

10-5-2000

Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting October 5, 2000

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 October 5, 2000." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 5 Oct 2000. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/133>

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 OCTOBER 5, 2000

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, October 5, 2000, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-three of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Dechambeau, Fisher, Foos, Gibson, Isayev, Lee, Lyons, Mothes, Ofobike, Purdy, and Schmith were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Dhinojwala, Hebert, Louscher, Marino, and Pope were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- **APPROVED REVISIONS TO GUIDELINES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FROM THE APCC.**
- **APPROVED A SPACE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE CFPC REGARDING REDESIGNATION OF GARSON RESIDENCE HALL AS A COSTUME STORAGE FACILITY FOR THE SCHOOL OF DANCE, THEATRE, AND ARTS ADMINISTRATION.**
- **POSTPONED UNTIL THE NOVEMBER MEETING AN ELECTION OF AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chair asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Lillie made the motion which was seconded by Senator Erikson. The Senate then voted its approval of the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 7 - The Chair asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the September 7 meeting. Senator Midha so moved. This was seconded by Senator Erikson. Senator Kennedy reported that she had received no corrections to the minutes. The body then gave its approval.

III. CHAIR'S REMARKS - Chair Sheffer made no remarks.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chair, however, did make two announcements. First, he asked that committee assignments and Senate elections which had not yet been completed be done so by the November meeting. New committee chairs were instructed to contact Marilyn Quillin and provide information regarding their meeting dates. Ms. Quillin would then inform the Executive Committee before its scheduled meeting. This would allow the Executive Committee to set up agendas for these committees and see whether there were common purposes in some of the deliberations of the committees. Secondly, Chair Sheffer announced the Senators who had been elected from SEAC. These included Senators Dottie Schmith and Holly Mothes from SEAC. The Chair was unsure whether these individuals were in attendance. Thirdly, the Chair introduced the new Senator from the C&T College - Rebecca McCollum. Rebecca had been elected to replace Larry Gilpatric. The Chair welcomed all new members.

V. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - The Chair introduced President Proenza.

"Thank you, Dr. Sheffer. I have four brief points to review with you today. First, some exceptionally good news. We had a verbal acceptance to our offer for the Vice President for Research. Because the news needs to be announced appropriately, those of you who participated in the process of course know the candidate's name, and I would simply ask that you understand that that is exceptionally good news. It's a sitting Vice President for Research at a major research university, distinguished professor, the kind of quality that we have indeed been seeking. So I am extremely pleased and will more formally announce that

as soon as the timing of the release is brought together.

Let me dispel two rumors right away. First, with regard to issues surrounding the change in policy in sick leave. The good news is that you now have more sick leave than you ever dreamt you could possibly use and utilize; it's great news. The bad news is that we have to keep track of it, and a lot of your colleagues are misinterpreting tracking that with undue burden on the usual academic process. So let me assure you that it is not intended to keep you from working at home when that is appropriate. It is not intended to keep you from going on professional trips, meetings and so forth. Please understand that that is not sick leave; it's professional leave, and you must report that to the University because for insurance purposes the University has to know and be aware that you are traveling if the insurance is to be in effect. But just suffice it to say that it is not intended to keep you from working at home if that is appropriate. It is not intended to keep you from going for a doctor's appointment for an hour if that is appropriate. So use good common sense and I think we're going to be okay; don't fear the worst because that's neither intended nor appropriate nor in any way, shape or form going to happen. Use good common sense and be reasonable about it. Those of you who serve as department chairs know what your faculty do and when they do it. Those of you who are faculty, please, please keep track of these issues because by law they must be attended to.

Item 2 - part time hiring of people who have taken early retirement. The Board has a policy that indicates that when appropriate, and appropriate justified strictly on a part-time basis, that may be indeed done and it has been done. The issue is one of moving to what the Board has promised would be done, and that is that the reliance on retired faculty would reduce, because the intent of the early retirement program was sold to the Board and to others as one of rejuvenating the University. The Board agreed and still agrees with that because some of your colleagues are indeed continuing to be very valuable members of the academic community and currently, in the current situation of a very tight labor market, for example, may be the only individuals available to teach a particular course on a part-time basis. Indeed, we can continue to do so. The Provost will be working on a plan not to eliminate that but to assure the Board that we are doing due diligence and not abusing the process of rehiring early retirees. The practice is not prohibited. The draft that was generated some time ago that said it's only for two years, is moot. It was a draft and was certainly never policy or was never submitted to the Board for approval.

