

Verbatim Transcript

University of Akron
Faculty Senate

2016-05-19

CHAIR RICH: This special meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. As you know, in the Senate's regular May meeting the Senate requested that the President appear before the Senate in a special meeting in May to address the points that were made in the No Confidence Resolution that the Senate passed in its February meeting. That is the sole purpose of this meeting. To allow the President to address the points that were made in that document. There will be an opportunity for members of the Senate to ask questions. I will give first the President an opportunity to make a statement, and questions will follow. If you're seeking the floor later on to ask a question, please do so by raising your name tent with your name facing me, right side up.

Also, if you have not signed the attendance sheet, and you are a member of the Senate, please raise your hand and Heather will get you the attendance sheet-- as soon as she's done handing out another name tag. And if for some reason that doesn't work, please make sure you do sign in before you leave today. Or just wander back, if you are near an aisle, and wander back to where Heather is, right back there. But we do need a record of who was in attendance. All right. As I indicated, the way we'll proceed is that the President will make a statement, and then anyone who wishes to ask questions may seek the floor by raising their name tent, and I will recognize you as much as I can in the order in which you raise your hand. With this qualification: I will try such as possible if somebody attempts to ask -- seeks the floor a second time, to make sure that there's no one who hasn't already had the floor and wishes to speak. Okay? Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Great. Thank you. Can everyone hear me okay? My voice does not carry as well as Chairman Rich so I think it would be helpful to everyone if I use the microphone. What I thought we would do today is for me to take a few minutes to address the points in the resolution. But we're together for what could be as much as two hours so I would like for this very much to be a conversation. So in my addressing of the points, I will be purposefully brief in order to get more to a conversation with you. So if I don't

cover a particular point well enough in the opening statement, please come back to it and then we'll dig a little bit deeper into the story, into the different points of view, and I am quite comfortable, assuming Chairman Rich is comfortable, on going off-script, too, if there other issues that were not delineated in the Resolution that you want to talk about. I think it would be very helpful to take this time to talk about those issues as well. So let me make just kind of an opening comment to provide a little context for the points that are raised in the Resolution, and then I'll hit each of the highlighted points, and then we'll create a conversation around that.

As I reflect back on this two years, what I will remember is that it all really began really during the interview process when the Board essentially said, look, we believe we've got a problem. We have declining enrollment; we were as high as 30,000, and we are systematically reducing each year in a fairly linear form all the way down to 25,000. If that continues, our fixed costs are so high, we think we're going to have serious problems. And then secondly and related to that, we think we have a financial problem, and we're not sure how big the problem is. We don't feel like we've had a real budget. We're not sure that we really understand the numbers that are being presented to us and how real they are. And so those are the two big issues that we need our new President to address, the moment he or she arrives. And I explained that I'd certainly be comfortable helping them understand the extent of the problem and leading an effort to try to both strengthen the finances and reverse the enrollment decline because if we don't do that, it puts everything that we do at risk. And so that was kind of the overriding picture that I had of the University coming in. Great university, doing great things, but everything at risk if we didn't really quickly solve those two problems. So when I arrived, you know the first three months were just not only meeting people but trying to dig into those two issues, to get a sense of how big were the challenges. How big were the two challenges. It didn't take long to get a sense of what we were dealing with.

And so I think it's very appropriate that the first two items mentioned in the Resolution, points one and two, pertain to declining enrollment, and they pertain to quote-unquote miscommunication of the budget deficit. So those two points align. So let me talk a little bit about that. My understanding of the enrollment picture of the University is that we went to selective admission on or about, I think we decided it in 2010-11, and implemented it for the fall 2012 class, and that essentially said we would no longer accept students with an ACT of 15 or less. Because they were literally flunking and I learned this -- up to this point I've been saying at a 90+ percent failure rate. The number given to me this week was actually 98%. They were failing at a 98% rate. So I think the university did the right thing. Even before the legislature changed the funding model, this university decided it's not right to accept these students knowing that they're failing at a 98% rate. That took 900 students out of the enrollment equation by virtue of that one decision. So of the 4500 students that we've lost over the last five years, 900 are attributable to this selective admission. The rest of the enrollment decline over that period of time, I would say, are competitive factors. The competitive environment. The demographic -- population demographics coming out of high school, and the fact that we had limitations in some of our most attractive and popular programs. When you add all of that together, it probably accounts for the rest of the enrollment decline during that period. So we knew -- and we also knew looking forward that the population demographics were not going to change, so if we did nothing it would get -- if we did nothing different it would get predictably smaller. So we knew status quo wasn't an option to reverse the enrollment decline; we had to do something new. You had to innovate. And that led to a lot of college-level conversations in the second three months that I was here, we began all the college-level conversations, and again, the approach was how do we become more distinctive? How do we elevate academic quality? How do we do these things in an economically sustainable way? Because, in the end, we've got to reverse that enrollment decline. And that's -- that was the impetus for all the college-level conversations at that time.

The next three month period, if you'll recall, then we turned to the university level. We had three summit meetings with representatives from internal constituencies and external communities that met in February and April of last year, to identify some university-level initiatives. But collectively, those college-level initiatives, and those 10 to 12 university-level initiatives were our best thinking -- our best collective thinking about what gave us the best chance of reversing the enrollment decline.

And we never expected all of those new initiatives to work. What we were hoping for was that, over time, enough of them would work that it would be enough to reverse the enrollment decline. So again, I come from a discipline probably like many of yours, where we think about kind of a portfolio approach to innovation. That if we're going to innovate, we know that just like a stock portfolio some going to be winners, some are going to be losers, some are just going have kind of average returns, don't say much, but we're going to try enough new initiatives to identify the three or four that become the ones that we can build a strategy around. So we discontinue what failed to not be effective and we reallocate the resources to things that are. But the only way that that works is if your number of initiatives is big enough to give you enough of a sample, if you will, to give you a chance. 'Cause you never know which ones are going to be the home runs and which ones are going to be the losers. So it's very much kind of a portfolio approach to that. And as noted, as we'll get to these other points, there have been some winners and there have been some losers. But that's not surprising. And again, from my discipline, that's to be expected. Because we take kind of a portfolio approach to innovation.

The second issue on finances, when the Board said we're not sure how big the problem was, it didn't take us very long to quantify that. And the resolution talks about the miscommunication of a \$60 million budget problem. And all that I can say is, from the very beginning we began talking about quantifying our financial

challenge, we always said, both in slides behind me and in what we said verbally, that that \$60 million problem had three parts: \$20 million of just operating expenses being too high relative to what had happened to our operating revenues over the last several years, primarily driven by loss in state appropriations, and declining enrollment, so we never adjusted by about \$20 million our spending by virtue of the fact that we were losing enrollment and losing state appropriations. So 20 of that 60 was just our operating expenses were now too high relative to what had happened to our revenue. The revenue that we were taking in. We always said that the next 30 million of the \$60 million problem had to do with not spending enough to maintain the beautiful, extensive physical plant that we had now built. We'd spent \$650 million in new construction. You still had huge amounts of deferred maintenance on campus, even after that new construction. That in order to keep the physical plant at just a steady-state, replacing roofs when they need to be replaced, air-conditioning units, whatever, it would take a minimum of about \$40 million a year just to keep the plant at a steady-state. And yet, we were only budgeting to spend 10 million a year. So the difference between those two amounts was the 30 million of the \$60 million problem.

So now we've explained the two pieces of the \$60 million problem, and we always explained the third piece as being there's no money in the budget for new initiatives. Zero. And our goal, given our enrollment decline, given the need to invest in a portfolio of new initiatives at the college and university levels to turn enrollment, that we ought to set as a goal about 3% of our estimated revenue collection, which ended up being around \$10 million. So, by virtue of there being no money in the budget to do that, that meant that it was a \$10 million challenge to try to create that pool in the budget.

So every meeting that we had, we always said \$60 million challenge that has three components. And then, understandably so, we had some people say well that \$30 million of deferred maintenance is just an estimate. No question it's an

estimate. Some said, well, the estimate is too high. To which I have always responded, I'm not so sure it's too high. If anything my opinion is, and the opinion of most people is, it's too low. Because the way you get to that number is, every year our financial statements are audited by external auditors. They come in and they look at your calculation, what's called depreciation expense. That's your estimate, that's your accounting estimate, by how much your plant is deteriorated every year, and it goes into your financial statements. And that number gets audited. And most accountants would tell you, that because you're depreciating, or amortizing, costs that you incurred 15 years ago, but you're needing to replace those particular items in your physical plant at current market value, given the fact that typically there some amount of inflation built into that, that estimate is actually probably a low estimate of what your ultimate replacement value is going to be. So if anything it tends -- but it is just an estimate. And it's always the last thing that we knew would be difficult to really solve of this 60 million. We knew that, really, the other two parts were most important to fix first.

First we've got to quit spending more than we're taking in -- 20 million. Then we've got to create a pool to invest in things that will reverse the enrollment decline, and then, if we've made progress in that area then, perhaps, we can get to taking care the physical plant that we need to. And we knew we wouldn't be able to do that, probably, year one, year two, maybe we got around to making progress on that maybe by year three.

And that's how we communicated it. And not everyone heard it because, usually when you're in a meeting like this, even after hearing an explanation like that, if you're going to tell the story to a colleague, you're going to lead with the \$60 million number. And then that's all people remember. And then they learned later that it had three components and you didn't know that, and now I'm shocked by that and I feel like I was misled. And I felt like that's some of what has

happened. And that's why communications so challenging, especially in an organization like this.

