



Institutional Response Form

Institution: University of Akron

Institutional ID: 1599

Evaluation Type: Monitoring, Focused Visits: (Spring 2015) on (a) relationship and roles of faculty in shared institutional governance and (b) assessment of student learning in general education and in undergraduate and graduate majors.

Date: 09/17/2015

Printed Name of President or Chancellor*: Dr. Scott L. Scarborough

Phone: (330) 972-7869

Email: sscarborough@uakron.edu

Signature of President or Chancellor:

(*The Commission expects the response from the President, Chancellor, or chief executive officer if a different title is used).

Instructions for Submitting Response

1. This form, and an additional written response if you choose to include one, must be submitted electronically on the following webpage: http://www.ncahlc.org/document_upload/.
2. If you choose to write an additional written response, it should be in the form of a letter to the Institutional Actions Council, should not exceed five pages, and must be sent electronically with this form within the two-week timeframe.

If a response is not received within the two weeks, the Commission will conclude that the institution concurs with the accreditation recommendation.

General Questions

Please indicate ONE:

- ☐ The institution concurs with the accreditation recommendations and chooses not to submit a further response.
- ☒ The institution concurs with the accreditation recommendations and has enclosed a written response (please return with this form).
- ☐ The institution does not concur with the accreditation recommendations and chooses not to submit a further response.
- ☐ The institution does not concur with the accreditation recommendations and has enclosed a written response (please return with this form).

- ☐ The institution does not concur with the accreditation recommendations and requests an in-person hearing in place of an Institutional Actions Council (IAC) meeting (see definitions on page 2).

In-person hearings are restricted to specific types of evaluation recommendations by Commission policy. These are: reaffirmation of accreditation; biennial visits in candidacy; focused visits; and financial and non-financial indicator monitoring. All decisions regarding substantive change and staff recommended monitoring or changes to the Statement of Affiliation Status are not eligible for in-person hearings. *Pathways designations recommendations are not eligible for in-person hearings.* Contact your Commission staff liaison for more information. Fees for in-person hearings are found in the schedule of *Commission Dues and Fees* on the website, www.hlcommission.org.

Definitions

Institutional Response. The Commission expects a written response from the President or Chancellor of an institution (or chief executive by a different title) within two weeks of receipt of an accreditation report or reaffirmation recommendation and provides the attached response form for this purpose. The institution may choose to include an additional written response in the form of a letter from the President or Chancellor to the Institutional Actions Council. These additional written responses should not be longer than five pages and must be received electronically with this form within the two-week timeframe.

Institutional Actions Council (IAC). The IAC is composed of Board-appointed peer reviewers and public members. The First and Second Committees of IAC conduct electronically mediated meetings and in-person hearings to review and act on accreditation recommendations.

IAC Meeting. IAC meetings consist of five or more members of the First or Second Committee of IAC, who read the full materials of the evaluation, discuss the findings, and act on the accreditation recommendations. IAC committees may agree with the accreditation recommendations they review or offer differing recommendations or decisions. The meetings are electronically mediated and held eight or more times per year. The majority of accreditation recommendations are reviewed at an IAC Meeting. Exceptions include recommendations that are required by policy to be reviewed at an in-person hearing and recommendations that institutions request be reviewed at an in-person hearing instead of an IAC meeting.

IAC Hearing. In some circumstances, an institution may request or may be required to attend an IAC Hearing. IAC Hearings consist of five or more members of the First or Second Committee of IAC, who read the full materials of the evaluation, discuss the findings, and act on the accreditation recommendations. Conducted three times per year, IAC Hearings are held in-person and require the presence of institutional staff, Commission staff, and evaluation team representatives. There is a fee for requested hearings. An institution that is considering an IAC Hearing should consult with its Commission staff liaison for more information, as not all accreditation decisions are eligible for review and action at a hearing.

IAC First Committee. Members of the IAC First Committee conduct IAC Meetings and Hearings to act on accreditation recommendations. The First Committee is the initial group to review an institution's case after an accreditation evaluation; the Committee may agree with the evaluation team's recommendation or it may offer a different recommendation or render a different decision.

IAC Second Committee. In some circumstances, institutions or Commission staff may request that the First Committee's decision be reviewed by the IAC Second Committee. Members of the Second Committee conduct Meetings and Hearings to act on accreditation recommendations forwarded on request or by policy after the action of the First Committee. The Second Committee may agree with the evaluation team's recommendation or First Committee's decision or it may offer a

different recommendation or render a different decision. Institutions should consult with their staff liaison for more information.



THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

September 28, 2015

Higher Learning Commission Staff
Institutional Actions Council Members

Colleagues,

I have reviewed the report issued by the focused visit team dated March 17, 2015, including the addendum dated August 26, 2015, and am pleased to provide this institutional response for The University of Akron.

We concur with submitting an embedded monitoring report on shared governance within our scheduled 2017 year four Standard Pathway review. This concurrence is based on the team's recognition that we take the issue of shared governance seriously, and the fact that we are actively working with a consultant from the Association of Governing Boards on this very topic (as detailed in our previous institutional response dated May 11, 2015). As an institution, we have made and will continue to make improvements in our shared governance processes, with an eye on improving efficiency and communication, and effectively implementing strategic planning.

I look forward to a decision by the IAC in October 2015 and to the upcoming February 2017 Standard Pathway visit.

Sincerely,

Scott L. Scarborough, Ph.D.
President