

2-5-2004

Faculty Senate Chronicle for February 5, 2004

Elizabeth J. Kennedy

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

Kennedy, Elizabeth J.. "Faculty Senate Chronicle for February 5, 2004." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 5 Feb 2004. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/92>

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.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 5, 2004

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Thursday, February 5, 2004, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Chair Dan Sheffer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Fifty-two of the sixty-four Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Drew, Garn-Nunn, Kalka, Kreidler, Siebert, and J.Yoder were absent with notice. Senators Broadway, Carri, Londraville, Luoma, Maringer, and Slowiak were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

*** CHARGED THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITH REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO RESPOND IN WRITING, ON OR BEFORE FEBRUARY 19, 2004, TO THE SENATE'S REQUEST TO INSTRUCT HIS NEGOTIATING TEAM TO ACCEPT BINDING ARBITRATION IF A CONTRACT IS NOT NEGOTIATED 12 MONTHS FROM OCTOBER 21, 2003.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Chair Sheffer began the meeting by announcing one change in the agenda under reports. Provost Stroble had sent a written report, as she was at a meeting of the American Association of Colleges Teacher Education and could not be with us today. Also, we had asked Vice President Sharon Johnson to give us an update on enrollment; Vice President Ray would be giving both reports. That was the change to be noted at the time of the Provost's remarks.

With no further changes to the agenda, the Chair called for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Hebert made this motion; Senator Lyons seconded it. The body then voted its approval of the amended agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 2003 - Senator Rich moved that the minutes be approved. Senator Yousey seconded this motion. No corrections forthcoming, the body voted its approval of the minutes.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR - Chair Sheffer stated he could not believe that this was actually the first meeting of the Faculty Senate for the spring semester. It seemed to him that we had been meeting continuously since the beginning of January. He welcomed Senators back after a semester break, with the hope that all got to take some time and relax and also get some other things done.

Chair Sheffer's remarks today basically recaptured the events that have occurred following the release of the Office of Inspector General of Ohio's Report of January 9. This report has basically engulfed the Executive Committee's discussions as well as the discussions of many of you and your colleagues. On January 9, the OIG issued the report of a scene on campus at the beginning of the semester or late in the week of January 12. The Executive Committee met the day after the report

was released and prepared a letter to President Proenza, which was a request for written responses to a number of questions we were posing. In the meantime, President Proenza issued a response to the Inspector General's report in a campus-wide letter of January 19 via email. President Proenza received the letter from the Executive Committee on January 21 and responded in writing on January 28. The next day the Executive Committee met with the President and with Provost Stroble to discuss the President's responses and to ask several additional questions.

Last weekend Chair Sheffer had sent an email to all of the Senators with the attachments that included the letter from the Executive Committee to the President, and the letter to the Executive Committee from the President to all of you. This email detailed the areas of the discussion we had addressed in our meeting with President Proenza. We asked at that time whether the President would address many of these concerns with the Senate today.

In addition, the Executive Committee had asked each Senator via the above mentioned email to participate in a non-binding straw vote to illicit feelings about the need for the Senate to perhaps take some formal action. More than two-thirds of the Senate responded, and these were the results: Thirteen Senators voted for no formal action in the straw vote; 23 for no formal action at this time, but to wait for a period of at least two weeks for a response to the request for the Senate ad hoc committees to have an immediate role in planning, budgeting, and facilities decision making. Seven Senators had asked to take formal action immediately.

Based on the results of that straw poll and in reviewing the numerous written comments to the Executive Committee from Senators and our constituents, Chair Sheffer announced that he would convene a special session of the Faculty Senate on Thurs., February 19, to address any issues that arose from and any possible Faculty Senate actions to the Report of the Ohio Inspector General and the response of the administration to the requests made by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Chair said that he would ask Mrs. Quillin to please publish a notice of this meeting to the Senators and to the University community in general.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS - Chair Sheffer then stated he had the pleasure of introducing three new Senators to this body; namely, two new student reps., Marcus Kalka, the ASG President (not present), and Jesse Mann, the ASG Vice President. Also present was Bill Lyons, a new Senator from Arts & Sciences. The Senate welcomed these new senators with a warm round of applause. Chair Sheffer then invited the Senate to also welcome the new parliamentarian for the Senate, William Harpine, Professor in Communications, who had graciously accepted the Chair's invitation to become our parliamentarian.

Chair Sheffer continued, stating that he needed to bring to the body's attention a number of deaths that had occurred during the months of December and January of our colleagues. The first was of Professor G. Edwin Wilson, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, who died on December 10 after a short illness. Dr. Wilson was a native of Philadelphia, who earned his B.S. from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1961, and Ph.D. at the University of Illinois in 1964. He joined The University of Akron in 1984, a Chairman of the Department of Chemistry and continued in that position until 1996. When he retired from the University in 2000, Dr. Wilson was the Associate Provost of Research and also served as an elected member of the Governing Board for the Council for Chemical Research and was a member of the MIT Education Council.

Helen Swindler died on January 4. Mrs. Swindler received her bachelor's and master's degrees in education and taught english and speech. She taught for 12 years in the Akron Public Schools and was a part-time instructor at The University of Akron for 14 years. Mrs. Swindler retired from The University of Akron in 1997, then rejoined the speech staff to teach part-time summer school classes at the age of 89.

James King died on January 12. He earned a bachelor's degree from Mount Union College, a master's from Kent State, and a doctorate from Indiana University. Dr. King was a professor of educational administration at The University of Akron from 1969 until his retirement as Professor Emeritus in 1990.

Anitra Barkley Sacks passed away January 24. She earned a graduate degree in speech pathology and audiology and completed post-graduate courses at The University of Akron, and was formerly the director of the speech and hearing clinic here at The University of Akron.

Lastly, Diana Peske died on January 27. She graduated from The University of Akron with a master's degree in english and was previously an instructor of english here at The University of Akron.

The Senate then observed a moment of silence.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy began her report with a couple of business items. First, if chairs of Senate committees would please forward reports to be included in Chronicles to Marilyn Quillin (as email attachments). In addition, the Senate office did have a scanner now. The full NCA Report was also now available and could be accessed by going to either the President's or Provost's web pg.

Secretary Kennedy continued. The Executive Committee had met several times since the last regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting in December. On December 11 we met and discussed the three ad hoc committees - Planning, Budgeting, and Facilities Planning, which Chair Sheffer had announced at the December Faculty Senate meeting. As Senators would note, each ad hoc committee would appear on the agenda of each regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting; today represented the first reporting the body would receive from each of these groups. At that meeting we also certified the election of Senator Bill Lyons in the seat vacated by Stephen Harp.

On January 15 the Executive Committee met and discussed the following: The Executive Committee made a formal request for space for the Office of the Faculty Senate in Leigh Hall 5th Floor, consisting of approximately 800 sq. ft. total. The memo requesting the space would be part of the next Chronicle appendices should Senators wish to view the particulars (**Appendix A**). Also, Senators Sterns, as chair of the Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee, had been apprised of this request.

The Executive Committee had received a copy of President Proenza's response to Mr. Robert

Kreiser, Associate Secretary of the AAUP. As Senators would recall, Mr. Kreiser had written to the President on October 29 in regard to the Faculty Manual rule changes passed by the Board of Trustees in August 2003. This letter would also appear as an appendix item in next month's Chronicle (**Appendix B**). Should Senators wish a copy of the letter, please contact Mrs. Quillin. Note too, that, after having received the President's responses, Mr. Kreiser then contacted Chair Sheffer as was mentioned, asking for feedback. We were in the process of drafting a response to Mr. Kreiser and would keep Senators apprised of this.

At that meeting, the Executive Committee also invited Vice President Sharon Johnson to report on the status of the Spring 04 enrollment picture, as well as on the successes/failures of the past registration and enrollment process. Vice President Johnson informed Mrs. Quillin that she would not be able to attend, but as mentioned, Vice President Ray was going to make the presentation for her. The Executive Committee also charged the Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee to begin a dialogue with the Bookstore in regard to complaints that departments, faculty, and students had made related to book ordering, pricing, and listing of textbooks on departmental home pages. As mentioned, we crafted a letter to President Proenza, and we would like to thank all of the Senators who had provided feedback on our draft letter. We met again on the 28th to discuss the President's response and again on the 29th with the President and Provost Stroble as had been mentioned by the chair.

Senator Kolcaba then posed a question regarding those Senators who had been reassigned to different committees from either Facilities Planning or Budget. Were we now going to attend two committee meetings, subcommittees of the Senate, or should we go back to the ad hoc committee that was disbanded temporarily?

Chair Sheffer addressed the question, stating that what had been done initially was to get just a few individuals to begin activity with those committees, and they then would expand and ask individuals to join, so Senators did not have another meeting at the moment.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - No further questions forthcoming, Chair Sheffer then invited President Proenza to address the body.

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, colleagues. Over the last roughly three weeks I've visited with many of you individually and with many groups collectively. I've understood your sense of shock and dismay at the allegations made in the Inspector General's Report, and I have welcomed and appreciated your words of support as well as of concern for how we must move forward in the days ahead. As your president and as I've said, I particularly felt a great deal of sadness, disappointment, and regret. Clearly, bringing to bear my experience in higher education to this matter was simply not enough. Information that I did not get, or failed to get, or somehow or other did not seek. I bear that responsibility, and for the pain and difficulty that all of us are experiencing today, I apologize.

As I think you know, I have very consistently articulated and made clear that this University must endeavor to do its business better, must endeavor to know itself and what it can do and move ahead, and above all, that everyone is held to very high standards of accountability and of accomplishment.

As you might well imagine, because of that consistency in my approach, the revelations brought to light by the Inspector General's Report are even more disappointing and of great concern to me. Clearly, wrongful conduct of the sort that is reported there cannot and will not be tolerated. We must agree on that as a community. The tasks before us now are many, and I've articulated many of those in my report to the campus in the letter of January 19 and in the subsequent response to the Senate which all of you have seen, and I will not reiterate that. Let me bring you up to date in some ways and let you know what I can share with you at this time and why there are some things that I cannot share.

First, the tasks before us are of course to assess and repair any of the damage that has been caused here. Secondly, through the process that's already in progress particularly by an internal auditor, to ensure that our business processes are enhanced, improved, and work as they were designed to do, and that those that do not are improved. Thirdly, and ultimately most importantly, that we find a way to focus the entire energies of the University to the work of the University in service to its students and its community.

As you know, on January 19th I sent a message to the campus summarizing the steps that we immediately took, and that is there for you to see and the process has begun. The Inspector General's Report, in addition to allowing me to initiate dismissal procedures, called into action the series of legal steps which are now unfolding. As a result of that, you know that I sent letters of intended dismissal to the three individuals against whom findings were reported in the Inspector General's Report. According to our bylaws and our rules of procedure, that letter requests that if they wish to have a hearing they request to do so in writing, and all three have so requested. Hearings are being scheduled as we speak, and we hope they will take place as early as February 25.

In addition, you are aware of the steps that we're taking with the Office of the Auditor of State, the Attorney General, Ohio Ethics Commission, as well as with the County Prosecutor and local Prosecutor's Office. On January 28 in response to your Executive Committee, I furnished all of the information that was available to me at that time, and I hasten to add that I will insist and will provide you additional details as they become available. I will continue to insist that we have full sharing of information and that our processes become increasingly the transparent processes that you and I both seek.

Also in my earlier memo, I have called upon Vice President Ray and Provost Stroble to set up an advisory committee to guide us in reviewing the Information Technology Services area as well as the monies that were thought to have been "spent" or whatever, and a lot of the response is already contained there and presume you have had a chance to review. Ultimately, ladies and gentlemen, we must see that the laws are followed, and most importantly that we do find a way for us to see that we continue to move the University forward in service to our students and our community.

Again, while I want and I will intend and be able to provide you more detailed information as appropriate and to be as fully open as possible about this and related matters as I can be, today I hope you will understand that I cannot provide answers to many of the questions that are before you because they might compromise the ongoing work on this case by the various offices I've listed. Nor do I, and I hope again you will understand that, want to say anything at this time that would allow a guilty person to exploit a technicality in the law or that will prevent an innocent person from

receiving the appropriate fair hearing and due process that all Americans deserve. So please understand that I must by necessity speak in broad terms while trying to answer as many of the questions as fully as I possibly can.

First, it is important to note that the Inspector General's Report examined a division of 138 University employees and many others who have regular dealings with that division. As a result of that investigation, the Inspector General concluded that there were findings of wrongdoings of three employees. As I think you know, the University employs nearly 4,700 people and their integrity, in short that of all but three of our 4,700 employees, has not been called into question nor is it in question by that report. Still, the University must be able to assure the public, assure itself, assure all of us, you and I together, that we have the proper safeguards in place and that we work to continuously build an atmosphere of trust, transparency, and mutual respect and regard for one another.

To that end, our Internal Auditor, General Counsel, and I will work with many of you and with those offices of the Auditor of State as well as our Board of Trustees, to implement the recommendations made by the Inspector General that we will surely have occasion to find that we need to make. Any sign or allegation of wrongdoing or of perpetuating an atmosphere of wastefulness or disregard to the integrity of this institution will be investigated thoroughly and resolved appropriately just as we are doing with regard to the Inspector General's Report in the work that has begun.

Now let me close by saying a couple of things. First, I think you know that our University is a very vital resource for our region. It is being seen increasingly as an even more vital resource, and for that, we not only can take great pride but we know that that enables us to build an even better future for ourselves. We have a great tradition of dedicated service from our faculty, from our staff, from our contract professionals, to each other and to our students. We have talked about it very often as that sense that we have created a place that indeed enables and holds valuable what we do on behalf of our students and which we call the core competency of student success.

Please know in that regard that I will do all in my power to restore confidence to our institution and trust in each other, and to continue to gain recognition for all of your good work as faculty, staff, contract professionals and indeed as students, because it is what our students do that really brings us the highest recognition of our mission. I am committed to find a way to fully enable participation of faculty, staff, and contract professionals in our planning and budgeting processes, and I've begun to work with your Chair and with the Provost to find those avenues that will enable them, and we must be committed to doing that.

Finally, in the context of moving ahead, as Chair Sheffer indicated earlier, the report of the North Central Association accrediting visit and their report that led to our being fully accredited is now fully accessible for you to review at either my web pages or those in the Provost's office. Those documents belong to the University so you will need to use your own password to access them, but if you're registered at the University you will have free access to them.

There's a second report which I've brought copies of today, my annual report to the Trustees. It is entitled, 'Landscapes and Mindscapes, the President's Report for 2003-2004,' and can be accessed on the web at: www3.uakron.edu/provost/nca/doc/presidentRpt.pdf. I ask that you review that and

share your thoughts with me and with your colleagues, because I think it is the very best testament to that which we've achieved over the past five years, as well as a tool for us to retrospectively examine where we've been and where we might go together in the next five years. So I invite your review of that, and that report contains an initial organizational outline that gives you a sense of how we try to organize the material for ease of understanding, and then it goes into the full report and outlines what Landscapes and Mindscapes are all about.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your attention and I welcome those questions that I hope I will be able to answer without referring to the matters that are pending before the Board."

Chair Sheffer then called for questions of the President.

Senator Kolcaba began by stating that, with all due respect, she thought there was an elephant in the room in regard to faculty morale because of our loss of income that we could take home with us. She was very upset with the failure of the Board to negotiate with the duly elected union. We had been assured by the President's office that they would negotiate in full faith. Morale was already low before the IT incidents. Did the President feel that he was in a position to talk some sense into the Board for the sake of moving forward in minimizing the bad publicity of one story on top of the other that was throughout the Akron community?

President Proenza replied with the following:

"Thank you, Senator Kolcaba, and I think you're right. There is a huge other presence in our midst and it has to do with the fiscal condition of the country, of the state, and indeed the roughly 2-1/2 years that we have done without, an undeniable fact. So let's begin there for a moment. First, I sincerely believe that there is an upward movement in the economy and that is what will begin to bring us some relief. But it would be foolish for me to suggest that that hasn't affected us. It has affected me, and in visiting with the chairs the other day the very same issue came up and as I think you know, I have been one of the most vocally outspoken persons on behalf of higher education in the entire state of Ohio. I'm not exactly happy about it either. Indeed there would be little point in my suggesting that we should be happy, and I'm not happy, you're not happy, collectively we all feel this.

On the other hand, let's also face it - if all we do is focus on the negative conditions that we find ourselves in, recognizing that for the last three decades in the early part of each decade such a cycle has taken place and then recovered, we would tend to focus in a situation that would spiral our own ability to do good things downwards instead of upwards. So as an institution we will focus and are focusing, and Vice President Ray is working as we speak, to try to get the best budget projections that we can to see how it is likely that we can move forward.

The Board approved last week a refinancing of our 1999 bond issue that will give us an ability to put roughly \$8-9 million into reserves, thereby keeping us more economically healthy and not putting us in a situation where our existing resources before the refinancing would have to be squirreled away rather than used for operating budgets and/or possibly faculty and staff salary increases. So we're working very hard and I hope he may have a brief preview of that. Lurking in the background, I have to add, please remember that the Secretary of State Kenneth Blackwell has a proposal on the

table to eliminate the one cent additional tax that was put in place to get us through this budget crisis. If that comes to pass before the state revenues recover, we will be again unfortunately severely taxed; there is no escaping that.

Now what I would suggest is not that we ignore the realities and that we underscore, that all of us are unhappy. I've been beating my head against a wall in Columbus, in Washington, at every turn with our representatives, with our Senators, with our Governor, as well as the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy. While that hasn't led to actual money on the table, there are some encouraging signs in a few places, but not every place. We made some gains but not the kinds of gains that we want. So what do we do in the meantime? I would ask that each of you please find what it is today that you can do positively for yourself, for your students, for each other.

In talking with the chairs the other day, there were three or four individuals I know fairly well, and I know how they make their lives better. One of them has the opportunity to have an exchange program each summer to which he goes to a university abroad for the summer and has a tremendously uplifting and enlightening experience, at the same time he gets to share that with his family and children. Others that are noted in the group and I see here, for example, in several cases have the opportunity to do some tremendously scholarly writing and to receive the benefits from their peers recognizing that by their citations, by their being used for possible legislation or for advancing the field, is tremendously satisfying.

A few days ago I was with a tremendously bright group of students during a leadership conference that was tremendously uplifting to me because I don't get a chance to spend enough time with students, and Jesse Mann also was there. So find one, two, three things that give you satisfaction that isn't another \$100 or \$300 - that will come, I assure you. That happened in the early 70's, early 80's, early 90's and we're in the early 2000's. The curve is shaping up, the economy will improve, our enrollment is going up, we should be able to come out of that. But in the meantime, just individually say to yourself, I will not let myself descend into a downward spiral, and there are some satisfying things in my life."