So the last thing I would say about the enrollment, the points one and two in the resolution, is that we have been experiencing this steady enrollment -- the part that's frustrating this year, and sad this year, is even though total enrollment was declining, we were beginning to see some progress with our first-year class. The beginning of the enrollment pipeline. If you think of enrollment as being this six-year undergraduate pipeline and this three- or four-year graduate pipeline that constitutes your total enrollment, you know we just graduated one of the largest graduating classes in the history of the university. So that means coming out of the back of our pipeline is a historically big number. Okay, and that's both reason to celebrate and reason for concern when you're looking at total enrollment.

But what was particularly sad about what we're looking forward to is we were starting to see the front part of the pipeline stabilize and increase. In fact, that had happened the last two years. And so I think what is being referenced here is probably the fact that as recently as a couple months ago we were about 34% behind where we were this time last year with our first-year class. Not the whole enrollment pipeline, but the first-year class. And that's a big number. That number has narrowed, consistently has narrowed. It's now down to 23%. Went from 34 to 33 to 29 to 24 to 23, so obviously we're monitoring it pretty closely. That's still 900 students though, I'm told.

And the other thing I would say is, historically we get 20% of our freshmen class during the summer months so, unlike many universities that will end their recruiting on May 1st, that's never been what we've done. We always continue to recruit through the summer. And historically we get about 20% of our first-year class. We're hoping that we'll do better than 20% this year and continue to close that, but if not, then it will be yet another successive year of total enrollment

decline, especially when you take what's coming off the back end of the pipeline, and a smaller number that we had on the front end of the pipeline.

Now why has that happened? I think everyone would probably agree it has a lot to do with the negative publicity in the local area. I don't have a proof of that, but that's what, I think, people suspect. And the anecdotal feedback is that people are concerned about the financial condition of the university. And really, what I can say is, when a parent or student says that to me is, well, I can understand your concern but please know what you're reading about are our steps to keep our finances strong. To live within our means. To protect the academic core and to be more efficient and more selective and more focused in other areas of the university. That's what universities do to keep their finances strong. And that's what we will always do, and that's what we tell the rating agencies, as well.

So the last thing I would say about the finances before moving on to the other point is that historically our finances are very thin, very thin here. And the metric that I use to give me the best reading is something that's called a composite financial index. You just plug in your audited financials, they get checked every year by an external group, you throw it into this formula that's been developed by one of these national accounting firms for -- it's specifically for higher education, and when you do that it basically creates a number of ratios but also produces one composite financial index that's on a 10-point scale. And essentially, for as far back as we've calculated it, which is I think eight years, our number has never been more than about three. So we hover in that 1 to 3 range. To give you a sense that our finances have been very thin and continue to be that. Which was really kind of a double whammy. We need to invest to reverse enrollment decline, but our finances are so thin we don't have any money to invest.

So that was the two-pronged problem that we had to attack pretty quickly. And I think I've told this group and I've told many other groups, the hardest decision that we really had to make was did we feel like we had the time to phase in all

the changes that we needed to make in order to create the financial strength and the pool of investment to be able to begin making investments that might turn enrollment around, or did we feel like we had to hit it hard that first year and I've used the term, you know, that rip-the-Band-Aid-off approach. Rightly or wrongly, and I might even say wrongly at this point, we chose the rip-the-Band-Aid-off approach. We chose to hit it as hard as we could the first year, thinking that the risk in phasing it in is that the slope can still continue to get worse; the number could get bigger and the number runs away from you as you're trying to phase it in. The number's actually getting bigger because you're not going at it hard enough. The other problem is that smart people figure out you're phasing it in over a number of years, and then people are ready--when's the next shoe going to drop? But as a multiyear impact on morale, when people figure out, oh, this is a phased-in approach. I wonder what's going to be cut next?

So again, rightly or wrongly, for those reasons we said no, we're going to bite the bullet; we're going to try to protect the academic core, but we're going to hit everything else as hard as we can and try get caught up. To solidify the base so that we can look everyone in the eye and say, we did everything that we can, now let's just get refocused on moving forward from here. There is no planned second shoe to drop. And that's the reason why we hit it so hard. The problem in hitting it so hard, though, is that we activated so many constituencies that were unhappy with us cutting their favorite program. Now, what I would consider a non-core program, but that's debatable, especially if it's your favorite program, it's hard to accept the fact that it was non-core. But that's what we're trying to do. We activated so many constituencies, that it got so loud, that we ended up with what we ended up with. Both internally and externally. And so this price that we appear to be paying on the first-year class is part of that trying to, again, part of the price we paid to try to solidify the financial base and make these investments. And that's really the context for most of the issues here.

The next one in the resolution talks about the reduction of key services on campus, and specifically calls out IT, distance learning, and admissions. All that I can say to that is -- true. We cut IT. And we went to the director of IT and said we need your staff at the minimum -- absolute minimum level, okay? To function as a university. We're going to try to protect the academic core, and while you serve the academic core, you're still an administrative unit. I need you to give me your absolute minimum staffing numbers you need. And then we went with that. Now did we cut too deep? It appears that we did. It appears that we did. But as soon as we solidify our finances, then we'll again make the investments to try to get back to a staffing level. Or if it becomes something that we can't live with, then we have to find the money somewhere else. Which we ended up having to do in a number of areas. We knew that we couldn't be all-knowing on the position eliminations, that we have to fix some of our initial judgment calls and we've done that, going forward.

Same thing in distance learning. And while one could argue whether that's core, there just wasn't enough good things being said about that service, or the participation levels in that service, to believe that it was something that we needed to protect and save. And there was always a plan to rebuild it later by combining efforts in learning assessment and teaching and learning, but all the feedback from the current level was that something that we needed to remove from the budget. And we did.

Now admissions is called out and frankly I don't -- we've made investments in admissions, we've not pulled back on our investment in the admissions area. So that's one that's probably not true. Maybe we reallocated but the overall in admissions, because it's so closely tied to enrollment -- what we're trying to fix -- we've actually made investments in the admissions area. So their budget has probably grown, not been reduced in recent years.

The next point in the resolution pertains to declining donations by 42%. Now, actually, unlike enrollment, those numbers have actually closed pretty dramatically since this was produced. So what I know is that what they're projecting is that pledges -- new gift pledges this year will actually be 56% higher than last year. Overall gifts -- if one removes one large gift that we got last year, if one removes that one outlier, that one data point -- they're actually projecting will be flat relative to last year by the end of the year. But pledges would be up 56%. I'm calling out myself; I said if one removes one big gift from last year. I'll say that so everyone understands that's what I'm doing, but it's not the kind of dramatic, oh-my-goodness kind of an issue that it once appeared to be. You did have some people say that until things stabilize at the university, I'm not giving any money to the university anymore. We're starting to see more of those people starting to give again. So that's a good sign. I would say that of the donations, that's the least of our concerns at the moment.

The next item has to do with quote-unquote discord among faculty, students, alumni, and community members. And I agree. I think there's been a high amount of discord. And that's probably the issue that I have reflected most on, and I don't pretend to have the answer to all of the variables that created the discord. I have my own theories, which I'm sure are inadequate, and that collectively we could come up with a much better theory and we should. The university needs to learn from this experience. But my theory is that a lot of the discord was tied to the budget cuts. We -- again, when people feared, incorrectly, that we were closing E.J. Thomas, it created a huge amount of discord in the arts community, and that was just bad communication. Honestly, we never imagined anyone would think that we would close E.J. Thomas, and somehow that rumor not only got started, it appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal before we could put it out. We just never even thought that people would think that. Because in reality, what we're trying to do is, actually find better program for E.J. Thomas that would attract more people into the center. And what we're trying to do was to find a way to quit losing \$2 million a year running

E.J. Thomas. That was what we're trying to do. And in that particular case, if one looks at where we are today, that's pretty much where we are. We don't lose 2 million anymore. We may lose 3 or 400,000 -- that's a huge improvement. And the shows that we're getting with E.J. Thomas with the new partnership with Playhouse Square I think are going to be a lot more attractive, and draw more people into the performing arts center moving forward. So in the end that, as one example I think, is one that was such a moment of discord that, in the end, will be a very good story that we can tell.

Not only the budget cuts -- the baseball; I mean, there's a baseball contingency. University Press -- huge concern over would it endure? Would it prosper? Would it continue to function? Everywhere we cut, there's always a contingency of people that are impacted by that. When we went through collective bargaining, when it was reported that we were looking at some of the retiree dependent benefits as part of those conversations that activated yet another group of people highly concerned that we were even looking to do something there.

Now the other thing that I would say that added to the discord, after the budget cuts, was the conversation about first, renaming, and then, rebranding. So I would say those two things combined activated most of the discord that made its way into conversation around faculty, students, alumni, and community members. I'd add a third to that list, and that is the percentage of new hires that were tenure track, versus nontenure track. I think those three issues: the budget cuts, the rebranding initiative, and the tenure track and nontenure track mix, in my opinion, counts for -- I'll pick a number -- 90% of the discord that we're dealing with. And really kind of understandably so.

And I've done a lot of reflecting on what we could have done to minimize the discord, and the only thing that I can come up with that I think would have significantly minimized the discord is if we would have just waited a year before

implementing all of that. And just built relationships for a year. And built goodwill. But then it goes back to, did we have time? Or would the problem have been twice as bad when we ultimately got to it a year later? Now if I had it to do over again, I want to say I now want to try to do it the other way, to find out. But I'm not really sure what new kind of problems it would have created by doing that. And that was ultimately the hardest decision we made. Phase in, take your time, build relationships, but does it run away from you? Or, hit it hard, get it over with, look everyone in the face, and hope everybody can -- kind of rallies and recovers and you can move on. On a more solid financial footing, with a chance of having some new things that might reverse the enrollment decline. That was, in my opinion, the most difficult decision. That triggered a lot of this.

The next one in the resolution is the increase of the student fees. And I admit, in retrospect we would not have tried that. But what I would say is, at the time, there was reason to believe that these fees might have been approved and accepted by Columbus. And for those who have not followed the issue, upper-division program fees, and facility fees, are fees that universities have increased over the years to make up for some of the loss of state support that universities get. And the thought was that we had structured a fee that would survive Columbus' scrutiny. But it turns out, for reasons that I'll allow you to speculate, there is a high level of anti-tuition increase, anti-fee increase, in Columbus this past year. A very high level. So there was a very strict standard that was applied, and our fees didn't meet that standard. Frankly, that was \$10 million fee increases that was intended to go toward solving our \$60 million financial challenge. Financial problem. That was part of the three-year plan to try to implement \$10 million, cut expenses by 40, to raise fees by 10, and then pray one day that enrollment reverses, and to see it through profitable enrollment growth. That was the three-year plan, that had all of its components, but that's a summary of that three-year plan. Well now that we didn't get the fee approved, we enter now year two of the budget process needing to come up with a plan B for that 10 million. Either a different series of fee increases that we work with the

students to try to craft in a way that would meet the Columbus standard, or to try to get the 10 million some other way. That'll be part of this next year's budget process, to do that.

Next item in the Resolution is the rebranding of the university. I think most of you know this story but, again, it's in the context of what do we need to do to reverse this enrollment decline? Is there a way for the University of Akron academic experience to be branded in a way that would make it easier to communicate to a student from further distance from Akron, in a compelling way that would cause them to skip over some other public and private universities and choose to come here? And what we thought we were doing is essentially looking back at our history and saying, what makes our educational experience special? And when we did that, what we concluded, with the help of marketers and a lot of people in the conversation, was that what makes our educational experience very distinctive is the extent to which we've engaged in some of our greatest programs students in many different kinds of experiential learning. Whether was internships; whether it was co-ops; whether it was service learning; whether it was clinical experiences; whether it was student teaching -- whatever it was, one of the distinctive elements was the amount of experiential learning, highlighted by the very extensive and long-standing engineering co-op program.

Another element that made our educational experience distinctive is the unique history that the University of Akron has with area industry, going all the way back to the rubber industry. That experiential learning, and that connectedness to industry was something unique that we could say, if you live in Chicago, no reason to go to University of Toledo, come on over to the University of Akron because you can have a very distinctive, hands-on, form of higher education that oh, by the way, leads to great career outcomes coming out the other end, okay? You get to learn from great faculty in the classroom and then you get to apply it in the real world, and make contacts and connections that will lead to great career opportunities when you graduate. So those -- that experiential learning, that

connection to industry, in our mind was the classical definition of a polytechnic university. And so the idea was let's distinguish the University of Akron for what it is and how it's different, in a way that students would -- so that would be the message. And they wouldn't understand it at first, but it would be an attention-getter that we would then explain, and that explanation would be the value proposition that would cause them to want to come here. Now, and -- to help make the point -- others were doing it. Others were employing this same technique, and seem to have had good experience with it. University of Wisconsin South, Wisconsin's Polytechnic University. And you've heard me talk about the new Florida Polytechnic University they're building in Florida; you've heard me talk about the new -- the change in the name of the college at Purdue; you've heard the new Polytechnic campus at Arizona State. So there seemed to be kind of a trend of grabbing this notion of a polytechnic education, but the problem, as we've seen, is that -- and it's very interesting; it appeared to come from the nurses first -- well, polytechnic doesn't include nursing. Of course it includes nursing. You've got your clinical experience; that's very much a polytechnic education. But they didn't hear it that way. And if they didn't hear it that way, then it wasn't helpful. On the other hand, a lot of folks -- I still get people who love the idea. Now, I will say this, and I'm not the first one -- I didn't make this observation, I've only noticed it since someone said this to me -- there does seem to be a little bit of a gender interpretation issue. But either way, since females are more than -- much more than 50% of college populations, it's not working. The idea then was to -- okay, it's not working, emphasize the experiential and the connections, quit emphasizing the word. They're getting lost in the word. Just dropped the word and emphasize what the word means. And that's the approach that we've begun to take and will continue to take. But again, it was all part of we just need to be known for something. Both at the college level, the program level, and the university level to help make the case, to recruit from further distances.

Next item in the resolution has to do with the impact on the research mission as it pertains to tenure-track faculty, graduate funding, and access to research funds. And this, to me, is kind of one of the more sad elements of the resolution because we never, ever, ever meant for anyone to believe that we weren't dedicated to our research mission at the institution. We were simply trying to figure out how to stabilize our finances so that we can continue that great tradition. I mean, what we found was that we had \$15 million of startup funds that have been pledged to new faculty, with no plan to be able to fund it. So our goal was always to honor those commitments, but, my goodness, we've got to find a way to find the cash to honor those commitments. When we looked at the number of graduate assistantships that we had in the non-academic areas of the university, it was so obvious that we were an outlier. And then we had an outside group come in and confirm that we were an outlier. Then we went to Graduate Council and said, would you look at this and see if there's a way to rationalize this, that we appear to be an outlier in a way that's probably hurting us financially and we probably can't sustain it. Will you look at it? And just by virtue of asking Graduate Council to look at it, it created a fear, a concern, that oh, no -- here we go. They're not supportive of research. When again, that's not it at all. One of the things that we're trying to do is preserve, minimally, the great research programs that already exist in the university, and we want to be able to build others. But we can't do it if there's not a financial base on which to do that.

The next item in the resolution has to do with the hiring of directors and deans, despite serious concerns, objections of faculty and search committees. So I know of two cases where that applies. In the case of our Honors College dean, and in the case of our CAST dean. And if I remember correctly, however, actually our CAST dean was part of the recommended list that came to the President's office from the search committee. So we made a selection off of the list. Okay. In the case of our Honors College dean, I think -- I don't believe that she was recommended. I have to check on that. But all that I can say to either -- these are human beings, number one. And let me just make this point: I think

one of the things I've enjoyed most about these last few months is kind of reflecting on all that can be learned from our experience, is the number of people that have come and said here's a book I which to read. I think this might help kind of understand what's going on. And I get about a book a week brought to me. And actually some of them are incredible. Two in particular. I'll never forget some of the lessons out of two of these ten books that I've received. And one of them is entitled -- in fact, I highly recommend both of them. One of them is entitled *The Anatomy of Peace*, written by the Arbinger Institute. I don't know if I'm saying that correctly, but Arbinger A-r-b-i-n-g-e-r Institute. And if I remember correctly, it's very interesting, it's co-authored by a gentleman from Israel whose father was killed by a Palestinian, and his co-author is a Palestinian whose father was killed by an Israeli. So they co-authored to write this book. And there are some marvelous lessons in terms of explaining some of the discord that we have, but the first point in the book, and it seems so simple, it's got a much more kind of elaborate system of analyzing this, is just to remember you're dealing with people, not objects. And in the case of these two people, I would say our Honors College dean I think is proving to be a huge asset to the institution, okay. And, she adds to the diversity of our campus in many different ways, including racial diversity. And I think in the case of the other individual, who is a person, he's had to deal with a lot of attacks since he got here. And he's not perfect. And none of us are. And I am hoping that he will perform at a high level and, ultimately, will be kind of embraced for the community on the unique elements that he brings. But those are the only two cases, and the reason that we did that by the way is because he did have a different background. He had a not-for-profit higher education background that we wanted to learn from. Because one thing that the not-for-profit industry does well is not academic quality, they don't do that well, but what they -- oh, excuse me -- for-profit. I meant for-profit. They don't do that well. For-profit doesn't. But what they do do well is to serve -- provide student services to the nontraditional student population that seems to work with nontraditional students. So we wanted -- knowing we needed to diversify our enrollment, knowing that those programs in CAST and Wayne College are very

important, not only in terms of being a public university, but providing the cash flow that funds a lot of the things that we do as a comprehensive public research university, we wanted someone with that background to add to our way of thinking about how to approach the problems that we have. So that was the reason that we went in a little bit different direction with both of those hires, frankly.

The very last issue in the resolution is the outsourcing of fundamental university responsibilities, to outside for-profit and out-of-state vendors, with little or no consultation for the university community. So I suspect, and I know we've outsourced two functions, three actually, three. Three functions since I've been here. So let's kind of walk through all three of them. And I'll go from easiest to hardest, okay? That's what I'm doing. The first one that we outsourced was food service. And I don't hear -- I hear some, but overall the feedback that I get, the net feedback, is extraordinarily positive on the new outsourced. I'm not thing all the feedback's been perfect, but on balance it is heavily weighted in the positive direction. They've come in, and the feedback from the students is good. They've invested -- I think they have plans to invest a total of \$11 million of their capital, money that we don't have, their capital to update and improve all of the facilities. And yes, they're a for-profit, but yes, we also share in that, and they have great dialogue with the students on a regular basis. The only complaint, frankly, that I have heard has to do with some of the dietary. And so that's an issue that they will work with the student to try to address. So they're trying to drive volume, in terms of what students want, but they're also trying to be respectful of what students need and try to find that happy medium between those two elements. That's really the only complaint that I've heard on that.