Finally, if I could ask Becky (Herrnstein) to distribute some items for you, I want to report on the status of strategic planning. You will recall that at the last Senate meeting I made a report on the progress that we've made on strategic planning. You're going to get two documents. One is a letter from me to you as members of the Faculty Senate appraising of this as a progress report (**Appendix A**). Remember, we said we would regard this as an ongoing process of strategic thinking, so this is where we are and I solicit your input. The letter outlines all as best as I could recall and I may have missed some meetings, but all of the major meetings of the Trustees of the University administration, of us in retreats, both major and minor, of the working groups that were guided by the Strategic Thinking Steering Committee, and so on. So it gives you sort of an outline of the bulk of activities in which the campus was engaged during this past year.

The second document has some text attached to it (**Appendix B**). Then at the back an improvement of the one I showed here a month ago is therefore a draft of this status of our planning, and I invite your comments so we can finalize it at least for the time being. Now remember, we'll regard this as a work in progress. In that sense, because new information becomes available, because new ideas come into the picture, we can elaborate on this. So this doesn't mean that this is sealed in stone. But this represents, ladies and gentlemen, the best thinking of The University of Akron over the past 21 months. I invite you to read it; I invite you to comment on it by sending me email if you like or through the Senate President or in any other way you think would best reach me. We will continue because strategic thinking is never something that stops.

From this broad guideline of priorities and strategies we will develop a series of initiatives, continue to collect information and refine our thinking about the strategies and the underpinnings of the plan and continue to elaborate it as a community working together in the spirit of shared leadership. So it's now

before you and I would invite the Senate's comments and suggestions as to how we can improve it.

Again, we'll be reforming the Strategic Thinking Steering Committee. We'll be continuing some of the activities toward implementation of specific activities. For example, instead of base budgeting, the Provost is initiating some activities there with the Planning and Budgeting Committee, with the deans and other appropriate groups. We'll move to another all-campus retreat sometime yet this fall because it's important that we all understand the context in which we have come to have this draft summary so that we all operate from the same page in the hymn book, as the old saying goes. With that, I'll be happy to entertain a couple of questions. I regret that I have to be going to another meeting today, so are there any questions?"

Senator Qammar stated that one of the things that struck her when she read the reiteration of the official policy on sick leave policy was how severely it could impact maternity leave. It would be very difficult for someone to have to miss the beginning of the semester and, of course, they wouldn't be able to come back in the middle either because that course would have had to have been taken care of in some way. It seemed to her as though that type of scenario might need some additional consideration.

President Proenza asked Becky Herrnstein to speak to this. Ms. Herrnstein replied that the policy couldn't contradict the Family Medical Leave Act. She stated that what Senator Qammar might want to give some thought to was unpaid leave which was protected by that federal legislation versus our paid leave policies, which were the sick leave policies that were under consideration right now. So certainly, if any contradictions between those two things were found, please inform her.

Senator Qammar replied that it wasn't that there was a contradiction, but that an academic environment placed a particularly difficult burden regarding the timing of your work and when it allowed you to do that.

President Proenza asked that the issue be explored with due regard to Senator Qammar's concern. He asked Ms. Herrnstein to ask Kathy (Watson) to address this specific question to be sure it was completely understood.

There were no other questions for the President.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - The Chair invited Provost Terry Hickey to address the body.

"My remarks will be very brief today. Last time I think the President and I took a good part of your meeting and then left. I don't know what time you finished up, but we had to go to Cleveland.

The work with Nancy Stokes on the RTP process is being carried out and progressing well. The committee and task force are working very hard and those efforts I'm sure she'll tell you about today. I'm very excited to see how quickly things are coming together. Likewise, the curriculum review process, and I'm sure she'll tell you something about that, is moving along well too.

The PBC probably doesn't know what's hit them. They have been given more information about the budget that my guess is they've ever had in their lives and may have ever wanted. But they're getting it anyway and I'm going to ask them to respond and work with me to make budget allocations based on clear and published criteria and make fair budget allocations. So I think we're well along in the process, and I wanted to move as quickly as possible because I want to get messages out there for spring semester and certainly for the summer term because I want to start looking at all of the different budget categories as a single budget - summer money, part-time money, as well as regular allocations, and I'd like to allocate all of those based on clear productivity criteria and very accurate data.

I'd like to point out to you and maybe Char (Reed) can give you more information, the Pavilion data base which may or may not mean much to you, but if you open it up, and I like graphs rather than charts, you will love it. In preparing my slides for the Board of Trustees meeting yesterday I started first thing Saturday morning working from home and the next thing I knew my wife was reminding me it was Sunday night and

time to go to bed. But there is a wealth of information in there, and you get some very interesting trends over time and you really get a feeling for how budgets should be allocated. So I'm eager to work with all of you on that.

I think those are the only things I wanted to touch on today, and I'm sure the people involved in those processes will be happy to talk more about it. I, too, will be happy to take a question or two."

Chair Sheffer asked whether there were any questions of the Provost. Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh stated that one of the faculty members had asked her to bring up an issue regarding technology money. Apparently, last year PBC made a recommendation about a certain percentage of money being returned and some sent to the main technology fund. Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh said she wondered whether this was true.

Provost Hickey asked what part of that - true or a rumor? Was there technology money? That was true.

Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh then asked whether the money was going to be divided up percentage-wise back to the units only. She understood that they got the technology money based on their enrollment that was generated from their students. Now she understood from this that only a percentage of it would come back to the units. With technology plans already in place - like a 5-yr. plan they were in the process of - the concern of the faculty was where there was going to be a change in the money they got back. That would greatly impact their plan.

Provost Hickey answered her by stating that he was not sure he could give her a complete answer. Not because he was dogging it, but because he didn't know the complete answer to it now.

He said that Vice President Gaylord had been working on a campus-wide technology plan that attempted to deal with our technology issues for a long time. For instance, he had been trying to standardize on certain software and hardware so that the upgrading of the software, for example, could be done very efficiently. He even had been working on a process whereby the repair or replacement of the hardware could be done in a very efficient fashion. There had been discussions with regard to using a portion of the technology money to fund those efforts.

For example, one was making the campus a wireless campus so that if you were to have a laptop with a wireless capability, literally, from what Dr. Gaylord told me - and I'm so far beyond my level of expertise here that any question would probably demonstrate my ignorance very quickly - but from what Tom told me, it would be possible to actually upgrade the software on all of the computers on the campus while you all were asleep, assuming that you had left your computer on campus and had not taken it home with you.

There were ways literally overnight to do what it now takes technical support very long periods of time to do.

So Tom had been looking for more efficient ways to implement technology, expand technology, and keep it current - ways to do more for less money than we had. The Provost thought that Mr. Gaylord would propose some of the technology money to go toward these efforts.

The Provost stated that he thought it was important to know what plans were out there in the various units and how those plans would fit with this overall campus-wide effort. He thought that what all of us were concerned about when trying to buy technology was that unless it was standardized on common things that could be maintained, it would be virtually impossible to keep up. The technology outdid the resources so quickly that everyone would fall behind. He stated that he thought what Tom was looking for were some ways to make a quantum leap forward to get ahead of the curve instead of constantly being behind the curve. He further stated he thought it was important and would suggest to Tom that it be understood what the plans of the units were and how their plans for the investment of those dollars could be impacted by the more global effort that he's thinking about.

Senator Erikson then pointed out to the Provost that relating to that same technology issue, one way to make sure there was some interaction like that was that this campus-wide technology plan go to CCTC, the subcommittee of the Senate that looked at the technology issues. That was its role.

Provost Hickey asked whether it were a Senate-based technology committee. To which Senator Erikson replied that the committee was called the Computing & Communications Technologies Committee. The Provost stated that he would bring that to Vice President Gaylord's attention. Senator Erikson mentioned that Dr. Gaylord was in fact an ex officio member of this committee. Provost Hickey replied that Tom may already have known that; he worked well in terms like CCTC and APCC's.