Senator Witt then addressed President Proenza, stating he agreed with the President that we should look on the bright side of every opportunity. He did not think that the faculty were so far down in the dumps that they did not find a little enjoyment everyday in the jobs they did. He hoped we were not digressing from the point there. He had a couple of questions regarding the subject of faculty participation in governance and the rule changes that removed that participation over the summer. The President had asserted in his responses to the EC letter, and that was all we had seen so far, that governance issues were solely in the purview of negotiations with the AAUP in terms of getting those rules back. The Senator was wondering how long - and the President had no way to be sure - but how long did he think these negotiations would take? We had heard rumors that it could take two or three years. If negotiations took that long, was the Senate being asked to wait for 18 months?

President Proenza replied, "Absolutely not." He did not know how long the negotiations would take and did not think any of us had that idea. The reports that he had had suggested discussions had been positive and people were understanding positions, but clearly there was a lot of detail on the table that had to be worked through. But no, the Senate did not have to wait; there were many things that we could do. As he had indicated, the Provost and he were working with Chair Sheffer to find

those mechanisms that we could effectively employ as soon as possible. In the Provost's report she had a statement of a formation of an initial committee, but that was not enough. He was committed to finding a way for us to dialogue appropriately in matters of importance to the University.

Senator Witt stated that he thought the rules we had had in place before were not perfect, but we understood them. He thought the President would agree. It occurred to him that at the time of the scandal that we might have felt better if we had had more and not less participation in governance. He was still not sure why we could not at least talk to the Board or make a recommendation to the Board to bring those rules back the way they were. The argument that as it was now a proposal in contract negotiations... We also had RTP rules that were in the contract and as he understood it, people were getting tenure last year in spite of the fact that that was a condition we were trying to bargain for. Although he understood that some of them got tenure and promoted, they were now making a couple hundred bucks less a month as a result of other factors. Senator Witt stated that he hoped we could come to some agreement about how we could get around this problem and set the rules back the way they were. He for one, as a Senator, would feel better knowing that those committees were in place the way they were before.

President Proenza then stated that what he could promise the Senator was that he would work very hard with Chair Sheffer to find a way for full participation of faculty, staff, and contract professionals in the affairs of this University.

Senator Sterns stated that he would like to raise a different kind of question to President Proenza. We had had a number of major positions on this campus recently undergo change - the Community & Technical College, Registrar's office, and just in the last few days, Dr. Thomas Angelo's resignation was announced. He felt that we as a faculty should have a better understanding about some of these changes. He realized that there were certain HR issues that were involved, but the campus community would like to know more about why these changes were taking place.

President Proenza began by stating that Senator Sterns had spoken about Dr. Angelo for one... At which point Senator Sterns added, "... the change in leadership in the Community & Technical College..."

President Proenza then continued, first with regard to Dr. Angelo. Dr. Angelo had initiated a conversation with the Provost, at which point the President had been told that Dr. Angelo had wanted to make a change in his status within the next few months. It was the President's understanding that among the reasons was the fact that Dr. Angelo was engaged to be married to a lady in Australia; that was one of the factors that was weighing on his personal decision. The other was Dr. Angelo's sense that what he had come here to do was really achieved when the University was recognized formally by the Carnegie Commission as a Carnegie Cluster leader. That his teaching and learning had accomplished its first major goal and that he could now look to other professional opportunities for himself. That was the President's understanding, although Dr. Angelo had not conveyed that to him directly except very briefly in a quick email exchange.

The Report of the Provost dealt with what had transpired with regard to the Community & Technical College. In brief, for the last two years there had been discussions within C & T and with University College and others about better delineating the mission and opportunities before that college. There

was general understanding that we wanted to move forward, and as a result, the Board of Trustees agreed and called upon the administration to move forward on that. The approach the Provost was taking was basically the following: She had initiated a search for a dean, and the closing for that search was January 31. The applications would be reviewed, interviews would take place, and a dean would be selected who would then immediately be charged with doing the additional planning in concert with the relevant faculty to bring the new Community & Technical College into being in operation by the Fall of 2005.

Senator Gerlach then addressed the Chair, stating he wondered whether the President could enlighten us as to the disposition of some of the Senate's past business; namely, that in October, in which proposals were passed regarding benefits for domestic partners. What was the administration's disposition of that?

President Proenza replied that that particular resolution was referred to the Office of General Counsel as well as to HR for review. He had not had the recommendation back at this moment. We would proceed to review that as appropriate and with their analysis from both of those offices.

Senator Covrig spoke, stating he welcomed the President's encouragement for us to take positiveness and make our choices regardless of what the University's atmosphere created for us. That was good mental health. He had found that he maintained better positive attitudes when he had planned out, "What would I do with the worst case scenario?" He called it, "can of beans leadership;" he knew that if things went bad he had this saved, and then he liked to be surprised if things went better than he had anticipated. He would be interested in just a brief picture of how this administration was planning for the worst. What kind of leadership had the President planned steps for that potential, in the event it might go the other way?

The President responded with the following:

"As I think you're aware, we've reviewed many of the things that the University has done, some it's done very well and others that it needs to improve on, and we've been working steadily at that. Among those things that this past year we decided we have to do better, quite simply is communication. As you may recall, we had a communication audit and that process is underway. You should begin to see more of the effects of that partly in response to the fact that I actively want to have a very open and transparent process and respond to the kinds of questions you have, and quite simply understand that there are many things we're doing very well.

Secondly, with regard to broad planning and budgeting, we began a process a year ago to review that aspect. In particular, we initiated task force and decision making structures and I've now asked Char Reed...by the way, let me just pause and introduce Candace Campbell Jackson. Candace, if you would stand, most of you have met her already, but Candace is Assistant to the President joining us in December, and she has started to work with Char Reed and the committee to be sure we put that on the fast track.

What's involved there? For example, for many years the University quite frankly had done its budgeting on an ad hoc basis. What does that mean? That it would really get to it when it had the moments to get to it and when the legislature got around to letting us know what they were going to

provide. That's not a good way to plan. What did we do? We took a group of people down to Ohio State and to a few other institutions to begin to learn how major institutions do their budgeting, planning, and we established an initial framework for how we had to do it on a timely basis and evolve different groups into a decision-making structure to move us ahead. Vice President Ray is fully committed to that; in fact, he wants to go a step further in developing a 2-year planning scenario so that we have a framework for looking at our financial picture on a rolling basis, two years out at the very least.

Thirdly, as I indicated earlier, VP Ray has been very diligently working to find every opportunity for us to create appropriate reserves without taxing our operating budget. So the refinancing that I reported to you for example will hopefully net us about \$8 million that we can immediately put into reserves, possibly releasing some of the reserves that are there at the moment or at least not requiring that we tax those reserves, therefore giving us a little bit more degrees of freedom with which to plan for all of the needs we have - not just salaries and benefits, but to improve the situation for graduate students, to have more stipends, to have the ability to buy a piece of equipment that is so important to the daily life of each of us. So that's a general framework that will become more detailed within the next three to four months and we'll share that with you and get your input as well."

Senator Soucek then stated that there were two issues that he worried about. One was that during negotiations we would suffer from loss of income every year; we would not get any pay raises regardless of economic outcome of the state. The other issue was the rather pointed suspicion that because a union did exist now, we had lost what we thought were health care benefits and now we had been informed that they were not really benefits. And, there were no pay hikes. Everything was going to be status quo or less for the next several years until negotiations with the union were done.

President Proenza replied that all were concerned about the increased cost of living and the current economy. However, as soon as monies were available that we could allocate to improving the compensation position of all of our employees, they would be made available with or without a contract in place.

Senator Hebert then addressed the President, stating he would like to return to Senator Kolcaba's question which he thought was only partially answered. Part of the uncertainty that was described there had to do with the fact that we were all going to be in a state of flux until we got a contract negotiation. Now he and everybody else in this room understood that when you went down to the legislature and asked for money, that was an uncontrollable factor. When you went to Washington and asked for money, that was an uncontrollable factor. But it did seem to him that the one thing the President could do, that he had the power to do, was to lead these negotiations. We were talking about shared governance. It seemed to him that that would be between the faculty and the administration, and yet in the negotiations the faculty was dealing with an outside lawyer who was going to walk away from these proceedings and not have to live with the results of whatever was negotiated. So it seemed to him that the one thing the President had control over that would really help the situation now was to make a positive influence, to have a positive influence on the negotiation - get them going, get them speeded up, get the right people to the table. Because there were days when our team went there and there were basically no administrators there at all.

President Proenza replied that, as he had said to many, just because he had stepped away from

negotiations because he must represent all of the constituencies of the University community and not just the bargaining unit, did not mean that he was not doing other things. Indeed, he was having regular meetings with Vice President Ray as our lead team member in negotiations. The President stated he had called attention to several positive articles and elements that he would like for them to consider in moving forward. Just because he himself was not there did not mean that he was not advocating some very positive approaches. He hoped that the Senator would see some of those in the process going forward.

Senator Stachowiak stated that he had attended the President's inaugural speech at EJ Thomas. At that time, the President had said when everybody asked about money, his issue was that as the facility grew and as there was an increase in enrollment, then there would be this payback. The Senator thought, having been involved in unions for the last 20 years here, that he understood what everyone here was going through. Just as a side comment, we had to wait; it was an adversarial relationship which could not be pushed. It was going to happen when it did. But to get back on track here, we had put a lot of money in a field of dreams mentality - we would build it and the students would come. What were the demographics that the President was looking at that told him that the students would come? What was our hope and goal size for this institution in terms of population? What would that mean back to us in terms of monies available for raise increases and issues like that?

The President responded with the following:

"As many of you will remember, it was a little over two years ago that we were literally about to hold a celebratory party because we had made that quantum leap in enrollment and were going to be able to celebrate and go forward with an allocation of some new resources. Ironically, as fate would draw that card, that was precisely the time that the economy started to go downwards, the state got the budget and we all were in a state of shock because we worked so hard. We were actually literally planning the celebratory events, and then this economic shock hit us. Again, I think the light is at the end of the tunnel. How do we know that? We now have in place an increasingly better, more rigorous enrollment management plan. I think most of you have seen the elements of that; it's beginning to work. For the last three years our applications have been steadily above the previous year, and that gives us a great sense of confidence that that is going to be a continuing trend.

Secondly, our enrollments have been improving, and there were actually some places we saw some nice increases. What we think will happen and I think you saw the way we're marketing this, is that five years ago we set out as a university in this great quest of rebuilding our campus. We said we would do it in five years. This is the fifth year because we started late in 99, and as I think you know, this is the year that it's all coming together. By this fall all of the major structures will be finished. The remaining one will be the Student Services building which will come on-line by December, the Student Union second phase will be finished by August, the Student Recreation Center will be opening in approximately May-June, the residence hall for our honors students will be opening in August as we've had a little delay with weather, but they've been working inside so the inside work is ahead of schedule. In what started out to be six buildings, thanks to prudent management, is now eight and soon will be nine and maybe ten if we get that gift for the international business program in the College of Business.

What does that say? Our students are now literally saying, wow, it's amazing, it's great. And because they now know if they come in the fall these facilities will be on-line. We think many of the students who've been saying, I'm not going to go there now because their facilities are not in place, will start thinking more positive. So this should be a transition year and a positive one at that."

Senator Lyons then addressed President Proenza. The Senator began by stating that one of the strengths the President brought to his job that he and many appreciated was that the President had spoken quite eloquently to the state about the value of higher education. The Senator would like to respectfully request that the President use those skills to speak eloquently for the need to ensure that negotiations come complete contract within 12 months, and to instruct his team to agree to binding arbitration at the end of 12 months if they did not have a contract. For the reasons that, we needed some good publicity rather than bad publicity; we needed a boost to morale, and we needed to demonstrate that we were saving money rather than wasting money.

President Proenza replied that, as he had said to Senator Hebert, he was doing so and would continue to do so in as strong a manner as he possibly could. He then thanked Senator Lyons for his suggestion.

Senator Hanna addressed President Proenza and members of the Senate. She stated that she stood here as the sole representative of the part-time faculty at The University of Akron. She knew that we talked eloquently about negotiations in pay and all of the crunching that many felt in this room, and yet she would like to ask the President what opportunities there were for looking at the part-time allocations of credit hr. and being afforded simple amenities such as phones and offices, opportunities to also compete for grant proposals, grant monies, and the like? She seemed to never hear anything of that, and being new on Faculty Senate, she would like to hear a few comments on this issue.

President Proenza replied that both the Provost and Vice President Ray had been asked to look at all aspects of our Human Resources, including our part-time faculty, our graduate assistants, and all aspects of the University. They had a number of elements that they were working through, including all aspects of how we better managed our costs so that we could provide some other benefits, amenities, regularly review salaries for staff, contract professionals, faculty, as well as the per semester credit hr. allocation for part-time faculty. He thought that that was emerging, and to remember that we started out the focus of our staff and contract professionals through the Mercer process, then went along with the task force that Chand Midha chaired, the salaries to our full-time faculty, assistant, associate and full professors. Now we were in a position to move forward in concert there as soon as resources were available, and obviously we needed to bring other contingencies of the University such as graduate students and part-time professionals.

Senator Lee then stated that he had two points - one of them was general and one of them was a little more specific. The general one was to emphasize and confirm what he thought he had heard the President say and to cheer it, which was a ghost of PBC, may it rest in peace. He thought he had heard the President acknowledge that there basically had been no budget process; there was an ad hoc process, which he thought would help to explain to a lot of PBC members why it was that the budget could suddenly appear seemingly as a result of no process at all. If that was true, he

applauded that the President was recognizing it and that there was a plan in place to have a transparent process. The Senator encouraged the President in that effort. The more specific question dealt with the President's invitation to read his annual report where it had said that there was an internal audit for 2003 and that in 2004 we would complete the implementation of procedures recommended by the internal auditor and by the external auditor in their recent management letters. He was wondering whether those letters were available and whether the recommendations they made were available.

The President replied that he believed that it was so. Vice President Ray could get a copy. While he, the President, might not put it as strongly as Senator Lee had in terms of the absence of one, it certainly needed a whole lot of improvement and it needed to be disciplined and appropriately engaged with. It clearly was not where it needed to be.

Senator Mann then spoke, stating that his question was two-fold. First, in reference to the last Board of Trustees meeting, he would mention Vice President Ray's report to the Board of Trustees that revenue from sales to students both here in Akron and the Wayne campus were far exceeding expectations as well as planned expenditures were below expectations. If that maintained, would unexpected money be available to Faculty Senate to look at in a similar manner as the \$6.2 million?

President Proenza replied that we were certainly looking into that. He did not know where that fit in terms of our efforts to balance the budget in the first place, but if the Senator would sit down with Mr. Ray, he then would be happy to provide details on that.

Senator Mann continued. The second half of what he was questioning was, in the President's letter from Jan. 19, the Senator had noticed that the President was very specific with the request for the State Auditor Betty Montgomery focusing on these issues. Yet in his statements earlier today he had mentioned that any allegations of mismanagement and things of that nature would be investigated. Was the Senator to understand that the audit had actually been broadened beyond what was stated in the President's Jan. 19 letter, or was it still only specific to this issue?

President Proenza stated that this process began with the report that was provided to the Inspector General. The process in the state was that the Inspector General's Report in the case of some findings kicked off a series of elements that involved other offices, one being the Auditor of State. The Auditor of State would begin there but would not be limited to that.

Senator Lyons then stated that, with all due respect to the President, what he had intended as a request seemed to have been interpreted as a comment. Would the President be willing to commit today to instructing his negotiating team to accept the binding arbitration proposal that was put on the table in order to save us millions of dollars, avoid bad publicity, and complete negotiations quickly?

President Proenza replied that he appreciated where the Senator was coming from. In the same spirit the Senator was asking with respect, let the President examine what the specific request of binding arbitration meant, both in terms of the state of Ohio and in general. We did exist in a broader domain than we were partially at least constrained by. He would certainly commit to reviewing that and if appropriate, to recommend it.

Senator Lyons thanked the President.

Senator Braun then spoke, stating that he had a question that referred to some dealings that PBC had had in the past, and some of the comments that the OIG Report had made. The President had instituted a process to identify wasteful expenses and so forth, was he correct?

President Proenza replied, "investigating the allegations." To which Senator Braun asked whether these were just in allegations of wrongdoing.

President Proenza replied that it would certainly point out to us whether there was something we were missing that we should have been catching as we went along.

Senator Braun then stated that he would like to suggest that perhaps the President should empanel a commission to look across the board in this University to see whether there were operations that should be de-escalated that could make funds available, to escalate other operations that could be more beneficial to the University. In other words, in times of fiscal crisis, and we had been in one and he did not think we were going to get out of this one so easily, it was a good idea to look where you could make operations leaner and obtain savings.

President Proenza replied that he had a preliminary comment on that. He certainly would remind all that that was the full intent of part of the ROI discussion, part of the Balanced Scorecard discussion that was still in process. We were committing to creating a framework of responsibility-based budgeting. As part of that, the beginnings of setting priorities that would then lead to decisions such as the Senator suggested was very appropriate.

Senator Braun stated that, with respect to ROI - and he did not want to open that huge can of worms again - he thought that when we tried to adjudicate ROI in PBC there was a lot of opposition because things were partitioned between academia and administration. There had been a lot of opposition to look in certain corners, but other corners were investigated very deeply.

To which President Proenza interjected that he fully concurred with that; that it not be selective. He then added that that could be discussed in more detail.

Chair Sheffer called for further questions. None forthcoming, he thanked the President for his comments and answers to questions. The Chair then continued by reminding Senators that Provost Stroble was not here today but had issued a report to Faculty Senate (**Appendix C**). The Chair directed Senators' attention to the area called, "Ongoing Issues," pgs. 3 and 4, that dealt with the beginning of discussion for representation in budgeting by the various constituencies on campus. This would certainly be part of the material we would be discussing between now and the special meeting on February 19.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT RAY - Chair Sheffer then invited Vice President Roy Ray to give the enrollment registration update requested of interim Vice President Johnson. The Chair directed Senators to the accompanying handout (**Appendix D**).

"Thank you. This is a report from Vice President Johnson regarding enrollment for spring. The spring 2004 enrollment in terms of head count is 22,265, and in terms of student credit hrs. was 244,057. As you know, we haven't had a drop here for some three years, and when I arrived here I thought it was important that we reinstate the deregistration process in order to avoid the write-offs we've had to incur in regard to non-payment of tuition. So we started that in the fall and we refined it for spring semester, so what we're doing now with the only numbers that are really accurate that we can compare to, are the 2001 numbers.

If you look down the table you'll see for comparison purposes, spring 2004 enrollment with spring 2001 is up by 178 students in terms of head count, and in terms of student credit hrs. is up 4.4%. Next year we'll be able to compare next year to this year and we're looking forward to the fact that hopefully enrollment next year will be up substantially, because that's the life blood of the University and provides the funds that are necessary, especially as you look at the decline in state support in enrollment, which is where our future lies.

Registration went relatively smoothly; maximum effort was put forth in reaching out not only to currently-enrolled students to register, but students who failed to re-enroll from a previous term were also contacted directly and encouraged to enroll. That was a "we missed you" marketing effort that Sharon Johnson put into effect, and again, students were cancelled for non-payment as of 1/25/04. We cancelled 419 students and approximately 3,890 billing units. You can see the handout where those students were cancelled, and 50% of them were freshmen who did not pay."

Senator Norfolk then stated that he was sure that VP Ray was aware of this, but there were a whole bunch of students who were purged who had paid part of their bill, added a course, and they were purged from everything. Was that going to be fixed next time?

Vice President Ray replied with the following:

"Yes. The drop process has been imperfect and obviously we haven't learned from past experience, so we've had to totally reinstitute it and there have been bugs in it. But we will fix those bugs, and hopefully it will be less onerous for everyone as we go into the summer semester and fall semester. Let's look ahead to fall term enrollment - applications for fall are up 823 or 18%, and freshman applications are up 19.6% or 855. Of course the key element here is to convert the applications to paying students, and that will be a challenge that we must pay attention to.

Recruitment attention will be given to increase the yield rates in all categories. Yield builders include 'Spotlight days' increasing campus visitation opportunities, telemarketing with the college and departmental follow-up, and more interaction with the students via the web. We want to try to recruit and enroll transfer and adult students, and in that regard there are a number of enrollment recruitment meetings that are being held in the undergraduate colleges and other faculty groups to hopefully present a comprehensive, strategic enrollment plan with the effort to try to increase enrollment. They are doing an assessment of the student registration process in order to try to improve it, simplify it, and make it easier.

We're looking at how we can assess the reasons for students withdrawing from the University - why are they leaving here and where are they going? What can we do to encourage them to stay?

Sharon is involved in an analysis to develop a regression formula which will then help us to predict students' potential success in freshman years and beyond. Hopefully, this prediction model will enable identification of academically prepared/talented students as well as those at a greater risk, those who don't carry on to completion or graduation. They're looking at plans to develop a bridge process to facilitate relocation of transfer of students from the Wayne campus to the main campus."

Senator Shanklin then spoke. He had two students, one a freshman and one a sophomore, one out-of-state and one in-state. The out-of-state student had had a problem with getting the funding approved for his registration; these incidents both had happened on Monday, the first day of classes. The in-state student was advised incorrectly and added a class that she shouldn't have added; she needed to add a different section. But the upshot was that both of their schedules were purged on that date, the first day of classes, and they each got charged \$100 additional fee for having to go through this again. Now the Senator could understand the late fee if we were talking about adding a course and it was the second week or the third week of school, but this was the first day of classes. He did not know how long that policy of charging \$100 for doing this had been in effect, but that seemed a little high to him.

Vice President Ray replied that they would take a look at that and, if in fact, that was what had transpired, it should not have occurred.

Senator W. Yoder then added that, if the error had been made by the advisor, the advisor could have that fee waived. Therefore, he did not think it a significant issue.

Senator Lenavitt stated that this report appeared to really focus on what our mission was, which was our students. How did we recruit our students, how did we create and deliver creative programs? We needed help. Courses had to be taught; summer programs needed to happen. We needed help with having a creative, prosperous and energetic summer program, and we needed help to do that. He knew our faculty could attract students at the high school level as they were getting ready to graduate.

Vice President Ray replied that we would do all we could.

Senator Erickson noted that in the report it said there was an assessment of the student registration process underway. She hoped that that process included talking to students and getting their input. She wanted to remind Vice President Ray that the communication audit that was done across campus was done in May; students were not able to participate. If there was any group that we really needed communication from it was our clients, our students. She strongly recommended that any of these things be extended. There had been a lot of problems; she had heard how painful that Mon. and Tues. were. She also had heard how staff under a lot of stress got pretty testy. That should go out as an apology at least to our students, that we were sorry. It was going to be better in summer, but let's have an apology to the people who really needed to have had that kind of communication.

Vice President Ray replied that the best thing we could do was to make sure we paid attention to how we improved the process so we did not run into these kinds of problems. Unfortunately, and a lot of this had to do with the fact that people waited till the very last minute to pay, we were going to

develop an incentive program to try to encourage the students/parents to pay earlier, and would roll that out in a couple of months.

Senator Jorgensen then addressed the vice president, stating she had a positive note for everybody. A couple of weeks ago she had awoke at her usual 5 a.m. time to hear WAKR say that Kent State had had an increase of 14% in their applicants. Could we put ours on the airwaves, because we needed to. We had beaten Kent. When she had gotten to school that day and went on research's web pg., we had been up more than Kent. This was something that needed to be very positive. The other point was, we lost a size of our population to the 2-year institution. Right now, she was having request upon request of, "Where could I go this summer to do a lot of my courses at a 2-year institution," no. 1, because of the cost factor. She thought that we had to be demonstrative when we were talking with students, to empathize with them but also to encourage them to remain at The University of Akron for their course work. She encouraged faculty to take a stand for that also.

Senator Konet had a couple of questions about the dropped students. First of all, were the students notified in any way that they were going to be dropped? She had seen a fair number of them and when she showed them their class schedules, they were stunned. She realized that students did not always read everything we gave them, but she was curious as to whether or not they were notified.

Vice President Ray replied that the students were notified twice about the drop, in some cases more than that. We had made a special effort last semester where we called everybody. Every student was called before they were dropped. He wanted to collect every dime he could, so he did not want to drop anybody.

Senator Konet continued, stating that students had come to her area to take their tests and realized they could not take their tests because they were not enrolled. Many of them went back to the Registrar's office and took care of that. So, did these numbers reflect the people who did re-enroll? Are these the final numbers after they re-enrolled this past week?

Vice President Ray replied that that was correct. He thought around 900 were actually dropped and about half re-enrolled.

Senator Sterns then stated that he understood another issue was that after a specific date people had to print their own bills because no bills were going to be sent. He guessed that also had caused difficulty. Was the Vice President also aware of that?

Vice President Ray replied that we had been trying to get away from printing bills because they were available on the website. One problem we ran into was that a student on average changed classes at least 7 times; many did so more than that. So every time a bill got sent out, until the eighth bill, it was not correct. So the easiest and most efficient way to do it was to do it on the web.

Senator W.Yoder had a question about the enrollment figures. As he had read this, there was a decline in the number of transfer students and adult students. If freshman enrollment was up 855 and overall applications were only up 823, that would suggest that there was a dropoff in transfer and adult students that had applied?

Vice President Ray replied that he could not analyze that for the Senator; he did not know.

Senator W.Yoder added that perhaps additional work needed to be done with the 2-year colleges. To which Vice President Ray replied that it was a potential; from these number he did not think we could extrapolate that information.

Senator W.Yoder then had a second question. Over the past three years we had played with enrollment numbers, looking at not doing the drop or the dump. Would we not be able to get a fairly accurate figure if we looked at the number of students at the end of the term rather than at the beginning? We might have a better sense of what had happened over the past two years.

Vice President Ray replied that we could do that but there still has been no drop, so those students may or may not be actual numbers. He carried heart paddles with him because he thought those numbers the last three years were not accurate, and he did not want to comment any further than that.

Senator W. Yoder then stated he had noticed also that the report's 421 number was probably a little bit high, because he knew there were at least 4 or 5 that had come through his office that had registered as of today.

Vice President Ray replied that if they had to get everybody's signoff, those numbers would not be reflected here.

Senator Mann then addressed Vice President Ray and his statement that he had mentioned that he had contacted the students twice before they were dropped. The Senator was curious to know in what manner - was it simply by emails?

Vice President Ray replied that the email was there, and as he understood it, they were contacted either by someone in the college or by someone in the registration office, or it could have been from both places.

Senator Mann then stated he would like to make the recommendation to the Vice President that the administration make it a policy to at least give a phone call to these students before dropping them. There was mention earlier that the email went out to The University of Akron email site because we had had no other list, but he also understood that many of our students did not actually use their Univ. of Akron email site. Granted, we could argue back and forth that they should, but it was a question of whether they did. As far as the enrollment issues, one of the best ways to lose students, rule no. 1, would be to charge them fees they felt were extraordinary, uncalled for. This \$100 fee charged after the first day, whether it was their own or someone else's fault, if it was something that would annoy or upset a student, that was something that would cause them to drop a course. If they had to run back and forth trying to find counselors, making long trips over to the financial aid office, those were things that would cause students to not want to be here.

Vice President Ray stated that he could not agree with the Senator more. We were going to try to improve how we served the students at the point that they pay. We wanted them to pay, but we wanted them to be happy that they were paying.

Senator Clark then offered one more variation. Where students had been dropped from classes on the purge because something had not come through with their financial aid which they had not known about, they were dropped from classes and then found they were unable to get the classes. In that case it was not really on the students' heads and yet they were hurt.

Vice President Ray replied that we were going to try to work out some of these rough edges.

Senator Jorgensen then offered a response to Senator W. Yoder. The College of Business went out actively with the Office of Admissions to recruit transfer and adult students. We visited all the 2-year institutions with them. It was not so much as it was not an active increase on their part; it went back to that same old scenario – they were going to stay at that 2-yr. institution just as long as they could until we raised the requirement. We only required 32 hrs. at The University of Akron to get a degree, so they were staying put as long as they could at that 2-yr. institution.

Senator Kennedy then stated she wished to follow up on what Senator Jorgensen had said. If the cost factor was excused for just a moment, if students really wanted to go to a 2-yr. college, Senators could send them to the Community & Technical College here.

Chair Sheffer called for further questions of Vice President Ray. The Chair then stated that he had one request, which was that the Student Affairs Committee be involved in this assessment of the student registration process if they were not currently involved in that.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - See **Appendix E**.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - See **Appendix F** for Curriculum Proposals.

NCAA FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE - See **Appendix G**.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - 2004 Summer Fellowships (**Appendix H**).

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE - Senator Norfolk presented the good news first. If faculty had a laptop in the laptop program, it would be taken away in the middle of May. That was the good news. The promo was expiring on Sept. 30, and the machines had to be boxed and gone at that time. The current estimate we had from IBM was

\$500 per machine...(He was then corrected by another Senator) that it was \$800 for the T-23, which meant he doubted anyone wanted to buy those. The IT shop was going to help people migrate their data from an old machine to a mythical new machine. Right now we were working on specifications for the machines. As part of that process we were trying to find out what people needed, not what they wanted but what they needed. There was a very short survey put together by Jim Lenavitt, which he had asked Marilyn to forward to all Senators. Would all please forward it to as many faculty as possible so that we could have as much response as possible back by next Friday. Senator Norfolk asked Senators to please forward that information to him so that bids could go out and faculty would not be machine-less by the middle of summer.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING - Senator Clark began her report by referring Senators to the handout provided (**Appendix I**). The handout contained a description of the Senate Ad hoc Committee on University Planning. What Senators had was the initial vision, the mission of how this might function. She would like to say that its intention was to facilitate communication between the administration and the University community on planning matters. In particular, the committee would serve as a non-exclusive conduit for questions, suggestions, and input regarding University planning as set by the administration. In turn, the committee would help pass along and disseminate any information disclosed by the administration in response to the questions, suggestions and input. The committee might make recommendations and/or submit resolutions to the Senate regarding the University planning matters, and in this way the committee would supplement the University's efforts to communicate with the University community on important matters of general public concern. Some areas of concern might include academic program review, Balanced Scorecard initiatives, and strategic planning. The initial organizing members listed were people who had worked on PBC and particularly related to some of the quality measures and Balanced Scorecard, but the committee was open to others who might wish to join.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY BUDGETING - Senator Fenwick stated that his report read much like Senator Clark's, only his dealt with budgeting. The ad hoc committee had met twice now and put the mission statement that was sent out by listserv this morning; he had handouts as well (**Appendix J**). Again, as with the Planning Committee, this committee's purpose was to facilitate communication on budgetary issues. There also was a second document sent out by listserv. That was our initial set of questions we wanted the administration to address. That had to do primarily with the process of budgeting rather than specific dollar amounts or particular units. He asked that Senators take some time and look at these documents, especially the questions, and get back to the committee. Senators could email him or any of the other committee members that were listed.

Senator Witt had a question for Senator Fenwick. He wondered whether these two ad hoc committees had anything to do with the Operating Advisory Committee that Provost Stroble had mentioned.

To which, Chair Sheffer replied that it appeared to him that there were some of the same members on both of these particular committees.

Senator Braun then had a question for the Chair which actually referred back to these committees. He stated that all these committees had spend a lot of time to make decisions, analyze situations, and so forth. What was going to be their weight on the University business? We knew the weight on University business in PBC; the Chair had organized all these committees and they should exist. He was not arguing against their existence, but that they should exist and have some power. So could either Senator Fenwick or Senator Clark comment on that?

Senator Fenwick replied that his understanding was explicitly that we were not involved in the decision making process. We were to facilitate the communication between the administration, faculty, staff, students, retirees, but we had no decision making power.

Senator Braun then replied that this was just like before.

VI. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Lyons stated he might need some help from the parliamentarian, but he wished to request, if the body agreed, a written response to his request to the President before our special session.

Chair Sheffer then asked whether Senator Lyons were making a motion. Senator Lyons replied that he assumed that that was the motion, that he would like to have in writing a response from the President to his request before our special session, and he moved that the Senate charge the Executive Committee with this task. Specifically, that the body charge the Executive Committee with the task of requesting President Proenza to respond in writing to the request he had made earlier that the President instruct his negotiating team to accept binding arbitration if a contract was not negotiated after 12 months, and to get that response in writing before our special session.

Senator Mann seconded Senator Lyons request. The Chair then called for discussion of the motion. Senator Gerlach then pointed out that Senator Lyons had said twelve months, but from what date? Senator Lyons replied that SERB had a legal date for the beginning of negotiations, and it would be 12 months of negotiations.

Senator Hebert replied that they had filed October 21. Chair Sheffer then stated it would be 12 months from October 21.

Senator Kennedy stated that she needed some clarification on this because she was not one of the bargaining unit members. Binding arbitration – had the President not said he wanted to find out what that was? So we were going to ask him to do something and we did not know what it was?

Senator Hebert replied that the President knew what it was. To which, Senator Kennedy replied that she did not.

Senator Lyons stated that the President had responded that he was going to look into the issue and if appropriate, make those instructions. The Senator was asking that the President respond in writing that he had looked into it and here was what he had decided to do.

Senator Hebert then stated he would like to speak strongly for that motion. As he had mentioned in his previous remarks, there were many things that the President did not have control over regarding the atmosphere at this University, but the one thing he did have control over was getting these negotiations done timely. We were in a situation now where the administration had chosen an adversarial, high-cost, long-term approach. We needed them to turn that around and take a look at negotiating on a low-cost and short-term position, and we needed that commitment to get going.

Senator Covrig then stated he wished to speak in favor of the motion as well. He did think that the President needed to show some strong leadership here and he had not. Somebody else was leading him, and he needed to show leadership. The only thing the Senator did not like about this was why the Executive Committee needed to make this decision, as the body just voted for response from him?

Chair Sheffer stated that he believed the motion was charging the Executive Committee to write that

request formally. No further discussion forthcoming, the Chair then called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously, without dissent.

Senator Lenavitt then called for a point of clarification. The Senate had responded to the Chair's non-binding straw poll. When the body met on the 19th, were we meeting to see and review what the President responded to with regard to those questions, as perhaps we were talking about two different issues? One had to do with the business of having to comply to standards that had to do with our promotion, our retention, conflict of interest. It was unconscionable that we could be held to a standard, and then we had the issues regarding our governance.

Chair Sheffer replied that a straw vote was non-binding, something that the Executive Committee wanted in order to find out what the general feeling was at this particular point, whether we wanted to do something immediately. Were people interested in an action of some form, some sort of motion; were they interested, not interested, or interested doing this after finding out responses to the questions that the Executive Committee had asked the President?

Senator Lenavitt did not see why that could not be part of that special session to basically address the concerns that were brought up in the OIG Report and what was going to happen as a result of that. The Chair stated that if Senators would take time and read the Provost's report, they would see some response.

Senator Gerlach mentioned that he had the Executive Committee's letter to the President, but not the President's response, to which Chair Sheffer replied that someone would send him a copy. There also was a survey sent via email in which the chair had listed possible actions to take, to which Senator Gerlach replied that he would not get email and did not need Spam.

Senator Mann then stated that he had been thinking deeply about the audit from the Auditor of State Betty Montgomery. It seemed as though President Proenza had gone out of his way to state that it was specifically focused on the things already raised. The Senator did not see any purpose behind investigating something that had already been investigated twice by top investigators in the state. Senator Mann stated that he could not understand what anyone hoped to uncover that had not already been uncovered. Therefore, he had taken it upon himself as a student here to send a letter to Betty Montgomery requesting that the audit not be limited to only those incidents, but that she consider making it a full audit across-the-board. He would encourage the Faculty Senate to consider taking similar action if things did not go as Faculty Senate as a whole would desire, that that might be one possible option of recourse.

Chair Sheffer then called for a motion to adjourn. Senator Norfolk made the motion, which was seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin

APPENDIX A

January 13, 2004

TO: Associate Provost Nancy Stokes

FROM: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Marilyn Quillin, Administrative Assistant

REQUEST: Request for space proposal

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I would like to request space for the Office of the Faculty Senate in Leigh Hall, 5th floor, consisting of approximately 800 sq. ft. total. Individual rooms to be in these “approximate” measurements (our space at this time):

Senate chairperson’s office space: 8 x 16
Administrative assistant/reception area: 8 x 24
Conference room: 12 x 24

If this proposal is in order, please send the necessary space request forms to Marilyn Quillin (+4910), and thank you for your consideration.

mq

APPENDIX B

December 8, 2003

Mr. B. Robert Kreiser
Associate Secretary
American Association of University Professors
1012 Fourteenth St. NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005-3465

Thank you, Mr. Kreiser . . .

. . . for your letter of December 1, 2003, seeking the administrative perspective on governance at The University of Akron. I am sorry that I did not respond sooner, but I understood your letter of October 29 as inviting comment at my discretion rather than requiring an immediate response. I have given considerable reflection to your concerns, and I want to ensure that my administration continues to support collegial academic governance at our University and to demonstrate that commitment.

In response to faculty concerns about the effectiveness of existing faculty/administration relationships, especially in the area of decision-making, Provost Beth Stroble and I partnered with Faculty Senate to create a joint task force to analyze decision-making entities and functions at The University of Akron and to review potentially instructive best practices. After hearing faculty concerns about communication on campus, I commissioned an internal communications audit and subsequently have solicited faculty and staff reaction to the resultant findings and recommendations, which we will begin to implement during this academic year. In short, there are positive signs of good faith actions by my administration to enhance faculty involvement.

Please be assured that the matters raised in your letter can, and should, be addressed by both parties through the collective bargaining process in a manner that is consistent with their respective duties to bargain in good faith toward an agreement. I strongly believe that shared collegial academic governance and collective bargaining can co-exist on our campus, and I remain committed to working with faculty and staff in practicing shared leadership at The University of Akron.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

Luis M. Proenza

APPENDIX E

REPORT OF WELLBEING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY SENATE FEBRUARY 5TH ,2004

The Wellbeing Committee met on February 2nd The major topics of discussion are outlined below.

New Health Insurance experience

The Chair asked Committee members to ask their constituents for their initial experiences with the new vendors for health insurance. Some people had had negative experiences with their pharmaceutical benefits, but more information needed to be collected. All those using the new pharmaceutical benefits vendor need to know that the old provider does not have an obligation to provide old prescriptions with multiple fillings to the new provider. You will need to get new prescriptions.

Further information on the coverage chosen by employees would be provided at the next meeting.

It was noted that the new dental plan includes a card for dental insurance. Employees have been sent these cards, but may still not be aware of the need to use them. The dental claim form for the new coverage on the provider's web site is not the one we need to use: contact HR to obtain the correct form.

Issues relating to Retirees

Linda Sugarman brought to the Committee several issues relating to retirees:

- a. that retirees could not use the University Computer store
- b. that retirees could not get the Roadrunner discount
- c. that retirees were not included in the electronic directory of the University

After discussion, it was agreed that Ms Sugarman should followup on these issues with the administration and report back to the Committee.

Reports of Subcommittees

Wellness and Child care: The Chair is inviting Brian Lewis, Director of the new Recreation Center to the next meeting of Wellbeing to discuss issues of Wellness facilities and drop-in child care.

Sick leave

Professor Newman reviewed with the Committee the key provisions of the sick-leave-bank plans in place at Toledo, NEOUCOM and Kent State.

Respectfully submitted

Elizabeth Erickson,
Chair, Wellbeing Committee

APPENDIX F

Proposals Approved By Provost To Faculty Senate February 2004

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-04-05	Philosophy	New course: 3600:201 Philosophy of World Religions
AS-04-08	Environmental Studies	Remove pre-req for admission to certificate program
AS-04-09	Biology	New course: 3100:180 BS/MD Orientation
AS-04-29	Biology	Remove pre-req for 3100:120
AS-04-33	ELI	Create departmental number 3030
AS-04-40	English	New course: 3300:381 Creative Nonfiction
AS-04-53	Sociology	New course number: 3850:304 Social Problems
AS-04-54	Geography	Change degree title to BS in Geography: Geographic Information Sciences (submit to OBR)
AS-04-61	Geology	New course: 3370:496 Geology Service Learning
AS-04-72	Math	Change in pre-req for 3450:221

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
BA-04-21	Management	Deletion of Production & Operations Mgt-Option A
BA-04-22	Management	Deletion of Production & Operations Mgt-Option B
BA-04-23	Management	Change program name to Supply Chain/Operations Management Minor
BA-04-24	Management	Change pre-req for 6500:324 Data Mgt for Info Systems
BA-04-25	Management	Change pre-req for 6500:325 Analysis, Design, and Development of Information Systems
BA-04-26	Management	Change pre-req for 6500:471 Mgt Project
BA-04-27	Management	Change bulletin description 6500:221 QBA I
BA-04-28	Management	Change bulletin description 6500:222 QBA II
BA-04-29	General Business	Change program description; add required course 6100:100 Career Placement; add elective 6200:320 Accounting Info Systems
BA-04-32	Marketing	Delete 6600:485 Global Sales Strategy; change course description 6600:475 Business Negotiation and 6600:480 Sales Management
BA-04-33	Marketing	Delete Global Selling Minor
BA-04-34	Marketing	Delete Global Selling Certificate
BA-04-35	Marketing	Delete 6600:485 as elective from Professional Selling Certificate
BA-04-36	Marketing	Delete 6600:485 as elective from International Business Certificate

BA-04-37	Marketing	Delete 6600:485 as elective from Professional Selling Minor
BA-04-38	Marketing	Delete 6600:400 E-Marketing Promotions as elective from Consumer Marketing Minor
BA-04-39	Marketing	Delete 6600:485 as elective from International Business Major
BA-04-40	Marketing	Delete E-Marketing Minor
BA-04-44	Marketing	Revamp E-Marketing and Advertising Program including addition of 4 new courses: 6600:380 Direct Interactive Marketing ; 6600:435 Marketing Analytics Laboratory ; 6600:445 Creative Marketing Laboratory ; 6600:492 Direct Interactive Marketing Practicum
BA-04-47	Accounting	Discontinue admission to undergraduate AIS Program
BA-04-49	Accounting	Name change 6200:201
BA-04-51	Accounting	Name change 6200:202

Community and Technical College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT0408	Associate Studies	Restructuring of 2030:152 Elements of Math II
CT-04-09	Associate Studies	Addition of Matrices to 2030:153 Elements of Math III
CT-04-15	Allied Health	Degree and program name change (requires OBR approval)

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-04-01	Sports Science and Wellness	Suspend admission to Health Education program
ED-04-02	Sport Science and Wellness	Suspend admission to Outdoor Education program
ED-04-03	Sport Science and Wellness	Suspend admission to School Nurse program
ED-04-04	Sport Science and Wellness	Suspend admission to Community Health program
ED-04-06	Ed. Foundation and Leadership	Add prereq Passage of Administrative Licensure exam to 5170:795/796 for Principalship concentration
ED-04-08	Ed. Foundation and Leadership	Add prereq Passage of Administrative Licensure exam to 5170:795/796 for Superintendency concentration
ED-04-09	Ed. Foundation and Leadership	Add prereq Passage of Administrative Licensure exam to 5170:795/796 for CIPD concentration

ED-04-10	Ed. Foundation and Leadership	Add prereq Passage of Administrative Licensure exam to 5170:795/796 for Pupil Services concentration
ED-04-11	Ed. Foundation and Leadership	Add prereq Passage of Administrative Licensure exam to 5170:795/796 for Educational Research concentration
ED-04-12	Ed. Foundation and Leadership	Add prereq Passage of Administrative Licensure exam to 5170:795/796 for Staff Personnel concentration
ED-04-13	Curriculum and Instruction	Delete prereq from 5500:625 Contemporary Issues in Reading Instruction
ED-04-14	Curriculum and Instruction	Delete prereq for 5500:524 Teaching Reading to Culturally Diverse Learners
ED-04-21	Ed Foundation and Leadership	Change in mode of delivery 5170:590

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
EN-04-11	Eng PhD	Add 4100:697 Engineering Management Report

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-04-04	Art	Course number change
FAA-04-05	Art	Change prereq 7100:281 Web Page Design
FAA-04-06	Art	Course number and title change: Fundamental of Photography
FAA-04-08	Art	Change prereq 7100:479 Professional Photographic Practices
FAA-04-23	FCS	Add non-thesis option to Master's Degree in Family and Consumer Sciences - Child Life Option
FAA-04-29	FCS	Change admission and graduation GPA requirement to 2.5
FAA-04-31	SLPA	Change in course title
FAA-04-32	SLPA	Makes 7700:731 Seminar: Clinical Externship repeatable to 6 credits
FAA-02-33	SLPA	Change in # credits 7700:747 Graduate Audiologist I
FAA-04-35	SLPA	Change in course title 7700:751
FAA-04-36	Art	Reduce maximum number of allowable credits for 7100:496 Internship in Art
FAA-04-37	Art	Change in pre-req for 7100:467 Metalsmithing Portfolio Review
FAA-04-38	Art	Change in pre-req; add co-req for 7100:420 Sculpture

		Portfolio Review
FAA-04-39	Art	Delete 2 pre-reqs from 7100:323 Lost Wax Casting
FAA-04-41	Art	Restructuring BFA Painting and Drawing program
FAA-04-42	Art	Change course title, description and pre-reqs for 7100:450 Advanced Life Drawing
FAA-04-43	Art	Restructuring BFA Sculpture program
FAA-04-46	Art	Change pre-reqs for 7100:455 Advanced Painting and Drawing
FAA-04-47	Art	Change course title 7100:250
FAA-04-48	Art	Delete 7100:349 Intermediate Drawing
FAA-04-50	Art	Change pre-reqs for 7100:348 Intermediate Painting
FAA-04-51	Art	Change course title and description 7100:246
FAA-04-57	SLPA	Delete 7700:241 and 7700:340; Add 7700:235 Introduction to Audiology
FAA-04-58	SLPA	Course title change 7700:240
FAA-04-59	SLPA	Change # credits for 7700:250 Observation and Clinical Methods
FAA-04-61	SLPA	Delete 7700:350 and 7700:351
FAA-04-64	FCS	Restructuring Bachelor of Arts in Fashion Merchandising Program
FAA-04-65	FCS	New course 7400:422 Textiles for Interiors
FAA-04-66	FCS	Change title and description 7400:226
FAA-04-67	FCS	Title change 7400:425

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title

APPENDIX G

Report of NCAA Faculty Representative

To: Faculty Senate
FROM: J. Dean Carro

As you know, our new Head Football Coach, J.D. Brookhart, has hired his assistants and they are all out on the road recruiting new student-athletes. The NCAA has revised its format for its on-site visits, and accordingly has changed the date for our visit. Our NCAA on-site visit is scheduled for May/June 2005. The steering committee has been selected and is chaired by Dr. Karla Mugler. Our self-study will be due the beginning of 2005. In an effort to have as open a process as possible, our self-study information will be available to the University community on the internet. The members of the committee look forward to working with the faculty and staff to gather the information needed to complete the report.

Description of Senate Ad Hoc Committee on University Planning:

The Ad Hoc Committee on University planning will facilitate communication between the Administration and the University community on planning matters. In particular, the Committee will serve as a nonexclusive conduit for questions, suggestions or other input regarding university planning as set by the Administration. In turn, the Committee would help pass along and disseminate any information disclosed by the Administration in response to these questions, suggestions, and input. The Committee may make recommendations and/or submit resolutions to the Senate regarding University planning matters. In this way, the Committee will supplement the University's efforts to communicate with the University community on important matters of general public concern.

Areas of concern may include: Academic program review, Balanced Scorecard initiatives, and Strategic Planning.

Organizing Members:

Kate Clark, Senator, College of Fine & Applied Arts (Chair)

Francis Broadway, Senator, College of Education

Aimee DeChambeau, Senator, University Libraries

Mary Helen Kreidler, Senator, College of Nursing

Others may be invited to join.

**FACULTY SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE (FSBC)
MISSION STATEMENT**

The purpose of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (FSBC) is to provide a means by which members of the University community represented within Faculty Senate, including faculty, staff, students, and retirees, may voice questions, share knowledge, and provide constructive feedback to those responsible for establishing and monitoring University financial direction and performance. It is imperative that a state assisted institution hear and consider the concerns and best thinking of all constituents. The FSBC will function as a facilitator for this communication to take place, and will endeavor to act in all ways as a beneficial agent for the Faculty Senate, for the University of Akron (UA).

Edward J. Conrad, Rudy Fenwick, Elizabeth A. Kennedy, Brant T. Lee, Richard M. Maringer

Brief report for the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Budget Committee

The Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Budget Committee met twice, on January 22, and February 4, 2004. The committee developed a mission statement and initial list of questions to the Administration regarding the University's budgeting process. Those in attendance were: Edward Conrad, College of Business Administration, Rudy Fenwick, Arts and Sciences, Elizabeth Kennedy, Community & Technical College, Brant T. Lee, School of Law, and Richard M. Maringer, Wayne College.

Respectfully submitted,
Rudy Fenwick (Chair)

APPENDIX C

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

February 5, 2004

BY PROVOST STROBLE

I am not able to join you for today's meeting because my attendance is required at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE). The AACTE nominating committee has requested that I serve a three-year term on the Board of Directors; that necessitates my attendance at meetings that began at noon yesterday in Chicago. Please accept this report in lieu of my presence with you.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. CHAND MIDHA AS ASSOCIATE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Chand Midha as Associate Provost for Academic and Financial Affairs in addition to his duties as Chair of the Department of Statistics and Director of the Center for Statistical Consulting.

Dr. Midha's new responsibilities include:

- Conducting the review of academic and administrative programs
- Providing support for the Provost's Office with regard to collective bargaining
- Assisting with the launch of the University of Akron Summit County Community College
- Providing oversight for the University of Akron Press
- Assisting in the establishing of goals and priorities for the Office of the Provost
- Other duties as assigned, including the oversight of Institutional Research and the Data Warehouse and assistance with transition issues related to the ITS.

Please join me in welcoming him to this leadership role.

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON SUMMIT COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Attached to this report is the resolution approved by the Board of Trustees at their December 10, 2003 meeting. Their action directs the administration to conduct planning and take necessary actions to immediately conduct the appropriate academic and curricular planning as well as the financial, staffing, space and other related planning and to take the necessary actions, in order to effect the transition of the current Community and Technical College and the Division of Workforce Development and Continuing Education into the intended University of Akron Summit County Community College. First steps include the completion of the search for a new dean of the current Community and Technical College, including the Division of Workforce Development and Continuing Education. Because the search committee will soon review

applications, I hope to recommend appointment of this individual in the month of February.

Many questions about specific programs, policies related to students, coordination with other units on campus, etc. await answers until this planning process begins under the leadership of the new dean. I will ask the new dean to work with faculty, staff, and students in the Community and Technical College, the Division of Continuing Education and Workforce Development, and with broad-based campus groups such as the First Year Experience Task Force as well as with partners in business, industry, area schools, and community entities.

BALANCED SCORE CARD

I have requested that Associate Provost Nancy Stokes schedule meetings with Council of Deans, Vice Presidents, Core Team, Department Chairs and the former ROI/Quality Measures Workgroup to fine tune the proposed institutional targets and measures. I have requested that Senate Chair Sheffer work with me to schedule a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on this topic. We will then proceed to collaborate with Institutional Research to develop baseline data for this year and targets for the next three years at the institutional level before working with each unit to establish unit targets. In this process, we will refine and link ROI measures to the Balanced Score Card. As you may know, the staff members of Institutional Research have reported to the Office of the Provost since last fall. Staff from the Data Warehouse have now joined them. We are conducting a search for the Director of Institutional Research and hope to be fully staffed to meet campus needs by early summer. The staff in IR and the Data Warehouse report to Associate Provost Midha.

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL REPORT AND NCA REPORT

Both reports are now available to the campus community on the website and linked from both the President's and Provost's home pages.

ITS UPDATE

Recently the ITS areas have been reassigned to Vice President Ray and me to ensure smooth functioning and deliver of services for the campus community during this time of transition. These assignments were made:

Vice President Ray
Communication Services
Hardware Operations and Operating Systems Services
Enterprise Application Services

Provost Stroble
Learning Technologies and Scholar/Learning Services

Institutional Planning, Analysis, Reporting and Data Administration.

Within the Business and Finance division, Thomas Beitzl will serve as liaison to the VP and interim director of the ITS areas reporting to VP Ray. Within the Office of the Provost, Holly Harris Bane and Dr. Chand Midha will assist with transition areas pertaining to the ITS areas reporting to the Office of the Provost. Divisionwide ITS staff will continue to provide services for the entire ITS division.

It is important to recognize that, while the ITS divisions currently report to two different vice presidents, those groups will continue to work together to support the technology needs, services and mission of the whole University—both in the current interim organization and in whatever new structure may emerge in the future.

VP Ray and I are assisting President Proenza in establishing an ITS strategic planning team, which will include broad-based campus representation. The team will conduct a strategic analysis of reporting lines, organization, leadership, staffing and project priorities, and other related topics. Members of that strategic planning group will be named in the near future.

During this time of transition, we thank the ITS staff for their continued hard work, cooperation and dedication. We also want to thank the entire campus community for their patience and support.

ONGOING ISSUES

President Proenza charged VP Ray and me to review the financial issues raised by the IG report, particularly the details about the carryover funds in the VPCIO budget. He and I provided data in response to the letter from the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate. Further, President Proenza charged us to work with faculty and staff to review ways that any available funds should be allocated, if it were determined that funds were available for reallocation from the carryover balance.

Further, members of the Executive Committee have requested that the ad hoc Faculty Senate committees (budgeting, planning and facilities) be included as part of the “. . . appropriate faculty and staff representatives. . .” mentioned in President Proenza’s letter of January 19.

The President and I have conferred on this request. We sought assistance from Senate Chair Sheffer, Associate Provost Midha, and Vice President Ray. We also conferred with members of the administration bargaining committee and outside counsel since this is a topic closely associated with recent BOT changes in the rules and the pending unfair labor practice charge brought by the AAUP-Akron.

Additionally, my responsibility as Chief Operating Officer requires that I enlist the input and counsel of individuals with broad institutional perspectives as well as those with specific knowledge or expertise.

Accordingly, I propose to create an Operations Advisory Committee for the specific purpose of providing additional review related to the VPCIO carryover funds mentioned earlier; and, for the ongoing purpose of reviewing and reacting to operational issues, including budgetary issues, about which, from time to time, Vice President Ray or I may seek additional input. Individuals asked to serve on this committee will change depending upon the task or issues at hand.

Based upon advice of our labor counsel, we propose to invite participation on this committee from individuals who are not members of the faculty collective bargaining unit, although the majority of committee members will be individuals who also hold faculty rank .

Vice President Ray and I will convene the meetings during the spring semester.

Individuals currently invited to participate on the Operations Advisory Committee include:

Chand Midha
Dan Sheffer
Elizabeth Kennedy
Ed Conrad
Dick Aynes
Jack Kristofco
Rosemarie Konet
Dottie Schmith
Brian Davis/Amy Gilliland