But I don't really think that's the major source of discontent that's being referenced in this. The next item that I'm aware that we outsourced was, the Nursing School went into a partnership with a group called Academic Partners, whereby they did the recruitment of the students, and our faculty delivered the

academic programs. And the reason that we did that is because this same group has similar relationships with 30+ other public universities, most recently with Ohio University, in the state of Ohio, to the point where Ohio University has captured 80+ percent of this market for the RN to BSN degree-completion program. But Ohio University cut them loose, believing they could do it -- they'd learned to do it on their own; they could protect their market share. Academic Partners was looking for a new Ohio partner, believing there was still untapped market in the marketplace. And we sent it to our College of Health Professions, to say, do you want to try to do this, and they said yeah, we want to try. And so, now the unfortunate thing is, I think they have tested the market, and found that we would have to reduce the price so extensively to recapture market share, that it may not be in our economic best interest to move forward with the program. And I know the College of Health Professions and the university is in kind of the final stages of analyzing whether it makes sense to move forward, because the only way to move forward is to cut the price even more and we don't know that that makes to do that. But that's kind of where that is currently.

The last one is the one that's probably what's referenced most importantly in the resolution, and that is the Trust Navigator story. Let's talk about that story. Let's recap that. You know, when I was interviewed for the job, in the open community meeting in the student union, someone asked me the question, has the University of Toledo done anything recently that shows great promise in increasing student retention? And I remember having my laptop there, scrolling to a photo, hitting the button, and behind me was a photograph of the -- and I forget the number, probably somewhere around 20 -- 20 new success coaches that the University of Toledo had just hired to deliver success coaching services, in hopes to replicate the same results that have been achieved by Central Michigan University. Employing the same program. And I said I am most optimistic about this because they bring a renewed energy to the campus. It is not intended to supplant academic advising. It's not academic advising. It is success coaching. It is essentially the proactive connecting with students, to get

to know the students and to connect them to all the resources that can help them persist and succeed, if we can get the student to the university resource in time to help. So, can we get them to the tutoring service before it's too late? Can we get them to the writing lab before it's too late? Can we get them to the counseling center before it's too late? Can we get them to the financial aid office before it's too late? The idea of Success Coach, ultimately, is to use predictive analytics, and to create a system by which you get them -- or get them to their academic advisor before it's too late. It's not intended to be academic advising. So when we got here, we looked at implementing success coaching. Likewise, and the internal champion for that ended up being a lady by the name of Stacy Moore, a highly respected student affairs professional on campus. And we told her, look, there's some outsourcing options and there's some insourcing options. You tell us which one you want to employ. And to my surprise she came back saying we want to employ the outsourcing option. To which we said, okay, then you've got to do an RFP. And there are pluses and minuses, as she made the case. One was, we can get the program up and running quicker. Secondly, if it doesn't work, it'll be easier to terminate the program if we don't initially hire a bunch of people. And three, they will be able to hold them accountable a little better than what we have in the past. In other words, if they don't perform, it's easier for an outsized vendor to do with a poor performing employ than it is for a public entity to do that. So for those reasons we went with the outsourcing option. People took exception to the fact that we had used a group that had never done it before, but the reality is, that group had planned to be on our campus anyway, as a student organization, offering the same service on a fee-for-service basis. They were going to be here anyway. They were kind of the winning low-bidder by a large margin, and the only one to offer to deliver in-person service, instead of telephonic service. And we knew that Stacy Moore ultimately would be overseeing whatever they did anyway, and so for that reason we decided to give Trust Navigator a try. And we're looking at the data right now to see whether or not it's made a difference. Early indications are that students don't seem to be persisting at a higher level with it. It's a little early to be

conclusive, but on the other hand, given our enrollment picture and our budget picture, we may not have the option to wait until we get perfect data. So I think if I'm reading the tea leaves correctly, we're pretty close to trying to make a recommendation earlier rather than later on whether to do that. So that's where we are on all three of the outsource options.

And I would say that is a first try -- not so short, and I apologize -- in addressing kind of the major points that are in the resolution. Chairman Rich, I think at this point it'd probably be good just to use the remaining time to have a conversation; question and answer, if that's okay.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for the President? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich, one thing that wasn't mentioned was the ITT Tech portion, and I've been reading in the newspaper about the Stark State situation, and when I think of potential enrollment loss from something -- I am not sure we've had a more serious threat since the Vietnam War. And I am not joking. Because of the draft, there was a real concern back then and what I'm wondering is -- we can talk about this other issue, other issues, for a long time but moving forward this is a serious threat. And it seems like if we have this kind of budget deficit, what are we going to do? I see that as potentially a 10 to 20% loss, and where we're a de facto Cleveland State University, which has very few freshman and sophomore students. How do we deal with that? And what are your plans on dealing with that? Because quite honestly, this dwarfs the other enrollment loss that we've had, very likely.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I think you raise a number of issues that merit a serious conversation around, so let me try to parse it and make sure that I get to all of it. And then I'll maybe kick it back to you, and see where you want to take it after that. So you mentioned ITT, you mentioned the Stark State, and I think the common element to both issues is we're trying to think about ways to reverse our

enrollment decline by diversifying our enrollment portfolio more so than what we have done in the past, okay? That's the overriding issue that kind of brings all these issues together. The satellite campus structure that we have, plus what we do on the main campus, with CAST in particular, I think it's very important to that bigger picture of how do we diversify enrollment going forth. I think there's the nontraditional student, there is -- and there is the undergraduate international student. We'll leave that conversation for another day; what we need to do at the international undergraduate level. But this is the big nontraditional student market because -- and in my opinion, it's the part of the higher education market that's going to grow -- not just my opinion, the data that I've seen suggests this is the market that's going to grow the most in the decades ahead. Not the traditional population, especially in the Midwest and the Northeast. It is the nontraditional. So if we're going to recover enrollment, we're probably going to do it in the nontraditional area. Step one, in terms of our trying to attack the problem, was to try to hire someone with a different background to see if we could make our existing satellite campuses perform at a higher level or to close them or open new ones at different locations or move them. The second thing that we did was to try to find a partner. We believed that the for-profit sector had gotten themselves into such trouble, that there would be opportunities to step in where they had made mistakes, and to create a -- and to provide a quality public solution to a substandard for-profit reality. That's what we were trying to look for, opportunities to do that. And we looked at a number of opportunities. Not just the ITT. We looked at a number of opportunities. And we just never have been able to make it work. But we did look. And because we never had the opportunity to talk about it -- up until recently, I was under a personal nondisclosure because it's a publicly traded company -- again, the idea was ITT is in 38 states, and has like 140 locations in markets all over the United States, including markets that are growing. And this is not online education. This is classroom-based education that prepares people for two-year associates degree programs. It prepares technicians, who get pretty good jobs. Where they made their biggest mistake was in their handling of their financial aid. And they got in

huge trouble with the federal government for financial aid violations. They were in trouble too, and probably remain -- I'm not following it any more -- but they probably remain in trouble with consumer fraud protection board; they probably remain in trouble with the SEC, so we were looking at is there a way to provide a high-quality public solution to a for-profit problem? The sign would come off, okay? Something else would go on. We would assume responsibility for the academic programs. Presumably we would correct anything that was wrong, and we would give, what is now down from 85,000 students to 45,000 students, a much better future with a higher-quality public university degree. And the thought was, although it never got to that point, maybe this is delivered through Wayne College. To differentiate it between what we do on the main campus. And yet, still, because of CAST and Wayne College, still two-year degree programs are very much a part of our public university current mission. So we didn't see it as being extra-mission creep. In fact, getting now to the Stark State, it's a pretty important part of our mission: to hang on to what we do in CAST.

But needless to say, we looked at multiple partnerships. That hasn't worked out, so we continue now to look at, okay, if we can't do it through partnership, then how can we do it internally? How can we do for what some people would call organic growth? And what do we need to do to protect our current CAST programs' enrollments, versus not just Stark State, but Western Governors University, and other types of competitive elements in higher education that are only growing. Including the expansion of other four-year public universities in our region.

And so, coincidentally, I don't know if any of you know the last dean that we ever had with something called the Evening College at the University of Akron. Art, you probably know Caesar. You know Caesar? I had lunch with Caesar today. And again, in the name of brainstorming, in the name of what do we do to protect this market, and not only protect it, but to enlarge it. Reverse the enrollment decline. Another idea is should we bring back the Evening College? It was

enormously successful -- if Caesar's numbers are correct -- when we closed that program in 1985, 7000 students went out the door. We could use 7000 students right now. We'd be talking and enrollment increase, not an enrollment decrease, if we had those 7000 students right now.

So, I agree with you. And I have agreed from the beginning that as much as I -- hear me -- love our history and polymer science and polymer research, in a lot of ways I'm not worried about them. They're great and they're going to continue to be great. My job is to make sure they have the resources to continue to be great. And the way that I get them the resources to continue to be great is to make sure that programs like CAST remain strong. And other programs, throughout this university, at the so-called -- and I don't use this term -- lower levels of our university remain strong. I don't like the term. It implies something less than what we do at the higher levels. This is just part of the mission, the fullscope mission of a public university, and especially our mission. Going back to the days when we had evening programs.

So, that's a long way of saying I agree with you. I had a meeting with the leadership the other day with CAST, and told them we've got to get on it. You know your students better than anybody else, is what I told their leadership. I cannot solve this problem for you. I will help you anyway you tell me you need help, but you know these students; you know these programs; you know what makes them distinctive, great, and better than anything that any other university can bring in the area. So tell me what we need to do to keep those programs strong. And at the same time, I do think there's an opportunity to partner with starters. Because 2+2's are an important element, especially in this day and age, for the price-sensitive student, and if we can -- and Stark is, I think, our highest transfer institution that we work with. So we want to continue to be good partners with Stark, as we continue to do everything that we can to keep our program strong. Any follow-up from that? You want to take it in a different direction?

SENATOR ALLEN: Chairman Rich, my concern is that, in fact, there would be a net loss of enrollment from that because as you go from a one through four university, primarily, as the University of Akron is much more than Cleveland State, and go to a 2+2 where you're the last two, you're going to take an enrollment hit. And that, again, is my greatest concern. And particularly what I'm hearing, we're working on developing a collaborative honors program, where they do the first couple of years of even their honors program. I guess I don't understand how that is in any way beneficial to the University of Akron.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, it's only beneficial if, by virtue of both of our operating programs, the total size of the market increases. And you're right. I'm not at all disagreeing with you. I'm just trying to find where there might be opportunities to create kind of win-win, but we've got to do what we've got to do to keep our university strong. And they're going to do what they're going to do and I think their reaction to what they're doing with their honors college is what -- is somewhat in response to what we've done with our honors college. So, again, we live in a world, and I don't think it's a bad thing, were everybody kind of looks at what one another are doing and tries to ratchet up the quality to make sure we're all performing at the highest level.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: Chairman Rich. President Scarborough, first I'd like to thank you for coming to speak with us today. I'm sure this is not how you really wanted to spend your Thursday afternoon. But I do think it's a very import part of the process of rebuilding trust and confidence. And in particular, I wanted to give you just a -- my own personal feeling of a lot of what has transpired and sort of when in discussions within this body, and I will say, primarily within this body. I think what has happened in the community and in other groups might be a little bit different than what we discuss around lunch tables and in the halls and

whatnot. And I think I'll start off and say, for the most part I think, while all of us would have an issue with some of the decisions and in particular some of the cuts that were made, I think we all understand the need to make those cuts. So personally, I'm okay with the cuts that were made. I might disagree with them. But I realize that they had to be made, and I realize that you can't have a committee of the university going around and deciding how to make difficult cuts. So they had to be made, and they were made, and I agree that the Band-Aid needed to be ripped off. But, I think where the problems have arisen, and especially amongst the faculty, is that in a lot of the subsequent decisions -- you've mentioned this shotgun approach to new initiatives and things -- they were decided -- it was decided which shotguns to fire without the input of the faculty. So yes, some of them are going to be good, some of going to be bad, but with faculty input I think you'd have a better chance of identifying what would and would not work. Maybe not what would and would not work outside in the community, but from within the university, what would and would not work. So I think, I think a lot of our issues and a lot of what went behind this resolution is, in fact, this idea of shared governance. Is, in fact, not just communication at the end of the process, but communication while the decisions were being made, and real input into the decisions that were ultimately taken. So that's the point I want to stress. Is that it's not -- it's not the cuts, it's not some of these things that we discussed. Like I said, we're all intelligent folks and we all really understand how the university operates. It's the fact that we have been -- I guess we've been left out of the decision-making process and as a result -- and I don't mind being left out, I've got stuff to do -- but as a result, the expertise that sits in this room and sits in the offices and sits in the campus as a whole, has not been utilized, and I think that's a lot of where the -- that's a lot of where the issues and problems stem from. So again, if we want to rebuild this confidence and if we want to rebuild this trust, then I think it needs to start in the process of making the decisions. Not in the communication of those decisions.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, I agree, I agree. And I'll admit to you -- it's so interesting, I'm just going to share with you just some of the things -- I mean, I've got people in my office that say we're too transparent. Isn't that funny? Isn't that interesting? So what's interesting is that we thought -- and we were wrong. Don't get me wrong, don't hear me incorrectly -- we thought we were creating more shared governance in this process. We thought by going college by college and having a conversation, as flawed as it may have been, and it was more successful in most colleges than it was in some colleges, okay? We thought that was a step forward. We thought that in addition to having university Council Budget and Finance Committee, having kind of an informal group with university leaders go through it line by line, we thought that would end up being a step forward, not a step backwards. We thought by having these three summit meetings here, internal and external communities where leadership constituency groups were represented, we thought we were contributing to shared governance. We thought that when we were going to try this rebranding campaign by bringing the officers of the Board to a Faculty Senate meeting to have a kind of a tripartite conversation, if you will, around that that we were doing something new that might be a contributor to shared governance going forward. We thought we were making everything -- we were doing everything we could think to do to kind of advance shared governance. Only to find that it just wasn't resonating. That -- I don't know if it's the new mass media age that we live in. I don't know if it's just a different expectation of shared governance that the university's never even gotten close to meeting that we're dealing with. I don't know if it is that shared governance is just a hard thing to make work anyway. So I'm agreeing with you, I just want you to see the other side of it where we thought we were trying to do everything that we could think of -- going to Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings, answering questions, we thought we were doing it. We didn't think we were stepping on any of the prerogatives of any group. We took the GA issue to the Graduate Council. If there was a curricular issue, we brought the Senate -- to the Faculty Senate. We weren't going to try bypass them by bringing the Data Science Center here. We thought we were

kind of honoring all of those. And because this wasn't academic advising with success coaching, we worked through student affairs. Because to us it was a connector of student services. That we were going to try an experiment with. So all that I can say is there was never ever any malicious intent not to respect or even add to shared governance. We just hadn't found the right solution that gets everyone to the expectations that they have. And so I, you know, I'm encouraging you to continue to press the issue, and I'm encouraging all of us to constructively try to envision ways of interacting that gets closer to the mutual respect that everyone deserves, at the same time kind of understanding the inherent limitations of involving everyone who might want to be involved in the conversation, when they do have a lot of things they need to do with their time. I mean a lot of people don't have the thought I should've been involved with that until they learn that someone's already represented them and supported moving in a different -- well, why didn't I know? Because your representative was representing you in that conversation. Its representative shared governance. It's not direct democracy. But in an age of crowdsourcing, maybe that model's outdated, too. So I don't know if -- I'm going to pitch it back to you. Is there anything else you want to --

SENATOR QUINN: Well, so, I guess I would say that the examples you gave were examples of shared governance. But fundamentally, to me, shared governance means that we are involved not just as advisors, but really as part of the decision-making team. And I think that's -- I think that's what's sort of missing in all this. And I'll use the rebranding example. I haven't heard a faculty member step up and say, oh, I knew about that ahead of time, and these were the discussions that we had. Things like the Trust Navigator. I mean, those are decisions that really affect -- they're not just student services issues. They really affect the academic programs here at the university. And no, we don't all need to be involved in all of those decisions. Again, we don't want to be involved in all those decisions, but we need to make sure that there is faculty input. And how that should be handled, how that should be guaranteed, I don't know. If I knew I

would tell you, and we would just go do it, and we wouldn't be here. But again, it's not just communication of the decisions. It's not even just getting input into how we feel. It's that we -- there needs to be some voice of the faculty that's in the deliberations when these decisions are being debated. Should we do this? What are the pros and cons? That's the time that faculty expertise, and the expertise in the community, right, can be valuable in saying, hey, you know what? You didn't really think about this. This is going to affect these other things that haven't been mentioned yet. I do systems sort of science and engineering stuff and the thing that I know is that small changes here can have big changes over here, right? Unintended consequences. And without the expertise of faculty, you'll never see those unintended consequences. Even with the expertise of the faculty, you may not see them anyway, but you have a better chance of nipping that kind of stuff in the bud with our help and our assistance and our expertise in the decision-making and the pros-and-cons stage.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The only thing I'll say is, I agree with you. It's just how do you operationalize that? Let's work together to figure out how to operationalize that better. I think everyone agrees with the goal to try to get expertise, as much of the expertise around, to make the best decisions. The question is, how do you do that with a number of issues and the timelines that we're dealing with. Let's just work, you know -- I think the Board would even -- you have raised one point where you say, it's not just input, it's part of the decision-making. Really now you kind of get close to an issue where we may need to have -- be good for the university to kind of have a summit with the Board, Faculty Senate, and the administration to get a little bit to see if we can get a little bit more agreement about what that means. Because I can tell you, it may not be the majority the Board, or not this Board, but many of the Boards. They know that all authority is given to them, and the only authority that they don't have is what they delegate to others and they do that through official documents. Now they want everyone's input. But they're going to want to know who ultimately is the final decider on issues and that's a tricky conversation to

have, but it's an important one to have. Just so everybody kind of has a clear expectation. Is it my input or am I making the decision? And always remember this, their problem with it is, if you're making the decision, then you're responsible and you are also therefore assuming accountability for the outcomes and the consequences that come with those outcomes. So if you want to be the decider, that is a total package. You get it all.

SENATOR QUINN: Well, I'm not necessarily suggesting that we should be deciding --

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I'm just saying we ought to have that conversation.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Scotto.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Chair Rich, I think the President should know, if he doesn't already, that his explanation of what happened with Academic Partnerships from Buchtel Hall bears little or no resemblance to what actually happened, and is continuing to happen, and is failing to happen, in Mary Gladwin Hall. We had a really terrific program, last summer, on our own. We had 100 students enrolling in our RN to BSN program. Academic Partnerships was brought to us by the President. I was involved with the initial talks about what that would be like. And I was disinvited to the table for obvious reasons. We signed a contract in the fall that they were going to come and promote our program. We were told our program, which was a little jewel, would not be touched. And yet I wrote over ten curriculum proposals to change the program, to make it fit the Academic Partnership model. But we weren't changing it. It was the same. Except that it's completely different. I could go on and on about this but, the contract is signed and they are in breach of contract. We are on our own. So now we have this program that has been changed and it's unrecognizable. We have our faculty that are desperately holding on, trying to deal with our students and be there for

them. Yesterday, I sat at my desk for four hours, for which I was not paid, and I wrote nine curriculum proposals trying to put Band-Aids on this thing, poor bleeding program. And regardless of what we said, or thought, or asked for, we were promised over and over again by Rex Ramsier that we would have the faculty and we would have the backup and we would have the advisors and we would have everything that we needed. None of that's happened. And we're just desperately trying to keep these students online, and keep them in the program and support them and bring their program to fruition as best we can. And that's what it's really, really like. And blah blah blah. But do you realize how we have been injured, and then you add this insult to us by saying, you know, it's like this - - we've heard all those explanations before. It's like this -- if you just understood the process, then you wouldn't mind, it would be okay. But if we said we're going to change your name tomorrow to Scott Clownborough. Oh, you don't like that? Let me explain why it would be good for you. Oh, you don't like it still? It's still good. It's still good. Let me send you some letters with Scott Clownborough on there. I mean really. We're insulted. And we never hear you say, gosh, I'm sorry.

[Applause]

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Honestly that's the first I've heard of any that.

SENATOR SCOTTO: I know.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: So if what you're experiencing, I am deeply sorry you're experiencing those things. I just -- I didn't know to be able to do -- to reach out to you and say I'm sorry you're dealing with this. Let's see if we can find someone to provide a solution. I mean, what I've told you about what I know is what I know about the program. The program -- there's two programs. One is the joint program with Academic Partnership, and one is our own program, right? And you're right. What I was told was that program will continue. And on the

other program, what I am told is they moved down the path to try to implement, they found out that we couldn't get the market share without reducing the price even further, and we've been trying to decide whether or not that's in our best interest or should we simply terminate it now. Because we can't afford to do programs where we lose money at this point in our juncture. And I think the team is hopefully working with your colleagues, are getting close to making that decision, but they're not finally there yet. But I'm under the impression, whether we move forward with the Academic Partners or not, our program will continue. And you're right that's all that I know, and I apologize if it's insensitive in some way to not know the struggles that you face, but I'd be happy to follow up on your behalf, now that I know that. I am sorry you're experiencing what you're experiencing.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chair Rich, and thank you for coming to meet with us. I'm following up on what Senator Scotto has raised in my comment -- first a comment, then a question. The comment is about the outsourcing that was mentioned. And that was in the preamble to the resolution. At a time when the University of Akron can really ill-afford to have any more hits to its reputation, it seems like all these entities to which we're outsourcing have allegations of fraud. Aramark -- have you read about Aramark? I mean it's important to read about where these entities have been facing allegations elsewhere, before we actually engage with them. Aramark's food, that they have served to prisoners, has been filled with maggots. They have been charged with skimping on food to save money, to make more money. Their contracts -- the ways in which they enforce contracts have been shown to be highly unethical. So Aramark and Trust Navigator, the head of Trust Navigator under investigation for fraud, and ITT Tech. So all of these places that we're going for, are unethical in their business practices and I don't think the university needs to be associated with them. So that's the comment. And my question is you mentioned how you'd like to -- how

the mission is to protect the academic core. And I would like to know how we can do that without faculty. Or with this vision that you mentioned on several occasions, of kind of having a core faculty and then a ton of NTT's and, then this 20% model, and so I guess if you would like to respond to either, that would be great.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, in the case of ITT we chose not to go for it, because there was a downside in pursuit of the upside that we ultimately decided was not worth moving forward. So that, I agree with you. We chose not to go down that path. In the case of Aramark, we've got vendor committees that do background searches, my guess is they're an international provider but I certainly know they're a national provider, they're a huge entity. They deliver these services on lots of different campuses. It wouldn't surprise me if they had issues from time to time that they would need to address, hopefully resolve adequately, given their size and scope. It doesn't excuse it. It simply suggests that it wouldn't surprise me. I've been on campuses where we sent out teams to visit Aramark sites as part of the selection process, to view -- and I know there's problems with that. They know you're coming. They're not surprise visits like food inspectors are. So, but that's the first I'm hearing. But they are a -- generally speaking -- they are a respected, national provider that does a good job. Not to say that they haven't had issues. But that's the first I've heard of it. But in the selection process, there are committees with constituencies on them to look at those types of issues. The next one that you mentioned: Trust Navigator. It is true. One of the principles of Trust Navigator, not the one that's involved on campus, but one of the principles of Trust Navigator in another business that he had, not this one, but another business that he had, it was alleged that there were improprieties with regard to that business. And we did look at what the settlement agreement with the state was. Ultimately, all the state said was that there were reporting deficiencies. And we deemed that to -- having done our due diligence to make sure that there was no impact on our agreement with Trust Navigator here and it wouldn't impact -- but we did follow that very closely and

met with the principal on two occasions to learn firsthand what the issue was. And in our opinion it ended up being an issue that ultimately will probably not be a part of the final decision. There will be other, more important issues in terms of deciding whether to move forward with this service. We only want to partner with ethical partners. There's no question about that. But we also do our due diligence to make sure the allegations are substantiated and that they are -- that they pertain to the kind of work that we've asked an outsourced vendor to provide. In the case of ITT, we didn't do it. In the case of Aramark, they're a highly reputable entity. In the case of Navigator, we follow that issue closely. We'll soon be making a decision whether or not to continue with that.

I'm trying to remember your second issue. What was the second issue? Oh, the faculty. We are definitely hiring faculty. I mean, you know that. I think I've approved over 100 faculty hires in the last year. The issue is not that we're not hiring faculty. The issue has been what percentage of those faculty are tenure-track faculty. And again, I think what's important to realize is that we've been through very extensive processes -- number one, some departments are actually requesting NTTs. There's some significant part of that number where the number that we approved were NTTs being requested. But in other cases, what we have said is, given our financial challenge, if what the department is saying that they need is people to teach undergraduate courses, then the presumption is that they make a case for why a tenure-track position is so much better than a nontenure track, when the primary goal to be accomplished is the teaching of undergraduate courses. If, on the other hand, the issue is the research mission of the department, an accreditation issue within the department, or graduate education within the department, 99 out of 100 times that's going to be a tenure-track faculty member. So it's going through all of those levels of analyses, primarily at the department, dean, and provost level that ultimately determine which of the 100+ positions that we've approved were approved for either NTT or nontenure track. And even with the NTTs, we have worked diligently to try to improve the careers of those folks in the new collective bargaining agreement. I

think there's a huge step forward in their career path in terms of job security and longevity and prestige even, in terms of what's in the new collective bargaining agreement for those folks. And I've never heard anybody on this campus, ever, express anything other than appreciation and admiration for what our NTTs do and the job that they do. Never heard one person complain about that. So again, we're just trying to be respectful of our financial condition, respectful of the fact that it's a faculty mix that serves the different missions of the university that constitute a public university like the University of Akron, and in reality we're not an outlier relative to what's going on across the country because of the overall economics, the stress levels and economics that are impacting a lot of these decisions.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY: Yes, I want to pick up on that question. First, I think the enrollment decline -- I'll give you my perspective. I think, Scott, it's you. All right, that's a big part of it. I'm going to say that right now. I think that you're the main source of the problem. If we talk about shared governance, the ITT deal has before-the-devil-knows-you're-dead written all over it. We were going to be consulted about that, after the fact. There was no intention to ever talk to us about that. That was the whole purpose of the nondisclosure agreement. To get it signed, get it done. Just like Success Coaches. The Success Coach data, by the way, if you look at it, it's bad. It's really bad. We are wasting \$1 million. We squandered money. You have squandered money. On Success Coaches. On rebranding. We were about to squander money on ITT. Thank God we didn't do that. But you weren't going to tell us -- talk to us about that. You had no intention to talk to us about that. Again after it was done. Now let's talk about shared governance, because that relates to it. Strategic plan after strategic plan on this campus has said we want tenured faculty. You know tenure doesn't have a price tag. It's a title, not a price. For example, in our department we hired somebody, an NTT for forty-something thousand a year. Other departments

have tenure-track lines for 38,000 a year. Less. At the very least, it's the same. Tenure doesn't cost money. Now you talk about us being an outlier. You compare us to Georgia Tech. You compare us to Virginia Tech. Seventy to 80 to 90% of the faculty are tenured. So, yes we're an outlier. We're way behind everybody else. We lost 48 tenured lines between fall 2014 and fall 2015. We begged and pleaded for most of those lines to be replaced with more tenured faculty, because if we were having an enrollment decline, and we're planning on bumping up our graduate programs, those have to be taught by tenured faculty. If we're losing enrollment, we have to do research. If we're planning on getting more graduate students, the graduate courses should be taught by people who are publishing. Many of our departments face a crisis of accreditation, that people are not publishing, or we don't have the people with the publishing record, to teach the graduate courses. So we've got to have more tenured faculty. We've said it here we need more tenured faculty. We said it over and over again. And it's not happening. It's not happening. So when you talk about -- I don't know where this idea of consulting with faculty; I don't know where your notion of shared governance is coming from. It comes from the fact that we say we want tenured faculty and you hire NTTs instead. It comes from the fact you try to close the deal with ITT before we know about it. It comes from the fact that you may very well renew the contract with Success Coaches, and we've said no, we think it's a bad idea. That's where the problems coming from. Eighty percent of faculty in a survey said the research mission of this university has been harmed since you took office. Eighty to 90% of students surveys of undergrads, graduate students, faculty have said the academic quality of the university's being hurt. Distinguished professors wrote a letter saying the academic quality of this university is being threatened. The Chairs said the same thing. And yet you're saying, oh, I don't know where this is coming from. It's not people misreading a Beacon Journal editorial. If you want our trust, hire more tenure-track faculty. If you want our trust, don't go for deals -- you said you would think about other deal -- don't go -- the ITT deal; don't do it. So when the future deal comes up, you said you're open to new possibilities, talk to us first. But until that changes, we

have a serious problem here. This bid was about no confidence -- we're here today because of no confidence. And yet, everything you've talked about is how I didn't communicate it correctly. Not that there's a policy problem. There is a policy problem with you in charge.

[Applause]

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I'd like to add to what Senators Klein and Coffey have said on the whole issue of shared governance because that really is the fundamental issue in this Motion of No Confidence. And it's one that you did not address. You spoke for an hour and said the same things that we've heard for the last year and half; that we're facing economic challenges and enrollment challenges. And yet never acknowledged that both of these have become substantially worse since you've been in charge. Let me just talk a little bit about shared governance and -- to add to what Senator Coffey was saying -- that we have lost probably close to 100 tenure-track faculty in the last 2 to 3 years. Forty-eight just last year. We hired one last year who started this fall. And what is important about tenure-track faculty should be things that you know. One thing, we can talk to you. Nontenure-track faculty are not in a good position to do shared governance because their jobs are on the line. I'm a distinguished professor; I can say whatever I like. So that's one. The other one is, as every book that we read in book club before my grand exit showed, undergraduates do better when they're taught by dedicated research-oriented faculty. You just said now that straight undergraduate education doesn't deserve tenured faculty. This completely undercuts the whole reason of universities. I think in terms of doing shared governance, you have to, for starters, recognize the Faculty Senate is important. Faculty Senate in February, three and a half months ago, voted No Confidence. Until today, you've acted as though that vote did not exist. You were asked in the March meeting what your response was, and said you couldn't

respond. You skipped the April meeting. The May meeting you just sort of talked as though there were other issues. This is important. To treat us as though we don't exist, to treat our decisions as though they don't exist, is not shared governance. One more example: two weeks ago, in Faculty Senate we voted to immediately suspend the GenEd Core program, which the initial data shows is not working. A full quarter of the students who took one of those courses in the fall did not come back to take any courses at the university in the spring, even accounting for those who graduated. This is not retention. It wasn't even attracting students. This year we didn't even bother to advertise it, so I don't think we enticed any new ones into the pipeline. And yet it's going ahead. We voted two weeks ago to suspend it. We didn't even get a response. This doesn't count as shared governance. The Senate counts as we get to talk and you could do whatever you want. I'm sorry.

[Applause]

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns

SENATOR STERNS: Chairman Rich. Pursue further the issue of shared governance. And this is one that I really can't lay at the President's feet, because the President has communicated our thoughts, but the fact that the Board of Trustees has kept the University Council in limbo for two years, in the most recent round, is totally unacceptable. And I know that we've asked you repeatedly to bring that to the Board. But if you really believe that shared governance is important along the other lines, then we must bring this to completion as soon as possible. This is a travesty, being created by our Board. And the fact that they went out, and got the consultant that they did, and got back the kind of document they got, and in my conversation with a number of Board members, they're just as disappointed as we were as faculty to get it. So that's not your fault. But the Board must, if it really is going to operate in a true shared governance approach, has to listen and has to complete that work. And as

Provost Ramsier has pointed out, we're getting ready for a Higher Learning Commission visit. And we will have failed to meet our shared governance obligation if we don't move forward. And I hope that you will join us in making this apparent to the Board, that they are not meeting their obligation

[Applause]

CHAIR RICH: Senator Saunders.

SENATOR SAUNDERS: President Scarborough, thank you for coming and I apologize for not be very PC, but I'm kind of blunt, and I'm more concerned about where we're going. And so my question is we've heard rumors in the last week that there is another round of layoffs coming; that it's contract professionals at the end of May. We are hearing that salaries will be cut; there's issues -- if we take a hit like we're taking this year, we will not be able to keep the doors open next year. And so my question to you is, if you came with the best of intentions, we wanted you here with the best of intentions. Things have happened. Problems have snowballed. The way I see it is you're guilty in the court of public opinion. Fair or not, you're the face of the problem. So my question is how do we move forward and keep the doors open if the face of the problem -- how are you part of the solution? If we're going to try to move forward and keep the doors open.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right. And I would say, whether I'm here or not, the institution is going to be facing the exact same problems going forward. So let's assume that I'm not here. What the university still has to deal with now what will be five or six years of continued enrollment decline. The only question is will it continue on the steady linear path it's been on, or will be even deeper because of some of the public issues that we refer to. But regardless, that is the paramount issue. The second issue is, regardless of what happens with enrollment, we have to have a budget every year that lives within a reasonable projection of what our revenue is going to be, even if it's lower. In my opinion,

the can got kicked down the road after the federal stimulus money disappeared December 31, 2011, the university never adjusted for that loss. Even though that was the new normal. Everyone said, the federal government has given you two years to adjust to the new normal, and most institutions didn't do it. They continued and hoped that that money would be there beyond 2011. It wasn't. For us this is the new normal. And so regardless of what happens with enrollment, every year we have to adopt a budget that says this is our new revenue reality, let's come together to decide what's most important to fund and there may be some things that we did in the past that we can no longer afford to do in the future. That's our first obligation. To do that collectively. Then, as part of that budget, hopefully we will discontinue funding things that we hoped would show promise but didn't. Whether they're a year old, or 10 years old, okay? And including whatever budget that we adopt that will continue to be invested in things that show promise for -- to help contribute to either the reputation, the quality, or the enrollment growth that we ultimately need.

So what are some things that I'm hoping, some things that we tried in the last year, that will continue to be funded going forward in the next year that, in time, will help be a contributing factor to ultimately stabilizing or ideally increasing our enrollment? First, whatever is happening at the college level that is new. The Law School's done some new things, showing some terrifically positive results. I sure hope that we adjust to our new revenue reality. That we continue to fund those things at the college level that are showing such promise. I use the Law School just as one example, but whatever's going on in the other colleges, even though they're new, if they're showing potential, I hope that as we adjust our budget, those remain in the budget going forward. Or otherwise we'd be very shortsighted in our approach. Some of the things that we tried at the university level, that I hope -- that in my opinion are part of that portfolio of new initiatives that are showing great potential, are things like the EXL Center, I hope that that funding continues in the budget because to me it's showing great potential. Too, I still believe the idea, in the initial steps that we've made around a Center for

Data Science Analytics and IT, is showing great potential, especially outside the university, with employers in the region. Sixty companies are already connected to this new center and it's in its infancy stage. I hope that as we put together a new budget that that initiative continues. I hope going forward, that the -- whatever contribution that the university needs to make, chooses to make, with the National Center on Choreography, I hope that continues. I hope, in the new budget, that the new partnership with the LeBron James Family Foundation/ Akron Public Schools, I hope that continues. There are some things that we tried that, if they don't show good potential, I hope we terminate those programs and reallocate them to the new ideas that emerge in the process. But the only way we do that, again, is adopting a budget that is consistent with our new revenue reality. And then making investments in our collective judgment that represents the best bets going forward. That's the equation. And to the extent that our decision-making process brings everyone's thoughts and ideas and expertise to improving that decision-making, through the shared governance process of the university, we need to do that. We need to find the way how best to operationalize this so that people have more confidence in it. That's what I think we do going forward. We do need to, I think, extend our enrollment reach. We do need to become more national and international in our recruitment. But we need the ability to do that successfully. We need great programs at the graduate, undergraduate, levels of the institution that will do that. We need the faculty who can make that happen. We need to accentuate what our unique strengths are. I happen to think that they're in experiential learning, in that connectedness to industry, in those historical strengths of world-class research that we've done. At a minimum we should continue to invest in those things. To me, that's the future of the place, as we go forward.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you. I think from what I've heard today over the past two hours, certainly it's stuff that I've heard many times over the past year and

half, that's also been pointed out. I've heard the pain, the kind of concern, and on top of everything else, the sort of in a sense an almost -- and it's also something I feel -- a sort of plaintive well look, we're trying to help. Why aren't people listening? The most important thing that I think I've heard today is that, regardless of who is here in the future, in your office, and I think it would behoove us to at least think as to how things got to the place they are now because, once again, you've been here for two years -- I would argue that some of these concerns have been around for longer than that period of time -- you have become the face of the issue, for better or for worse, as has been pointed out. But what I think is most important is the issue of shared governance, and how you do it. I've had the conversation with you directly and with others, until I'm blue in the face about ways to do it. People don't listen because it's a pain in the neck. Because you have to listen to people whose ideas you may not particularly like, whose expertise you don't particularly value, but who are part of the process anyhow and ought to be. Why? Because this is a community. A dysfunctional community sometimes. Extremely dysfunctional right now, but it's a community. So, with all of the posturing and all of the personalities and all the personal aggrandizement that has been going on and will be going on, shared governance is exceptionally important, and it behooves the faculty to relearn how to do it, but most importantly it needs the Board of Trustees and the administration to respect and honor it. Every time that the Faculty Senate or any other body is consciously or unconsciously avoided, because oh, we don't want to have to deal with that is a disrespect to shared governance, and it has a cumulative effect. It's brought us to where we are today. I'm very encouraged by some of the attitudes, especially from the younger faculty. Because that's where the future is, obviously. But it's possible to do it. We've talked about how to do. I've talked to you about how to do it. I've talked to the Trustees about how to do it. We know how to do it. It's a question of it not being respected. So if this continues, as I said a few months ago, if this trend continues we can expect the University of Akron and similar universities to become more and more similar to the public K-12 education model. Which is one in which there is very much a top-down approach, there's a

lot of lip service to the faculty and teachers that really does not translate into any kind of power or action or support. So, I want to add my voice to those who thank you for coming, and taking the time to explain, once again, your point of view, and thank you very much Mr. Chair.

[Applause]

CHAIR RICH: Does anyone else wish the floor? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: Thank you. You mentioned that a lot of our problems are with budget coming in. Can't deny, can't disagree with that at all. One problem that I have, and I think others in this room might also with this, is some of the administrative hires that have been made at substantially larger salaries than their predecessors were, along with cuts of people that -- IT for instance -- that support everyone. Not just the academic, but the entire campus. There's got to be a better way to be making some of these cuts. It does not feel that the cuts were made in a way that affect the administration nearly as much as what they end up affecting the academics -- the support for the academic portion of it. We are being asked to do more and more: to teach more courses, to take more students on. I am not seeing any administrators being asked -- okay, I'll have to change that -- some administrators are being asked to do more. But vice presidents, we still seem to be creating more of those offices, splitting the duties so that they can do less, to where I think we should combining some of those again so that they are doing more just like the faculty.

[Applause]

CHAIR RICH: Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Thank you, Chair Rich. Again, thanks for coming. I'll ask an actual question at this point; they seem to have gone away. You've

mentioned a number of the initiatives that you have high hopes for in the coming year. One of the things that I do with my students when I'm handing out assignments is I assign them analyses that are sort of intended to fail. Intended to reveal poor options. Can you tell us about some of the things that maybe aren't living up to your expectations; maybe you have some concerns about. I'm not getting enough of the flipside to really see how the evaluation process is working.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: They're the same ones that you've identified. We're looking closely at Trust Navigators. And hopefully will have as good of a picture as we're going to have, and make a decision on that with all the input that we can as soon as possible. The GenEd Core, we're looking at -- I know that the Provost's office and others are looking at that, the same way that you're looking at that. That's certainly another one that we're looking at. At the same time, I would tell you, though, that CAST is -- in thinking about what they need to do with some of their associate degree programs, they're also looking at the GenEd Core as part of the possible solution to that. So we're waiting for that conversation to kind of play out and mature a little bit, as well. Just to make sure that that's not something that might be useful to them as part of the conversation. The Corps of Cadets; that's another program that we're looking at to see whether or not -- I mean, we're not investing much in it, but there is at least one FTE that we've invested to see whether or not that's a student organization that might add to the character and the student life of our campus. That's another one that we're taking a hard look at, and will as we move forward in the budget process. Oh, there's probably others -- I mean, obviously the Academic Partners is one that's probably very close to a similar type of decision and analysis. What we do with student fees would be a fifth category of options on the other side of the equation that are kind of ones that we're looking at to see whether or not it's an idea that we want to refine and continue, or whether to give up on it altogether. Those are probably the five examples that come to mind most quickly. That kind of balance out -- we talked about the portfolio, now you've heard me talk about the ones I

hope will continue in the budget, because I think they show promise as part of this portfolio of new initiatives. This is the other side of the portfolio, where they underperform. So, again, the problem going into this, and in my discipline people are very comfortable with this, and other disciplines they're not, is the idea that there are going to be these winners and losers. The hard thing is you don't know which ones they are until you try them all. And so that's kind of a portfolio of 10 or 12 that I think, today, that kind of fit into both sides of that equation.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Franks

SENATOR FRANKS: I have two daughters currently enrolled here, and I am willing to personally guarantee you that the Trust Navigator money would be much better spent on hiring more counselors and advisers, and bolstering the tutoring program in Bierce Library, so that the writing lab can have walk-in hours, and so that they can be open during exam week. Some students have writing exams, writing projects, and so forth. I don't want to relate all of the anecdotal stories that daughters have related to me, but, you know, they're asking me, dad, is my degree going to be worth anything? Are people going -- are potential employers going to look at my degree and where I got it and am I going to be hireable? I will personally guarantee you that that money can be better spent.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's great input -- feedback. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: This is very quick. What is the budget for the Excel Center?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I think what we have set aside is about \$780,000.

SENATOR KLEIN: Okay. And the budget for the Corps of Cadets?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Oh, it'd be in the \$60,000 range. For one FTE.

CHAIR RICH: It occurs to me that there was one question that was raised that I don't think you've responded to, and I wanted to make sure you had a chance to do it. It was part of a compound question, so that had to do with rumors about layoffs, in the near future.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, I mean there's really no conversation about layoffs yet. We're not even at that point of the budget process where that type of a conversation would even occur. Where we are in the budget conversation going forward at this point is, again, we're trying to learn from last year. We're trying to make sure that shared governance improves in this year's process, in terms of the development of the budget. We're trying to put as much energy into the University Council Budget and Finance Committee, and its relationship with University Council, as we possibly can to make that group of people as empowered as they've ever been to help solve, on our behalf, as our representative, the budget challenges that we have. What they're doing at the moment is following the enrollment picture very carefully. The CFO is having a lot of conversations with a lot of constituency groups to share the most current information about not only the process, but, you know, what the enrollment picture looks like given the total pipeline, not just what's happening on the front end, but also what's happening in the back end and with graduate programs. And the thought process is that we will engage in a process, as long as it takes, to get the input and all of the ideas and suggestions into the budget deliberations. The ideal would be that we don't make our final adjustments to the budget probably this year until sometime in September or October. Give this process time to occur. The reason I share all of that is simply to say that whatever rumors that you may be hearing are simply people translating what they've heard about enrollment, about what the likely impact might be. But we are a long way

of having begun conversations around a particular level of layoffs, or position eliminations.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Just to follow-up on that, as Chair of the [inaudible] HR Committee of University Council, we're in the process of developing a layoff planning process. Because -- not because last year we can go back and redo it, but please -- I hear you say, I don't want to do it with the same mistakes as last year. And we would say, we are saying, that there is a need for planning. Heaven help me. And it needs to involve the people -- you can't -- there are two things. One, it needs to be planned and you need to think as a Senator mentioned before, it's a system situation, and you try and look at the unintended consequences, so that any kind of cuts are ones that will cause the least harm. And secondly, please don't keep respect of the people involved and don't expect -- it is a really bad situation, which I know existed last year and I can see it happening again -- where once you get rumors that people are going to have layoffs and nobody knows, then morale is in really bad shape among those who are not tenured faculty. And it's not a help, anyway, to do that. If people feel they were involved, people feel that we need to deal with this cost situation, and they are part of trying to work out the solution, then you can get something done effectively, and not have the negative effects that you're talking about. All of us understand that, and I think you've heard our Senator and member of -- of Dan's committee say that very effectively. That you need to do that, and it's in -- what is -- so I'm hoping that when we send you our report, that it's one that is taken seriously because it took an awful long time for us -- the rest of our planning and retirement reports to get any response. And so -- and it fits in, I'm afraid, with some of the other things people have said -- so we're hoping that going to the future, that that will be taken more seriously.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Mitchell.

SENATOR MITCHELL: Thank you. We came to this room because we had a Vote of No Confidence, and said that we were not confident in where you were going. I haven't heard anything to make me change my mind. And I was wondering if you could explain to us whether -- and in fact, it took three and a half months to even get anything in response. You've heard a lot of thoughts that we don't really feel like we're getting a lot of shared governance. We're not -- the communication involves listening as well as what the administration says. Could you tell us some reasons that we should change our mind, or maybe it doesn't matter if we change our mind?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, you know, what I would say is that I take every conversation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate very seriously. If you can help me find more ways to evidence that, please help do that. Because that is the intention. To do that. Having said that, I've never been through a Vote of No Confidence before. I wouldn't even expect there would be a response required, and once I learned that one was requested I suggested that we work through all of the deep issues with the Executive Committee. I met with the Executive Committee on the topic, which suggested that we have a summer work session, to work through all of the issues. Then I learned the Faculty Senate voted to have this meeting, and here I am today. Ultimately, my serving as President is ultimately determined by the Board of Trustees. And I am okay with whatever they determine. Every day I'm trying to do my best and get better every day. That's been the day ever since I took my first full-time job out of college. That hopefully will continue to be my attitude going forward. I have great respect for everyone that I've met at this university. I realize that everyone has different talents; strengths and weaknesses, myself included. I try to take very seriously my self-assessment of what my strengths and weaknesses are. I'm constantly trying to adjust, where I have the opportunity, the team around me to make sure that where I'm weak I'm bringing in someone who's strong. So that we have, collectively, we have what the

university needs to move forward. Trying to bring Bill into the office is a pretty easy example of -- a fairly clear example of what I'm talking about. You know, I'm like any other human being, you know. I don't know how you take when someone says I have no confidence in you. My view of working with people has been shaped by my early experiences with youth sports. I never showed up for a ball game where I was penciled in as second base, and the short stop said to me I have no confidence in you and I don't think you ought to play. You know, that just has never happened to me. I've been plenty of times where they said have you had your eyes checked yet, or you haven't hit near that curve ball in three games. So, you know, this is new territory for me. I certainly hope I don't experience it again. I have said repeatedly I view life as an opportunity to learn and grow. And get better. I do not have an expectation of perfection, for myself or anyone who works for me. And all that I ask of myself and for people who work for me is that you learn from your mistakes, and get better. And try to do better the next day. And if I ever feel that there's an expectation beyond that, I will respect it, but I will not allow it to change how I view the reality that none of us are perfect. But collectively, if we could ever turn shared governance into this concept that I've seen, and most people understand more fully of, we're in this together to maximize each other's strengths. We're in this to help. Then I think we've got something. But that's just how -- that's for me. That's how I digest it. And try to challenge myself to be better at it. You may approach it in another way, which is great. And I think that is part of the honest value of diversity. In appreciating the different points of view. So, I'm saddened by the fact that you haven't heard anything to change your mind. And I respect it. At the same time, my obligation to the institution is to get up every day and to do my job to the best of my ability. Work, and build teams around the institution, so we make better decisions going forward. And that's my commitment to you. In whatever capacity that I serve.

CHAIR RICH: We are now almost 20 minutes beyond scheduled time. I think it's time for us to end this meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it possible for a student to weigh in?

CHAIR RICH: Afterward. I declare this meeting adjourned.