber stamp. If there are questions or comments, please raise them - it takes all of us working together to pass good academic legislation.

This concludes the remarks of the chair.

IV. Special Announcements

Chang Dae Han (also known by his baptized name, Paul), age 85, passed away on July 25, 2021. Paul was the Benjamin Franklin Goodrich Endowed Professor of Polymer Engineering at the University of Akron, where he taught and conducted research until his retirement in 2012. Prior to his time at UA, Paul had a 27 year tenure at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. His positions there included professor, department chair and Director of the Polymer Science and Engineering Program. During his academic career, Paul published over 300 original research articles, graduated 52 doctoral students and published three research monographs.

Dr. Jerry Drummond, emeritus associate professor of mechanical engineering, passed away on Sept. 14 at the age of 76. Drummond received his M.S. from The University of Akron in 1972 in mechanical engineering and a Ph.D. from The Ohio State University in 1981. His favorite activities during his 35 years here were working as an advisor in the Honors College and advising student design teams.
Maya McFetridge, age 18, died September 18th, 2021. Maya had attended Berea High School in Berea, Ohio, where she discovered her love for art and painting. She had begun taking classes in the Myers School of Art at The University of Akron, and a fellow student described her as “a friendly face I was just beginning to know.” Maya’s artwork will be displayed at the Myers School of Art in an exhibition of student work in the near future.

The Senate observed a moment of silence to mark the passing of our former student, and colleagues.

V. Report of the Executive Committee

Since our last meeting in September, the Executive Committee has met three times.

The EC met with Chair of the Board of Trustees Joe Gingo, President Miller, Provost Wiencek, and Chief of Staff Wayne Hill. We had a long-ranging conversation about how to tell the UA story, grow enrollment, and build enthusiasm. And, finally, we discussed a process of reflection and planning as part of the new goal-setting process at the university.

In other business, the EC finalized the composition of the newly ratified ad hoc Investment Criteria Committee and have filled nearly all the remaining open seats on University Council Committees. We continue to work on implementation of the MOU on shared governance between the Akron-AAUP and the administration.

For more information on these discussions, please contact Angela Hartsock.

VII. Remarks of the President

President Miller thanked the senate for their work.
Campus Safety: President Miller noted the current intense focus on off-campus safety. A comprehensive plan is in development and has been previewed by shared governance leaders; it will be shared with the campus community soon. The plan includes different approaches to the area south of Exchange Street. There have been meetings with landlords in the area. President Miller noted this will be a joint project with the city to enhance security in the area. UA General Counsel and the UAPD will review the mutual aid agreement on policing in the area in question. The administration also plans to meet with business and community leaders. Leaders of the UC-EC, Senate-EC, and Akron-AAUP will be briefed.

Legislation: The president noted the status of House Bill 435 related to vaccination and masking mandates and House Bill 327 related to the teaching of divisive concepts. He reported constructive conversations with the authors of these bills. He also acknowledged the work of Matt Akers; President Miller noted Akers is doing a fantastic job of working with Akron-AAUP, IUC, and other campus groups. He stated there are no scheduled hearings yet, but that UA does have testimony ready that has been shared with governance groups.

Fall Semester Activities: President Miller observed that fall is an historically important time to connect with friends, alumni, and donors. Due to COVID, this is not a full-scale process, but activities are happening. President Miller and Mrs. Miller have had extensive meetings with various friends who can support our programs. He acknowledged the $3 million gift from Timken.

Campus Listening Tour: The president and provost have conducted 10 listening sessions and are almost finished with the process. President Miller stated that ideas were being collected and cataloged to be summarized and shared. Some ideas will be implemented to help with enrollment.

School of Law: President Miller noted this is the centennial year for the School of Law. He congratulated the faculty, leadership and friends of the university he has had the opportunity to meet through celebratory events.
President Miller concluded his remarks by recognizing the Board of Trustees for their work on the current safety issues.

Chair Budd invited questions for the president.

Senator Bisconti asked President Miller for an update on plans to address the student vaccination rate on campus. The current vaccine policy stated December 13, 2021 as the effective date. The senator noted that 40% of students and 25-27% of faculty and staff are currently unvaccinated; she requested an update on how the policy will be implemented if the rates don’t change into November and December.

President Miller noted that two things are clear to the administration. First, the actual vaccination rate is probably higher based on some indicators. Second, no one will be separated from the university. The goal is to request vaccination or application for exemption. The intent is to find a way for everyone to attend in spring. He noted we are not carrying a lot of cases currently and exemption requests are under 200. President Miller noted the possibility of updating the vaccine policy and further encouraging vaccination.

Senator Bisconti followed up by thanking the president and questioned whether in light of impending registration, should the policy be walked back sooner. She noted individuals that might have felt safer due to mandate and are now discouraged; she questioned if we will continue masking.

President Miller stated the policy is not a vaccine mandate and described the policy as a strong imperative with a process for exemption. There is ongoing work on a mask mandate process. He noted that people should assume we will continue as we are now; the university will still ask about and encourage vaccination. Masking policies will be determined after review of environmental data. The president acknowledged the public forum and stressed that UA is open and everyone can register.
VIII. Remarks of the Provost

Provost Wiencek began by extending condolences to the families of Myra McFetridge and Alexander Beasley. He thanked Chair Budd for her comments and expressed his awareness of the impact on everyone, most notably the families.

Enrollment: The provost pointed to the seasonality of enrollment and the need to attract and recruit students at this time. He noted that retention is a year-round focus and both things require a multi-faceted approach. He listed efforts around customer service, improved billing statements, and intentional advising. The provost noted productive work with the advising task force. The task force first considered flexible work arrangements (FWA) for advising staff and the possibilities of FWAs to provide additional access to advising services.

Applications: Application targets have been set with a renewed focus on marketing efforts. The intent is to get the positive message out about the excellent education at UA; there are efforts to promote data that shows top employment records for students getting jobs and high salaries for graduates. Everyone should make an effort to share the good news.

Shared Governance: The administration continues to engage with shared governance groups and the Akron-AAUP; conversations have been productive and collegial.

Strategic Planning: The University Planning Group is generating a list of tasks; more updates are coming.

Ad hoc Investment Criteria Committee: The committee has met and is identifying the substance of their work. The committee confirmed the provost’s experience with this process in the past; the provost stressed this should be faculty driven and he is present as a resource. He extended thanks to the faculty senate for taking this on.

Colleges and Deans: The deans have been active in helping the university through current challenges; they are focused on enrollment growth. There will be
a new ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) that will provide an opportunity to rethink how we do our work. The provost noted he is a proponent of budget autonomy at the college level; this will be discussed with the deans in a special meeting.

Grants and Funding: The provost noted some large grant applications. One involves polymer-related economic development in northeast Ohio including a potential pilot plant; the School of Polymer Science will have a large role to play. There are also two submitted NSF (National Science Foundation) grants related to research training for graduate students.

Campus Listening Tour: The group listening sessions have generated great ideas that reinforce and amplify each other. They are also receiving ideas through UC; forms can be used to submit written ideas to UC. There has been a marked increase in submissions this academic year.

The provost invited questions. None were offered.

X. Committee Reports

Academic Policies Committee – Chair Klein

Chair Klein brought forward the first item related to a request for priority scheduling for student workers. She reiterated the stated position and noted that the biggest incentive for student workers would be a competitive hourly wage. She noted that APC is bringing the recommendation with the intention of increased discussion and debate. Chair Budd opened the floor to debate; none ensued.

Chair Klein brought forward the second item related to revisions of the Transient Credit Policy (Appendix A) for students who take classes at other institutions during their degree. She stated the intentions of the revisions are to prevent students from hindering their progress and to clarify the approval process. Chair Budd opened the floor to debate.
Senator Luettmer-Strathmann voiced concerns that this allows students to take cheaper courses at Stark State. Chair Klein stated that APC considered that students do this, but our peer institutions do not restrict this. She noted the preapproval process and credit caps seem reasonable. Senator Luettmer-Strathmann followed up by requesting the grounds for not approving a class, noting if a course has been approved for transfer credit, then it cannot be denied. She observed previous experience with students who take challenging coursework at other institutions where pass rates are higher to earn the credit. Chair Klein noted her sympathy with the concern but also the need to allow some transient credits. She stated the cap was already in place and the revisions make the policy more stringent than some universities since courses must be approved. Senator Luettmer-Strathmann reiterated that if a course has been evaluated for transfer credit it would be automatically approved for transient credit. Chair Klein confirmed. Senator Makki stated she understands the concerns and noted this may be more of a summer term issue due to our reduced summer schedule and the financial impact of doing this during a regular semester. Chair Klein noted that APC discussed how the revisions result in a stricter policy rather than providing opportunities for further transient credit. Senator Evans voiced favor for some of the changes, specifically removing the requirement to state “why” the student is requesting the transient credit. He speculated about an opportunity for colleges and programs to have stricter rules for certain majors. Joseph Minocchi acknowledged this as a difficult question to answer when courses are covered by the Ohio transfer module, but that course equivalency could be reviewed and updated periodically. He noted that at the seven peer institutions whose policies were reviewed by APC, including The Ohio State University, if the course was preapproved prior to the student applying for credit, there were no additional stipulations or requirements for students to receive transient credit. They did have conversations about physical location, geography, and mode of delivery related to transient courses; none of the other state universities are enforcing any related restrictions. Senator Kasunic clarified if Section B, Number seven was always a part of the policy; Chair Klein confirmed the UA GPA has always been
determined only by courses taken at UA. Senator Kasunic followed up to ask if a student fails a course at UA and takes an equivalent course for a passing grade at another institution, does the original failing grade remain in the GPA; Joseph Minocchi confirmed it does.

Chair Budd requested a vote on the policy revision; 33 senators voted, 29 in favor of the policy revision brought by APC and four against. The motion passed.

Computing and Communications Technology Committee – Chair Randby

Chair Randby noted there were no motions to present but commented that the committee will begin working on cybersecurity issues. They will be considering a Security Awareness Training program that was presented to senate. A policy will need to be approved by March 2022; this will require training. The goal is an educational process not a punitive process. Chair Budd invited questions; none were posed. (Appendix B)

Curriculum Review Committee – Chair Saliga

Chair Saliga noted that CRC brings two course proposals and two program proposals. (Appendix C)

Chair Budd opened the floor to debate; none ensued. Hearing no apparent opposition, Chair Budd asked for opposition to approval by unanimous consent. No opposition was voiced; the proposals were approved by unanimous consent.

Chair Saliga drew the attention of senators to the memo that announced the need to submit proposals before the end of the year due to the shift from numeric to alphabetic subject codes which will render the system unusable until the transition is complete.

Program Review Committee – Senator Elbuluk
Senator Elbuluk noted the final summary highlights the work of the review committee. (Appendix D) Three programs were reviewed: sociology, counseling, and social work. The report highlights the challenges and opportunities for the three programs. He noted that the Sociology Department requested credit for their contribution to the joint program in Criminology and Criminal Justice. The School of Counseling is in need of investment in faculty. The Social Work program has opportunity for growth.

Chair Budd invited questions; none were voiced. Chair Budd thanked the committee for their work.

XI. AAUP report—Toni Bisconti

Senator Bisconti reported that the Akron-AAUP has been part of shared governance meetings on campus safety, vaccine legislation, and bills related to faculty freedom of speech. President Miller, Matt Akers, and Wayne Hill have met with the Akron-AAUP-EC to update the group on progress being made related to Ohio House Bills. The LMPC (Labor Management Policies Committee) has been working on MOUs for dean searches and workload policies for each department to ensure fairness. The membership drive will be starting soon, and liaison and membership meetings are coming up this month.

XII. Graduate Council report—Senator Graor

Senator Graor presented the two documents brought from the Graduate Council; one is a report and the second is the bylaws.

Senator Graor spoke to the motion being brought; noting that after college reorganization there was a need to restructure the Graduate Council. The report provided describes the changes that were approved in faculty council; graduate faculty voted to accept these changes in May 2021. The changes effect membership for council and standing committees. The 16-person membership
stays the same, the distribution of membership across the colleges changed based on enrollment, program size, and number of graduate faculty.

Regarding the bylaws, Senator Graor noted minor housekeeping to update the document.

Chair Budd invited debate; none ensued. Chair Budd asked for objections to approval by unanimous consent; none were voiced. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

XIII. GSG report—Senator Frey

Megan Kenworthy, Vice President of GSG, substituted for Senator Frey. She noted GSG is looking into an option for a paid social media position to promote the group and a graduate student Brightspace page for centralized communication. There are two forums planned as GSG informational sessions for graduate students.

IXV. USG report—Senator Kasunic

Senator Kasunic thanked Athletic Director Guthrie, President Miller, and Chair Gingo for coming to a USG meeting. She noted they challenged USG to think about enrollment and the Zips Pride social media campaign to promote student government and act as marketing to prospective students. USG unanimously passed a resolution in support of the vaccination requirement. The new USG senate is in an election cycle to fill college seats that were unfilled. Six students are running with a couple seats still open. Senator Kasunic also noted groups forming around off-campus safety.

XV. Report of University Council Representatives—Senator Evans
Senator Evans noted that UC consists of members from across campus groups. One task is to receive and review topic submissions, since the beginning of the semester over 45 topic submissions have been received. Anyone can submit through the website; submission can be anonymous. Submissions are reviewed by UC-EC and then forwarded to the appropriate committee, body, or office for consideration. There are eight standing committees of UC with each having 12 members from various groups on campus.

UC-EC continues to review and revise bylaws to improve alignment of activities of UC with the strategic planning effort.

Senator Evans also noted that UC was notified that staff employees with appropriate credentials can teach courses (this policy will be implemented soon).

XVI. Old Business

Chair Budd asked for new business. None was offered.

XVII. New Business

Chair Budd asked for items for Good of the Order. None were offered.

XVIII. Good of the Order

Senator Evans complemented the alumni office on recent participation in Akron Pride Parade.

IXI. Adjournment

Chair Budd adjourned the meeting at 4:14 pm.

—Angela Hartsock, Secretary.
Questions and comments about the minutes can be emailed to

ahartsock1@uakron.edu.
APPENDIX A

Report of the Academic Policies Committee to Faculty Senate, Oct. 7, 2021

Priority scheduling for students who work on campus: The Director of Career Services and Student Employment asked APC to consider the proposal to offer priority scheduling to students who work on campus to incentivize more students to apply for on-campus jobs. Although APC acknowledges the research that suggests that on-campus employment increases retention rates among students who work on campus, APC does not find that priority scheduling would be much of an incentive for students to apply for these positions. Rather, APC believes that students are more motivated to seek employment on campus because of scheduling flexibility. Moreover, according to students, the greatest incentive would be a competitive wage that is significantly higher than the low hourly wages offered across campus for student work. Additionally, UA currently offers priority scheduling to so many different groups of students (accessibility, notetakers/helpers, ROTC, veterans, OAA scholarship recipients, etc.) that priority scheduling will soon be meaningless if it becomes so widely offered. Therefore, APC voted unanimously against the proposal.

Transient credit policy: APC has revised the rule for students who take credits at other universities while enrolled at the University of Akron in order to better prevent students from harming themselves academically. The cap of 18 credit hours for a bachelor’s degree and 9 for an associate degree remains the same, but APC has clarified what is necessary for preapproval. For courses with established equivalency we will not deny transient approval. Students must consult with advisers to receive approval, and although taking certain courses at other institutions may not be in students’ best interests, they are not precluded from doing so in the same way that we do not disallow equivalent coursework from other institutions for incoming transfer students. APC has also removed the requirement for students to demonstrate why they are taking courses elsewhere, as this requirement is not required by any of our peer institutions. Please see the attached edited rule, 60-03.1.
3359-60-03.1 Credit by transfer and/or examination.

(A) Transfer credit for undergraduate courses.

(1) A total for all non-remedial, non-developmental college-level course work completed with earned grades of "D-" or better taken at an institution of higher education in the United States which is fully accredited or has been granted candidacy status by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies: middle states association of colleges and schools, commission on higher education; new England association of schools and colleges, commission on institutions of higher education; north central association of colleges and schools, higher learning commission; northwest commission on colleges and universities; southern association of colleges and schools, commission on colleges; western association of schools and colleges, accrediting commission for community and junior colleges; western association of schools and colleges, accrediting commission for senior colleges and universities will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record. Each course posted to the degree audit system will reflect the course number, title, grade and credit value; no grade-point value will appear on the record; however, grade-point average may be considered for purposes of evaluating, ranking or otherwise determining admissibility to the university or to specific programs. In addition, the name of the institution, as well as the time period during which the courses were taken, will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record.

(2) No grade-point value will appear on the record, and no grade-point average will be calculated for the course work listed. Transfer students shall be accorded the same class standing and other privileges as all other students on the basis of the number of credits earned.

(3) All residency requirements must be completed successfully at the receiving institution prior to the granting of a degree.

(4) "CLEP" or advanced placement credit posted on transcripts from regionally accredited previous Ohio colleges and universities is eligible for credit at the university of Akron.

"CLEP" or advanced placement credit posted on transcripts from previous non-Ohio institutions is not eligible for credit at the university of Akron. Students must present original documentation attesting to scores earned prior to receiving alternative credit considerations.
The University of Akron does not guarantee that a transfer student automatically will be admitted to all majors, minors, or fields of concentration at the institution. For courses that have been taken at an institution of higher education noted in the reference above, the dean of the college in which the student intends to obtain a degree will specify which courses listed, other than general studies, will apply toward the degree requirements at the University. This specification will be made at the time the student enters the degree-granting college. The office responsible for transfer student services will specify which courses listed will apply toward the general education requirements when the student enters the university.

(B) Transient student. A university of Akron student may take coursework at another institution of higher education as a transient student. The purpose of transient work is to provide the university of Akron student with opportunity to: 1) take a course that is not offered at the university of Akron; or 2) if the student is away for the summer, to take a course in a distant location; or 3) in rare cases, a student who is only a few credits shy of graduation and must leave the university of Akron due to extenuating circumstances, to take a course at a distant location. These courses will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record. Each course will reflect the course number, title, grade and credit value; no grade-point value will appear on the record and the grade for such course will not be included in the university of Akron grade-point calculation. The name of the institution will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record as well as the date that the coursework was taken.

(1) Coursework must be taken at a regionally accredited institution.

(2) For all transient coursework, transient coursework with established equivalency, prior written permission to take the course approval must be received from the dean of the student's degree-granting college, or from the dean’s designee. If the student is not yet admitted to a degree-granting college, written permission approval must be received from the dean, or the dean’s designee, of the student’s intended degree-granting college, or, if the student has not declared a major, from the dean, or the dean’s designee, of the degree-granting college offering the course. For transient coursework without established equivalency, student must provide a syllabus to the appropriate department or school chair/director for evaluation, after which approval must be received per the procedure outlined above.

(3) A student must earn a grade of "D-" or better in the course at the other institution in order for the credits to apply towards the student's degree.
requirements at the university of Akron unless otherwise specified by the degree-granting college. The student must provide the official transcript for the course in order to receive credit.

(4) No more than eighteen total credit hours of transient work may be approved prior to the granting of a baccalaureate degree. No more than nine total credit hours of transient work may be approved prior to the granting of an associate degree.

(5) Approvals for transient attendance at other institutions are valid for only the requested term and are subject to all restrictions of the dean of the college approving the request for transient credit.

(6) Students who are on probation or dismissed are restricted or denied transient permission except in rare and compelling circumstances. Note:

Students nearing degree completion should review university graduation requirements.

(7) Coursework taken at another institution cannot be considered for the university of Akron repeat-for-change-of-grade policy or the academic reassessment policy and will not be calculated into the university of Akron grade-point average.

(C) Credit by examination. A student interested in earning credits by special examination may do so with the permission of the dean of the student’s college and the dean of the college in which a particular course is offered and by payment of the special examination fee. The grade obtained in such an examination is recorded on the student's permanent academic record. Credit by examination is not permitted in the semester before graduation. Credit by examination may not be used to repeat for change of grade.

(D) Bypassed credit. Certain courses designated in the general bulletin by each department enable a student to earn "bypassed" credit. A degree-seeking undergraduate student who completes such a course with a grade of "C" or better is entitled to credit for designated prerequisite courses which carry the same departmental code number. Credit for such bypassed prerequisite shall be included in the total credits earned but shall not count in the quality point ratio, or class standing, or hours required for graduation with honors. Bypassed credit is not awarded on the basis of completing a course either credit-byexamination or credit/noncredit. Bypassed credit may not be used to repeat for change of grade. The appendix to this rule outlines courses approved for bypassed credit.
The university shall from time to time publish a list of courses approved by the faculties of the college for bypassed credit.

Effective: 12/22/2019

Certification:______________________________________________________
M. Celeste Cook
Secretary
Board of Trustees

Promulgated Under: 111.15
Statutory Authority: 3359

Rule Amplifies: 3359

Prior Effective Dates: 11/04/1977, 08/30/1979, 01/30/1981, 05/15/1982,
07/30/1987, 05/22/1991, 05/23/2003, 08/20/2004,
02/12/2005, 07/03/2005, 07/02/2006, 06/25/2007,
3359-60-03.1 4
02/14/2013, 02/01/2015,
08/27/2017
APPENDIX B

Computing & Communications Technologies Committee Report

The CCTC met on Tuesday, September 14, 2021.

1. Scott Randby was elected as chair for the 2021-2022 academic year.
2. A list of possible discussion topics was devised.
3. At least the next two meetings of the committee will be devoted to a review of a draft of an information security awareness training policy that was submitted to the Faculty Senate by Information Technology Services.

The next meeting of the CCTC will be on either October 12, October 19 or October 25.

Scott Randby
CCTC Chair
## APPENDIX C

### Course Proposals for Faculty Senate for October 7, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4100:200</td>
<td>4100:200: CEPS Internship</td>
<td>Edited</td>
<td>carlett</td>
<td>9/16/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Proposals for Faculty Senate for October 7, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223001AAS</td>
<td>223001AAS: Fire Protection Technology</td>
<td>Edited</td>
<td>kfshaff</td>
<td>9/29/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224002AAS</td>
<td>224002AAS: Emergency Medical Services Technology, EMT/Paramedic Option</td>
<td>Edited</td>
<td>kfshaff</td>
<td>9/29/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Third Cycle Report of the Program Review Committee
Presented by
Professor Malik E. Ebuluk,
College of Engineering Member of Program Review Committee

The Program Review Committee completed its 3rd cycle of a 7-year schedule to review all academic programs on campus.

To provide a brief overview of the process, the programs are notified of their participation in the upcoming cycle in December. In general, all materials including instructions, templates and data are provided to the programs by mid-January. The programs have until mid-April to complete the self-study. Once complete, the chairs and deans provide independent letters of assessment by mid-May. The documents are uploaded to a Program Review SharePoint site where committee members may access and begin reading materials.

The committee reads all the materials provided and prepares to discuss them mid-June (this can vary depending upon the number of programs in a cycle and if external reviews are a part of the process). The committee meets to discuss its charges, acclimate new members to the process and discuss the review process. The programs are then discussed. The minutes of these discussions form the basis of the initial report. In addition to the discussion, the report provides basic numbers, including enrollment, degree completion and faculty numbers. It outlines strengths and accomplishments of the program, as well as opportunities for improvement. The report draft is circulated among the committee within a few weeks of the completion of the discussions for editing and approval. The report is provided to the program at the start of the fall semester and a meeting with a faculty representative(s) is scheduled. This allows the program to correct the committee on any errors in the report and it gives the committee a chance to better understand the needs/challenges of a given program. The meeting summaries are then included in the initial report. In addition to this initial report, the committee also crafts a brief, final memo that indicates common themes, as well as offering suggestions to improve the program review process. The documents are then presented to and accepted by this body.

This year’s cycle included three programs, the Department of Sociology, the School of Counseling and the School of Social Work and Family Sciences. It was evident the programs are working hard and have a lot to be proud of in terms of the education and opportunities they are providing their students. Programs can boast of accreditation, strong performances on licensure exams, significant experiential opportunities, research funding and a strong dedication to service.

While you can read the reports for a more detailed summary of each program. Following the meetings with the program representatives, there are some points to be made:

The Department of Sociology – The campus data and reporting structures do not accurately reflect the structure of their Criminology and Criminal Justice, BS degree. The degree is equally owned by Sociology, Political Science and Criminal Justice Studies. This is a great cause of frustration for the program and should be addressed, possibly by structuring this as an internal consortium or conducting program review on this degree separate from those of the programs that share ownership.

School of Counseling – The committee noted the need for faculty investment in this program. While we acknowledge there are investment needs across campus, this program should be considered in any discussions of investment.

Social Work – The program noted they have opportunities to grow enrollment with the current faculty. Unique coordination and teaching approaches/modalities throughout their offerings enable them to be in this position.
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Program Review Committee Initial Report
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PROGRAM REVIEW TIMELINE & REPORTING STRUCTURE
2020-2021
All programs in this review cycle were provided the following documents:

Program Review Self-Study Template
Program Review Reviewer Guide
Program Review Timeline
Directions for Accessing Benchmark Data
Access to the program review dashboard

In addition, research programs were provided:
5 Years of Research Expenditure Data
5 Years of Community and Industrial Graduate Assistant Program (CIGA) Data
(as appropriate)

**CONTEXTUAL REFERENCE FOR REVIEW**

Supporting Continuous Improvement
The committee wanted to begin our report by providing some contextual reference for this review.

This review is a formative review completed in the context of supporting continuous improvement of our educational offerings, strengthening the value of our degrees, providing a clear path for our students to identify their ideal degree and supporting them through the completion of that degree. As a result of the formative approach, committee comments are not to be taken as quantitative appraisals and at no point during the review were programs compared to each other. The committee put no scoring metric to this process.

As was noted last year, the 2020-2021 program review cycle was completed during the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the COVID-19 pandemic, faculty completed their self-study while working remotely, in addition to teaching online; chairs and deans were inundated with addressing the individual needs of the programs and colleges. In addition, the Program Review Committee (PRC) conducted all reviews and discussions remotely. We would like to acknowledge the tremendous accomplishment of completing the 2020-2021 program review cycle and the dedication of all those involved. Given the unprecedented circumstances, the fact that this program review cycle was completed is a testament to our campus and our commitment to the quality education of our students.

It should also be noted that the program review process is subject to continuous improvement. Based upon committee recommendations from last year, it was suggested that the PRC become a standing committee of Faculty Senate (FS). The intent would be for the standing committee to provide their findings directly to FS for their endorsement and the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) would no longer conduct a second, independent review. At this point, we are aware of a MOU that is redefining the work of the PRC. As discussed in our final memo, we are unclear as to our charge and need clarity prior to moving forward with the next cycle.

Finally, the committee would like to re-iterate suggestions from previous year’s processes. First, we continue to support an incentive-based program review process. We re-iterate that program review is formative and focuses upon continuous improvement; we believe an incentivized system to encourage high quality self-studies and continuous improvement efforts will help to appropriately focus those efforts. Second, we continue to acknowledge the importance of external reviews. While our finances have restricted our recent ability to include external reviews in program review, we suggest that these be considered when possible. Specifically, the committee support the idea that minimally any program that does not have a campus visit as part of an accreditation process should have an external program review. We further note external reviewers should conform to a selection process that includes input from the program faculty, chair and college dean. Third, the committee acknowledges the need to
continuously improve the program review process. However, as noted above, with the signed MOU, we currently lack clarity on our charge.

Respectfully submitted by the PRC members (2020-2021):

Committee Members

Malik Elbuluk, PhD (College of Engineering and Polymer Science)
Jennifer Hebert, MA Professor of Instruction (Assessment Director)
Gary Holliday, PhD (Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences)
Galen Karikker, DMA (Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences)
Scott Palasik, PhD (College of Health and Human Sciences)
Linda Shanks, PhD (College of Health and Human Sciences)
Craig Wise, MSc, PE (College of Engineering and Polymer Science)

Co-chairs:
Marnie Saunders, PhD (Graduate School)
Thomas Calderon, PhD (College of Business) Faculty Co-Chair retired at the start of the summer 2021
EVALUATION APPROACH

The 2020-2021 program review committee consisted of eight members. In an attempt to provide a fair, balanced and consistent review, all eight members read and discussed the three programs in the review cycle. There were no conflicts of interest with the member’s home department; no committee members hailed from the programs in this review cycle. All program review discussions were based upon the program review committee’s interpretation of materials provided about the units in the form of the self-study report, Chair’s letter and Dean’s letter. The committee completed a formative review of the three programs utilizing an approach similar to a traditional SWOT analysis. Our analysis focused upon Strengths, Challenges, Opportunities and Concerns (SCOC). The committee based their discussions on the SCOC template that was provided to all units upon review notification. The approach agreed upon was ‘holistic’ in that the overall program SCOC was completed rather than a point by point SCOC of the topic sections in the self-study template. The committee notes that opportunities may be seen as concerns and vice versa. We have tried to provide the correct classification of our comments but we acknowledge we may not always correctly identify overlap or classify as the units intended.

Review Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/Optunities</th>
<th>Challenges/Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(within the unit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(outside the unit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. SCOC template utilized in program review committee discussions.
BUCHTEL COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

I. Sociology

The committee thanks the Sociology faculty for the effort and time put into the self-study report. Based upon the quality of the self-study, overall the committee felt they understood how the program operates.

Enrollment: Fall 2009 - Fall 2020
Strengths / Opportunities:

- An overarching strength of the program is the resilience, creativity, commitment and adaptability of the faculty of the Department of Sociology. In spite of the untimely death of a valued and esteemed colleague, separation of additional faculty and the suspension of the graduate programs, the Sociology faculty continue to strive to support students, the university and the community. For example they are to be commended for
filling 98% of their 3403 available seats in Introduction to Sociology (5-yr period) and they boast a program-wide course completion rate as high as 92% (preCOVID).

- The committee felt the Sociology department has accomplished an amazing amount, in spite of the sharp decline in faculty.
- The committee also appreciated the transparency of the faculty responses in the self-study. They were direct about the challenges and optimistic about the role they hope to play in moving the university forward.
- The committee was impressed with the role Sociology has played in developing and educating the Criminal Justice majors. As a faculty very experienced with assessment, they play a significant role in ensuring the quality of these programs.
- The committee commented on the four undergraduate, stand-alone certificates and felt it was a great example of Sociology responding in a timely way to the needs of our students and the greater society. The four interdisciplinary certificates to be established will focus on: Interdisciplinary Methods and Evaluation Research; Conflict Transformation and Social Justice; Public Health; and, Pathways to Justice.
- The committee felt a strength of the Sociology program is its community focus with faculty very engaged in critical issues affecting our community.
- The committee felt Sociology’s goal of becoming distinguished for experiential learning was timely and appropriate. This effort is also strongly supported by the Chair and Dean in their letters.
- The committee noted the continued publications of the faculty, given their understaffing.
- The committee commented on the use of the one NTT faculty as the advisor to all students. Sociology feels this is appropriate and adds value for the students. The committee agrees the content expert is well-positioned to advise, but sympathized with the workload.
- The committee felt there has never been a more appropriate time to invest in social justice as it relates to all of our programs on campus and that it would be short-sighted not to connect the dots with our other programs/offerings.
- The committee noted the Sociology program has strong advocates in both their current Chair and outgoing Dean. The Dean encouraged the incoming Dean to support the efforts and direction of this program.
- While the report did not extensively detail the assessment practices, the assessment director on the committee noted the program is strong in assessment and has a clear plan of assessment for the new undergraduate program. They utilized the American Sociological Association (ASA) mapping kit in overhauling the undergraduate program. As such, their learning outcomes are strong and clear. They also demonstrate a
willingness to improve upon assessment and are very receptive to feedback on yearly assessment reports.

- Assessment descriptions indicate the faculty are very deliberate in assessment, have a structured approach (eg, class size and faculty assignments) and importantly, this involves all faculty.
- As an indication of the dedication and collegiality of the faculty, the committee commented on their willingness to share best practices for incorporating service learning in online courses and meditation minutes with all UA faculty.
- The committee noted that the Center of Conflict Management will be retained and will be moving to Sociology under the strong and capable leadership of Robert Peralta.
- This program is important in educating students of diversity with Pell grants.
- The report cites sources indicating a high number of sociologists in the field (52%) hold a Master’s degree.
- The committee also noted that the campus climate, the ability of the faculty to be awarded external research funding, and timely initiatives, such as President Miller’s Committee on Racial Equality and Social Justice, all point to a need to strengthen and invest in the Sociology programs at this time.

Weaknesses / Challenges:

- The committee questioned if having the goals of 85% of the program’s courses requiring experiential learning opportunities and increasing the number of paid learning experiential opportunities to at least 33% were overly ambitious goals given the current faculty numbers. It was also not clear how these learning opportunities were established, if they were all external to the campus, etc. Committee members with internships in their programs noted finding internships can be a bottleneck to enrollment and essentially constitute a full-time position.
- In the spirit of helping Sociology become the regional program known for experiential learning, the committee suggested Sociology create a list of viable places and assignment types. The committee would hope that the list would help to make UA aware of these needs and UA in turn, could help the program foster commitments.
- The committee acknowledges the concern with Wayne coordination that was noted in the selfstudy and supporting letters. One member of the committee was aware of efforts to address this following the recent General Education assessment. It was noted that faculty incentive is being provided to increase communication between campuses; efforts appear to be strengthening communications.
• The committee noted the intent of the faculty to grow enrollment for the major and questioned if there were opportunities for the highly talented TT faculty to engage early in the program with undecided students. As of now, it appears introductory and freshman level courses are largely taught by NTT and PT faculty. We understand the workload is already an issue but wondered if there was a way to selectively engage TT faculty with potential majors early on.

• While the committee has asked for clarification to determine if the experiential opportunities are external, the committee wondered if there were ways to channel these opportunities internally – for example, sociology students sharing and/or leading mental health informational sessions with students across campus could elevate everyone.

• The committee understands the faculty are already stretched and that graduate admissions have been suspended but wondered if there was the possibility/opportunity of offering the interdisciplinary certificates at the graduate level, as well as the undergraduate level. The committee felt several of these certificates could appeal to the working professional and the nontraditional student. And, the stand-alone nature is ideal for post-baccs seeking additional skills. It was also suggested that UA work with the program to help market these opportunities to maximize enrollment and focus on the unique, experiential focus of Sociology’s offerings.

• The committee also thought there may be opportunities for Sociology to partner with other campus groups while not overly taxing the Sociology faculty. For example, the strong community commitment is echoed in other programs, for example the Construction Management Association of America (CMAA) (through Construction Technology) which often works on house repair in the local community.

Additional Clarifications:
The above notes were distributed to the Sociology representative prior to meeting with the committee. The intent was to allow the program time to prepare and to understand where the committee had questions and clarification was requested.

• The committee would like clarification on the experiential learning opportunities, what a typical course versus capstone opportunity would look like and how external positions are arranged. They also questioned if the magnitude of opportunities proposed was realistic.

• The committee sees tremendous value in the Sociology program, its faculty and its offerings. The committee would like at least part of the individual meeting to be devoted to better understanding the needs of the program and the recommendations the committee can make for tangible support.

Faculty Meeting:
The committee met with representatives from the Department of Sociology on 9/14. The representative(s) began by providing current faculty numbers. There are 4 TT, 1 NTT, 1 visiting faculty line and 2 joint faculty with a primary appointment in Criminal Justice. The representatives also thanked the committee for acknowledging the resilience of the faculty and they noted that the changes have given them the opportunity to rethink their program and solidify their ideas.

Significant time was spent with the representative explaining the Criminal Justice degree. The committee, not unlike the rest of the campus, has failed to understand the structure of this degree. It was explained to us that the Department of Sociology is an equal owner of the Criminology and Criminal Justice, BS degree. The degree is equally shared between Sociology, Political Science and Criminal Justice Studies. An MOU has been created to reflect the shared ownership and responsibilities of this degree and all three programs must agree to changes, operating much like an internal consortium. Creating this innovative offering took 10 years and it is important to recognize this given it is one of the largest undergraduate degrees at UA. As such, the representatives pointed out that the work they are doing in this degree is for their majors, even though the degree name does not reflect this. Furthermore, they advise all students in both the criminology and corrections tracks; Criminal Justice advises students in the policing track and Political Science advises students in the law track. And, the Department of Sociology is responsible for the Methods I and Methods II sequence for this offering. The representatives’ frustration was evident as they correctly noted that our data and reporting practices do not accurately reflect the structure of this unique offering and that these unique offerings which span programs, departments and colleges are critical to offering relevant, accessible and effective education to our students. The possibility of this degree being reviewed as its own program, independent of their separate programs was suggested.

The representatives also explained the experiential learning they are working to incorporate into a majority of their classes. They explained that these include external interns, but the majority are on a much smaller scale and offer the student an opportunity to apply and practice their learning. Examples of experiential learning within the courses include developing a letter writing campaign, analyzing data for an external agency, interviewing individuals in a given field, developing infographics to be used by an external agency and running a focus group. These experiential learning opportunities build in a meaningful way such that the student is prepared to take on additional responsibilities as they move through the program. As a result, external internships have turned into job offers upon graduation for these research-competent students. And, the Department of Sociology is planning to build upon their success to create paid internship opportunities.
The representatives corrected the committee on the faculty that teach Intro to Sociology and indicated that approximately 30% of the sections are taught by full-time faculty exposing the students to the core program faculty early in their studies. They further indicated that all faculty are actively involved in recruitment and they currently have no junior faculty in the department.

II. Counseling

The committee thanks the Counseling faculty for the effort and time put into the self-study report. Based upon the quality of the self-study, overall the committee felt they understood how the program operates.

Enrollment: Fall 2009-Fall 2020
Strengths / Opportunities:

- The School of Counseling consists of three distinct graduate programs: Clinical Mental Health Counseling Program, Marriage and Family Therapy Program, and School Counseling Program, each with very distinct goals. The committee commended the programs for their accreditation.
The Clinical Mental Health Counseling Program prepares students as Licensed Professional Counselors/Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors. The program is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP).

The Marriage and Family Therapy Program prepares students as marriage and family therapists. The program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE) and is the only COAMFTE-accredited program within the state of Ohio.

The School Counseling Program prepares students as practitioners in the field of school counseling. The program is accredited by CACREP.

The committee commented on the potential for program growth in this school given the employment trends. Specifically, there is a 25% expected job growth for mental health counselors. It is further noted that an additional 109 mental health providers are needed to mitigate the immediate needs in Ohio. These growth opportunities affect both Clinical and Mental Health Counseling and Marriage and Family Therapy. Employment of school counselors is expected to grow by 8% over the next decade. Not unexpectedly, needs are focused in areas such as addiction, diversity and inclusion, and trauma informed care.

The committee commended the programs for continuing to modify their curricula to meet these emergent needs. The committee also commended the programs for their forward-thinking approach, eg new certificates and moving to a hybrid format.

The committee commended the school for having a certified inhouse training clinic for students. The certification was received in 2021 from the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (OHMAS).

The committee commended the program for completing a self-study report with live links to data. The committee found the links helpful in demonstrating that the faculty have a strong knowledge of their field.

The committee commended the programs for their various performance strengths, for example:

- The Clinical Mental Health Counseling Program: 100% internship placement rate; 98% pass rate on comprehensive exam; and, 95% state licensure pass rate.
- The Marriage and Family Therapy Program: 95% program completion rate; 98% licensure exam pass rate; and, 95% job placement rate.
- The School Counseling Program: 95% pass rate on OH counselor exam; 100% internship placement rate; 85% job placement rate with explanation – teachers often complete this program to augment their teaching.
The committee appreciated the detail with which each program explained their assessment practices and how their objectives and learning outcomes align with their accrediting bodies and post-graduation licensure, as applicable (e.g., MFT). As required by accreditation, the programs also routinely review their practices and student performance. The committee commended these programs for ‘closing the loop’ with their assessment and regular feedback practices. The committee also commended the programs for using surveys in their assessment.

The committee felt the programs had strength in unique offerings including their various service to the community and their online training in addiction services.

The committee commended the faculty for their commitment to graduate education, as well as for their own scholarship and research.

The committee commended the programs for their online tutoring numbers. This is notable given the programs do not benefit from assistantships.

The committee commended the programs for the strong relationship building they achieve with new and prospective students from the fairs and advising practices; there is a strong faculty commitment.

Weaknesses / Challenges:

- Given the three distinct graduate programs in the School of Counseling: Clinical and Mental Health Counseling Program; Marriage and Family Therapy Program; and, School Counseling Program, the report was written as separate, perfunctory sections. As such, there was little discussion of the program from the School perspective and little synthesized discussion.
- The committee commended the programs for their one-on-one advising practices, but questioned if this practice was sustainable given their current faculty numbers.
- The committee questioned if the lack of a PhD program hurt their competitiveness for students.
- Given the School of Counseling offers only graduate education, the committee questioned if there were sufficient connections with appropriate undergraduate programs to maximize the potential for these students, upon graduating, to enroll in the counseling graduate programs. The committee further questioned if there were identified needs with respect to campus pathways to attract potential graduate students.

Additional Clarifications:
The above notes were distributed to the School of Counseling representative prior to meeting with the committee. The intent was to allow the program time to
prepare and to understand where the committee had questions and clarification was requested.

- The committee further questioned if there were identified needs with respect to campus pathways to attract potential graduate students. If so, the committee would like further clarification, particularly as it relates to recommendations the committee can make to help establish/strengthen/solidify pathways, as appropriate.

- The committee questioned if the reliance on adjunct appointments in the School was reasonable. Furthermore, the committee questioned if this strengthened the programs in the long run, or if there were any risks to the programs’ accreditations given the current full-time faculty numbers.

- The committee discussed a comment in the report that “rules limit faculty members’ ability to fully collaborate with community partners or experiment with creative forms of team teaching with faculty in other departments”. The committee would like to understand what rules are serving as obstacles to collaboration.

Faculty Meeting:
The committee met with representatives from the School of Counseling on 9/14. The representatives educated the committee on the nature of the School of Counseling programs in response to a comment on cohesiveness of the self-study as opposed to independent specializations. The representatives explained that unlike many degree programs housed within a single school/department that often have tremendous synergy, the programs in the School of Counseling lack a cohesiveness among the programs that is a result of the programs having different accreditation standards that necessarily create differences in how the programs are addressed. They further indicated unique challenges among each of the different degree offerings that further focus efforts on program, rather than school needs.

The representatives discussed challenges with reaching potential graduate students given the lack of an undergraduate degree in the School of Counseling. They noted that the pipelines were in place given open houses and access to undergraduate programs at UA and other universities. They have an immediate need for tangible help with marketing. They are receptive to suggestions and need UA help/support with reaching students via relevant social media avenues, such as twitter and tik tok.

The majority of the discussion focused upon the critical shortage of faculty to run the programs in the School of Counseling and the threat to accreditation. Over the last 18 months, the faculty in the school has been reduced by 50%. While the programs have opportunities to grow enrollment in their self-pay programs, they must cap enrollment given accreditation standards of faculty-to-student ratios. As evidence of this, their applications exceed their available slots. As such, they
enroll for fall and try to move additional students to a spring admission; students by this time often enroll at Kent State. With the additional faculty, they could continue to grow the enrollment. Given they currently have ~200 self-paying students in graduate programs requiring 60 hours for a Master’s degree, a modest investment of 1-2 full time faculty lines could result in significant revenue to the programs/university and the opportunity to provide potential students with their first choice of a UA graduate degree. More somber is the representatives’ belief that if a minimum of 1-2 new, full-time faculty hires do not occur within the next 12-18 months, the programs are in serious risk of losing accreditation. Current accreditation standards in the Mental Health offering require a 1:12 faculty-to-student ratio, whereas the current numbers are 3.5 faculty to 162 students; this is a 1:46 faculty-to-student ratio and jeopardizes accreditation. The other programs in the school are in the same situation, if not worse. If the programs cannot maintain accreditation, the students will fail to be eligible for licensure. The representatives further noted the frustrations with finding qualified part-time faculty to support the programs. Given the credentials required of these part-time hires, the programs are finding themselves searching for new hires every semester. With these hiring responsibilities, teaching loads and recruitment and service responsibilities, the intense, intentional advising that is a strength of their programs, is not sustainable.
III. Social Work

The committee thanks the Social Work faculty for the effort and time put into the self-study report. Based upon the quality of the self-study, overall the committee felt they understood how the program operates.

Enrollment: Fall 2009–Fall 2020

Degrees: Fall 2015–Spring 2021
NOTE: In Fall 2020, the School of Social Work underwent a restructuring change and was merged with Child and Family Development to form the School of Social Work and Family Sciences. Only the Social Work programs were a part of this review; Child and Family Development were not reviewed at this time.

Strengths / Opportunities:

- Social Work has the distinction of being the only UA school that offers a full undergraduate degree on three campuses and a full graduate degree on four campuses. This is consistent with the self-study numbers that show strong growth opportunities for social workers, particularly those in the healthcare and mental health/substance abuse areas. It appears there is opportunity for this program to grow.

- The UA Social Work programs (undergraduate (BASW) and graduate (MSW)) are fully accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). Programs are up for reaccreditation in April 2022 (undergraduate) and February 2023 (graduate). The committee felt the program should be commended for these accomplishments.
The committee commended the UA Social Work programs for having been granted eight year accreditation status without follow up documentation, a feat achieved by only a select few schools. The committee commended the program for completing a self-study report with live links to data. The committee found the links helpful and demonstrates the faculty have a strong knowledge of their field.

The committee felt the mission statements for both the undergraduate and graduate programs are appropriate, strong and lead into tangible, well-thought out goals that demonstrate a distinction between the level of education. Whereas the undergraduate preparation focuses on foundational knowledge and generalist practice competencies, the graduate preparation focuses on advocacy, partnership and leadership.

Given the accreditation requirements, the committee felt the programs have strong assessment methods and processes in place. And, they review the assessment process every two years.

The committee commended the program - the undergraduate and graduate curriculum were updated in 2015 and designed to align with the accreditation standards and include learning outcomes consistent with the nine social work competencies established by Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS).

Assessment occurs at both the course and degree level with the latter including standardized testing. The assessment coordinator also informed the committee that the program faculty are receptive to assessment and continuous improvement.

The report included significant tables on areas such as teaching assignments and class sizes. It would be helpful moving forward if the data is put together in a way that enables comparisons, eg enrollment trends across semesters. The data as provided did not lend itself to evaluation or discussion and neither were provided in the self-study.

Licensure prep sessions have been initiated (Summer 2020) at both the undergraduate and graduate level to improve first-attempt passage rates. The committee commended the faculty efforts for their commitment to student success.

Current national and state labor statistics point to a strong job market for graduates in the social work field. Particularly strong are opportunities for jobs in mental health, substance abuse and healthcare. The committee questioned if there were opportunities to capitalize on these markets, eg., competency certificates in mental health and substance abuse.

The committee commended the program for participating in the Child Welfare Workforce Professional Education Program (CWWPEP) which provides an excellent opportunity to reduce the cost of the program with tuition reimbursement.
• The ‘step-up’ program is also a great way to partner with community colleges while providing a pathway for students with 2-year degrees to continue their studies and work toward licensure.
• The program is working to improve enrollment and are focused on a 10% increase per year. Efforts to grow enrollment include reducing costs, marketing and social media.
• The Chair and Dean letters were in agreement with the self-study, indicating the faculty in Social Work are doing a lot with less. This program has no graduate/administrative assistantships to support their efforts or the important work with which the faculty are involved.

Weaknesses / Challenges:
• The report acknowledges the need to improve first-attempt passing rates for the licensure exam, particularly at the undergraduate level.
• The report indicates the faculty typically have a three-credit research load for fall and spring. It is not clear if the research loads require this (self-study discussion was very minimal), given there are no students funded on external grants and funding has been limited prior to an OCWTP subcontract.
• The research has minimal student involvement. It would be great to find opportunities to involve undergraduate and graduate students in these efforts. This is particularly important given their reduced course load.
• The discussion of the Master’s program and its assessment were not as in-depth as the discussion of the undergraduate offerings. The Advanced Standing degree was not mentioned and no discussion of the external experiences was provided. The committee was not able to comment on these areas.
• Given the long list of data tables provided without discussion, the committee felt strengths of the program were often buried in the self-study.
• With respect to clinicals, internships and field experiences, the committee recognizes significant effort is required to handle the logistics and address the necessary onboarding. The committee would like to better understand this aspect of the program; specifically if there are enough placement locations and if so, is growth enrollment feasible with the current locations. The committee also raised the question of communication between the 3 undergraduate and 4 graduate campuses. No discussion of how this occurs with respect to curriculum was provided.

Additional Clarifications:
The above notes were distributed to the Social Work representative prior to meeting with the committee. The intent was to allow the program time to prepare and to understand where the committee had questions and clarification was requested.

- A clarification on faculty numbers would be appreciated. The report indicates that they hire TT, NTT, CP and PT faculty, but faculty numbers by classification (or total) are not provided. Ten faculty bios are included, but it is not clear how these faculty maintain the programs on all campuses. The report indicates the hiring of six new faculty as part of a subcontract on the OCWTP grant.

- A discussion of field experiences is warranted. It is not clear what the experiential requirements are for the degree(s) and how easy/difficult it is to find these placements? This would precede any discussion on the ability to grow enrollment in the Social Work programs.

- The committee questioned if the program had the necessary resources to maintain the programs on all four campuses. Furthermore, they questioned if faculty numbers were sufficient to maintain accreditation. The committee could not glean this clearly from the self-study.

Faculty Meeting:
The committee met with representatives from the School of Social Work and Family Sciences on 9/14. The representative(s) began by correcting an error regarding the licensure preparation sessions. This is not a new offering; they have been offering these sessions for 10 years. Moving these sessions online is new. The package of licensure preparation materials that students receive gives students 180 days of access to online testing materials as well as a 5 volume set of prep materials. During the online sessions, the faculty walk the students through the process and the students are then able to prepare for the exams on their own time. The BASW first time passing rate for licensure improved dramatically this past year, increasing from 60 to 74%. The representative(s) also corrected the hiring of individuals on the grant; they indicated these are staff (working remotely) and not faculty as noted in our initial report.

They also pointed out to the committee that they do have significant offerings in mental health and substance abuse. This includes courses at the undergraduate and graduate level, a certificate in cognitive behavior therapy as part of the Master of Social Work program. The latter is a unique offering that is offered by only a few programs in the country. The representatives also spoke to the step up programs and indicated that their program is responsible for the largest number of UA transfers from Stark State; they also connect with Lorain and Tri-C.

The representatives clarified a comment in the report pertaining to faculty having a 3 hour research load; they indicated this is limited to 3 TT faculty and 1 NTT faculty that can buy his research time. They also noted that they have 5 contract
professionals and that their accrediting body focuses on credentials of the instructors more so than their faculty title and type of appointment. This allows them to count part time faculty in their faculty-to-student ratios which are 1:12 (graduate) and 1:25 (undergraduate). They indicated they have the potential to grow enrollment and have enough faculty at this time to do so. They further indicated they are very fortunate to have an alumni community of qualified instructors willing to teach.

The representatives provided more detail regarding their graduate offerings. They offer a 1-year and a 2-year MSW. The 2-year program is for students not holding an undergraduate social work degree and consists of a foundation year followed by the concentration year; the 1-year (advanced standing) offering is for students with an appropriate undergraduate degree and encompasses only the concentration year. To ensure the success of students in the advanced standing program, the school requires a 6-credit Integrative Seminar prior to the start of the Concentration year. Since the self-study largely focused on the undergraduate degree, the representatives also explained that they are currently working on the MSW’s assessment rubrics so they align with those of the BASW degree.

The representatives provided additional detail on the significant, external field experiences required in these degrees. Undergraduates will complete 450 field hours; graduate students will complete either 500 (1-yr degree) or 900 (2-yr degree) field hours. The 500 hours completed by graduate students in the concentration year are completed over 2 semesters and at the same agency, to provide significant depth. Students are made aware of field opportunities and the school has over 200 agencies on their rosters. These opportunities are available to students on all 4 campuses and are located across the state of Ohio. Students initiate contact with the agencies and must interview for positions. A faculty liaison meets with the student and the field instructor to ensure the opportunity meets expected standards.

The committee asked for clarification regarding the coordination and communication between the 4 campuses, as it was not addressed in the report. The representatives explained the very detailed system that is in place. Specifically, they noted they are accredited as 1 program. As such, each course has a faculty coordinator, master syllabus and text with identical assignments. With constant communication, this results in a seamless approach. As to resources, the school is able to maintain its offerings on all 4 campuses with innovative and creative instructional approaches. These include: (i) offering Cognitive Behavioral Therapy I and the graduate and undergraduate addiction courses all online (and have been for several years) such that students from all four sites can take these online courses; (ii) offering Child Welfare I in a distance learning format which links Wayne and Lakewood to the UA campus; (iii)
offering the first semester of the MSW foundation year in distance learning format which links Wayne to the UA campus; and, (iv) offering 2 courses of the MSW concentration year in remote, synchronous format which links the Wayne and Canton sites. Taken as a whole, this ability to link courses and campuses significantly reduces the need for part-time faculty hires when students from 2, 3, or even 4 sites are linked with one instructor.

APPENDIX: ENROLLMENT, DEGREE AND FACULTY DATA TRENDS

- Source – Institutional Review

The IR website has not updated UA data trends since 2019. This below statement is what is provided. Fall 2020 Enrollment Profile.pdf (uakron.edu)
IT Program Review Dashboards

In lieu of IR data, IT-created dashboards were used with consistent selections.

- Enrollment trends for programs and university were from Fall 2009 - Fall 2020
- Degree trends for programs and university were from Fall 2015 – Spring 2021
- Faculty trends for programs and university were taken from Fall 2020

University Enrollment Trends (Fall 2009 – Fall 2020)

University Degree Trends (Fall 2015 – Spring 2021)
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The committee completed an initial report of the programs in the 2020-2021 review cycle which provides a detailed review of each of the programs. This final memo encompasses a high level view of the programs, as well as input to improve the program review process.

The committee would like to begin by commending all of the units in this review cycle for their efforts in making this process possible. We look forward to their positive influence on the effectiveness and quality of program review moving forward. Additionally, we would like to thank the Chairs and Deans for their letters that provided valuable input and direction to committee discussion.

Highlighted comments in the Initial Report as a result of meetings with representatives allude to some of the key findings. For example, the School of Social Work and Family Sciences has the ability to grow enrollment with its current infrastructure. The Department of Sociology is struggling to make the university understand the Criminology and Criminal Justice, BS. This is a degree equally owned and shared by three programs. There needs to be data and reporting practices that can accurately account for this shared structure. The School of Counseling is at a very critical juncture. Without faculty investment in the immediate future, their accreditation and programs are in jeopardy. Moreover, given the opportunities they have to grow enrollment based upon applicant numbers, a modest faculty investment of 2 positions would secure their accreditation; 3 hires would enable the program to grow enrollment in unfunded graduate programs that are currently turning away applicants.

It would be remiss of us to not acknowledge the extraordinary time in which this review process was undertaken. With our entire campus moving to remote education as a result of COVID-19, the self-studies were completed by faculty working remotely, as were the reviews by the Chairs, Deans and PR Committee. As a testament to our campus commitment to the education of our students, we believe strongly that the remote completion of this year’s program review process in no way affected the quality of the reports/reviews, and the significant effort of all parties is clearly reflected in these documents.

With respect to the review process, in this 3rd year of our cycle, the process included a slightly modified timeline that provided the programs under review additional time to complete the self-study reports. This was necessitated by the pandemic. In addition, the recommendation to institutionalize program review as a standing committee of Faculty Senate continues to gain traction. The committee continues to be firm in its belief that continuous improvement of our educational offerings is contingent upon the continuation of the program review process. Institutionalizing the committee has been suggested as a means to keep the process robust and immune from staffing (faculty/administration/leadership) turnover.

Recurring themes in reports this year were concerns for understaffing with recent faculty cuts and lack of communication with Wayne programs. We are not in a position to comment on the first concern except to note that from our work, we feel faculty have done everything in their power to maintain quality programming in spite of the cuts, and should be commended. To the second concern, the PRC
would suggest that the Curriculum Review Committee consider involving itself in this matter to improve communication and coordination between the campuses. Main campus programs note among other concerns, not getting assessment reports and course evaluation materials. Even though Wayne operates with a large adjunct faculty, we have reporting responsibilities that are necessary to improving our programs. We should also note, that we are of the understanding that this issue is on the radar of the General Education assessment process such that programs are re-establishing communication between faculty on both campuses.

The committee would like to comment on the Memorandum of Understanding – Shared Governance document which was signed by The University of Akron Chief Negotiator (George Crisci) and The AAUP university of Akron Chapter Chief Negotiator (Richard Londraville). The MOU outlines a program review process that includes rating the programs. As a result of the rating, additional actions may follow, including detailed guidance for underperforming programs with actions such as leadership changes, and/or consultation with college and OAA administration. Additionally, they will be subject to more frequent and accelerated review with feedback that could include the decision to discontinue the program. As proposed, the program review committee will make recommendations to Faculty Senate; Faculty Senate will make recommendations to the President. Ultimately, no program will be terminated without having at least one, two-year review cycle.

While the program review committee understands the intention of this process is to eliminate program discontinuation without notice, the committee does not support using the program review committee in this manner. The committee has worked incredibly hard these last three years to complete formative program review, which is a process of continuous improvement of our academic offerings. Taking on this role, we were initially assured by then Provost Ramsier that this process would not be summative. As we work through our 3rd cycle, there has been a considerable shift in attitude regarding program review and reports are much less defensive than they were in the initial cycle which immediately followed the campuswide summative program review.

Program review needs to be allowed to continue as a formative process. The formative process encourages the programs to complete the self-study and engage in the necessary discussions to improve upon shortcomings in the program, curriculum, advising, scheduling, recruitment, experiential opportunities, etc. And the committee needs this level of honesty to be reported in the self-study to effectively complete the review process and make necessary recommendations to support our students. A rating process will destroy the trust that has been re-built and will result in self-study reports that are written to avoid any perception of inadequacy. If we want to come together as a university, we cannot have a culture of fear.

The possibility of a 2nd committee working independently to meet the MOU objectives was discussed. It was felt that a better way to address discontinuation, was to identify programs at risk and utilize a special committee tasked with working with the program(s). To programs that are at risk, the self-study template
does not sufficiently encompass all areas that should be considered in these decisions; separate materials should be created. To programs not at risk, they would know where they stand prior to completing the program review self-study and could provide the necessary, candid report that is critical to continuous improvement. It should also be noted that program review is a volunteer commitment with the workload heavily focused in the summer. The additional lifting required by the MOU exceeds what should be requested of one group to complete. At this point, the committee discussed their lack of clarity in moving forward. The question of ‘what is this committee’s charge and where are we going?’ was raised by several members and a meeting with out-going and in-coming Faculty Senate Chairs is requested.

The committee would like to thank the university’s faculty and administration for the opportunity to serve in this capacity. We hope the work of this committee benefits our faculty, staff and students. Respectfully submitted by the PRC members (2020-2021):

Committee Members
Malik Elbuluk, PhD (College of Engineering and Polymer Science)
Jennifer Hebert, MA Professor of Instruction (Assessment Director)
Gary Holliday, PhD (Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences)
Galen Karikker, DMA (Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences)
Scott Palasik, PhD (College of Health and Human Sciences)
Linda Shanks, PhD (College of Health and Human Sciences)
Craig Wise, MSc, PE (College of Engineering and Polymer Science)

Co-chairs:
Marnie Saunders, PhD (Graduate School)
Thomas Calderon, PhD (College of Business) Faculty Co-Chair retired at the start of the summer 2021
To: Faculty Senate
From: Senator Chris Graor
Subject: Report from Graduate Council

During the 2020-2021 academic year, the Graduate Council discussed and approved changes to its organizational structure to align with the campus restructure. This included addressing the composition of the council, as well as its three standing committees. These changes were voted on and approved by the Graduate Council. They were further presented to the graduate faculty for approval via electronic vote; the vote was open from May 3-11, 2021. There were 54 responders in all; all voted to accept the following changes.

1. Graduate Council Membership: Maintain the total Graduate Council 16-person membership – 14 of which are elected graduate faculty and 2 of which are faculty senate representatives
   - 6 members will hail from the College of Arts and Sciences
     - 1- Arts division
     - 1- Education division
     - 1- Humanities division
     - 1- Natural science division
     - 1- Social science division
     - 1- At-large
   - 2 members will hail from the College of Business
   - 4 members will hail from the College of Engineering and Polymer Science
   - 2 members will hail from the College of Health and Human Sciences
   - 2 – the senate representatives can hail from any college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or Division</th>
<th>Number of elected members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Humanities Arts division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Natural sciences Education division</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Social sciences Humanities division</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Visual arts Natural sciences division</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - At-large</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering and Polymer Science</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health professions and Human Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of polymer science and polymer engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Membership of the Standing Committees

- **Grad Faculty Membership Committee** will continue to consist of a total of 6 graduate faculty – the 2 officers elected among the council and 4 members representing each of the 4 (previously 6) colleges. Additionally, it was decided that a minimum of 4 of these 6 members must hold the equivalent of faculty III status (easing requirements to allow more to serve – prior all members had to hold category III status).

- **Grad Faculty Curriculum Committee** will continue to consist of a total of 6 graduate faculty – the 2 officers elected among the council and 4 members representing each of the 4 (previously 6) colleges. Additionally, it was decided to include the recommendation of an ad hoc grad faculty member from the School of Education on this committee, if not already represented.

- **Grad Faculty Student Policy Committee** will continue to consist of a total of 6 graduate faculty – 3 elected among the council and 3 members from graduate faculty – such that the committee has representation from all 4 colleges (previously 6). The committee will continue to have student representation – 3 graduate students round out this committee.

Discussion was based upon the size of the graduate programs/degrees awarded/the number of graduate faculty in the program, etc. Per the current bylaws, this composition should be reviewed at least every 3 years.

See UA Bylaws of Graduate Faculty (attachment); Minor housekeeping edits were also made to correct outdated information, such as requiring minute meeting copies to be sent to the university archivist.

3359-24-01 Bylaws of the graduate faculty.

(A) Name. This organization shall be known as the graduate faculty of the university of Akron.

(B) Purpose. The purpose of the graduate faculty shall be to encourage and contribute to the advancement of knowledge through instruction and research of highest quality, and to foster a spirit of inquiry and a high value on scholarship throughout the university.

(C) Duties. The duties of the graduate faculty shall be:

1. To develop curricula leading to appropriate graduate degrees;

2. To participate in research, publication, and professional societies;

3. To recruit, encourage, and supervise superior students in their graduate studies;
(4) To conduct graduate classes and seminars that stimulate creativity, independent thought, and scholarly attitudes and performance;

(5) To serve on supporting committees, as needed; to supervise student research; and to direct theses and dissertations;

(6) To help develop and maintain a graduate library appropriate to a sound graduate program;

(7) To elect the members of the graduate council, and if elected to the council, to serve in the best interests of the graduate faculty and the graduate school; and

(8) To participate in the selection of a dean of the graduate school.

(D) Membership.

(1) The following shall be members of the graduate faculty.

(a) President of the university.

(b) Senior vice president and provost.

(c) Dean of the graduate school.

(d) Associate/assistant dean(s) of the graduate school.

(e) Deans of colleges offering graduate programs.

(f) Distinguished professors.

(g) Chairs of departments/schools offering graduate programs.

(h) Appointees as indicated in paragraph (D)(2) of this rule.

(2) There is only one graduate faculty of the university of Akron. Within that graduate faculty, members have different responsibilities. All members of the graduate faculty are defined as being "Category I" members. Those members of the graduate faculty, who request and are granted the prerogative to direct master’s theses or master’s theses and doctoral dissertations (described herein), are defined as being "Category II" and "Category III" members, respectively.

(a) Application for graduate faculty membership is made upon the recommendation of the graduate faculty of the department/school
or a duly constituted committee of that faculty. Applications are reviewed in turn by the department chair/school director, the college dean, and the graduate council. Appointments to the graduate faculty are made by the dean of the graduate school on the basis of the recommendations of the graduate council. Any member of the university faculty, who holds a full-time appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor, including those ex-officio members designated in paragraphs (D)(1)(a) to (D)(1)(g) of this rule, may be nominated.

(b) Nominations and recommendations for appointments of members shall be made in the following categories:

(i) "Category I": teaching of master's and doctoral courses and serving as a member of thesis and dissertation committees.

(ii) "Category II": "Category I" responsibilities plus directing of master's degree theses.

(iii) "Category III": "Category II" responsibilities plus directing of doctoral dissertations.

(c) Ex-officio appointments shall be in "Category I." A majority of members serving on doctoral dissertation committees must be in "Category III". Candidates, who received their terminal degrees within one year of applying for graduate faculty membership, will be granted the category that they request for a five-year period.

Reappointments in "Category II" and Category III" will then be contingent upon requirements for these categories. "Category I" appointments will be for the duration of the faculty member's appointment to the university and does not require renewal.

(d) Quality is the primary factor in awarding membership on the graduate faculty. Those closest to the discipline are in the best position to provide a qualitative assessment of a candidate's research, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments. The role of the department/school's graduate faculty, the department chair/school director, and the collegiate dean in evaluating the candidate's credentials for graduate faculty membership is to provide the crucial quality assessment. All applications forwarded for graduate faculty membership must contain written qualitative assessments of the candidate’s research, scholarly and/or creative activities.
(e) In addition, in order to ensure minimum quantitative standards on a university-wide basis, the following shall be the minimum criteria for appointment to "Category I."

(i) Candidates must possess a terminal degree appropriate to their fields.

(ii) Candidates may present other evidence of scholarly or creative activity such as panel membership, discussant, patents or performance activity.

(f) The following shall be the minimum criteria for appointment and reappointment to "Category II."

(i) Candidates must possess a terminal degree appropriate to their field.

(ii) Candidates must be actively engaged in scholarly or creative activities demonstrative of current knowledge of and involvement with their fields. Examples of this requirement include:

(a) Paper presentations at regional, national or international meetings of the professional discipline; and

(b) Reviewed performances or exhibits or published creative work; a minimum of one refereed publication is required. For non-publication-oriented disciplines, reviewed creative work or activity in recognized forums is required.

(iii) Candidates may present other evidence of scholarly or creative activity such as panel membership, discussant, patents or performance activity.

(g) The following shall be the minimum criteria for appointment or reappointment to "Category III."

(i) Candidates must possess a terminal degree appropriate to their field of expertise and employment.

(ii) Current scholarly competence as demonstrated by at least four refereed scholarly publications or the equivalent. Examples may include refereed journal articles, chapters in scholarly books, conference proceedings, and successful external research grants. Two of these refereed publications must be journal articles or chapters in scholarly books.
(iii) In appropriate disciplines, scholarly books containing substantial original material by the author may be substituted for the refereed publications described in paragraph (D)(2)(g)(ii) of this rule.

(h) It shall be the responsibility of each department/school to develop its own guidelines specifying criteria for members of that department to be nominated for graduate faculty status, based on standards in their own disciplines. The guidelines will be developed by the full-time graduate faculty of the department/school and the academic dean. Guidelines must be approved by the graduate council and the dean of the graduate school. These guidelines shall meet or exceed the general criteria described above and shall be approved and on file in the graduate school office prior to the submission of any appointment application.

(i) Persons, who do not meet all of the preceding criteria but are recognized by their departmental/school colleagues as being highly qualified in their special fields of study, may apply in a specific category by the graduate faculty of a department/school for membership in the graduate faculty.

(j) All applications shall be accompanied by an abbreviated vita (form provided as part of the application). Such curriculum vita must provide complete information concerning possession of the appropriate terminal degree for the discipline, concerning research and scholarship with bibliographic citations (complete, ordered list of authors' names, volumes, years, pages), and other scholarly or professional activities indicated by year. The curriculum vita must differentiate refereed publications from non-refereed.

(i) The applicant, departmental graduate faculty committee, department chair/school director, and the college dean are to provide or attest to both qualitative and quantitative information substantiating the nominee's qualifications.

(ii) The candidate must specify which category of membership is desired. Candidates, who are clearly qualified for "Category III", should request consideration for this category of membership, even if they are not affiliated with doctoral programs.

(3) A faculty member holding joint appointments in more than one university department/school must seek graduate faculty status in each department/school in which graduate faculty membership is desired.
(4) Any person desiring to appeal graduate council's actions taken under the provision of paragraph (D)(2) of this rule may request a review by a committee composed of: two members of the graduate council who are not on the graduate faculty membership committee, and three members of the graduate faculty who are not in the candidate's department/school, to be appointed by the senior vice president and provost or designee who shall serve as a non-voting chair.

(5) Appointments to the graduate faculty shall be for initial and subsequent terms of five years for "Category II" and "Category III" status. Terms shall begin on the first day of the fall semester and end on the day preceding the first day of the fall semester five years later. Appointments made during the fall semester shall be considered as having been made on the first day of that semester. For appointments made during the spring semester, the term shall be considered as having begun on the first day of the following fall semester. Applications for reappointments shall be made not later than March first for a term to begin in the following fall semester.

(6) Adjunct, part-time, visiting, non-tenure track, and other faculty members shall be eligible for ad hoc temporary "Category I" appointment to the graduate faculty. Such an appointment shall be given for the performance of specified graduate faculty functions (e.g., for teaching specific master's or doctoral level courses and serving on specific master's or doctoral committees).

(a) Ad hoc temporary functions shall exclude:

(i) directing of doctoral dissertations or master's theses, and

(ii) service as the representative of the graduate school on dissertation committees.

(b) The dean of the graduate school shall make such an appointment for a specified period of time to fulfill specified function(s), normally for a period of up to five academic years. Faculty shall be nominated for such an appointment by the full-time graduate faculty in the department/school, the department chair/school director, and the collegiate dean, and must possess the appropriate terminal degree, documented experience, and other credentials relevant to performance of the specified graduate faculty function(s), as defined by departmental/school guidelines.

(c) An ad hoc appointment may be renewed, but only on a case-by-case basis.
(7) Only members of the graduate faculty shall be permitted to teach courses at the graduate level. Only those members who hold a full-time, regular (non-ad hoc temporary) appointment to the graduate faculty at the university of Akron shall be eligible to vote as graduate faculty members.

(8) For some disciplines, "Category III" graduate faculty status is essential for a faculty member's career path. Therefore, a new hire past the one-year terminal degree may be granted "Category III" for a five-year period according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time since report of terminal degree</th>
<th>Publications* required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 year</td>
<td>0 refereed publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>1 refereed publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>2 refereed publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>3 refereed publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Or creative activity according to department/school criteria.

(a) The above is equivalent to one refereed publication per year following the receipt of the terminal degree or four refereed publications in the last five years.

(E) Officers. Officers of the graduate faculty shall be the president of the university, the senior vice president and provost, the academic deans of colleges offering graduate programs, the dean of the graduate school, and a vice chair elected by the graduate council. Their duties shall be as follows:

(1) The president, as executive head of the university in all its departments/schools, shall receive the reports of subordinate officers, shall advise and counsel them, and shall have the powers and responsibilities stated in the bylaws of the board of trustees of the university.

(2) The senior vice president and provost shall receive the reports of the graduate council, and shall advise and counsel the dean of the graduate school and the graduate faculty as the chief academic officer of the university responsible to the president for the supervision of the academic functions of the university.

(3) The academic deans of those colleges offering graduate programs shall be responsible for direct supervision of graduate faculty and programs within their respective colleges.
(4) The dean of the graduate school shall be responsible for the administration of the graduate school, and shall supervise its programs and its student body. The dean shall serve as chair and preside at meetings of the graduate faculty and shall be responsible for recording and maintaining of minutes of all meetings of the graduate faculty, sending out notices of all meetings, and for seeing that all graduate faculty receive copies of the agenda prior to, and minutes after, all meetings. Two copies of all documents shall be sent to the university archivist.

(5) The vice chair shall be elected by the graduate council and shall preside over graduate faculty and graduate council meetings in the absence of the chair.

(F) Committees. The graduate council shall be the executive committee of the graduate faculty and shall represent the graduate faculty in proposing matters of academic policy and procedure of the graduate school, and in counseling and advising with the dean of the graduate school in matters of administering the graduate school.

(1) The graduate council shall consist of sixteen voting members, including fourteen elected graduate faculty members and two elected faculty senate representatives. In addition membership shall include the following non-voting members: one elected graduate student; the dean of the graduate school; and the associate dean of the graduate school.

(a) The faculty members shall be elected from the colleges and divisions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or division</th>
<th>Number of elected members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchtel college of arts and sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - HumanitiesArts division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Natural sciencesEducation division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Social sciencesHumanities division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Visual artsNatural sciences division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Social science division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - At-large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of business administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of engineering and polymer science</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of health professions and human sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) The student member shall be elected yearly by the graduate student government.

(c) The dean shall not have voting rights, except in the case of tie votes.

(d) The number and apportionment of graduate council members shall be reviewed within three years of the adoption of these bylaws and at least every three years thereafter by the graduate faculty. A similar review shall be conducted whenever a college not now offering a graduate degree shall institute one.

(2) The term of office of a faculty member on the graduate council shall be three years and the terms arranged so that no fewer than four members shall be replaced each year. Members may serve no more than two consecutive terms. No more than one member of the faculty of any department/school may serve on council during any given year. Faculty membership on the graduate council is limited to those members of the graduate faculty who qualify under paragraph (D)(2) of this rule or department chairs/school directors who qualify under paragraph (D)(1) of this rule.

(3) The faculty members retiring from the graduate council each year shall duly constitute a nominating committee which will meet in March and propose the names of two graduate faculty members from each college or division represented by the retiring members.

(a) The nominations shall be transmitted to the dean of the graduate school by April first, and the dean shall circulate the slate to the graduate faculty. Prior to April fifteenth, any five qualified members of a college or division may nominate an additional member of their group by petition addressed to the dean of the graduate school through the college dean.

(b) On or about April fifteenth, the dean of the graduate school shall send an electronic ballot to each member of the graduate faculty concerned, which ballot shall list all nominees for the graduate council classified according to college or division. Faculty members shall vote only for the representative of their own particular group and shall vote for one nominee only, except when a member-at-large is elected from the Buchtel college of arts and sciences. The electronic ballot shall be inserted in an unmarked envelope which shall be placed inside another envelope. The outer
envelope shall be signed and returned to the dean of the graduate school no later than May first.

(c) The graduate council shall then tally the vote and preserve the ballots for one month after the May meeting. In the event that no candidate for a given position receives a majority of the votes cast, there shall be a reballot between the two candidates with the largest pluralities. Results of the election shall be announced to the graduate faculty, and the newly elected members shall take up their duties on September first.

(d) If a vacancy should occur on the graduate council with one year or more left in the term, a special election shall be held. The newly elected member shall serve for that portion of the term for which the originally elected member shall be absent. For the special election, the last nominating committee shall be asked to submit a slate of two names from the appropriate faculty group; other nominations may be made in accordance with the procedure described in paragraph (F)(3)(a) of this rule. If a vacancy occurs with less than one full year remaining in the term, the dean of the college may recommend for appointment to the graduate council a person from the appropriate college or division to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term.

(4) The duties of the graduate council shall include:

(a) To evaluate the qualifications of nominees and recommend membership on the graduate faculty.

(b) To vote upon all matters of policy of the graduate school, not otherwise established by the graduate faculty.

(c) To counsel and advise the dean of the graduate school in administering the policies of the graduate school as related to, but not limited to admissions, dismissals, transfers, awards, curricula and degree programs.

(5) The dean of the graduate school shall serve as chair of the graduate council. At its first meeting each fall, council shall elect from among its members a vice chair and a secretary. The vice chair shall work with the chair on the agenda for each meeting and preside in the absence of the chair.

(6) Standing committees of the graduate council shall be as follows:

(a) A graduate faculty membership committee, comprised of a chair and one other faculty member of the graduate council who will serve
as vice chair, plus four persons from the membership of the graduate faculty, shall be elected by the council. Six different colleges shall be represented in the membership of this committee. **A minimum of four (of the six total members) must hold category III faculty status.** This committee shall review all nominations for membership on the graduate faculty, using the guidelines in paragraph (D)(2) of this rule, and make recommendations to the graduate council. Those persons approved by the graduate council shall be recommended to the dean of the graduate school for appointment to the graduate faculty. Any nominated person who is rejected by the council or the dean may seek further consideration through the procedure described in paragraph (D)(4) of this rule.

(b) A graduate faculty curriculum committee, comprised of a chair and one other faculty member of the graduate council who will serve as vice chair, plus four persons from the membership of the graduate faculty, shall be elected by the council. Six different colleges shall be represented in the membership of this committee. **Additionally, an ad hoc member from the school of education should be included, if not already represented on this committee.** This committee shall review all curriculum proposals and related curricular issues referred to either the graduate council or the dean of the graduate school under the operative university curriculum review policies and procedures.

(c) A graduate faculty student policy committee, comprised of a chair and two other faculty members of the graduate council, one of the two identified as vice chair, and three persons from the membership of the graduate faculty, shall be elected by the council, plus three graduate students to be elected by the graduate student government. Six different colleges shall be represented in the faculty membership of this committee. This committee shall assist the graduate council and the dean of the graduate school in resolving issues regarding admission and denials of admission, transfer credit, dismissals, special standing, and other matters relating to the general welfare of graduate students.

(d) The dean of the graduate school shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of all standing committees of the graduate council. No other member of the graduate faculty may serve on more than one standing committee at a time.

(e) Ad hoc committees of graduate council may be appointed by the dean of the graduate school as needed. The chair shall be a member of graduate council and shall report to the council.
(7) Minutes of the graduate council meetings shall be available electronically to all members of the graduate faculty and graduate council within two weeks of each meeting. Unless a formal objection to the action of council is submitted in writing to the dean of the graduate school within two weeks after the date of distribution, council actions shall be considered as approved by the graduate faculty. All such actions should be forwarded to the faculty senate whenever action by that body is required.

(a) If written objection to any action of the graduate council is received by the dean of the graduate school, the dean shall report it to the council for consideration. One member of council shall be designated by the dean to arbitrate the matter between council and the objector. If agreement has not been reached after two weeks, a special meeting of the graduate faculty shall be called. The action of the graduate faculty on the issue shall be binding and reported in the next minutes of the graduate council.

(8) The graduate council shall meet at least once a month during the academic year and two-thirds of the membership shall constitute a quorum.

The agenda for meetings of the graduate council shall be prepared by the dean of the graduate school in consultation with the vice chair prior to each meeting and shall include a report from each standing committee. Any member of the graduate faculty may submit items for the agenda to any member of the graduate council.

(G) Meetings.

(1) The graduate faculty shall hold a regular annual meeting. A quorum at any meeting shall be ten per cent of the graduate faculty membership. Members shall be notified one month prior to the date of all regular meetings.

(2) The agenda for each regular meeting shall include:

(a) A report by the dean of the graduate school on the state of the graduate school,

(b) A report by the vice chair of graduate council on the activities of the graduate council,

(c) A report from a representative of university libraries on the state of the libraries as they pertains to graduate study,
(d) A report from a representative of information technology on the state of the computing and telecommunication units as they pertain to graduate study,

(e) A report from a representative of graduate student government, and

(f) Other business.

(3) Special meetings of the graduate faculty shall be called by the dean/director of the graduate school when:

(a) Ten members so petition, or

(b) The counsel and guidance of the graduate faculty are sought by the dean/director and/or the graduate council.

(4) The chair of the graduate faculty shall appoint a parliamentarian, who shall base any ruling on "Robert's Rules of Order, Revised."

(5) Minutes of each graduate faculty meeting shall be posted electronically for all members of the graduate faculty and sent to graduate student government. A permanent file shall be kept in the graduate school office. Two copies shall be sent to the university archivist.

(6) These bylaws may be amended by vote at special meetings of the graduate faculty that are called for the specific purpose of considering such amendments, and provided that the amendments are distributed to the entire membership in writing at least one month prior to the meeting and are approved by two-thirds of those present at such meetings. Amendments may also be made by a two-third vote of those voting by secret mail—ballot, provided the amendment has been submitted to the entire membership in writing at least six weeks prior to the deadline for receipt of the vote. Amendments are subject to ratification by the board of trustees.
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