

12-6-2001

Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting December 6, 2001

Elizabeth Kennedy
facultysenate@uakron.edu

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

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

Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Elizabeth. "Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting December 6, 2001." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 6 Dec 2001. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/135>

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 DECEMBER 6, 2001

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, December 6, 2001 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-two of the sixty-eight Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators K.Clark, Holz, Reed and Yoder were absent with notice. Senators Anderson, Broadway, Brouthers, Carri, Chafin, S.Clark, First, Louscher, Purdy, Trotter, and Turning were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

*** APPROVED MOTIONS FROM APCC:**

*** RULE 3359-20-03.7, NEW RTP RULE: "CHOOSE ONLY ONCE"**

*** RULE 3359-20-06.1, NEW RULE FOR PART-TIME FACULTY:
"COUNTING SEMESTERS OF TEACHING"**

*** CALENDAR CHANGES**

*** RULE 3359-20-03, THE FACULTY GENERAL PERSONNEL
POLICIES: DEFINITION OF INSTRUCTOR**

*** DRAFTED NEW RULE TO CREATE NEW TITLE OF COLLEGE
LECTURER**

*** APPROVED AMENDMENT OF SENATE BYLAW 3359-10-02(H)(f)
REGARDING THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
RETIREES AS FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVES**

*** APPROVED AMENDMENT TO SENATE BYLAW 3359-10-
02(H)(6)(a)(ii) REGRADING ELECTIONS OF SENATORS BY
SECRET MAIL OR ELECTRONIC BALLOT**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Qammar made this motion; Senator Lyons seconded it. The body then voted its approval of the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2001 - Chair Sheffer then began consideration of the minutes of the meetings of Oct. 4 and Nov. 1, 2001, and called for any revisions or changes to those minutes. Secretary Kennedy stated that there was one correction to the minutes of November 1, on page 22 of the Chronicle. A word was inadvertently left out of the last sentence in the second to last paragraph on that page. It states, "Chair Sheffer then stated that the body would come back and () this amendment." The word "consider" was left out.

No other revisions or corrections forthcoming, Senator Gunn moved that the minutes be approved. Senator Buckenmeyer seconded her motion. The body then voted its approval of the minutes.

III. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS - The Chair began his remarks by pointing out that all had made it to the end of the semester. We still had finals coming up, and he certainly wished all a restful

time, if that were manageable. He thought a number of the committees and so forth would be busy throughout the break, but he hoped that everyone had a very nice holiday season.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chair recognized a new Senator, Cheryl Garcia, who was the SEAC representative and would fill the unexpired term of Holly Mothes. The Senate then welcomed Senator Garcia. Chair Sheffer also stated that just prior to this meeting, a representative from the Alumni Association had dropped off nomination forms for Outstanding Teacher and Teacher Scholar Awards, in hopes that all in the Senate would take these and perhaps consider nominating someone for one of these awards. If Senators would be sure to pick one up on their way out, that would be appreciated.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met three times since the last regular Faculty Senate meeting of November 1 - twice with Executive Committee members only, and once with President Proenza, Provost Hickey and Mrs. Herrstein. At the November 12 meeting we discussed budget issues related to the department of communications and spent some time talking about some of those issues. At the 28th meeting we discussed with the President and Provost some of those issues again. We also discussed with the President some of the issues he was going to present to the Board of Trustees at their next meeting. We also asked about the Academic Plan and where the University stood in terms of developing one. She believed that Provost Hickey would address that for us today. We also talked briefly about some other budget issues related to the ROI allocation model and when that might be implemented.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - Chair Sheffer stated that President Proenza had taken ill and was unable to attend today's meeting.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Chair Sheffer the invited Provost Hickey to address the body:
"The President sends his regrets, but he was not looking that good when I left him a little while ago, so I think he's going to try to go home and recover from whatever it is because he obviously has a busy time coming up.