Senator Midha then commented relating to the question. He thought Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh was referring to the fact that the first time the technology fee was assessed, the plan was that 35% of the revenue collected would go back to the colleges and 65% would go to the Provost's office. Last year colleges did receive 35% of that money, and that was what she was inquiring about, whether there was going to be any change.

The Provost replied that he was not sure he knew the answer to the question, but he wanted to point out here that as we tried to allocate budgets on a more understandable basis and relate it to productivity, we were going to have to move monies around. He did think if we were really going to bite that bullet and allocate monies based on productivity criteria, then we would have to think about all of the money involved and how we could spend it. He stated he was not setting aside any pots of money and saying that we were going to allocate everything else but not this. He did think the campus as a whole would have to do the same thing and look at all of our resources and see how they could be allocated in a way that benefitted the institution as a whole. He asked for understanding about doing that.

The Provost further stated that what he could guarantee was that we would bring everything out in the open, on top of the table and everyone would have a chance to take a look at it and comment on it. If anyone had any concerns about that, talk to colleagues on the PBC, and he thought they would say that he was leaving nothing under the table; everything was coming out on top. And the opening up of the Pavilion data base actually allowed open access to view what the various numbers were at the University. That data base had only recently been opened up to everyone, and Char would provide instructions on how to access that. It would tell you everything you wanted to know, so there was no way to keep a secret once you had access to that database because it put everything out on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Senator Kennedy reported that the Executive Committee had met twice during the month of September - once where the agenda for this meeting was set, and the second time with the President and Becky Herrnstein, where we discussed matters of mutual interest.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson stated that all should have had a copy of the report of the Well-Being Committee. Most of that report was an appendix item to the minutes (**Appendix C**). This was not an action item to the Senate, but there was something in that report that she needed to bring to members of the Senate to ask for input. The committee had met twice, once without a quorum and the second where Senator Erikson was elected chair of the committee. We reviewed the health care carriers with Mrs. Desnay Lohrum from Human Resources. We started with the health care plan now in effect, and in the forthcoming week you would receive your packages to decide whether or not you wanted to change how you had signed up. She stated that the university was not changing carriers, but you could revise your choice.

It had seemed like a good time to see about experiences that might have shown good or bad experiences with those carriers. You should have that information before you sign up, which she understood had to be completed in the beginning of November. So members of the committee would be seeking information from the university community by the end of next week on problems that had occurred with health care providers. Your representatives on University Well-Being would probably be contacting all members of their units, but if Senators could collect any information and pass it on to members of the committee, it would be helpful. It would be summarized and sent out earlier in the following week so you could have that

information.

The other items could be read individually as to the sick leave which the President discussed. It should be noted that for those of you who had supplemental life insurance, your costs were likely to be going up, as the Board did not pass the life insurance using the present carrier and was looking for bids to keep it lower.

It was not significant to those who did not add to your life insurance, but some of you could expect to hear in November whether or not you would have to pay more.

Finally, we had several topics for consideration, one of which was policies of food and beverages including vending machines, domestic partner issues which the Senate was directed to look at last year, and child care issues. Anyone who had other topics was asked to please contact Senator Erikson or other members of the committee.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Before giving her report from APCC, Senator Stokes stated that the Chair had asked her to address what was happening with the RTP Task Force and how it related to the WOW committees that had worked all last year. The WOW committee had presented to the faculty in May 2000 a list of 20 points, a summation of best practices. The RTP Task Force was using that as one of their guidelines as part of the creation process of the new guidelines for reappointment, tenure and promotion. Of those 20 points, about half of them were actually college-oriented as opposed to having been university-wide kinds of points. For example, communication of requirements for advanced tenure done yearly by the department chair. That was an example of something that could be done by the colleges. It was important to the RTP Task Force that, as much as possible, the colleges would have a say in what had happened with their own RTP guidelines. The university-wide standard was the umbrella in each of the colleges. They were the ones who knew what criteria was most important to their own discipline. They should be allowed to create their own guidelines and criteria. So please be assured that we would be using the WOW summation of best practices and keeping them very closely in mind and remembering that the colleges were just as important in this issue as the University guidelines were.

She then asked whether there were any questions about the Task Force that she could answer. Senator Saliga said she thought this was an appropriate question for the Task Force. When she read what was coming up about reappointment, tenure and promotion, the question she had was, why was the membership of these committees mandatory for every tenured faculty in the department? Some of the departments, a few of them, were very large and we had ended up in the past with committees of 30 for tenure because that's how many tenured people were in the department. Just a question - what was the rationale behind requiring all tenured people mandatorily being on the committee?

Senator Stokes replied that it was listed as a responsibility of every faculty to serve in that capacity. It was your responsibility and that was the rationale. We could change it, but that was the rationale.

Senator Saliga replied that it was a question she thought she would like to have considered, because it got out of control to schedule a time that 30 people could meet for these meetings. It was very challenging.

Senator Stokes stated that she understood. She also wanted to mention that the Task Force was working on things that they were calling "talking papers." These were not drafts. They were not to the draft stage yet. They were only at the discussion stage, which was why they had not circulated any of the information to the Senate or to the faculty within your colleges. It might have been the case that some of the people on the committee had shared these papers with other faculty in their colleges, but they were not at the draft stage yet; but they were on talking paper no. 5. As soon as they were, you would certainly be appraised.

Senator Stokes then moved on to the materials received by Senators in the campus mail. In May of this year, Faculty Senate passed changes to the guidelines for initial appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion of the general faculty. These were then forwarded to the President and then to the Provost and Office of General Counsel. The Office of General Counsel had some concerns, and Faculty Senate at its last meeting asked the APCC to address those concerns. This was the result that she brought back now

(Appendix D). There was one small change that came from John Edgerton (she thanked him). All the times that "retention" was listed, the word should have been "reappointment." There were two instances on the draft that read retention, and they should have read "reappointment." It was always to read "reappointment."

APCC brought this to the body as a motion.

Chair Sheffer stated that since the motion came from the committee, it didn't require a second. Was there any discussion? None forthcoming, the Senate then voted its approval.

Senator Stokes then asked whether the Chair wanted to do Curriculum Review at this time. Chair Sheffer said yes. Senator Stokes began her report by stating that these policies would be incorporated into the Task Force guidelines so you would see them again in the future. The CRC had been meeting this fall and had now completed a draft of the changes to the curriculum process that were passed by Senate in May of 1999. Those changes never went forward and she didn't remember why, but CRC had now completed a draft and would be tweaking it and fine-tuning it with the hopes of bringing it to Senate in November.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns started by describing a change in the use of a facility. He apologized for being late and stated he had copies of his report on the table **(Appendix E)**.

The Garson Residence Hall had requested that all rooms represented by 6,026 sq. feet be made available for use as a costume storage facility for the School of Dance, Theatre and Arts Administration. This would allow for the consolidation of all costume storage from the Ballet Center, EJ Thomas loft space, and the Bel-Aire building. Garson was no longer used as a dormitory and this would be a positive use of the space. The committee supported the recommendation by acclamation, and it was recommended that the costume storage issue be incorporated into plans for the Guzzetta addition. Senator Sterns then presented the following resolution: **Whereas the Faculty Senate supports the redesignation of Garson Residence Hall as a costume storage facility for the School of Dance, Theatre and Arts Administration.**

Dr. Gerlach stated that there didn't need to be a "Whereas" in the resolution, to which Chair Sheffer said to strike the "Whereas." He mentioned that as this was a motion from a committee, it didn't require a second. Was there any other discussion? None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The motion passed.

Senator Sterns then stated that the committee had also focused on issues of campus parking. Extensive discussion had focused on the temporary all-permit parking situation, and the feedback had been received by committee members, the chair, and the parking office. Issues included the difficulty of faculty finding space to load and unload equipment, and to come and go related to activities involving community supervision at schools, hospitals, etc. The committee reaffirmed its position that the campus should return to designated faculty and staff parking as soon as possible. The committee had requested a briefing by Mr. Ted Curtis and Mr. Ramesh Vakamudi regarding the current campus-parking plan and deck design. Other concerns discussed included how to facilitate transportation to parking lots during evening hours with a concern regarding safety and security. And feedback regarding the campus loop buses and scheduling was requested by the committee. The committee was the appropriate venue for faculty concerns to be expressed, and the committee would work with Mr. Jim Stafford and the Parking Task Force to explore solutions. Senator Sterns stated that he had been getting a lot of heat but was happy to take it.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Reed stated that she had no actions but did want to make a couple of comments. She did a brief written report, as the committee's last meeting was just Tuesday afternoon **(Appendix F)**. She wanted to make a few corrections in her own report, but first she wanted to, on behalf of the committee, thank Dr. Hickey for his hard work in having put together the presentation that we looked at the other day and also his commitment to work with the committees in terms of trying to achieve some growth and resources, which she thought everybody here understood was absolutely essential if we were to try to do all the quality things we would like to do as an institution. Secondly, to really have achieved some change in how we allocated our resources rather than this kind of incremental approach that we all had been hoping to do away with. So we recognized that this was easy to

say and hard to do and it might be a tough task and we might be under attack like Harvey once in a while, but we accepted that challenge from Dr. Hickey and looked forward to working with him.

As Provost Hickey had mentioned, and she would write it down when she finished talking, what we decided to do was really take an overview. She had struggled with the decision of whether to put any figures in it. But what we were really looking at were more general kinds of patterns of the University, both in terms of enrollment and the general shape of change over a long period of time. Also within colleges, the general shape of that change and then some data that was currently out there on the website as far as revenues and expenses. We had not analyzed this carefully, and as Dr. Hickey pointed out, there were a few categories of revenue that might not have been in there; for example, endowment income that supported endowed professors. So we had to be careful in terms of how we started publishing the information, as we knew it was kind of soft and quick and dirty at this point. But she did provide some real general statements that we heard and looked at and would continue to look at over time.

There were a couple of clarifications she wanted to make in this report. First of all, under the Sept. 19 meeting she wanted to clarify that the 1.3% decline figure referred to credit hr. production, and the decline in head count was actually 1.7%, just in case Senators saw some different figures there. Also, she noted that under the Oct. 3 meeting, point no. 3, the safe thing to have said at this point, as we had only done a quick and dirty look at information, was that in general the number of faculty had declined at a rate similar to that in enrollment. So she wanted to amend that statement, as really our decline in graduate assistants had been less than the rate of decline in enrollment. So if Senators would just mark that on their reports in terms of amending it to in general the number of faculty had declined by amount similar to that seen in enrollment, that would have been a more accurate statement.

(She then wrote the address for the Pavilion website on the chalkboard.) As long as you had a UA ID name and password, you could access this. But it was really important that you typed it exactly the same as it was written, because otherwise you got other messages:
(<https://www.uakron.edu/ir/Pavilion/index.htm>)

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - Senator Huff reported that the Ohio Faculty Council had met on Sept. 8. He stated the Council elected a new chair, Ginny Hamilton, from Shawnee State, and was addressed by Roderick Chu, the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. The Chancellor had been primarily concerned with talking to us about budgeting for higher education in the state. There was a group that had been brought together called the Ohio Higher Education Funding Commission that had been looking at the issue of funding across the state. There were many constituencies that were represented in this group, and they had come to the conclusion that education in this state was seriously underfunded. By any measure, it was underfunded compared with any other state that we bordered and with most other states across the nation. They were concerned that this was going to have a very serious negative impact on our economic future and that it was a crisis situation they wanted to correct. They were proposing a major increase in funding across the state and it was described to us, without completely specific figures, as probably the most significant increase in the last 30 years. They did not want to simply spread money around - "peanut butter" was the analogy they did not want to imitate. They did want to support increases over the next biennium of 5.5% above current funding.

In addition to that, they would like to target several specific areas that they could try to put a significant amount of money into. We had no figures on the Challenge Program which already existed, but they said they wanted to substantially increase funding for that program; also, the College Net Program which would guarantee that every bachelor's degree graduate in this state was information-technology competent. There was a program they wanted to use to significantly increase communication technology on all campuses, and they had some benchmarks about how many computers per student to make sure that every faculty member had a computer and that they were updated every three years. Details regarding this information was all on the Ohio Board of Regents website.

The other area was major research investments. These were talked about in terms of \$50 million blocks

that would be sent for three specific research areas. This was going to be competitive and would be available for all of the 4-year institutions to make proposals for. Again, this information was all on the OBR website.

They were concerned with two real problems they saw in this. First of all, in regard to opportunities, Senator Huff pointed out that they saw this as the best time in the last 30 years to make this happen. They believed that there was a solid case. This was not coming from university presidents who asked for more money. This really came from the business community saying we needed a better educated population. They were hoping for a lot of support from the business community in the upcoming election to support this.

This budget had now gone from this funding commission to the Ohio Board of Regents, where it would be refined. Then we were promised that we would get specific information about exact numbers that Senator Huff could pass on to all of you. Two problems - funding for K-12 in the state was perhaps a bigger problem than the one we had and they didn't know what the future resolution of that was going to be. It could have a major impact on funding that would be available for any other activities in the state, and the idea that we had term limits and we had candidates that were successfully campaigning to cut taxes no matter what impact it had on what program. Everyone in Columbus was concerned about what the implications of that were. This entire package was on the OBR website.

The rest of the business we had was about the Ohio Faculty Council and how it was operating. Senator Huff read at our last meeting and distributed to all a mission statement. He gave a long laundry list of things to be accomplished. One of the things that was clarified at our last meeting was that that mission statement had not been developed by the Ohio Board of Regents. It had actually been developed by the first members of the Ohio Faculty Council, and, more than a mission, it was a wish list. Those were the things they would have liked to be involved in, but they were not realistically the things the group could really expect to accomplish. What was made very clear to us at the meeting was that we were intended to be a way for the Ohio Board of Regents to communicate with faculty and for faculty to be able to communicate with the Ohio Board of Regents. We have been welcomed at their meetings, at their committee meetings. We have had to register in advance and plan to be there, but they would like for us to be in attendance. Some of the members of the Council had attended these meetings which had lasted not just all day but two days. They have spent some meetings politely listening and did not get a chance to speak. But when a faculty perspective was something they wanted to have, if there were a faculty representative in the room, they had been asked to speak, their opinions had been listened to, and it had affected the outcome of some of the things they had been deliberating.

So it was very much in our interest to have had a representative at all of these meetings. The committees met around the state and the Ohio Board of Regents met at different locations around the state. We considered assigning specific representatives to specific committees with the idea that as they continued to meet, they would be known by the committee, have gotten to understand the committee's business and have had a more positive impact. The problem was if a committee was meeting in Cincinnati on a weekend and it was going to be an all-day meeting, it would be very difficult for Senator Huff or someone from northeast Ohio to be at the meeting. So what we were intending to do instead was to divide the state up regionally. Universities were all over the state, and when regents were meeting or their committees were meeting in northeast Ohio, someone from Akron or Kent or Cleveland or Youngstown would be designated to attend that meeting. That was our plan, our agenda for the year, that we would attend all of these meetings, that we would keep up-to-date on what was going on, what their business was, and especially make sure that if there were someone with particular expertise with an issue, that they would get to that meeting.

The problem was that that would require more full days away, so there still was the problem that Senator Huff indicated at the last meeting. He suggested that we needed a higher level of involvement by faculty members. This was discussed by the Council and the idea that was accepted was that any university that chose to select alternate representatives could do so, and that alternate would be someone who would receive regular email communications. They would keep up-to-date with what was going on. If there was a

meeting and Senator Huff could not attend or if our chair could not attend, we would have someone in place that we could go to. A lot of the schools had picked substitutes. It would be a different substitute at each meeting. The person who came in would not really know what the issues were and what we had been talking about.

So Senator Huff thought the idea of having an alternate made perfect sense. He hoped we would be able to act on this, especially since there were two meetings coming up that he would not be able to attend. Our meetings were all scheduled for Fridays in Columbus, the second Friday of each month, and he had arranged his teaching schedule this year so he would be able to attend. They had moved the November meeting to the Tuesday before Thanksgiving so he knew he could not attend that one. He had classes and some special meetings in his school on that day. So we would need an alternate or a substitute or we would not have a representative there. The Ohio Board of Regents was meeting on our campus on the 19th, and again, he had to cancel classes for that day if he was going to attend. He did not know whether there was someone from one of our other sister universities in northeast Ohio who could attend. But this was again a prime opportunity if there were an alternate in place, someone else we could turn to who might be able to attend this meeting.

Senator Huff then made the following motion: **I propose that the Faculty Senate designate an alternate representative to the Ohio Faculty Council.** However, Chair Sheffer pointed out that there was, in examining the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, a provision now for an election of an alternate. Senator Huff withdrew his motion.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - The Chair stated that Senate needed to have an election for an alternate for the representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. He asked whether there were any nominations for that position. Because no nominations were forthcoming, Senator Ritchey asked whether the election could be held up for a month until some nominations from outside the body were obtained. Chair Sheffer stated that if there were no nominations from the body, members should go outside the Senate and determine whether a nominee or two could be attracted to the position. The Chair asked whether that was suitable and the body agreed.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Midha reported that recently the University had been listed as one of the best 99 places to work in Ohio.

Senator Sterns wanted to mention, even as all of us had been dealing with the demands of finding a place to park vehicles on the campus, that he had been getting a much more negative feedback than would have been reflected by this body. Maybe we were all being kind, but he wanted to point out that the situation was turning. Some of the major decks were going to be opened fully and some people had been very disturbed by this notion of students as customers. He had not heard as much negative comment about this use of students as customers. He did not know the correct term, but it seemed to have inflamed a lot of opinion. He felt very positive about the fact that all of us had been willing to roll up our sleeves at least during this emergency period and deal with the all-permit approach. But he had also been confronted with a phenomenon that faculty were a legend in their own mind who could not understand why it was that they could not find a parking space when they came on campus at 10 or 11:00. Senator Sterns wanted to point out that they never could have found a place at that time. But there seemed to be a lot of feeling about it and he thought we ought to realize that. He was especially proud of our University that nowhere had you seen that the faculty were not caring about this issue. Although he was getting a lot of flak by the faculty, he thought it was an important gesture to our student body. He stated that when he said that to a college which remain unnamed, they thought he had lost his mind.

Senator Gunn stated that she had just been reflecting on the planning and budgeting report and thought we needed to be careful with credit hr. production or head count going down because in a university a lot of the students weren't full-time students. Some came to take 18 courses, some came to take 3, and she

thought head count was misleading sometimes in terms of the number served, not like the College of Wooster where heads were there all the time.

Provost Hickey replied that that was a good point. However, a historical look which he had done, indicated that the enrollment/head count curves paralleled the credit hr. production. In many ways, the head count was somewhat irrelevant. We were paid based on full-time equivalents. Full-time equivalents were determined by student credit hr. production divided by 15, and that produced the FTE. If you looked at FTE, we were at about a 16-17,000 student institution, and that's what we received our state support based upon.

The Provost stated that he and a lot of people used the terms interchangeably. Head count seemed to be the term used here most in the past. The reality was if we had one student taking 600,000 credit hrs. we would get paid for that the same. One of the positions he had held and had been recently vocal about was that he really did think we were going to build our enrollments four credits at a time. He thought we were going to build a lot through the part-time student whether we delivered that during the day, during the evening, possibly on weekends - they all count. If you had four credits among four students, you had a FTE so he thought we had to think about building credit hr. production in that way.

The Provost also wanted to point out something which he hadn't known till this past weekend. If it had not been for our evening program right now, we would have been under 20,000 students. We had 2,704 students enrolled only in evening courses. If it had not been for them, we would have been already under 20,000. He further stated that the 1.7% reduction in head count enrollment, 1.3% reduction in credit hr. productivity translated into a \$1.7 million budgetary shortfall for this year. So there were real implications to the loss of credit hr. production. It was a long way of saying Senator Gunn was absolutely right; it was the credit hr. production number that was the most crucial for how we earned our living.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - There was a motion to adjourn which was seconded. The body voted its approval and the meeting ended at 4:05 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin