

2-1-2001

Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting February 1, 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 February 1, 2001." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 1 Feb 2001. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/131>

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 1, 2001

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, February 1, 2001, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Clark, Edgerton, Filer-Tubaugh, Hanlon, Kim, Lavelli, Lyons, Mothes, Saliga, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Binienda, Braun, Ebie, Fisher, Graham, Hebert, Kendra, Lee, Louscher, Pope, Purdy, Qammar, and Stinner were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTION

*** APPROVED COURSE AND PROGRAM PROPOSALS FROM CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chair called for a motion to amend the agenda, so that President Proenza's remarks became the second item of business. This was so moved by Senator Lillie and was seconded by Senator Sterns. The body voted its approval of the amended agenda. President Proenza began his remarks.

II. REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

"Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for indulging me, as I have to be at two places at once, and the only way I can do that is to be late for the second one. I want to take a few minutes - first, to welcome Vice President George Newkome, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate School. George, could you rise for a moment and be recognized... (applause) I also have the privilege of telling you that yesterday the Board of Trustees approved my recommendation to designate Dr. Newkome as the James and Vanita Oelschlager Professor of Science & Technology. In connection with Dr. Newkome hitting the ground running, because he's not only a distinguished scientist but has 14 years of experience as a vice president of research, he has begun to work on the issues, and as you know, we have a conflict of interest policy that is in an interim status and I've asked him to continue that process. So in the same spirit that we worked closely together last year to effect an interim policy, I would like to ask Senator Lillie and Senator Kennedy and two other individuals you might so designate to work with Dr. Newkome in affecting that in a collegial and shared leadership fashion.

Ladies and gentlemen, I wanted to just make a few comments with regard to the Governor's budget proposal to the legislature which was released just on Monday. That budget proposal and the state address that the Governor made a week ago Wednesday is a significant positive statement for higher education. But as some of you may have heard me say today, it is simply not enough. Ohio is behind and has got to find a way to catch up, sooner rather than later. That said, you need to understand just a couple of things. First, K-12 education and higher education and medicaid, of course, are the only pieces of the state budget that are in the plus category. So we might have been in the cut category; we are not. The Governor is proposing a modest increase in the state share of instruction, some modest increases in the performance challenges, and he is putting some money toward creating a beginning step in the science and technology and for economic development initiatives such as the Ohio Plan.

Now where we are is that this budget is now being presented to the legislature. The legislature has to work through it, much as the federal Congress does when the President presents his budget to the Congress, and we will not know therefore for some time what the actual appropriation to higher education is. Technically, it is fairly close to the Governor's recommendations, so we don't expect any major departures. In the meantime, however, I have asked Vice President Nettling and Provost Hickey to work with the Planning and Budgeting Committee to effect the kind of budget scenarios that we will need to consider in order to do appropriate planning so that we are ready to propose an actual budget to our Trustees that can be approved and then implemented.

I have asked that we meet our continuing obligations, and as you know, some of those have increased in cost, such as energy costs. Gas has been an issue we've had to deal with. Equally, I have asked that we attend to those expenditures that we may need to effect to ensure that we continue to meet the needs of our students, and particularly that we can be more effective at recruiting new students.

Thirdly, but hardly last, it's very important for us to consider appropriate measures to ensure that we give our faculty and staff an appropriate salary pool to work with in allocating their base compensation increases. We will be developing those budget scenarios over the next few weeks. Clearly, the Governor has said that would be roughly a 2% increase in the base budget for this next fiscal year beginning in July, and I believe it's 3.7 for the following year."

Vice President Nettling pointed out that the increase was, in fact, still 2% for the following year. The President continued.

"So we have to develop scenarios; we have to work with the legislature, and hope that they will increase that number to 3, 4 or 5%. The university presidents are sending a very strong message to the legislature next week indicating that our first priority is indeed that instructional base on which our basic operations are needed. I have no further remarks today, but if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them."

No questions were forthcoming.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7 - Chair Sheffer then asked for consideration of the minutes of the meeting on December 7. No changes were put forth by any member of the body. The Secretary did have some corrections. Secretary Kennedy stated that on pg. 16 of the Chronicle, Dr. Prough was quoted as saying that he had spoken to Kathy Stafford. However, Kathy Stafford no longer worked for the University. The Secretary had received clarification from Dr. Prough that he should have said Kathy Watson, not Stafford. The second correction concerned Appendix D on pg. 23. The date on the minutes submitted by the Athletics Committee was incorrect - the date of the minutes on pg. 23 should have read November 16, 2000.

Without any other corrections, a motion was made by Senator Midha to approve the minutes. This was seconded by Senator McCollum. The Senate voted its approval of the minutes as amended.

IV. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS - The Chair welcomed all back to the semester and pointed out that Professor Mike Cheung was going to serve as the parliamentarian today.

V. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chair asked the Senate to remember Dr. Lung-ho Lin, Associate Professor Emeritus of Economics, who passed away on January 14 at University Hospitals after a long battle with cancer. Dr. Lin received his Bachelor's degree at the National Chenchei University in Taiwan, and his M.A. and Ph.D. at the University of Notre Dame. He taught at The University of Akron from 1978 until his retirement in December 1999. For many years he served as Graduate Advisor for the Department of Economics. Dr. Lin had great enthusiasm for his field of macroeconomics, which he passed on to his students. There were generations of alumni who remembered him with affection and respect. The department had set up a scholarship fund in his name. He was a friend and colleague to many Chinese faculty members on campus and a well-loved member of the local Chinese community.

Senators then stood for a moment of silence.

VI. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Senator Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met three times during the month of January, twice with only committee members present and once with President Proenza and his assistant, Becky Herrnstein. At the meetings, enrollment statistics were discussed. Executive Committee members were curious about the enrollment numbers but needed

clarification. This led into a discussion about the Governor's budget which the President had just addressed in his remarks. A second item dealt with the parking survey. As all knew, a survey had been distributed electronically via email and at the December Faculty Senate meeting. Senators had been asked to distribute this survey to their constituents. However, the Executive Committee was concerned about the limited response to the survey and discussed the need to repeat the survey. Senator Sterns would be reporting on this during his committee report.

The committee also talked about student-athlete graduation and retention numbers. In an earlier edition of the Chronicle of Higher Education, The University of Akron had not rated very highly in terms of athlete retention and graduation numbers. The Athletics Committee had since collected some of this data and reviewed this data, and had more favorable findings to report. Senator Baldwin (Chair of that committee) would report on that later.

Finally, the President had given the Committee a brief update on the status of the campus plan and the Landscape for Learning, as well as some news about the revitalization plan on campus. At this point everything was moving forward.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - The Chair then introduced Provost Hickey.

"Thank you. First, let me tell you that at the Board of Trustees meeting this week the new campus academic calendar was approved, which allows for three 15-week semesters. This would end the summer term and make the capability of dividing into three 5-week terms or a 10-week or 15-week or any other permutation that would make sense in terms of the students. Now this doesn't officially take effect until summer 2002. However, one of the advantages of this 15-term now is that faculty who support themselves off research grants in the summer can now request support for 15 weeks as opposed to 13 weeks. That capability is going to begin this summer, so faculty will be able to request support for a full 15 weeks starting this summer.

Those of you who read the newspaper this morning probably saw an article about the Medina Higher Education Center, and for many of you this is probably the first time you've heard about this. Let me tell you how this came about. I started meeting with officials in Medina back in the summer, and initial discussions were around our post-secondary programs delivered through distance education in the Medina high schools. Those programs aren't doing quite as well as we would hope; in fact, during the fall semester there were only 20 high school students enrolled in those programs. I made the point to the people in Medina that we had tremendous facilities in the distance education rooms and asked that they consider opening those rooms up to adult students during the evening hours and on weekends so that we could start offering distance education courses to individuals in Medina County. Those discussions not only were viewed positively, but they wanted to talk about other possibilities as well. So I started meeting with some of the economic development people in Medina County, and it became very clear that Medina is in search of a higher education presence in Medina County.

They also made it clear early on that they were going to obtain such a presence, and they would like very much for it to be The University of Akron that served them, but if it wasn't us, it would be somebody else. Those discussions prompted me to start thinking about ways in which we could better serve them. As a result, they put together a task force to look at the possibility of establishing a higher education center in Medina County located somewhere with easy access to expressways and in fairly close proximity to the city of Medina. As you may know, Medina County and the city of Medina are two of the fastest growing areas in the state of Ohio. Also, if you note the types of houses being built over there, there are obviously some individuals in Medina with considerable discretionary income, and I thought it might be very nice to be able to serve those populations. So this past Monday night I met with a Medina County Economic Development Task Force. At that meeting they voted unanimously and enthusiastically to join with The University of Akron in developing a higher education center in Medina.

The President and I then attended a dinner in the southern part of Medina County on Tuesday night, where

this amounts to a group of individuals who will likely be strong supporters of this in terms of what they say and what they give, and that was received very warmly by that group as well. Then we announced it to our Board of Trustees yesterday, and it was picked up by the news media at that point in time. The center is still in the early stages of conceptualization, but the initial idea is a facility somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000 sq. ft. in the \$20 million range. Fund raising efforts have already begun in the Medina area. This would be a combination of public and private support that would go into this facility. No location has been selected, although they are narrowing the field, and I encouraged them to look for sites that would be easy access to expressways and easy access for many of our faculty who might be teaching there on site. We envision a combination of distance education classes being taught there as well as live instruction being provided by faculty from both the University, including the Community & Technical College and Wayne College. We don't envision any permanent faculty there at all; this would simply be a situation where we would try to define their education needs and then provide for them. I'll be happy to address any questions you might have, but it's still in the very early stages. The newspaper said break ground within a couple of years. I think that's most optimistic - it could even be three years from now before we break ground, because as you might guess, the first thing we have to find are the dollars necessary to do this. I'll be happy to come back to that if you have questions.

Summer instructional allocation I'm working through right now. I'm determined to incentivize this process, and I'm working with Vice President Nettling and his colleagues and am very optimistic that starting this summer we will actually be able to incentivize the summer instruction at the college level such that the colleges get to retain a portion of the tuition revenue that they bring in over and above a defined amount. I will be bringing this to the deans' attention next week.

One final comment - the President has asked me to begin the process of putting together a group of individuals to work on developing an academic strategic plan to fit with the Landscape for Learning and the Charting the Course documents that have been put forth already. At this point I'm trying to figure out how to do this without requiring enormous amounts of effort on a lot of people's parts, and I hope to delve through some of these issues in the next few weeks. Having been through at least three academic strategic plans in my life, they're very important exercises, but if not planned and executed appropriately, it can end up requiring an enormous amount of time and ending up as documents that don't get referred to very often. I don't want to waste either your time or my time, so sometime this spring we'll be rolling out some ideas about how we might go about this as soon as I get those ideas. So I would encourage you to send me thoughts that you might have. If it sounds like I'm dragging my feet, I am, but the President has now asked me 27 times about this and I think he must be serious so we'll obviously have to move forward in that regard. I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have."

The Senate had no questions for the Provost.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - (Appendix A) Senator Erickson began her report by stating that the University Well-Being Committee had met twice since the last meeting of the Senate on Dec. 8 and January 26. At the December meeting, the committee reviewed issues relating to health insurance. On February 15, 2001, a subcommittee was going to meet with representatives of Medical Mutual about the problems that both Human Resources and many members of the University community had had regarding health service claim problems (e.g., time to process claims, and so forth) with Medical Mutual. The committee had to meet with them about that issue. The process of contracting for health insurance for the year January 2002 would begin this month. As in the past, representatives of the Well-Being Committee would be represented in the entire contract process. Senator Erickson stated that the committee also was in the process of looking at pregnancy/sick leave and child care issues. Both of those were in process as stated in the report.

At the January meeting the main issue discussed was the report of the subcommittee on domestic partner benefits. This issue had been referred to the committee last spring after the resolution that was passed by the Senate. Senators might have remembered that Senator Huff had brought the request from the Ohio Faculty Council, which, after some discussion, the Senate passed. The Well-Being Committee was

directed as a University committee to look at that issue. In the spring a subcommittee was appointed to look at domestic partner issues. That committee was reconstituted with changing personnel in the fall. It had a report of which Senators had been given a copy. The report included sample policies and forms for other universities, the University of Alaska, University of Michigan, and Wayne State. There were 15 pages of material on those forms. Senators who were reading this material might want to examine those on the Faculty Senate web page. Senator Erickson asked that Senators review this report and the appendices and be prepared to discuss the committee's recommendations at the March Senate meeting. She wanted to make sure all had time to look at this material. The committee examined first what other universities were doing.

The committee also examined the benefits to the University and the cost to the University for domestic partners benefits. The committee also provided a distinct definition of what a domestic partner was. This was in part based on what other universities with such policies did. Senators were referred to Appendix B and again to the web page. Senator Erickson concluded by stating that the report had recommendations which would be brought to the Senate for passage at the next meeting. At this point, the committee wanted all to read and think about this issue.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Mrs. Nancy Stokes began her report by stating that the subcommittee of the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee, the RTP Task Force, had been visiting with the different colleges across campus. The RTP Task Force had visited Education, the Library, Fine & Applied Arts, chairs and directors of schools and colleges, and with the Council of Deans. They had yet to honor Arts & Sciences and Community & Technical College but had covered a large portion of the colleges across the campus.

One glaring question that had come out was the question of implementation, about which the Task Force had not thought. However, the Task Force had now thought about it and had been able to respond to some of the colleges concerning implementation of the new RTP draft. That was, if and when the Board approved the policy, that would be the official date the policy became official. However, because the policy would require the review and possible revision of individual academic unit guidelines, it could not be implemented until that review and/or revision was completed. Thus, the Task Force would be asking the colleges and academic units and departments to do that review and those revisions within the time the policy was approved by the Board of Trustees until Dec. 15 of this year. Further, that those revisions and reviews would be given to the Provost by Dec. 15 of 2001. All guidelines needed to be approved by the Provost; that was what had always been done. At that point the Provost would either approve the guidelines as submitted or return them to the departments with suggestions. It gave three months for those approvals to take place, so that by March 15 of 2002 the entire process could be in place. That was the implementation that had been devised.

There was one issue that dealt with criteria. That was the issue of tenure and promotion occurring at the same time. In addressing that issue, the Task Force realized that it could not change criteria for probationary faculty; that was not an option. So for probationary faculty in colleges that allowed for separate tenure and promotion and had substantially different criteria for tenure and promotion, those probationary faculty would be allowed to remain under the criteria under which they had been hired. Of course, probationary faculty could choose the new criteria if they wished, but they would not be required to stand for tenure and promotion at the same time. If a given college had tenure and promotion separated but the criteria for tenure and promotion were substantially the same, then probationary faculty would be required to stand for tenure and promotion at the same time. The Task Force had discovered in many of the colleges that the criteria for tenure and promotion as associate professor were exactly the same. So the argument became, how could a faculty member be tenured and not promoted if the criteria was exactly the same? So that was why probationary faculty were required to stand for promotion at the same time as tenure.

That raised the question of what was substantially the same versus substantially different. The recommendation of the Task Force was that if there were any doubt within an academic unit about

sameness or difference, the chairman of the tenure committee should address that issue to the Provost for a ruling. The Provost would decide whether it was substantially the same or substantially different.

Those were the implementation pieces that had not been available until now. Mrs. Stokes then asked for questions.

Senator Sterns had a question regarding the implementation of college-level committees. He stated that he thought that could certainly serve faculty well, and that this had come up in discussions as to what the nature of the coordinating role in those committees was. A strong model in many schools contained pre-tenure reviews; others operated as more of an appeals function. Senator Sterns said that nowhere did the RTP Task Force document really address this since there had been no precedent.

Mrs. Stokes replied that she thought the document said that the college review committee was a substitute review. It was a qualitative review. Senator Sterns then stated that that might be true, except that The University of Akron had no history of the function of those committees. So it was very difficult to interpret what was meant. One could only look at how college-level committees had functioned at other universities. He thought that needed to be clarified. For instance, in many models, in order for the coordinating college-level committee to be effective, there might have been a pre-review again in 2 years, 4 years - that was not clear. In other words, when it came to the college-level committee, it would not be the first time that the college had ever seen the faculty member. In other colleges and universities the model was to look at issues to ensure that there was even treatment across all departments. Senator Sterns interjected that he hoped it was not being construed that he did not support such a thing. He was just stating that he did not know what the coordinating college-level committee would look like and how it would be implemented at this University. He would like to know more about what was in mind.

Mrs. Stokes replied that the intent of the Task Force for the college-wide review committee was to be a second substantial and qualitative review of the candidate. The Task Force had discussed on several occasions whether there should be a preliminary review by a college-wide committee. They had gone back and forth about whether to include it or not. Finally, it was not included for the simple reason that the Task Force thought it put too much pressure on a faculty member to convene that committee and do the internal reviews, at the third year, for example. That was the Task Force's basic decision. It was made because it was too much to ask to do two reviews of the tenure-promotion people and of third year people. It was discussed as something that could be added should there be a ground swell of support for that issue.

On the second point of how it was to be implemented, the college-wide review committee looked at criteria as they applied to the candidate, the criteria of the department from which the candidate came. If a faculty member was in the College of Arts & Sciences and was a candidate from Economics, then the people on the college-wide review committee would look at the criteria established by the department of Economics and judge the candidate substantially and qualitatively on those criteria.

Senator Erickson then wondered if that was how it was to be done, then college-wide review committees were essentially checking to see that departments did what they were supposed to do. College-wide review committees would not know how to judge criteria given them and would have to take whatever information departments provided regarding quality. The college-wide committee would not be able to make a judgment on the quality of the work. If guidelines were designed with that in mind, then the college-wide committee would be checking to see whether departments had met what each was supposed to.

Mrs. Stokes replied that college-wide review committees were to be making separate recommendations on the candidate. Senator Erickson responded that the Task Force was saying that the college-wide review committees would be using the same criteria, in essence giving a second judgment on whether the Economics department did an adequate job. This, she thought, was what Senator Sterns had been asking about.

Mrs. Stokes replied that it was a separate issue. To which Senator Erickson replied that it would be doing

one evaluation within department's guidelines.

Senator Midha then joined in by stating that part of what Senator Erickson was saying was correct. The college-wide review committee would in fact be looking at evaluations of the department, but they would also be asking for an external evaluation. Senator Erickson then asked whether there would be a second external evaluation. Senator Midha replied that the college-wide committee would be looking at internal and external evaluation.

Senator Erickson stated that this seemed to result in a lot of doubling up here. Senator Midha replied that he did not think there was doubling up. Senator Erickson stated that what was being said was that one group was not enough to make that judgment; that there had to be two or three. Everyone understood that the dean did this, but what was now being said was that in the college there needed to be two to check on what a department was doing.

Mrs. Stokes then stated that part of the purpose of the college-wide review committee was a leveling effort. There were colleges where some departments were less productive than others, and it would be nice if the whole college were more level.

Senator Erickson replied that that was why she was asking. If the one department's guidelines were to be used and then there were another department within the College of Arts & Sciences with different guidelines, then that might be another issue. But the college-wide review committee would be judging it by the department's guidelines. That was why she had some confusion here. If the Task Force's job was to try and change and level out the guidelines across the college, then that was a different matter.

Senator Lillie stated that there was one other thing he wanted to say about this particular topic. Sometimes personalities tended to become involved in these kinds of activities. Within small departments in particular there might be a situation in which there were some very serious personal problems. So part of the reason for the college-wide review committee was to basically hold accountable each department by saying each committee would look at each candidate's dossier and would use the department's criteria. Then if the college-wide review committee came to a different conclusion than did the department, maybe it was time all sat down and talked. So part of the reason was to make sure that if there was a problem, it didn't get out of the college.

Senator Erickson then stated that clearly, one of the problems was that the questions were probably being asked in Arts & Sciences. This was where college appeals committees existed.

Mrs. Stokes replied that the new college appeals committee would only deal with procedural error.

Provost Hickey then interjected by asking Senators to remember that the departmental criteria and procedures would undergo a rewriting process that would begin when the document had received all necessary approvals. Those criteria would come to the office of the Provost for approval. So there was an opportunity in the process in terms of looking at the various criteria forwarded by a unit. With regard to the third-year review, the Provost stated that he would welcome a third-year review if Senators wanted to put it back in. He thought it was a very good idea, particularly for the faculty member. He thought it gave the faculty member a very realistic assessment of how he/she was progressing. So he would welcome a third-year review. He hadn't fought for it at this point in time, but with a little encouragement he would.

Senator Sterns then stated that he thought it was this kind of clarification that was very worthy of discussion. He said that he thought it was very important if the University was going to institute this new approach, that it be done in a way that was facilitative and useful. Senator Sterns thought that the departments had always had a great deal of input here, and so the question was, what would be the balance under this new approach? He thought that this was a good discussion. It was not the place today for Senators to address it, but he did think he wanted to give enough comment. Faculty had spent quite a bit of time in his own department and he felt further discussion was warranted.

Chair Sheffer then asked whether there were any other questions regarding this process. Senator Huff made the statement that in regard to the process and reading the draft that was distributed, as he read through it, there were a number of places where there were references to the Faculty Manual. He tried (unsuccessfully) to check up on them. Mrs. Stokes stated that some of the references were wrong, but they had been corrected.

Senator Huff replied that he had not checked enough of them to base any kind of criticism on it, but that he thought this once again brought up the issue that it was difficult having a printed, bound Faculty Manual with one set of information and an electronic Faculty Manual with different information. When he had tried to check references, they were in neither one. So it had made review of this document difficult, and he had just wanted to point this out.

Mrs. Stokes answered by stating that she was sure Senator Huff would recognize that with a document of this size, the Task Force had done its very best to catch as many errors as possible, but there were still some remaining that were being caught.

Chair Sheffer then asked Mrs. Stokes to continue with the Curriculum Review report.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Mrs. Stokes began her report by referencing two handouts available to Senators (**Appendix B**). One contained a set of courses approved by the Provost to Faculty Senate in February 2001, and the second contained new programs also approved by the Provost. Because these were coming out of the committee, a motion was not needed. But a vote by the Faculty Senate was needed.

Senator Lillie then asked whether the Senate was supposed to vote on these. He thought that Senate was only supposed to vote if there were an objection. Chair Sheffer stated that the Senate just had to approve these. With no discussion forthcoming, he called for a vote. The motion passed.

Mrs. Stokes then informed the Senate that also coming from Curriculum Review Committee, new programs as listed would be taken to the Board of Trustees for approval after their approval by Faculty Senate. There were two corrections that she was sorry she did not catch. Under the College of Education, ED-01-35 should have read, "Sport Science and Wellness Education," the new title. FAA-01-51 should read, "Family and Consumer Sciences," the new name for the department.

As Chair Sheffer pointed out that as it came from committee, no second was needed. No discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken on the motion to approve the proposals. The motion was approved by the Senate.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - Senator Baldwin said that he wanted to provide a brief report. He stated that the Athletics Committee of the Senate had met on a regular basis, meeting last on the 25th of January. The committee had had at each of its meetings, the semi-new Athletics Director Mike Thomas, along with Mary Lu Gribshaw. The committee was very impressed in that the Athletic Department administration was very committed to the academic success of student-athletes. The Athletic Department Administration had presented to the committee five or six coaches who had also reiterated that and who were also quite proud of the average grade point average of the University's student-athletes. As a matter of fact, the committee had picked up on the fact that academic success was encouraged and that there was some competition in the Athletic Department in terms of providing success for our student-athletes.

But most recently the committee had become aware of an article that was published in the Chronicle of Higher Education, which had addressed 1993 data regarding retention rates and graduation numbers for student-athletes, including The University of Akron. Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh had brought this information to Senator Baldwin's attention on December 5, and Mary Lu Gribshaw and Mike Thomas were gracious enough to get the committee some data regarding retention rates and graduation for University of Akron

student-athletes in all of the programs from 1994 to 1999. In reviewing that data the committee found that the current data was quite impressive and quite a bit different than what the Chronicle of Higher Education had printed. With the minutes of the January 25 meeting, Senator Baldwin stated that he would be submitting a summary of the data given to the committee by the Athletic Department. More data would be available to Senators for their review in the next Chronicle.

Senator Lillie asked whether Senator Baldwin would send a copy of those results to the Chronicle of Higher Education. Senator Baldwin replied that he would. Senator Midha then stated that some of the figures on the report were not correct. Senator Baldwin replied that there were some questions regarding the meaning of some of the categories in the columns also. That would be clarified by the committee. Senator Midha replied that that would be appreciated.

NCAA FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE - Professor David Jamison presented the following report:

"I have been submitting an annual report to you in writing, but I wanted to come before you today to brief you and to take any questions you might have about my role as faculty athletics representative to the NCAA. I wanted to talk a little about those graduation rates and why there is improvement. I think as faculty members we can feel good about some things we've done on a conference and national level to do that. One of the reasons why I think graduation rates are improving nationwide are a number of initiatives backed by our Faculty Athletic Representatives Association.

As your rep, I'm part of the MAC faculty athletic representatives group and the national group. We've been very active in a couple of fronts. One of them is initial eligibility, the result of which is a much more realistic index of what it takes for a student to be initially eligible for financial aid and first year athletics participation at a university. If you recall reading about prop. 16 or prop. 48, you should know that what we've got now is an index, which indexes a student's high school grade point average and other predictors including ACT or SAT, which gives the University a better indicator of which students realistically have a chance to participate and succeed academically. The faculty athletics representative monitors that index. At our University no student participates, no student stays on the squad, unless I have signed that they are academically eligible, whether as initial recruits or as continuing students.

A second area in which we've been involved, and I think this is enormous progress, is continuing eligibility. If you follow this, you already know that for some years at some institutions, (and I'm proud to say I don't believe Akron was ever in this category), some student-athletes were basically majoring in eligibility. They took whatever courses they could to stay eligible for athletics. Some years ago in a measure endorsed by the faculty reps association, the NCAA adopted what we call the 25-50-75 Rule. It states that at the start of the third year of enrollment, the student-athlete must have completed 25% of a recognized degree program to be eligible to participate in athletics; 50% by the start of the fourth year on the campus; and 75% at the start of the fifth year. That's a substantial improvement, I think. It helps assure the students are majoring in something and are making adequate degree progress. We add to that a Satisfactory Progress Rule, whereby 24 credits must be completed during the academic year; 3/4 of those in the fall and spring semester, so that students can't slough off during the year and load up on course work in the summer, as was the abuse and habit at some places in the past. Further, to keep continuing eligibility, students must maintain a minimum grade point average.

I've also been, on your behalf, monitoring student-athlete welfare. I monitor practice times and opportunities to make sure we are in compliance with NCAA rules. I drop into practices; I review logs to make sure that coaches are logging the times of practice for our student-athletes. We're taking a serious look, as faculty reps in the conference, (and we've worked with your Athletics Committee in the past on this), a scheduling policy that will minimize class absences. Missed classes have a serious impact and are a particular problem for our region of the country, particularly with spring sports like softball and baseball. While it is a problem for the coaches, it's also a problem for us in the classroom when people are missing a week or two of classes. So we're monitoring that and attempting to deal with it.

I want to tell you about two other things that are done on your behalf as faculty members. One is if a student-athlete wants to transfer from The University of Akron and the coach does not want to permit him to do that or to talk to other institutions, we have a faculty appeals committee that reviews the request from the perspective of student-athletes and of the institution. I convene that committee, and may be calling on some of you to help with that.

The other thing we have is a Professional Sports Counseling Panel for those athletes who are at the elite level contemplating professional participation. Professor Prough and also Professor Sahl, from the Law School, and I serve on this panel. We've had six members of the football team this fall to counsel them about how to stay eligible and how to prepare themselves for professional careers and what options are available to them. Last year two of our men basketball players went through those services and are playing professional sports in Europe at this time.

There are two other things I'll be working on in the spring semester in which I'll probably be needing your help. One is that you may remember when the Knight Commission met the first time, they called for a new model of intercollegiate athletics that includes peer certification of the athletics program on a 10-year cycle, much like academic accreditation. We were Certified Without Condition the first time around. Dean Frank Kelley chaired our committee on the campus, and it's been five years since that happened. We are now due to do a 5-year interim report, since our second certification visit will be five years hence. I'll be writing that Interim Report this spring to indicate the progress we made since our last report. We are also required to monitor our compliance activities to make sure we're in compliance with NCAA rules. I will be doing a compliance audit this spring to make sure we're consistent with NCAA rules.

Finally, I can tell you that as a faculty member, I'm very pleased with the attitude and approach that I hear from the Athletic Department, from our AD, Mike Thomas, (who is here today), and from the coaching staff. I think they're addressing academics in a serious way, and we're going to continue to make good progress with that. My email is david34@uakron.edu if you want to ask me any questions. I'd be glad to hear questions now if you like, but feel free to email me with any questions you have about NCAA matters or student-athlete welfare."

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report by addressing the parking survey. However, he stated that the committee had not gotten an overwhelming response. He asked that all Senators please fill out the survey. The number who had responded to the original survey was embarrassingly low. He then stated he would make a brief report (**Appendix C**).

The University had gained parking spaces to make life easier. There was both a decline as well as an increase model here, because parking spaces were taken away as well as spaces given. A new 4-loop shuttle bus service had been instituted. Members of the Facilities Planning Committee actually had planned and ridden and helped design the routes. That made the CFPC even more deserving of Senators' feedback. Another concern regarded buses that were supposed to allow transfer from one route to another and whether they would stick around long enough so one could get off one bus and get on another. That had been documented and the committee was refining the process. Feedback though was welcome. The one thing about the new approach was that it reached all the parking areas and really attempted to accomplish what a shuttle bus service should do. Senator Sterns welcomed this professional growth experience that Senators had provided him in his quest to understand transportation and parking.

Senator Lillie then asked a question regarding how to respond to the survey. He asked whether Senators were to rate each of the questions using the 1-5 scale. Senator Sterns replied, yes. Senator Lillie then asked whether Senate was not going to take and rate the top 5 out of 7. Senator Sterns replied that that was correct. Senator Ritchey then asked whether Senator Sterns wanted all of the faculty members in the individual units to fill out the surveys. Senator Sterns replied that the survey was really asking that Senate members serve as representatives.

Senator Zap then asked what the survey item was which dealt with, "provide extraordinary service."

Senator Sterns replied that he thought the interpretation of that would be to have more buses pick up and drop off right at one's car, providing more hours of frequent service, that kind of thing.

Senator Zap then said that if one was arriving at 7:30 a.m., one was most likely getting a very good parking space, so that would be her one concern with that one. Also, was this just for full-time employees? (No.) So this was encouraging them? Senator Erickson replied that this was so they could get in closer. Senator Sterns added that, for instance, if one went to the parking area around the library and in the lots adjoining the dormitories, one would find that those cars did not leave. So a real question existed about what should be designated for dorm students, whether there should be a parking area that was slightly farther out. So even if someone showed up here early in the morning, he/she would notice no cars were moved. What caused movement was using EJ Thomas for performing arts events where attempts were made to get people to vacate those lots. Senator Sterns stated that he thought there was a real problem regarding the dormitory and parking issue.

Further, he stated that one of the reasons a bus service starting now at 7:30 was available was that there was no incentive for someone who came here early to park out in many of the lots available and walk in. Now there is good coverage of the lots behind the Chapel, behind Spicer, so that people could really have access to the full range of parking on a fairly regular basis. He thought that the opportunity was there to make it better. He stated that everyone should think about what he/she thought was a fair approach to some of this.

Senator Sakezles then had a question regarding how long the parking crunch would last given the cost of some of the solutions being put forward. For instance, if the University was going to put \$20-50,000 into low frequency, it would be relevant to know. Was the University going to have a parking problem for the next two years, the next 5, 10 years?

Senator Sterns replied that if the University's projected enrollment increases were achieved, parking would be a continuing issue. Things should get better as new parking opened up, but it would still be a challenge. Senator Sakezles asked for a year range for this.

Senator Sterns replied that financing was a concern. He stated that each parking space now was costing somewhere between \$10-11,000 per space. So it was something that was fairly expensive. The committee thought that the pressure would be off a bit as soon as the east deck was completed. He also raised the issue of going back to faculty-designated areas. He thought that the Facilities Planning Committee had always said it saw the opportunity to return to faculty-designated parking as appropriate.

Senator Sakezles stated that this really didn't answer her question as far as the number went. She stated that all could assume the situation was going to last for quite a while. Vice President Nettling then stated that the Landscape for Learning was going to spread out probably over the next 4 years, even if only phase 1 was currently the topic of discussion.

Provost Hickey then remarked that he had thought the timing of the current deck renovations and closing for construction was a somewhat shorter time frame. Vice President Nettling replied that it was. Senator Sterns stated that the Auburn Science deck had just been closed. Polsky was fully functioning now as well as the Exchange deck. In reality, most of the decks now were back in operation.

Provost Hickey stated that his sense was that the parking decks were front loaded in the construction plan such that the number of spaces available would be back on line within the next 18-24 months. Vice President Nettling replied that only the east parking deck was part of the Landscape for Learning right now. The north deck and the west deck were yet to be funded. Provost Hickey then inquired about the renovations of existing decks. Vice President Nettling stated that as far as existing decks, those should be pretty well done once the east deck was completed. Provost Hickey asked whether that would be within the next 18-24 months.

Senator Sterns stated that he thought the point being raised was excellent. The sooner funding was obtained for the other two decks, the better off the University would be.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Reed reported that the committee had met three times since the last meeting of Faculty Senate and had been working on two fronts. First, the committee had been trying to come up with (for the long run) a budget model that was more reflective of productivity of units and tried to have a better relationship between revenue generated and expenses of units. And also, to fulfill the committee's responsibility to this body, which was to bring to Senate, before the end of this spring and before the Board met, budget recommendations for next year. So during the last few meetings the committee had really been concentrating on working on that academic incentive model, the first draft of which was prepared by Dr. Hickey. Senator Reed stated that she knew that some of the units were looking at that and some of the colleges had actually brought feedback back to the table. She encouraged those who had not had the opportunity yet to review it in their units to spend some time in a faculty meeting and take a more detailed look at some of the issues being discussed.

Those issues were very complex, and she cited a few of those to illustrate the kind of conversations the committee was reviewing. In light of the somewhat tight budget situation, how could the committee come up with a model that both provided a return of more dollars back to units that were now operating with a very high return on investment, while at the same time still provide some reward incentives to units which demonstrated improved progress. So that was one of the challenges that the committee was dealing with. Both components were necessary for any model the committee devised.

Senator Reed went on to say that the committee also talked about things such as how to deal with special circumstances in units; for example, the Law School, which had a library that charged an expense to the units which was not common to other units within the University.

Further, she wanted to thank our business colleagues - Dean Hallam who presented to the committee and who gave to the Council of Deans a model that had a work sheet to play with in which changes could be entered. For instance, if masters enrollment were to increase by 1,000 student credit hrs., how would that impact revenue generated? If costs were cut, how would that affect ratios? The deans had been asked by the Provost as well as the committee to play with that model and see what some of the different scenarios might be.

Senator Reed mentioned that Vice President Hank Nettling had given the committee a preview of the Governor's budget which was actually very close on target. If anybody was interested, he/she could get into the Governor's complete budget recommendations from the state of Ohio web page. She suggested the address to access was: www.state.oh.us/obm. That was the office of budget and management which did have a link to the Governor's recommendations.

Senator Reed continued by stating that some of the new initiatives were coming up at the state level. One concerned how to improve math and science instruction and other topics which might have broad university consequences.

The committee also looked at the first-day figures and were really encouraged by those, as they did show some growth compared to the same time last year. As Dr. Roney had mentioned, there really had been a lot of effort put forth this year to try to get students to register early and to make arrangements for payment so that they were counted as paid enrollments.

Senator Reed stated that she had asked for an ad hoc subcommittee to look at the proposals that were submitted by the colleges for the House Bill 640 on instructional equipment funds. Some people had responded to her or had a little group of PBC looking at those requests and helping the Provost's office give feedback to them by the middle of this month. The committee appreciated that opportunity.

Finally, Senator Reed stated that the next committee meeting was Tuesday, at which time the committee

would be working on the calendar to make sure all was accomplished in a timely way for the budget recommendations that would eventually come to the Senate.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - None.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Redle reported that The University of Akron soccer team was one of 13 teams recognized on a national basis for its grade point average - it was above the 3.1 figure. He felt this was a nice bright spot in the face of some of the other discouraging news.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chair called for a motion to adjourn. This was so moved and seconded. The meeting ended at 4:15 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin