

The University of Akron IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

10-2-2008

Faculty Senate Chronicle for October 2, 2008

Richard Stratton

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

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

Recommended Citation

Stratton, Richard. "Faculty Senate Chronicle for October 2, 2008." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 2 Oct 2008. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/52>

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



35 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- **Approved a motion to create The University of Akron Magnetic Resonance Center or the MRC. 5**
- **Approved a motion to create College of Creative and Professional Arts. 5**
- **Approved a motion to create College of Health Sciences and Human Services..... 5**
- **Approved the following curricular proposals: Cultural Competence in the Public Sector, Disaster Relief & Recovery, and the Emergency Management BS Program. 6**
- **Created an ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the entire curriculum review process at The University of Akron with a view towards revising it and fitting in the curriculum review process into a new software system..... 18**

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle* may be directed to the Secretary, Richard Stratton (x7440).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held October 2, 2008 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of October 2, 2008

- A. Report and resolutions from the Academic Policies Committee 20
- B. Report and recommendations from the Curriculum Review Committee 26
- C. Report from ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee 29
- D. Report from the General Education Advisory Committee 34

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 2, 2008

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, October 2, 2008 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-three Senators, 33 were present for this meeting. Senators Arter, Cockley, Elliott, Gamble, Gerlach, Halter, Hamed, Marich, Miller, Sancaktar, Schantz and Yi were absent with notice. Senators Ash, Hallett, Kelly, Kruse, Sadler, Sotnak and Williams were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Sterns called the meeting to order and asked for approval of the agenda. Senator Cox moved the agenda be approved (2nd by Senator Wesdemiotis). The agenda was approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes – Chair Sterns stated the minutes of the last Senate meeting had not been circulated and hopefully the Senate will consider them at the next meeting.

III. Chairman's Remarks & Special Announcements – Chair Sterns continued with his remarks. “We have a number of issues to deal with today and over the next sessions of the Senate. One of the first and most important things we are dealing with of course is the deliberations of the University Council Exploratory Committee. We will be having a formal report from that group today. As you know we had anticipated and have been trying to make sure that the Senate would have a chance to review that document and actually take action. We had even scheduled a special meeting on the 16th of October. It has become apparent to the committee . . . that we will probably not be able to have that special meeting on the 16th. I know that will sadden all of you greatly, but the fact of the matter is that we will probably to take it up further on the November meeting. I just want to say that up front so that everybody can adjust their schedules accordingly.

And then I have both good news and bad news. The good news is that many of you may have read on September 26th from Perspectives from the Provost we know that both President Proenza and Vice President Provost Stroble are in China where they are part of the group establishing the Confucius Institute which will be finalized with Henan University. This will lead to the exchange of two professors as well as enhancing our curriculum in Mandarin Chinese and Asian Studies. The second good news is that on the same day that the Akron Beacon Journal reported that The University of Akron and the Laura and Alvin Segal College of Judaic Studies are teaming to allow our student to access the courses and degree programs at each institution. The bad news is that we are establishing a Confucius Institute and a Segal Institute without having them discussed or approved by the Faculty Senate. All new academic programs are to be brought to the Senate. I don't mean to be contentious this, but the fact of the matter is that we have not yet received official word. I personally was thrilled to see the Segal relationship because of my

own personal interest in Judaic studies but that does not mean that we don't have to go through the steps that are necessary for establishing these academic units. So to make sure that we all understand that we can be welcoming and embrace these two additions, but at the same time recognize they do need to be approved, as they do represent a change and modification in academic programs. So I hope this message will be received in the proper spirit. But I think that as we have been working on our new governance structure, we've become extremely aware of things that have to be done and how they have to be done. We are making note of that.

At this time I would like to announce the death of Dr. Stephanie Lopina. Dr. Lopina was associate professor of chemical engineering and passed away on September 14 at the age of 44. Before coming to The University of Akron, Professor Lopina earned a Ph.D. from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a master's from Lehigh University and a bachelor's degree from the University of Notre Dame, all in chemical engineering. Would you all please rise for a moment of silence in memory of Dr. Stephanie Lopina?" [Senate observed moment of silence]

IV. Reports –

a. Executive Committee - Senator Stratton reported that the "Executive Committee met on September 11th to organize an orientation session for new senators. In addition to the orientation, new senators learned about the structure and duties of the Senate. They also were provided with the history of the University Council proposal and were allowed to provide comments to the committee at that time. On September 18th, the EC and the Senate representatives to the University Council Exploratory Committee provided an opportunity for Senators to make comments on and suggestions for the new version of the University Council document.

On September 25th the Executive committee met to discuss the processes by which committee members are appointed to the Senate committees. We appointed additional members to the Academic Policies Committee, to the Computer, Communications Technology Committee (CCTC), to Student Affairs and also to the University Libraries. Some senators are not currently serving on a committee and if you are one of these please assist the Executive Committee by contacting the Senate office, Heather, with your preferences for committee assignments. At that meeting we also discussed the progress of the University Council deliberations, reviewed a letter from Associate Provost Rex Ramsier requesting the Executive Committee's assistance in new software for curriculum review. I believe there will be some more discussion of that under New Business. And finally we approved a draft agenda for today's meeting."

Chair Sterns asked the Executive Committee to meet with him briefly after the meeting. There was one small task to accomplish. He noted the absence of the President and the Provost and noted that daily information is available on the Provost's blog.

b. Committee reports -

Chair Sterns noted there were no reports from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and the Graduate Council. So he called for the report from Academic Policies Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier: “Academic Policies Committee has met twice since our last Senate meeting. In the written report there is an action item for the Senate. We did provide a rationale and a resolution prior to the seven day limit so according to the University Rules the committee can bring forward a motion for action. (full proposal on Faculty Senate website) That action is embodied in the resolution:

“Be it resolved that the recommendation by APC on September 16th, 2008 concerning the approval of the establishment of the center listed below be approved. The center would be called The University of Akron Magnetic Resonance Center or the MRC.”

Chair Sterns called for discussion. There being no discussion the Senate voted and **the motion passed.**

Associate Provost Ramsier continued by stating the results of the Academic Policy Committee meeting of September 30th, 2008 were not early enough to meet the seven day electronic post limit. Therefore he asked permission of the Senate to consider these two motions.

Senator Rich moved that the Senate proceed to consider these items. Second was provided by Senator Gandee. **The motion passed** and the Senate proceeded.

Associate Provost Ramsier: “This set of recommendations comes from the special resolution 1 and 2 [in the committee report]. I would like to address number 1 first. This is concerning the naming of the two new colleges that would be derived from what is currently the College of Fine and Applied Arts.

Recommendation number 1 is that the Academic Policies Committee as of September 30th recommends that the new college that would include the School of Music, the School of Dance, Theatre and Arts Administration, the Myers School of Art, and the School of Communications shall be called the College of Creative and Professional Arts.

Our rationale considered the transition work over the summer as well as input from faculty and staff of the college that currently exists. And due to the need for a timely naming of this college in order that the dean search can commence you have our recommendation for a new name.”

There being no discussion, **the motion passed.**

Associate Provost Ramsier continued with special resolution number 2. This resolution “originates from the committee on the same date September 30th, 2008;

we recommend that the new college that would include the School of Social Work, the School of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology and the School of Family and Consumer Sciences, shall be called the College of Health Sciences and Human Services.”

There being no discussion, **the motion passed.**

Chair Sterns asked for the report of the Curriculum Review Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier: “Curriculum Review Committee meets bi-weekly and we met September 23rd, we provide a formal report in which we have a simple recommendation we’d like to read into the record. I quote: ‘When curriculum proposals for new programs or changes to existing programs/courses have the potential to impact other colleges, it is advisable that such proposals be developed collaboratively with representatives from the potentially affected colleges.’

We bring forward action items, embodied in a resolution with the rationale:

‘BE IT RESOLVED, the recommendation presented by the Curriculum Review Committee on September 23, 2008, concerning curricular proposal approvals listed below, be approved.’

And there are three listed, Cultural Competence in the Public Sector, Disaster Relief & Recovery, and the Emergency Management BS Program.”

Chair Sterns asked for discussion. There being none, **the motion passed.**

Senator Erickson asked for clarification of the phrase in the report that was read into the minutes: “be developed collaboratively with representatives from the potentially affected colleges”

Associate Provost Ramsier: “That if one develops a proposal with the knowledge that it would affect a different unit, it would certainly help the committee out if the people got together and talked about it first rather than waiting until it gets to the committee and then we have an objection that we have to hold a hearing etc., so we’d like to see that people are trying to work collaboratively.”

Senator Erickson indicated that very often one does not know if a proposal affects another college. Under the current system there is no easy way to discover such interdependencies. One must through the Bulletin page by page by page. Often we do not know of the interdependencies until the proposal is reviewed by other colleges within the curricular review system. We should consider ways to make the process easier and more effective. There are ways that that could be done and they need to be investigated.

Associate Provost Ramsier agreed and appreciated the comment. This is part of the reason that we want a new electronic curriculum system. It would automatically notify the people who have cross listed courses or requirements. You wouldn’t have to go out of your way to find out, the technology would handle it.

Chair Sterns suggested, and **Associate Provost Ramsier** concurred that the committee is requesting goodwill in developing proposal, when you are aware of the problem. However, they recognize there will be times when you are not aware of the problem. Hopefully in the future technology will help to minimize the latter cases.

Chair Sterns noted there were no reports from Athletic Committee and NCAA faculty representative so he called for the report from the ad hoc Committee on Facilities Planning.

Senator Vollmer: “The Senate has a copy of the last meeting that we had on the 29th. Perhaps I can bring some points up. The committee asked Vice President Case to attend and to talk to the committee about

the parking on campus and traffic generally. He told us that there are 12 Roo buses in service; permits are up for employees up about 170 from previous years; and student parking permits are up as well. He did tell us that within the next six months, I guess sometime in spring semester, the university is going to lose another 700 parking spots for the construction of a multi-level deck along east Exchange by the flat lots on Exchange by the Schrank building. There are approximately currently 10,000 spots and so that leaves 9300. It was asked if Central Hower was an option for parking and it won't be for 5-7 years. The Martin Center, contrary to some experience, is available for parking. Starting this week, I guess Wednesday, residents now park only on the top deck of Schrank and the North deck. There is a new 400+ bed dorm planned east of the new stadium and that's supposed to be opened in fall of 2010. But no parking is planned for that building. I believe that's also the building in which the new College of Health Sciences and Human Services is going to be located."

Senator Stratton wondered if snow removal from the top floor of decks might be a problem with residents parking on the top floor.

Senator Vollmer: "I'm sure that was considered."

Chair Sterns asked for and received permission for Vice President Case to speak.

Vice President Case: "Thank you. Yes, that's normal in relationship to any other year we've had, snow on top of the decks. We clear it as best we can. If you have looked at some of the gravel lots we have, when we had residents parking over near where the stadium is now, those were all filled with snow too. So it's just a matter of plowing what we can and moving it out of there. They can shovel their way out. That's just normal. Wherever they park there's going to be snow.

I just want to clarify one thing. The 700 spaces that will be lost are a combination of 3 lots actually. The lot that's right across from Exchange Street dorm, in front of the Shrank and Exchange deck, there's three triangular lots that's all gonna be the new deck of about 1400 spaces. Where the stadium is the new residence hall will be another loss of about 100 and then in between Lincoln and EJ Thomas, which is where the planned Polymer Building is, that lot will be gone to. So that's the 700 spaces.

Just to expand on your report, the real issue that we're going to be looking at is taking a look at the 7 or 8 places around the campus which are probably 5-15 minutes away. There's some flat lots, there's some unused parts of the city parking that are available, there's some private lots that are available. We will be in the next few months getting a group together to see how we start utilizing those and busing people to the campus. As an urban campus we can think that we're all gonna park here someday. As we grow, unless limit the number of people on campus we don't have enough spaces for people and we're an urban campus. So we'd love to have a hayfield and put another 1,000 spots but we can't. So now we've got to start thinking about the next phase of parking services which is busing people in just like Kent does and all from their stadium etc. So we'll be looking at that quite soon."

Senator Erickson: "An issue that was brought up at the last Senate meeting and also as a representative of Arts and Sciences, I've had people contact me and that is, coming back this fall there were no designated faculty/staff parking lots. Without any input from any of us about that, it was just done. And it was

pointed out to me by a member of my own department, who checked, that all the rest of the state universities in Ohio do have staff/faculty parking lots. I think this is an issue for the Senate because the Senate as we know represents not only faculty but also staff and contract professionals, certainly students as well but this is an issue now. It's happened before that we did temporarily as a Faculty Senate representing this university, we agreed back when we had our first ever expanding of the campus we agreed to make all lots for everyone whilst this building was going on, with the agreement that would be brought back afterwards. Now this is not an issue that was discussed at the meeting so I was interested in this issue because as I said it was brought to me and it's been brought up at the last meeting that was done without input from the Senate. We are concerned about that."

Vice President Case: "I just want to refer back to last year. I think many of us were involved in my reports where I stood here many times to talk about the parking taskforce that was formed. The parking task force had constituencies from all over campus including Dr. Sterns, Susan Randalls from the Faculty side, many contract professional and about 24 in the room. A report developed that took into consideration every possible thought process on how to allocate spaces that report went forward we took the recommendations, implemented some of them in fall. So we had input from all constituencies and therefore we have been moving along utilizing those reports and the reports were on the web and are on the web and no different than the task force we put together that talked about parking."

Senator Erickson: "And the report recommended that there not be separate parking lots?"

Vice President Case: "Correct."

Senator Erickson: "It did?"

Vice President Case: "It recommended the best way to ... some recommendations were to how to put residents in the residents parking, it said where do we park people ... The committee ad nauseum debated whether to have student parking in, faculty in, everything in. So the nine months of debate among a group of 24, looked at all options on this campus and if you named one now I'll guarantee we talked about it."

Senator Erickson: "So you're saying that even those recommendations in that report there is a statement that the idea of having separate staff and faculty parking lots that those should be eliminated?"

Vice President Case: "If anyone can find the statement from when the Auburn Deck was eliminated and the faculty/staff said it was temporary until the recommendations from the committee came in, and the senior management acted on the committee's recommendations. But there is nothing in the report that says 'do this'. They gave recommendations as to exactly what was to be done."

Senator Erickson: "And one of the recommendations was that we did away with faculty and staff parking?"

Vice President Case: "I think it was debated, not that we gave a recommendation."

Chair Sterns: "I think your faculty representatives pointed out that faculty and staff would not be happy about this. And did our best to convince the group however didn't mean we prevailed."

Vice President Case: “And to say very similar of the debate of the 24 people, students thought they should have spots that were right next to the buildings also, so they didn’t prevail either, the group of 24, all types of constituencies on campus, we came to what we considered a consensus and that I will note that that report was endorsed by consensus.”

Senator Lillie: “I wanted to just make a comment or two. First, I was glad that you did work closely with a number of different constituencies. One of the questions I have that I wasn’t quite clear on, you said you had faculty, did you have representatives from the Faculty Senate or were they faculty that you selected somehow or someone else selected? I’m just curious about that.”

Vice President Case: “The request went to, I believe, the union and they included two faculty in the group: Dr. Sterns and Dr. Randall.

Senator Lillie: “Okay, thank you and I was curious about this little comment here that said that ‘parking has been an afterthought until now’ but it’s actually attributed to you. Is that accurate?”

Vice President Case: “Yeah, I think in terms of facilities planning, yes.”

Senator Huff: “Sorry I couldn’t be at the meeting the other day, I had a conflict. I noted the situation there have been many changes, new policy, the busses, trying to implement the new system with all the changes we’ve had for fall and a couple of adjustments since the first day of school. We’re very much affected by things in Folk Hall because of the residence building on Exchange Street where we lost spaces and we have all the additional residents there. We have a lot of residents that continue to park in the Folk Hall lot. The thing that a lot of people keep noticing is it doesn’t appear that the parking restrictions are being enforced. I didn’t know if there was a grace period that we’re going through, kind of letting students adjust or if it was an oversight or how this decision they be given some time. But you know things have not changed and it’s created an inconvenience. It looks as if the way the lots are marked we should be in great shape.”

Vice President Case: “I’ll make sure parking follows through with the lots where they are designated. There was a grace period during both changes when we were not ticketing. If you look at yesterday’s e-mail or Wednesday’s e-mail or Tuesday’s e-mail, whenever it came out, what we did was we did give a grace period. Last week we told them where they’re supposed to be parking; we started ticketing. This week the same thing, but even as of Tuesday we told people they must get cars moved to the top floor of the Exchange Deck and the Schrank Deck and the North Campus parking deck. We’ll continue to monitor and now they are going to start ticketing. The one thing in Folk Hall, you know that we do have parking over next to or the behind the new research foundation buildings. Just so everybody knows, all our analysis and slight tweaks are based on an hour-by-hour lot monitoring of every lot we have here. So we know how many spots are open at any time during this first six weeks of the campus. That’s how we know at any time where spots are open. What I will tell you is between 8 o’clock and 2 o’clock on Monday and Wednesday it’s going to be tough to find a spot in any lot that’s close by the university just because of scheduling. I won’t lie to you; I can guarantee that the data shows you that too. The idea there is probably in the future we should try to think about how to schedule a little better versus having kids going around. I’ve seen them go up a ramp, nine kids follow each other around to the top and they follow each other

around to the bottom. Although probably for the first five weeks they've done the exact same thing in the exact same lot, being open between 10 and 1 on Monday and Wednesday, they should probably think about looking elsewhere. But those are the times I know when you look at the data lots around the campus are filled. Any other time than that, we can look at the data and see that there are pretty much spots in any lot on campus, parking facilities except for resident's areas."

Senator Bowman: "I just had a real quick question. With the parking problem as it is, I wonder if you had the data on the ridership of the Roo Express for the past six weeks."

Vice President Case: "I didn't bring that with me, I know when we started out I think in the early parts of the semester, once people got used to them, I think we're up to probably six to seven hundred per day, which is an increase. If you look at last year, the only time we have to compare this to is the metro system we had before which was about 50 riders per week. We now are around at least 500 -600 per day. And that's probably gone up and up because as people have gotten used to them as the weather has gotten colder people have are now noticing what they are, where they are, they know they're on schedule, they know exactly where they are, the ridership is probably up and I can easily get the information for you Kristen in terms of that."

Chair Sterns: "Thank you. I said to Vice President Case the day that we had the facilities planning committee, I'm willing to take the heat for the recommendations that came out of the parking task force but I'm not willing to take the heat for the decisions that were made after the task force. So I don't want people to think that, your faculty representatives did not speak up. I didn't even know that we weren't going to have separate faculty lots until I arrived back from Switzerland. Because it wasn't clear to me exactly what the final outcome was going to be, because the recommendations were made and then they were carried forward. I think that's a fair statement. I think what the point that Senator Erickson was making is an important one; no one necessarily said that we should give up faculty parking. At least that's my opinion. The faculty representatives certainly spoke up. Now we were using a consensus approach and that may be the interpretation. I must also say something though that we also had discussions about special parking at an additional price for faculty and virtually no faculty were interested. So let's keep that in mind too. We did talk about having a premium parking lot for an extra charge and that didn't seem to interest anyone. But what I am impressed with and I want to compliment Vice President Case is the flexibility of thinking, we didn't have to wait till the end of the semester to make a tweak. Somehow in past years we couldn't make any changes unless they fell at the beginnings or the ends of semesters. And I think it's great that we have you're making these changes as we move through the semester. I think you all understand this is a very difficult situation, parking always is. I think that if you go and you look at the recommendations of the parking taskforce many good recommendations were made. I think if we can get the Roo bus system to really work for us it will help enormously. I think that's why the investment has been made, there's a sizable investment there."

Vice President Case: "I just want to thank you Harvey. I do appreciate all the hard work on the committee. I do want you to know all of the recommendations that were made by the committee were reviewed. If you want to cherry-pick data from all the public institutions in within the state of Ohio, it's very easy to do that. If you also want to look at the other data at other institutions which are who parks where, how much you pay for parking, etc. You will find some varied differences among us here at the university."

Among those are I think the average cost for a parking spot at another institution I bet you would be surprised what that is compared to the price we pay. So please remember, if you want to take certain data and compare to here go ahead but there's always all sorts of other comparison data we have available to us also. One thing the committee debated was the cost of permits; if you want I can bring to the next Faculty Senate the cost of all the permits at all the other institutions within the university system. It'd be interesting to see that. The ones downtown, I bet you would be interested to see how much people pay to park downtown. I'm not saying on a yearly basis, but on a monthly basis pay 50-70 dollars a month. So I just warn people when you look at data look at the whole picture. Because we could model ourselves after the other sixteen institutions but there's a lot of other things that would change here."

Senator Oswald: "May I ask while we're discussing parking, I'm hearing from students and wonder if this is accurate. I'm hearing that beginning this fall that they are all paying if they have a car or not, they are all paying the same parking fee and I understand that some of that is due to cost of the Roo and that they are using that. But it kind of seems like it's not equitable that students that house here and do not have a car are paying the same charge as those that do. Is that true?"

Vice President Case: "Yes and actually it's true to one point. If all the students would take a look at what's on the parking website, what's been sent to their home, what's been given to them at parking services there's now a \$115 transportation fee, there's no more parking fee at this university for students. The transportation fee is going to cover a parking spot if they want one and they have a car and want to bring a car. It's also there to cover anytime they want to ride all around this place on a Roo Express. So it's called a transportation fee. Every student has had many opportunities from the beginning of the summer to the middle of the summer to read about it in terms of what that fee covers now. It also now covers almost seven days a week of busing from 7 am to 11. I will tell you nobody has complained about the downtown route that runs on Thursday, Friday and Saturday at The University of Akron that takes students from here to their dining experiences downtown at night. We've had very good outcomes. It's very positive for the students. They've had good outcomes in terms of their relationship with drivers; they've gotten them safely from where they were coming to where they were going at night. The parking fee as the weather gets bad the buses; I guarantee the 600 numbers will be a minimum in terms of that one bus. Multiply those by the three buses that run you will see students all over. You do it now and you'll see students at the Roo Shuttle pickups. They want to go from Fir Hill to campus. So once they understood the advantages of what's called a transportation system which is actually pretty common among universities across the nation I think they've now adjusted and those calls for the first couple weeks and into the summer time, end of summer first couple of weeks and now once they see the benefits and now they're actually using it those calls and comments to our new transportation system has changed. I think they all have seen when they ride it what's called a transportation fee and there's much on the parking website to explain it to them."

Chair Sterns: "I'm sure that various senators from all constituencies will be hearing more from their membership. I think it's good if we keep discussing this; hopefully the ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee will keep focusing on this and looking at it and providing input so we can at least have an understanding.

You know there's a concept of *schadenfreude*; you know that other people's problems taking joy from them? Interesting German word. We don't want to think about the troubles of other campuses necessarily, it doesn't help us to feel better here."

Chair Sterns noted there were no reports from the Libraries Committee, Reference Committee, and Faculty Research Committee, though he mentioned that the Faculty Research Committee is beginning their training session tomorrow. There were also no reports from Student Affairs Committee, Computer and Communications Technology Committee, ad hoc Committee on University Planning, or ad hoc Committee on Budgeting, so he asked for the report from the General Education Advisory Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier: "We filed a written report of course this is for information and transparency, no action is requested. We acted on nine curriculum proposals: three were approved; six we had questions and concerns about that we relayed back to the originating unit. We did meet since this report was written on the 30th of September and discussed with the Mechanical Engineering faculty their proposals for a new program in Aerospace Engineering. Report of our actions will come to the next Senate meeting."

Senator Lillie: "I'm sorry I should have brought this up when we were talking about the agenda itself, but I seem to recall from our last meeting of the Senate that there was a discussion about how the General Education Advisory Committee reports. My understanding was that Senator Hajjafar was of the understanding which I thought the Provost confirmed that it actually reports not directly to the Senate but through the Curriculum Review Committee. I'm just bringing this up so we can be clear on it in the future and I would ask that that be examined."

Chair Sterns asked if Senator Lillie was requesting there be no separate item on the agenda for a GEAC report.

Senator Lillie: "That's what I would ask we would be clear on, because we did have it as a separate item at last meeting and there was some discussion about whether or not it should report directly to the Senate or through the Curriculum Review Committee. I'm operating from memory so I would ask that that be examined so we can clarify it."

Chair Sterns: "We do not have a report from the representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. Rudy Fenwick is our representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. For those of you who are not familiar with the Ohio Faculty Council, all of the university senates from all the University System of Ohio meet on a monthly basis with the Chancellor or other selected individuals. When possible I join Professor Fenwick. We should be having formal reports. The problem is he is the secretary so before he can give us the minutes he has to have them approved by the body so they're always behind. But we should have had a report for the previous month. We'll try to get that for you. If there is a report I will suggest we send it around electronically.

Let's move now to the University council Exploratory Committee: co-chairs Associate Provost Ramsier and Professor Lillie."

Senator Lillie: “I’m going to make a couple of beginning comments and then ask Associate Provost Ramsier to fill in any spots that I missed. I will start from the version of the University Council’s Principles document that the University Council Exploratory Committee sent out to the eight constituencies on July 17, 2008. You all should have gotten to see a copy of this document. In it there was a timeline that indicated that we would present the final principles document and bylaws for constituency approval, and there are eight separate constituencies, by October 2nd. In the course of time that marched into the October 16th special meeting of the Senate, which as you have heard looks like perhaps it is a little bit too soon for a final version of the bylaws. As you can see there is a schedule of approximately three months after that that would need it for the implementation of the University Council itself. So what we have done though, and I’m gonna ask co-chair Ramsier to also speak to this, is we had a meeting on September 19th that I was unable to attend but that co-chair Ramsier chaired in which feedback from constituency groups was indeed received. I’m going to speak in my capacity as a representative of the Faculty Senate about that in a minute, but I just wanted to let you know that that had occurred. Generally speaking it’s our belief that the feedback was generally positive. There were a couple of qualified statements and concerns but generally speaking it seemed to be positive. There’s seemed to be a general agreement on principles. There are some important aspects from various constituencies that still have to be addressed, but the basic underlying principle of a new governance document that would include people from a variety of perspectives and also the use of these kinds of committees to develop and recommend to the appropriate bodies university policy on a wide variety of topics and then representation from the University Council on implementation teams to implement such policies seems to be at least in general something that everybody likes or has said that they will continue to move forward on. As I said there are a couple of concerns, generally speaking the set of concerns that I could see and again Chair Ramsier can help me with this, the concerns I saw from the minutes that seem to be shared is what we are now calling sort of jurisdictional issues. What is the difference between the power and authority of and duty of the Faculty Senate and the other constituencies and the University Council? So we all seem to see that as a major issue that has to be addressed and we are working on that right now. Is there something you want to add about this maybe Rex?”

Associate Provost Ramsier: “I think Senator Lillie covered the major points. I too agree that the feedback was positive. There are some clarity issues that we need to provide, especially relevant here is to make it clear in the bylaws of the University Council that will be developed that the role the jurisdictional issues, the role of the Senate and the role of the Council and eliminating the potential for overlap. That’s going to be the major thing I think that we need to work on. We meet again tomorrow as a committee to consider more feedback, we still need feedback from the ASG and the Graduate Student Government which we’ll receive tomorrow and we’ll look forward to. Thank you.”

Senator Lillie: “There are probably one or two more things we should probably say. Co-chair Ramsier and I have met twice over the summer and yesterday with John Reilly who is the Assistant Vice President and Associate General Council. The University Council Exploratory Committee feels it would be appropriate for the Office of the General Council to be closely involved in helping to draft the bylaws of this body. So we met him twice, most recently yesterday and we are in the process of doing that. There are a few issues that arose in the course of the meetings that again we are going to back to the University Council Exploratory Committee tomorrow which will delay the date beyond what we had originally hoped. We are still hoping for having something done by the end of this semester that we can present to you in a fashion

that can be voted on. We are not anticipating at this point that it would continue beyond the end of this semester. Continue to hope that we're going to achieve that. I do believe we can through the cooperation and the collaboration of all of the people who are involved. One of the advantages that we do have is that we have spent two years with essentially the same people from several different constituencies in the University Council Exploratory Committee. We've gotten to know each other; we've gotten to build up some trust some understanding. We hope that that will be some capital we can draw upon as we move forward to try to finish this up at this point."

Senator Gandee: "Is it safe to assume that the construction or the development of the bylaws is out of the legal office and in your hands?"

Senator Lillie: "We had thought that the legal office could be helpful, we're gonna discuss that a little further tomorrow. I think there may be some room for discussion of whether or not we could help the legal office a little bit by perhaps actually providing our own first draft. But we have to talk about that; we haven't decided that yet."

Chair Sterns: "I think one of the things that struck me is that it's clear that Provost Stroble is really wanted to see this succeed; she provided extra support for the committee over the summer. The intention was that we would accelerate this whole process and it may be that were accelerating it it just looks like it's moving slowly. Time is relative right."

[Senator Erickson began to give a report on the University Council Exploratory Committee as a representative of the Faculty Senate. In the middle of that report, it was determined that there were no further questions for Associate Provost Ramsier and Senator Lillie, as co-chairs of that committee and they were allowed to sit down. The events are rearranged so the flow of Senator Erickson's report is uninterrupted.]

Senator Erickson reported that she and Senator Lillie, as our representatives on the University Council Exploratory Committee, received feedback during the new senator orientation meeting on September 11th and during the special Senate meeting on September 18th. They took that feedback to the meeting of the University Council Exploratory Committee on the September 19th. Specifically, they reported to the University Council Exploratory Committee that first bylaws are needed before the Senate can vote on the University Council proposal.

Second, that there needs to be staff support for the University Council. The role of the proposed committee structure is so important that serious staff support is required. Additional support should include reasigned time for university committee service, especially the chair of each committee, and adequate consideration for merit pay. This applies not only to faculty but also to contract professionals and staff. This support should be in addition to continued staff support for the Faculty Senate.

Third was the need to clarify, to the extent possible, jurisdictional boundaries between the University Council and the Faculty Senate. What is meant by the term "academic" in the University Council documents? Which issues are to be considered by University Council, which by the Faculty Senate and which by both?

The fourth and final issue reported to University Council Exploratory Committee was the dissatisfaction of senators with the level of their representation on the University Council. At one feedback session, Senator Erickson was asked about the level of faculty representation on similar shared governance structures at other institutions. She is doing my best to find that information. She has asked Rudy Fenwick to check with all of the chairs of the Faculty Senates across the state. She is exploring the situation Virginia Commonwealth University and the University of Southern California, which are reported to have similar governance structures.

At the meeting of the University Council Exploratory Committee tomorrow she hopes to begin new discussions about how to respond to the feedback the committee has received.

Senator Lillie: “May I just add one more thing in my capacity as a representative to this committee from the Senate, not as co-chair but probably should have said it as co-chair, one of the things that has been recommended to us is to use the current bylaws of the Faculty Senate as a template to develop the bylaws for the proposed University Council. So those are available to those who interested. They are available to you on the University General Counsel website and so you can get an idea of the kind of structure of this body from those bylaws and we will be working in that regard. The bylaws are very important. I really don’t see how I could recommend myself the University Council Proposal without having some of the things that Senator Erickson is discussing; in particular the bylaws, the clarification on the jurisdiction, the staffing and I may be missing something else but those are three extremely important topics that I believe we need to get clarified. I’m working very hard, I know everybody is working very hard to try to see if we can come to some kind of conclusion on this topic so we can make recommendations by the end of this semester and hopefully we will be able to do that.”

Chair Sterns: “I’m going to keep pushing for November you know with December as a backup.” There being no further discussion on the University Council Exploratory Committee and no report from the Student Success and Retention committee, Chair Sterns called for the report of the Student Judicial Policy Committee.

Senator Bove: “Last meeting in September the committee reported that we had just received some revisions to the Student Code of Conduct from Student Affairs. We did not have time to sufficiently review those revisions. In the mean time we have had the opportunity to look over those revisions and there are a couple of things that we need to square away with Student Services. To expedite that process Senator Rich has offered to have a discussion with Denine Rocco and Melissa Alvert regarding those revisions and we hope to get that clarified and situated and bring a recommendation on a Student Code of Conduct to the Senate very very soon.

A second point is that at the last meeting our committee was referred the document regarding the Student Code of Conduct in Athletics. We’ve had a chance to look at that code and in light of the fact that the athletics code of conduct made some references to the Student Code of Conduct we felt it was best to kind of square away the Student Code of Conduct before tackle the athletic code of conduct. So if the stars all align in the right order and everything is perfect, we hope to have a recommendation on the Student Code of Conduct next month and then following in December make a recommendation for the Student Code of Conduct in Athletics.”

Chair Sterns hearing no questions for Senator Bove or items of unfinished business proceeded to consider new business.

V. New Business - Chair Sterns asked Associate Provost Rex Ramsier to discuss the recommendation for Curriculum Review Procedure and the use of new software.

Associate Provost Ramsier: “In the last Senate meeting there were some questions from Senator Erickson to myself during the General Education Advisory Committee report, which is not a subcommittee of the Senate and which may now never report here again I understand. But the question was about why does the General Education Advisory Committee have to review proposals that for example were graduate level proposals? That allowed the discussion to become more open. The Curriculum Review Committee has been thinking about and talking about last year. The electronic system that we have now is cumbersome. People have difficulty searching for anything that is yet to be approved let alone anything that was approved in the past. There are many issues with the system. May I ask how many people have ever used the system? How many people with their hand up like the system? I figured it that way. Well you like the system It’s better than the old paper system; it’s better than carrying things by hand, but we feel that we can move forward with new technology. Over the summer alternatives were reviewed by Jim Sage made himself and his organization, people from Institutional Research who have a heavy workload with respect to curriculum because they have to go in and key code things after curriculum are approved and or changed; and many administrative assistants who have a heavy heavy duties to putting in a lot curriculum into the systems for their units. We really feel like there are options. Jim Sage has agreed that the type of architecture that we’ve looked at that’s marketed by some external organization looks pretty good and he thinks he could incorporate here. We went through contacts at The Ohio State University; they contracted with this group to develop their own custom made curriculum system and we saw a demo of it and it looked pretty good. I’ve asked Chair Sterns to bring this forward to find a way to have the Senate and faculty and contract professionals and staff, people that work in the curriculum system to get involved now to help us figure out the flow diagram: who needs to get notified when I change something in my discipline, who gets notified that it may affect their program, where approvals need to be, who needs to get e-mail notification that proposals are sitting idle or that approvals were approved or disapproved, whether there’s comments and so forth. So it’s going to be a big task, the curriculum review committee cannot take this task on. We have our own work to do to just keep up with the proposals that are coming in now. So have asked Chair Sterns if there’s a mechanism through which we can get some other help in order to move this forward for next fall. Maybe next fall would only be a pilot in a few departments or colleges I don’t know, but until we start we’ll never know.”

Chair Sterns: “Were you envisioning a special committee to review and help with the implementation?”

Associate Provost Ramsier: “Certainly I think if appropriate I would suggest that the Senate have an ad hoc committee formed that would include the types of representation across the campus who really use the system, in the front end putting in proposals and then at the back end Registrar, Institutional Research and then the committees that actually have to review proposals and see if it can’t come up with a working group that could help us get this in place.”

Chair Sterns: “I would be happy to empower an ad hoc committee. We would need to have senators contact the Senate office, because as you know all of our committees are appointed by our Executive

Committee. So we can't finish the business today but we could certainly create the committee and ask for volunteers to contact Heather about your willingness to have self-actualization through committee membership. Senator Erickson you had a comment?"

Senator Erickson: "I agree with you as somebody that has to work with system for a long time and felt that it was the role of the Senate to do this a long time ago and pushed and pushed, but it needed new software as part of that. I was going to ask about the task that we are supposed to do. As I understand it, you wanted to get a flow chart of how it works at the moment; that is the system as it now. It seems to me this would be a very good time to include within a requirement what the role of this committee should be." She argued that designing the new software to implement what some what argue is a procedurally cumbersome process seems inefficient. It might make more sense to discover how the current system could be streamlined and use that new, more efficient process as the guide to the software implementation. Waiting to evaluate the current process until after the software is implemented, might require the software be reprogrammed later to conform to a new process. What we need to do is to streamline it to include the kinds of checks and balances that are needed as well as just mapping it out.

Associate Provost Ramsier: "I would certainly agree that was we actually have been working on mapping what already occurs and highlighting where we know it doesn't make sense or where we should improve it.

Jim Sage has agreed to buy architecture and underlying technology to make it happen. We would then contract with this external company and they'd come in and they've asked us do you want to work with us. They need to sit down with all the end users and figure out how to design it, and write the code to make it that way. Then we test it. It will be custom made for The University of Akron. If I may add one idea I've had and I'll bring it here if they may want to volunteer to be on the committee is that OSU's system is truly internal as ours is. But we have a value added here. We may be able to take what OSU already has and morph it into what The University of Akron feels is most efficient, streamlined and appropriate. If we were to add on something at the very end that would allow our curriculum system [to generate different outputs, it would be helpful.] Once a curriculum proposal moves through the system for a new program, such as this Aerospace Engineering I mentioned previously as part of the non report, and then it has to go to the Board of Trustees, then it has to go to the Ohio Board of Regents. If it's a fully online course then it has to go to the Higher Learning Commission. Right now that means you have to rewrite the proposal effectively four different times in different formats. It would seem logical to have the end product be something that preformatted to go right to the Board, OBR and HLC if necessary etc. So that would be one ultimate goal to have it so streamlined that you did it once and you didn't have to do anything again."

Senator Lillie: "When I first came to The University of Akron in 1996 I remember being told about this new fancy computer program for curriculum review, so this something that I'm glad to hear we're continuing to work on. What I'd like to ask I guess is the scope of this particular committee because what I'm hearing is two things that may be bound together and may fit together.

What I'm hearing is

A request to have a committee that would review the entire curriculum review process at The University of Akron with a view towards revising it and also then fitting in the curriculum review process into a new software system, is that it? Okay then can I move that that be the charge given to the ad hoc committee?"

Chair Sterns: "Moved. Is there a second? Senator Erickson. Okay, further discussion? Now what Liz is calling for what we usually call them committee work she's wants to first do business which is and then aughtness so we have isness and oughtness here today. That seems to be the task."

A vote was called and **the motion passed**. The chair called all to consider service on this committee. Those who have cursed the curriculum review process now have a chance to make it better.

VI. Good of the Order - **Chair Sterns:** "Are there any comments in terms of good of the order? First let me say that it's nice to have such a large collection of guests with us today. It may surprise you the range of topics that come up here at the Faculty Senate. We have everything from parking to ethereal curriculum issues to creating centers for magnetic resonance to naming of colleges. The spectrum of issues is always intriguing and the behavior of the senators themselves is interesting."

VII. Adjournment - There being no further business, Senator Gandee moved for adjournment (second provided by Senator Tabatcher).

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,

Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF OCTOBER 2, 2008

APPENDIX A

Academic Policies Committee (APC) - Meeting Minutes

September 30, 2008

Noon - 1:00, LH 414

Attendees: Steve Aby, Deb Hayes, Gwendolyn Jones, Deb Keller, Fred Marich, Chuck Monroe, Rex Ramsier, Bill Rich, Peggy Richards, Shiva Sastry, Jim Slowiak, Laura Vinnedge, Martin Wainwright, and guests from the College of Fine and Applied Arts: Carolyn Anderson, Roberta DePompei, Bill Guegold, Teena Jennings-Rentenaar, Del Rey Loven, James Lynn, Linda McArdle, Tim McCarragher, Geroge Pope, Cyndee Ramsthaler, Sue Rasor-Greenhalgh, Neil Sapienza, and Dudley Turner.

1. Proposed agenda

Approved

2. Election of Committee Chair

One nomination was presented – Rex Ramsier. By unanimous vote, Rex Ramsier was elected to serve as chair of APC.

3. Naming the two new colleges arising from the reorganization of the Colleges of Fine and Applied Arts.

Discussion ensued regarding the names presented for the two new colleges. Several faculty from the College of Fine and Applied Arts were present for questions and comments. I.

APC recommends that a college to include the School of Music, the School of Dance, Theatre, and Arts Administration, the Myers School of Art, and the School of Communication shall be called the College of Creative and Professional Arts.II.

APC recommends that a college to include the School of Social Work, the School of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, and the School of Family and Consumer Sciences shall be called the College of Health Sciences and Human Services. In arriving at each of these recommendations, the committee considered the work of the College of Fine and Applied Arts transition teams as well as various forms of input from the affected faculty and staff. We also agreed to notify those affected of our plan to bring these recommendations to the floor of Faculty Senate on October 2, 2008, due to the need for timely decisions in order that dean searches may commence.

Resolutions and Rationale for the above recommendations will be prepared and brought before Senate October 2, 2008.

The next meeting of APC will be Tuesday, October 14, 2008 from 12:00-1:00 p.m. in Leigh Hall 413.

Respectfully submitted,

Rex Ramsier, Chair

**Academic Policies Committee (APC) Faculty Senate Report
October 2008**

We met on September 16th and will meet again on September 30th (biweekly throughout the semester). At our first meeting, we discussed the following:

1. Naming the two new colleges arising from the reorganization of the College of Fine and Applied Arts
Action: Discussion about the ballot tallies from FAA and the inclusiveness of the proposed college names ensued. It was decided that we would invite college representatives to our next meeting (Sept. 30th) for discussion.
2. Restructuring Academic Services in the Department of Athletics
Action: In principle we have no concerns about this proposal, but feel the need to check with Dean Karla Mugler in University College to make sure that she is aware of this change. To be revisited on Sept. 30th.
3. A proposal for a “University of Akron Magnetic Resonance Center (MRC)”
Action: Approved to take before Faculty Senate at their Oct. 2nd meeting.
4. A proposal for a “University of Akron Center for Silver Therapeutics Research (CSTR)”
Action: Brief discussion ensued, but we need more time to digest this newly received proposal. We need to discuss this proposal further at a future meeting.
5. FYE Computer Literacy Assessment Proposal
Action: Discussion ensued concerning the developmental nature of the proposed course, the true need for such a course, and whether the targeted skills were already developed in pre-existing courses in the freshmen year. We need to discuss this proposal further at a future meeting.
6. Parent/student concerns about actual diplomas not being awarded at Commencement
Action: None. We will take this issue up at a future meeting.

A motion for Faculty Senate with a rationale is provided for item 3 above.

September 23, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Policies Committee

RE: Academic Policies Committee Approval Recommendations

1. University of Akron Magnetic Resonance Center (MRC).

The purpose of this Center is to consolidate two existing nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) laboratories in Polymer Science and Chemistry into a single, university-wide NMR center, the MRC. The goals are to enhance the academic research environment and the University's tradition of service to industry.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

RESOLUTION 10/02/08

Pertaining to the Approval of the Following Recommendations from the Academic Policies Committee

BE IT RESOLVED, that the recommendation presented by the Academic Policies Committee on September 16, 2008, concerning approval of the establishment of the Center listed below, be approved.

1. University of Akron Magnetic Resonance Center (MRC)

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

RESOLUTION 10/2/08

Pertaining to the Approval of the Following Curricular Changes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the recommendation presented by the Curriculum Review Committee on September 23, 2008, concerning curricular proposal approvals listed below, be approved.

1. AS-07-057: Cultural Competence in the Public Sector
2. SC-07-51: Disaster Relief & Recovery
3. SC-08-20: Emergency Management BS Program

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

Academic Policies Committee Special Recommendation I

College of Creative and Professional Arts

After consideration of the transition team work as well as input from faculty and staff of the College of Fine and Applied Arts, and due to the need for a timely naming of this college so a dean's search can commence, APC recommends that a college to include: School of Music, School of Dance, Theatre, and Arts Administration, Myers School of Art, and School of Communication shall be called College of Creative and Professional Arts.

SPECIAL RESOLUTION I 10/02/08

Pertaining to the Approval of the Following Recommendation from the Academic Policies Committee

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Policies Committee on September 30, 2008, recommended that a college to include:

School of Music
School of Dance, Theatre, and Arts Administration
Myers School of Art
School of Communication

shall be called College of Creative and Professional Arts.

Academic Policies Committee Special Recommendation II

College of Health Sciences and Human Services

After consideration of the transition team work as well as input from faculty and staff of the College of Fine and Applied Arts, and due to the need for a timely naming of this college so that a dean's search can commence, APC recommends that a college to include: School of Social Work, School of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, and School of Family Consumer Sciences shall be called College of Health Sciences and Human Services.

SPECIAL RESOLUTION II 10/02/08

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Academic Policies Committee on September 30, 2008, recommended that a college to include:

School of Social Work
School of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology
School of Family and Consumer Sciences

shall be called College of Health Sciences and Human Services.

APPENDIX B

Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) Faculty Senate Report October 2008

The committee met on September 23rd, and has biweekly meetings planned for the semester.

We developed a simple recommendation for colleges across campus:

“When curriculum proposals for new programs or changes to existing programs/courses have the potential to impact other colleges, it is advisable that such proposals be developed collaboratively with representatives from the potentially affected colleges.”

We acted on several curriculum proposals that had either objections or concerns raised last Spring. A motion for Faculty Senate approval with a rationale is provided.

September 23, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Curriculum Review Committee

RE: **Curriculum Proposal Approval Recommendations**

1. AS-07-057: Cultural competence in the Public Sector

In this course, students will examine: 1) the rapid changes in demographics in the United States, 2) the importance of cultural competence in the public sector, and 3) how to communicate effectively in a culturally diverse setting. CRC was informed that the prior mature objection has been removed; voted to approve unanimously.

2. SC-07-51: Disaster Relief & Recovery 2235:410

Change mode delivery for 2235:410 to include an on-line option. A revised proposal was shared and discussed; voted to approve unanimously.

3. SC-08-20: Emergency Management BS Program

Addition and deletion of courses. A revised proposal was shared and discussed; voted to approve with two abstentions.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

RESOLUTION 10/2/08

Pertaining to the Approval of the Following Curricular Changes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the recommendation presented by the Curriculum Review Committee on September 23, 2008, concerning curricular proposal approvals listed below, be approved.

1. AS-07-057: Cultural Competence in the Public Sector
2. SC-07-51: Disaster Relief & Recovery
3. SC-08-20: Emergency Management BS Program

APPENDIX C

-8-08 Meeting of the Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee

Transcript meeting notes

In attendance:

Vollmer, Chair	Shubat	Sterns
Gunn	O'Connor	Kline
Hayes	Turner	John

Dr. Case, VP Finance & Admin. CFO, invited to discuss campus parking situation.

Chair Vollmer asked for explanation of rationale for allocation of parking shortly before the start of fall 08 classes. Also, how that meshes with parking plan that was presented by the Parking Committee's recommendations.

Sterns mentioned that this committee has tracked parking for years.

Case – over a year and a half ago the decision was made to get a consultant on parking. There have been millions of hits on “universities and parking” on the web. We take a look at what could be taken from reports and bring to campus. All constituencies were on committee to discuss parking issues. We tried to work through problems of the parking situation. In the end, came up with a lot of recommendations. We looked at recommendations and put them into an order. We wanted to get permit allocations and funding done. Heavy debate on issues. Parking Committee's report should be on record on the web. We moved forward and created subgroups to implement the plans/recommendations. Groups submitted plans for implementation for fall 2008. Parking designator signs were created and placed, some signage and assignments were changed after the start of classes. We assessed UA parking after first week of classes and getting feedback. Shuttle system put into place, institution of the transportation fee, 12 buses online now. Parking tried to take the residents and move them to specific lots. We take into consideration loss of lots in future.

Vollmer – who is we?

Case – myself, parking services, upper management. Decided to move some parking assignments around. Lincoln building lot to be gone next year. Safety primary concern...students have jobs that take them off campus. Adjusted parking to address safety concerns. Gave two weeks grace for transition. Last week we were evaluating the changes. Residents will now be on top floor only of Exchange deck and 4th floor will move back to all permits. Residents are now in N. Campus roof and Exchange roof as well as lots close to some of the residence halls on the south part of campus. That is the situation now. Difficult to adjust and change with limited parking availability. Lot monitors in all lots for first 6 weeks Lincoln lot will go next year. Now will start to look toward next year. Losing 700 spaces next year...

Number of permits about 170 higher for employees this year than in the past. Resident passes are up. Next 6 months is about preparing for the loss of spaces. Looking at lots adjacent to UA, about 7 options. Concentration on lot off-campus with busing into campus. We are an urban campus, there is no more land to buy, no more decks to be built due to budget constraints. Now about getting lots out of area that would be usable with busing.

Vollmer – when does new Schrank Deck along Exchange start?

Case – start in January is not recommended, probably after spring semester for the 3 surface lots along E. Exchange.

Gunn – how many spaces on campus now?

Case – Approximately 10,000

Gunn – will lose 700 places for 1/3 of students.

Case – turnover is constant. We are close to what the consultants have given us. When you have 10 people looking for the same space, there will be complaints. Need to look at scheduling of classes, why all scheduled for two heavy days?

Gunn – 76% of students work 30 hours or more per week, a lot of this is them leaving for jobs.

Case – trying to balance the different groups who park here. Next phase is to figure out how to get those groups into spaces/different times. No other parking facilities planned in next three years. A lot of people don't realize that EJ has a deck. East campus deck is better utilized than in the past. People need to learn where the parking is available. South where residents park is well used. Central campus is heavy.

Kline – what is the parking philosophy for the campus? Are we looking to outer lots with buses? What attempts are being made to make constituencies aware of these changes? What's been thought about that concept?

Case – the one thing that needs to be done is that once it's decided what the timeline is for building, need to get the message out on those changes, communication is very important.

Kline – any thought on allocations of permits, perhaps give inner parking to upper level students?

Case – Retention not a thought thus far. What do we do about freshman parking on campus? That will have to be decided by the committee. Is this a decision making issue for students? This is an issue for all campus. We have to get people to understand that the culture is changing. If residential continues to grow, dining and other services will face changes too.

Gunn – we could outgrow our infrastructure.

Case – true. There's a lot that will need to be discussed as the campus continues to grow. Parking has been an afterthought until now. The limitations we've encountered mean that this needs to be discussed.

Kline – issue of Central Hower? Close to campus, after APS is done?

Case – it is a long term issue to be addressed. Central Hower is a five-to-seven year swing space for the City. They will be using it for at least 7 years. Not on the table yet. 5-10 years from now, we would be very interested in it. Can't throw a deck down in the big lot across from Law School when that space could be used for another academic building.

Gave description of new deck at Exchange – will wrap around Schrank and Exchange. Will be long deck.

Shubat – will disrupt residence hall movement.

Case – will change it for better we hope. The deck will give some structure to their movement.

Shubat – never has been sidewalk between Exchange and Schrank South.

Case – we know it is a student thruway, we're going to try to make that safer.
Vollmer – no bridge across Exchange though?

Case – no, not yet.

John – residents must park on Exchange 5th floor only?

Case – yes, starting 10/1/08. Also have increased escort service on campus.

John – positively – trash container was moved eventually. Some things can't be moved, but trying to move departmental cars/vans to outer lots. Use authority to get them moved.

Turner – football games will create a cramped situation too?

Case – system will be in place to deal with parking. Football will have a specific plan. Frats and other properties will sell parking most likely. Pretty good plans in process. A weekday game will be a different plan altogether. Have tried to put information on web to get people to change. But some people still circle the lots..

Sterns – one of the things that were discussed was how on campus bus system will interface with Metro?

Case – the city and UA want to work together... we wanted to have at least one semester of campus bus system working before talking with the City. Neither wants to sacrifice service. Bus service needs to be clean, clearly marked and on time. Just getting people around campus is big concern. We knew new system would create problems, discussions, complaints. Once we explain things they usually are okay. We work for the best solution for everyone. Get urban league area improved as a surface lot.

Kline – Martin Center lot?? Changes, still allowed to park there?

Case – yes. We identified that early on that when there are big events there it's a challenge. Donors have some spaces allocated, visitor parking is being worked on as well. A large group we try to give space to.

Shubat – union and parking, are grievances a problem?

Case – labor relations are between the AAUP labor union and our labor relations department, only clause in contract is dealing with workplace environment. Process of grievances for union, goes into negotiations..

John – when does 4/5 Schrank level parking change flip take place?

Case – very soon, 10/1/08. No new signs saying “We’ve listened.” Never wanted that.

Sterns – compliment you on your flexibility.

Case – thank you, want to make best use of campus and what we have. Changes based on numbers and hopefully will equal out.

Vollmer – are decks well identified as to where to park?

Case – yes. Focus needs to be now on how to accommodate the loss of 700 spaces. Lots of people sharing info with us.

Kline – parking for Recreation Center for community patrons issue for football season next year? How will people who use center vs. football games? For those who don't use campus during week, how to accommodate?

Case – have not addressed issue yet. Special events will have to be dealt with, thought is to use East Campus deck. Not a lot of community members in Recreation Center, falls under visitor issues.

Sterns – there were complaints about the employees not finding spaces when morning Recreation Center users took them.

Case – that part of campus has seen many changes.

Vollmer – what about parking for new residence hall?

Case – no new parking planned for it. By the time residence hall is up, hopefully will have more parking planned.

Vollmer – to be opened Fall 2010?

Case – yes. But must deal with issues for fall 09 first. No deck planned for that area.

John – just like Exchange Dorm, take away parking to build hall, no parking created.

Case – have to keep thinking about where to get more space, trying to buy spaces/properties. More concerned about next January 09 and its problems.

Vollmer – new configuration of college of FAA in 2010, will require more parking for admin and staff.

Case – complex will be needed.

Vollmer – problem will be people needing to get into the new dean's office.

John – what about rubber bowl?

Case – in 3-5 years could be joint facilities with Summa, if we expand over route 8 then there would be joint facilities. Not sure what intention is to be for Rubber Bowl.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 PM Chair Vollmer thanked Dr. Case for addressing the committee's parking concerns and questions.

APPENDIX D

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) Faculty Senate Report October 2008

This report is for information and transparency, no action is requested.

We met on September 16th and will meet again on September 30th (biweekly throughout the semester). At our first meeting, we discussed the following curriculum proposals:

AS-07-061	Introduction to Ethics	under review
Action: We have received no response from the originating department with respect to our questions and concerns. However, since there is new leadership in the department we decided to send our correspondence again and request an indication of how the department wishes to proceed before our next meeting on Sept. 30th. We will revisit this proposal at that time.		
AS-08-105	Chg Prereqs and Nos. for World Civ courses, 3400:385-391	under review
Action: We have received no response from the originating department with respect to our questions and concerns. However, since there is new leadership in the department we decided to send our correspondence again and request an indication of how the department wishes to proceed before our next meeting on Sept. 30th. We will revisit this proposal at that time.		
AS-08-128	Geography of Cultural Diversity - change from 375 to 275	under review
Action: We have received no response from the originating department with respect to our questions and concerns. However, since there is new leadership in the department we decided to send our correspondence again and request an indication of how the department wishes to proceed before our next meeting on Sept. 30th. We will revisit this proposal at that time.		
SC-08-16	Massotherapy Technology	under review
Action: Relay the following comments to the originating department. 1. It does not appear that the mathematics course required is consistent with Summit college criteria. 2. It does not appear that there are enough social science credits to meet the General Education criteria. 3. The total number of UA credit hours is 31, which is less than the number required for an Associate's degree at UA. 4. Students that would follow this plan of coursework may not be able to graduate since the degree completion form audit might flag the three items above.		
SC-08-20	Emergency Management BS Program	under review
Action: Relay the following question to the originating department. 1. Did you really intend for students to take Math for Modern Technology (MMT) for the Associate's degree (AAS), and then Statistics for Everyday Life (SEL) for the Bachelor's? i.e. would it be better to just put SEL in the AAS degree requirements, or do students really need both MMT and SEL?		

SC-08-40	BS MET Program update	approved
Action: Approved.		
SC-08-45	Paralegal Studies	approved
Action: Approved.		
SC-08-46	Paralegal Studies Certificate	approved
Action: Approved.		
SC-08-48	Surveying and Mapping Technology	under review
Action: Relay the following comments/questions to the originating department. 1. Do you really intend to have English Composition II required in addition to the English taken by students for the Associate's degree? 2. Is there a curriculum proposal for the Associate's degree program that we should be looking at in parallel to this one?		
EN-08-###	Aerospace Systems Engineering - New program proposal with numerous courses	under review
To be discussed as a block of proposals for a new program on Sept. 30th.		

We are receiving responses to our questions and concerns and will move these proposals through the curriculum system and to the curriculum review committee as quickly as possible.