Two topics I want to talk about today, the first one being the relationship between the Balanced Scorecard and the Academic Plan, because I think there is some confusion there. And then in the end I will just mention the ROI implementation because I'm also fairly certain that there is some confusion around that as well.

The Balanced Scorecard planning process is in large part a reality-based data collection and prioritization process. The core team that has been assembled to do the data collection is not deciding what the Academic Plan of the University is. I think that has been one misconception along the way. The way I tend to think about the core team is as a court reporter, but you know a court reporter simply writes down everything that is said in the court and produces a transcript. The core team is collecting information from a wide variety of sources - I think 34 or 35 groups or individuals in the core team has now met. But the core team has another responsibility and that is to try to link together all of the things that are heard. So whereas a court reporter would just write it down, the core team is writing it down but then they're meeting to try to link together all of the ideas that they've heard in some logical sequence of events. Now they're not adding their personal views to this; they're not deciding that what we heard here was right and what we heard here was wrong. But rather, they're simply trying to put down everything that they've heard, but put it in a way that makes sense and is logical.

Then the process that they use in creating a Balanced Scorecard flow sheet they will then bring to the group that has had some Balanced Scorecard training back in the fall, 30 or 40 different individuals including the Chair of the Senate and a variety of other individuals. They will do that on the 18th of December and the purpose of that meeting is to in effect say, this is what we think we heard and this is how we think it lines up in a logical consequences way. Now what do you think as a group, do you think this is correct? Is this what you think that we heard, is this what you heard in the group you were in? Out of this hopefully will come a single Balanced Scorecard, at least another draft of it that will lay out the priorities of the institution and help the institution determine and clarify what we are going to be and what we are not going to be.

One of the concerns that I've heard with regard to Charting the Course is that people are having a little bit of difficulty understanding where they or their unit fits with regard to Charting the Course, and they need some more concrete examples. In many ways the Balanced Scorecard initiative is designed to operationalize Charting the Course so that it will actually give you in some very clear terms what we need to do in order to accomplish some of the goals, strategies of Charting the Course. So I think the output of the Balanced Scorecard process which I fully expect to be in our hands by the end of January will then allow us to take the next step.

That next step is a formal Academic Strategic Planning process that will very much involve the deans, the Planning and Budgeting Committee, and the Faculty Senate. It will be a more traditional academic planning process, but a very focused one. One of the problems that I have encountered with academic strategic planning processes is that they start out claiming that we are not going to be everything to everybody and then they end up being everything to everybody. So 12 or 18 months later everyone emerges exhausted from this process and has produced a document that is virtually impossible to fulfill given the fiscal resources. Balanced Scorecard really requires you to say how are you going to pay for this? In most academic strategic plans where it says fiscal implications, 80% of the numbers in those columns will be zero. They claim there are no fiscal implications; there are of course always fiscal implications and so that retards or prevents the actual implementation of the Academic Plan.

The Academic Plan will build on the priorities, the goals established in the Charting the Course and the Balanced Scorecard process, and then will provide a very focused Academic Strategic Planning process that I think can occur by the end of Spring semester, at least that's my goal. So we will go through the Summer and enter next Fall with a very clear plan and budget allocations tied to what comes out of the combination of the Balanced Scorecard and Academic Strategic Plan. So the two link together, and I think they do so in a way that will allow us to end up with a very reality-based and focused Academic Strategic Plan. So let me stop there before I go on to the ROI, and see whether there are any questions I can address with regard to either the Balanced Scorecard or the Academic Strategic Plan.

The Return on Investment model was approved and accepted by the Board of Trustees at their meeting yesterday. Now I was specifically requested by many members of the Planning and Budgeting Committee to get Board approval for the Return on Investment model. The concern was after all of this effort that somebody could come along and unilaterally decide we were no longer going to use this model, and therefore, if it had Board approval it was more difficult to unravel. That's certainly true, and I explained that to the Board members and they were very eager to approve the model; they did approve the model.

Now the concern seems to be at what pace does this get implemented? Let me remind you right now, as some of you may not know. Those of us who have been working on this for a year and a half assume that everyone knows all of the details. The Return on Investment model has two components. Half of the new tuition revenue generated is allocated based on credit hour production; that's only half. The other half is allocated based on quality initiatives and new investment strategies that hold promise for bringing additional resources to the University. The PBC has just begun the process to define what those quality measures are and what criteria will be used in assessing them and in assessing requests for additional resources based on investments, i.e., we think the following program will meet real student demand and can be a very productive and popular program for the University and we need \$80,000 to start it off. Obviously, a much more expanded version of that would be the kind of new initiative proposal that would come forward to the PBC for evaluation for investment of quality dollars. So there is ample opportunity for units to participate in the revenue stream coming from credit hour production and the revenue stream coming from the quality new investment side of the formula.

Some units will be able to capture relatively more money out of credit hour production than others - others are probably going to have better fortune accessing the money in the quality new investment side of the formula. I have asked the PBC to have in place the quality measures such that they have passed all necessary hurdles and approvals by the time we get to the end of the Spring semester. Now I really said I need them by the end of June, because I want to be able to use the combined ROI, the total ROI, in the allocation of resources for the next fiscal year. But knowing that I may be working on it by myself during the month of June, I think it is best to try to get all the information in and the approvals by the end of the Spring semester. So that is the process on ROI.

So those of you, or those of your colleagues who think the sky is going to fall at the start of Spring semester, you need not be concerned. We're not going to implement sort of a half-completed ROI in such a way that a unit loses because it doesn't have credit hour production and doesn't have an opportunity to compete for the quality money because there are no criteria in place. Obviously, the biggest impact, the first real big impact of the ROI will occur with the allocation of the 2002-2003 academic budget. I would remind you too, that all aspects of the ROI phase in over a 5-year period of time, so the amount of money to be moved, only 10% of that money, will be moved in year one. Openly, 50% of the tuition dollars will be allocated based on credit hour production, and 50% will be allocated based on these quality and investment measures. In year one only 10% will be allocated based on credit hour production, and 10% will be allocated based on these other quality measures. That allows us to keep the subsidy pool, the cross subsidy pool, and gradually decrease the cross subsidy pool, because once it is in place completely there will be very few dollars within the institution to cross subsidize outside of these processes that are built into the ROI model."

The Provost then asked whether there were any questions about the ROI model.

Senator Hoo Fatt stated that she had a question. The Provost has said that the Board of Trustees had approved and accepted the model - was that the same model shown to Senate? The Provost indicated that it was. Senator Hoo Fatt continued, saying that it had seemed when the Provost had shown Senate that model that he was not certain about certain numbers. He had had two columns and it was more or less unfinished. The quality part of it was unfinished also. Provost Hickey replied that the quality part was unfinished, there was no question about that. Senator Hoo Fatt then asked whether the Board had approved the idea of having an ROI or had they approved the model concept?

Provost Hickey then pointed out that the resolution of the Senate was that the ROI approach would be annually reviewed by the PBC, and tweaked based on experience. So what the Board approved was the implementation of the ROI model. The ROI model would drive the budget allocations of the University. So it approved what came to this group. It certainly didn't approve the details. One of the different numbers that Senator Hoo Fatt was talking about really depended on whether you put the fringe benefit cost of faculty into the colleges themselves or you left them as being covered by the institutions as a whole. If you put them into the individual colleges, then you drove down the ROI's of each of the colleges because they had greater resources and their revenues did not go up. For this first go-around what we had decided to do was to leave the fringe benefit costs as being paid centrally and not folding them into the budgets of the colleges. This meant that relatively more colleges were nearer the 1.7 ROI figure.

Senator Hoo Fatt had another question. What were the responses from the Board of Trustees when the Provost showed them the very low ROI for Polymer and Law and even Engineering compared to the other colleges. Had they commented on that?

Provost Hickey replied that the Board was very determined to have a productivity-based approach to budget allocation. He had told the Board on numerous occasions that he could not find any clear correlation between productivity and budget allocations at the University. Somebody could say, "Take the resources and allocate them how you, Mr. Provost, see fit." There was no reason to believe that the way he would do that was any better than the way anybody else would do it. So the way to do it was to get clear measures of productivity and then budget allocation processes to those measures.

The Board understood that this was going to be implemented gradually so that we did not have a devastating impact on any one unit. But they also understood that this would bring about a change in behavior. Certainly, he thought they understood that certain colleges like engineering, and polymer science and polymer engineering were probably going to gain relatively more of their new money on the quality side of the house, particularly as it related to research, for example. Or in engineering he could point to the undergraduate students' successes. The fact that while our engineering students might not have the same credentials coming in as engineering students who went to Case Western Reserve or some similar place, when they came out, employers in the area were telling him they preferred to hire our engineering students as opposed to engineering students who came out of other programs. That value added was a measure of quality.

What the PBC was trying to figure out now, and they were going to be enlisting the help of the individual colleges, was how to measure that, how to measure the various types of quality that we had and then assign some sort of weighing to it. Therefore, colleges could have their revenues or allocations enhanced based on that, rather than just credit hour production. The College of Engineering was only going to get so big before you had to dramatically increase the number of faculty, dramatically increase the facilities, and the labs. One of the things that Vice President Roney had been working on with all of the colleges was trying to figure what the optimal enrollment was for a college. The PBC members were also very aware that certain colleges simply could enroll more than a certain number of students. And the cost associated with them were such that they might never attain a ROI of 1.7. So one of the things that PBC was going to look at over time was trying to determine which colleges were working at their capacity. If they had an ROI of 1.5 or 1.55 and that was the best they could get, then there had to be a very open, on-top-of-the-table agreement that the institution was going to continue to subsidize activities in that college because of its importance to the goals of the institution, thus tying it back to the Academic Plan, the Balanced Scorecard and Charting the Course.

Senator Hoo Fatt then asked another question. Did the Provost think the PBC was really equipped to handle something so intricate like the ROI? There seemed to be a lot of things in that formula that required knowledge of a dean or department head, rather than a faculty member.

The Provost replied that he was glad she had asked that question, as he would have been sent packing had he asked that question. He could tell her that the members of the PBC had worked long and hard on this and had explored many, many details. Many of the questions and concerns that underlie Senator Hoo Fatt's comments and, he assumed, those of her colleagues, was an appropriate thing to do. We had talked about all of them and we understood that the ROI model that was out there now. While it might not be absolutely perfect, it was significantly better than what we had now which was basically a historical budget allocation model that took what you had now and incremented or decremented it by a certain amount of money each year. There was no reason to believe that the current allocations were done in any way that was really fair. He thought the ROI allocations would over time show the level that colleges were able to attain.

He then offered an example - the School of Law, because of its cap on the number of students and because of the relative expenses associated because of the cost of the faculty, would never attain an ROI of 1.7. They would not even get close. On the other hand there were many very high-quality programs and developing programs in the School of Law that he thought would garner resources based on that. But in the end he thought the decision was going to be, once the school was operating at its most efficient level, whatever that ROI turned out to be, then the question really that an institution had to ask itself was, did we want a school of law, did we want a school of engineering, did we want a school or college of whatever? And if the answer was yes and you were convinced that the department, the college was functioning at its best level, then you made an institutional decision. That was a very open one because everyone knew the amount of subsidy. You simply agreed that the institution was going to subsidize an institution by a certain amount of money because of its importance to the centrality of the mission of the University.

Now what you did not do if you decided that the ideal ROI for the College of Engineering, for example, was 1.55 and not 1.7, was agree to subsidize the money necessary to bring the college up. What you did not do was continue to subsidize it if the next year the college drops to 1.4 or 1.3. So the college had to continue to do its job in order to continue to garner the resources, but you let time and experience and additional data drive the ROI to where they really should be. And so he thought the Planning and Budgeting Committee had gone out of its way to build a variety of safeguards into the implementation of the ROI program so that we did not end up devastating some units that quite honestly did not deserve to be devastated.

Senator Gunn then stated that she had a question but not on the ROI. This was a mundane question maybe, but she thought it did affect current academic planning. She thought that one of the reasons we had not asked questions about strategic planning was that we wondered whether we could carry it off when we could not carry off some very basic things right now. She wanted to raise the issue of accounts payable. We were in a deplorable situation. In our School of Family Consumer Sciences for example, we did not know whether our accreditation money would get to our accreditation bodies in time. We were having bills come second and third due. She had faculty members who needed to be reimbursed for expenses from October and it was now the middle of December. She thought this was terrible. The University had had the reputation of paying within a week to ten days, and this was really locking up what we needed to do on the academic side. She knew there was a shortage of people, but

she thought we had to shift people around. We had to get those checks out. We could not function in the academic units this way.

Provost Hickey asked Vice President Nettling to address that. Vice President Nettling was given permission to speak by the Senate. Mr. Nettling stated that we were addressing that question. We had put in two additional people to help on this. Obviously, they needed the sufficient amount of training because of the new system we had going, but we were addressing it and checks would get out. If there was a critical check that needed to go, he asked Senator Gunn to let him know. He would be sure that that check got out. But we were working through it and it would get back to normal again. Senator Gunn then wanted to know when this would happen. To which Mr. Nettling replied that he could not give a time line, but in his own mind he would like to be there by the first of the year. Senator Gunn then said that we had credential checks due by the first of the year. We also had faculty members sitting on \$200-300 of supplies they bought to help the students who were not being reimbursed. Things were tight. Mr. Nettling stated that if there were an accreditation check that needed to go, he would make sure it got out tomorrow.

Provost Hickey then suggested that Senator Gunn talk to Mr. Nettling after the Senate meeting, or if he had to leave early, send him an email. The Provost thought that if we were judicious in the special treatment processing that we asked of Mr. Nettling's people, they could respond to it. Obviously, if everyone inundated them with special needs, that was going to interfere with us trying to get these people trained.

WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson began her report by stating that the University Well-Being had met during the month of November twice, on the 6th and 27th. They had met to discuss the issues of health care costs and how they could be reduced. That discussion was continuing. She did not think that it was worthy of giving you a handout report, but it would go into the Chronicle (**Appendix A**). We were in the process, however, and she wanted all to know that we were working on this whole issue. The committee had been provided with employee claims, of retiree dependent claims for 1998-2000, the PPO's, and traditional indemnity plans. We were getting the data on how much those plans were and we had also been provided with information on health plans. The committee was looking at five of the other state universities in Ohio and whether they paid premiums and what percentage of costs they paid. It went from being essentially us paying as we did, not at all, or all plans require premiums. So there was the whole range, and that was really all we could say at this stage. We were continuing to collect that data, and we were meeting next week with representatives from Medical Mutual and Summa concerning ways in which costs could be reduced in a longer term. Senators might remember at the last report that we came up with different categories, and this was one in terms of how the negotiations were with issues relating to deductibles and of course the issues relating to costs of pharmaceuticals. So at this stage all we were doing was collecting information. Our job was not just to reduce costs, but to consider the benefits of the employees and this was what we were carrying out at the moment.

She continued by stating that the committee was also planning to seek information from all in January on the potential effect of an opting-out incentive. The opting-out incentive was \$500 and it had not been changed for a long time. We were trying to get some information on what kind of response there was to this, and also where there was the possibility again if we put in costs. If we had to pay a premium whether people would in fact opt out, that was a way of reducing costs. If you put in some kind of premium and therefore people shifted out, that would release our costs. But we did not have a clue at this stage of how to budget that, so we were going to be seeking that information. We were also

looking to the health care consultant alternative possibilities for retirement.

Senator Sterns then spoke, stating that he had been getting a lot of questions from retirees on the last point Senator Erickson had made. He understood the committee was examining benefits and spousal benefits. He asked Senator Erickson to tell the body a little about what those issues were.

Senator Erickson stated that the issues were of dependents of retirees. Until 1992 people who were hired at the University had not only retiree benefits that would go on to STRS upon retirement, but that their dependents had benefits at the University. Those benefits originally were not that large because once the dependent went onto Medicare, then it was only an additional. That had been considerably less expensive even though that had changed just this year. Until this point those had been limited. The concern was that under the present system for most, the cost of this to the University of those retiree dependents was getting to be significant and was likely to be more significant especially when you had retirees with young families, because the spouses were covered until they got Medicare and children were covered until they got through college. The way they were covered at the moment was with the traditional indemnity system, which was the most expensive. We had discussed this before. At this point, because the retirees were scattered all over the place, the University had accepted that. Now we were going to look at it again. What we found so far according to Desnay (Lohrum) was that there were a number of people who had not wanted to move off their HMO's when they went to retirement and had not wanted their dependents off the HMO. We were looking at the cost of doing this at the moment. We would indeed bring in the retirees' representative to talk with them later on as well. At this stage we had not gotten anything for them to discuss, but once we had, which should be at the beginning of next semester, we would bring in a retiree representative.

ACADEMIC POLICIES & CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Stokes began her report by thanking Marilyn Quillin for forwarding to Senators the five items from the Academic Policies Committee brought forth in the form of motions. The first of the five items she addressed was what the Academic Policies Committee was calling "choose only once." That was language to be added to rule 3359-20-03.7, which was the new RTP rule and which allowed for a probationary faculty candidate to choose between original or amended criteria (**Appendix B1**). The question was raised, how many times did they get to choose? If they chose the new criteria, did they next year get to decide to go back to the old criteria, and that was the issue. So the language before Senators was, "Once a choice is made, the candidate may not reverse his or her decision; however, the candidate may choose each time criteria are revised and approved by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost."

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body voted its approval of the motion.

Associate Provost Stokes continued, stating that the second item she had in her stack was called, "counting part-time semesters" (**Appendix B2**). The issue was raised from the College of Arts & Sciences with the new rule for part-time faculty, which was rule 3359-20-06.1, that we count semesters of teaching. There was no language to say whether or not summers were included in that counting of semesters. So that affected only the associate lecturer and the senior lecturer designations. The language had been altered to read, "including summer sessions." This came as a motion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of this motion. Senator Riley stated that she did not have a question on that, but was there a typo on senior lecturer? All the others said "relevant experience," and senior lecturer said "relevant reputation." Was that accurate?

Associate Provost Stokes replied that she would have to look at the whole rule.

Chair Sheffer stated that it did not make sense. Let's deal with these first and we could then make a motion. He called for any further discussion on the recommendation from the committee. Senator Lavelli then asked for a point of clarification - did that mean that one 5-week summer session equaled one semester, so each summer session would be the same as three semesters? Associate Provost Stokes replied affirmatively. No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken on the motion and the body voted its approval.

Associate Provost Stokes then added that to address Senator Riley's concern, APCC would take that issue up in the spring semester and bring it back to Senate.

Associate Provost Stokes stated that next in her stack were calendar changes (**Appendix B3**). In the process of creating the calendar it was brought to our attention by several constituencies that by having the calendar start after Labor Day it meant that grades were due on the 24th of December, which made it kind of difficult. So the request was made to back it up by one week, so the calendar before Senators backed the fall semester up by one week and therefore grades were now due a week before, on the 17th of December. It also affected the preliminary calendar presented to the body for 2003-2004. All of the changes were in capital letters. This came as a motion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. Senator Norfolk stated that he had a quick question - what did that mean in terms of the end of the summer versus the beginning by backing it up? Associate Provost Stokes replied that it eliminated the week between summer and fall. Senator Erickson stated that it was not a week, only a day or so. No further discussion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of this motion.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. The next one in her stack was rule 3359-20-03, the faculty general personnel policies (**Appendix B4**). When we created the definition of regular faculty for the new RTP document, regular faculty was defined by the titles assigned to tenure-track faculty. We therefore then changed the definition of regular faculty in this rule to be consistent with the definition in the RTP rule. Consequently, the rank of instructor was left out being a non-tenure track position. So the committee was requesting that Faculty Senate approve this language to reinsert the rank of instructor as an official rank here at the institution. This was where it would appear in the rule. It came as a motion. No discussion forthcoming, the body voted its approval of this motion.

Associate Provost Stokes stated that the last item was the big document Senators had in front of them concerning the new title of college lecturer (**Appendix B5**). The task that APCC was asked was to write a rule to define and enumerate the benefits, responsibilities, etc., of a fixed-term faculty member. This was a fixed-term faculty member - the title college lecturer was chosen. There had been a friendly amendment from the College of Arts & Sciences to amend the name to university lecturer. She would like Senate to address that as an issue first, if it so desired. However, the whole document did come as a motion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion, first of the friendly amendment, then of the motion itself. Senator Harp asked what the difference was between an instructor, non-tenure track full-time, and a lecturer, non-tenure track full-time. Associate Provost Stokes replied that one of the responsibilities to begin with was the benefits package. The instructor was an annual reappointment, and these were term

appointments usually for three years. Senator Harp then asked whether the instructors had the usual tenure-track faculty benefits. And, he continued, they were soon to be Ph.D's, where this document had really the assumption of a master's, preferably a Ph.D.? To which Associate Provost Stokes replied that, no, instructors were not always soon-to-be, but they often had responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service, whereas the fixed-term only had responsibilities for teaching.

No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken. The motion was approved by the body with one abstention.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report by stating that the last meeting of the Facilities Planning Committee was made up of a very large summary report from Vice President Curtis. He had given to Senators a major summary sheet of all current facilities, activities, and time lines regarding projects underway on the campus (**Appendix C**). He thought this would give an opportunity to review all these ongoing projects, including the total budget. Of particular interest to the Senate would be the parking count by semester, which gave the ups and downs that we would experience during the construction process. He thought this was really one of the best meetings the committee had had in a long time in terms of what he called constructive communication in reviewing projects. He thought for those who had been involved in Facilities Planning for a number of years at this University, that this had been an extremely exciting period. Symbols were of course like North Hall coming down which was something we had been waiting for for a decade. Another example included projects being completed, buildings being opened, construction completed on time. He would say one of the greatest successes of our facilities program had been the construction management approach which had worked extremely well in terms of financial savings. He thought the frustration that the committee still experienced though was of projects yet to be done. One that we continued to monitor was the Biology Dept., and what was happening in the Auburn Science renovation and asbestos removal because we had been concerned about that for many years. He thought the biggest concern we had was not knowing what was happening in the state of Ohio with biennium funds for capital improvement projects, and a number of very important building renovations and updates depended on that funding source. So we had to monitor that very carefully, because even though we were making absolutely positive advances in terms of the physical aspects of our campus, at the same time there were a number of areas where we were still having exercises in frustration on behalf of our faculty. So he felt the best way to communicate this was to share the document, and he apologized, as a gerontologist who was supposed to be sensitive to middle-aged eyes - maybe he could loan Senators a magnifying glass. He asked whether there were any questions.

Senator Qammar then asked that if you had cost savings, especially where we had projects with the bond issue, did the cost savings have to pay off the bond? Or could the cost savings go to other things like getting asbestos out of biology? What was the coordination of those cost savings? Senator Sterns replied that he did not know the answer because he did not know what the University's internal policy was, frankly. Chair Sheffer then asked whether perhaps Vice President Nettling could shed some light on that. Mr. Nettling replied that if there were savings with any project that was funded within the bond issue, then once the project was over we had the authority to go back to the Board and reallocate those dollars to other projects that were in the bond issue that potentially could have gone over. So far we had been very lucky, but we had worked very hard to make sure projects were on time and in budget. But there was potentially something that might come along that went over, so those funds would be reallocated. Then assuming that was the case, there was a possibility, but we had to go back through the bonding agencies and get all that approved. But it did not leave the basket of the bond issue; it could not be used for operating expenses or anything like that.

Senator Sterns then added that he thought another thing that Mr. Curtis had been specific in pointing out was the very fine work of Joe Gregor. One example just came up at the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday. This was a new elevator contract for a 5-yr. period which would amount to a savings of \$740,000, almost \$800,000, because of the rebidding of the service contract. Senator Sterns thought that one of the things that had happened in the last year or two had been a review of many of these kinds of contracts for cost savings. Another thing we really needed to pay attention to were the issues of our 50 million+ deferred maintenance aspects on our campus. Of course these were austere times and it was tough to address that, but we really needed to track this. So he was happy to share this with the body. He thought this was the kind of communication Senators would like to see from our committee and he hoped that the committee had done that.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Franks began his report by pointing out that, as all had probably gathered from Provost Hickey's remarks, the Planning & Budgeting Committee had met and was working very hard. The Provost covered everything about the ROI that we had been doing up to this time. He asked that Senators pick up the written report because there was a lot of detail in there (**Appendix D**). There was a review of what the resolution was and he had added his email and phone extension so that if a Senator could not find his/her PBC representative, he/she could contact him quickly and directly. It had been his experience that if one had to look up someone's email then one might not follow through with questions or concerns. If he could not answer your questions and/or if there were questions Provost Hickey did not answer today, he would forward your concerns and questions about anything PBC had been working on to the whole committee and/or to Provost Hickey.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - Senator Kinion provided a brief report from the Research Committee. The Faculty Research Committee received 44 proposals for Summer fellowships. We were in the process of reviewing the proposals. Our budget would allow for 7 proposals to be funded. There would not be a request for proposals in the Spring due to the committee's limited budget. (See **Appendix E** for Fall 2001 grants awarded.)

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - Chair Sheffer stated that there were two items. The first was the amendment of Senate Bylaw 3359-10-02(H)(f) regarding The Association of The University of Akron Retirees as Faculty Senate representatives. This had been laid over for one month, and we were bringing it back now. If Senators would recall, the body had passed an amendment at the beginning of the semester and sent it to the President. He returned it to us and asked that we make some changes to that amendment. We made those changes and brought them to Senate last month. The additional wording to this amendment would state that Senators representing The University of Akron Retirees Association may not be elected to the Executive Committee nor serve as chair or vice-chair of any Senate committee on which they sit. So that was the amendment wording on which we were voting today. If we passed this, we would send this back to the President for his consideration.

Senator Hebert asked for a point of clarification - could any retiree be a member of that Association? Chair Sheffer replied that any retiree could, to which Parliamentarian Gerlach added that only faculty could serve as Senators. Chair Sheffer stated that that was in part II. If Senators reviewed the last Chronicle, the whole amendment was written as Appendix J. The second portion of that and which we had already passed said, "The Association shall elect two Senators from its dues-paying membership who are retired faculty members."

No further discussion forthcoming, the body voted its approval.

Chair Sheffer then stated that the second piece of unfinished business would be the Senate Bylaw 3359-10-02(H)(6)(a)(ii) regarding elections of Senators to be made by secret mail or electronic ballot. Secretary Kennedy was then asked to read the amendment and give reference to its location in the bylaws. She stated that the (ii) came under the section of elections, and the heading of that stated, **"Elections to the Senate shall be subject to the bylaws and rules of the electing unit and the following requirements..."** The (ii) would then read that, **"All nominations and elections shall be made by secret mail or electronic ballot."** Essentially, this meant that as it would be the decision of the electing unit, elections could be held by secret mail or electronic ballot.

No discussion of the amendment forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote. The body voted its approval.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS - None.

IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER - None.

X. ADJOURNMENT - A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin