CHAIR RICH: The February meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the Agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Raber. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Schwartz.

Are there any proposals to amend the Agenda? All those in favor of adopting the Agenda as distributed signify by saying aye? Opposed say no. The Agenda is adopted.

The next item of business is the adoption of the minutes of the November Faculty Senate meeting. Is there a motion to adopt those? Senator Bouchard. Any corrections to those minutes? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: I looked at the minutes today. I noted I was quoted as saying apparently that Lebron James had not made any contributions. It should read that according to the magazine quoted Lebron James had not made any contributions.

CHAIR RICH: Any objection to that amendment? The minutes are so amended by unanimous consent. Any other corrections to the minutes? All those in favor of adopting the minutes as just amended please signify by saying aye. Opposed no. The minutes are adopted. Next item is the Remarks of the Chairman.

Among the items on today's Agenda are a report of the ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee of Chairs of the General Education Learning Outcome Committees.

A report of the ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee to consider proposing a vote of no confidence in the president. A report from the Faculty Senate representatives to the Graduate Council. This report concerns the process for determining future allocations of graduate assistantship funds.

I would like to welcome three newly elected members of this body: Jon Miller representing the College of Arts and Sciences who is returning to the Senate after a 5-month hiatus; Jeanne-Helene Roy representing the College of Arts and Sciences. Walter Pechenuk, representing the part-time faculty. Welcome, all.

I would like to welcome the members of the news media present for this meeting. I trust the members of this body will bear in mind that what we say and do here today will be widely reported, and thereby affect public perceptions of this University. We have much to discuss today, so I shall keep my remarks short.

I do, however, wish to share with you some recent data on undergraduate admissions. As of yesterday, the number of confirmed admissions of traditional freshman is 684. As of this date last year, the number of such confirmed admissions was 1,080. This is a decrease of 37%. At this time two years ago the number was 897. Confirmed admissions refers to students who have been offered admission, accepted the offer and paid the $145 matriculation fee. The decrease in confirmed admissions
among traditional freshman so far this year is occurring disproportionately with students of ACT scores of 20 or above.

These data are cause for serious concern. They portend a significantly smaller entering class for the next academic year and a larger proportion of students who are marginally prepared or ill-prepared for college, less likely to persist and complete their undergraduate programs; and in greater need of scarce University resources to help them succeed academically. They also portend a large decrease in revenue for the next and successive fiscal years which would necessitate further budget cuts.

In an op-ed column in today's Akron Beacon Journal announcing the pledge of an additional three million dollars' donation by Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams and the planned naming of the Honors College after them, President Scarborough stated that the Williams Honors College will provide an Ivy League style education. He also stated that we're in the process of hiring more than 70 bargaining-unit full-time faculty members, with more hires to come.

As best I can determine based on the list of hiring authorizations I received from Interim Provost Ramsier two weeks ago, there are 69, not 70, search authorizations issued or pending in the Provost's office, and the 69 include 4 non-faculty positions, three contract professionals and one staff. Thus the correct number appears to be 65. Of the 65, at least 40 and potentially as many as 57 will be non-tenure track positions. My best guess is that the approximately 40 -- that approximately 45 will turn out to be non-tenure track and approximately 20 will turn out to be tenure track.

The net effect is that there will be substantially fewer tenure track faculty and more non-tenure track faculty positions after the next round of faculty hiring is completed.

It is difficult to see how a substantial reduction in the number of tenure track faculty members is consistent with the claim that the Williams' Honor College will offer an Ivy League style education. This concludes my remarks.

The next item on the Agenda is special announcements. I have two:

Jeffrey Schantz, Professor of Technical Writing and Composition in the College of Applied Science and Technology, died on January 2th at the age of 50. He earned a Bachelor's of Science degree and a Master's of Arts degree in English from Youngstown State University, and Ph.D. in English from Case Western Reserve University in 1998. Dr. Schantz joined the faculty here in 1997. His specialty was Native American Captivity narratives, stories of European settlers who were captured by Native American tribes.

Professor Schantz was active in Cub Scouts, athletic coaching and outdoor adventure activities. He was also an accomplished drummer and a member of several local rock-and-roll bands.

Zakereia Husein, an undergraduate student at The University of Akron, was shot to death on December 7th in a robbery of a pizza shop where he worked, after having handed over the money to the robber. Zak, as he was known, was 21 years old when he died. He was studying international business and was an active member of the Muslim Student Association on campus. His family came to Akron as refugees from Jerusalem in
the early 1990s. Zak died praying, with his brother holding his hand.
I would ask that you rise for a moment of silence in memory of our deceased student and our deceased colleague. (Moment of silence).
CHAIR RICH: Thank you. The next is the report of the Executive Committee.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Since the Faculty Senate last met on December 3rd the Executive Committee met twice by itself and once with the President and Interim Provost.
The Executive Committee met on January 21st for regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the President and Interim Provost. The EC made three Committee appointments:
Pei-Yang Liu from Nutrition Dietetics was appointed to the Distance Learning Review Committee. Stacey Nofziger from the Sociology was appointed to the Faculty Research Committee. Susan Wynn from the College of Applied Science and Technology was appointed to the Part-Time Faculty Committee.
The EC certified the elections of Jon Miller and Jeanne-Helene Roy in Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and Walter Pechenuk to represent the Part-Time Faculty Committee. The EC was asked to recommend faculty members to serve on an Enterprise Resource Planning Committee in the Information Technology Division. The EC will contact members of the University Council IT Committee, Faculty Senate CCTC Committee and faculty in the College of Business Administration to identify potential members for this Committee. We also discussed the need to fill a vacancy on the University Council Communications Committee. Later that day we met with the President. We were updated on the following topics:
The Gen Ed Core 13; the General Education coordinator position, now filled by Janet Bean and the chain of command for that position; meetings with deans regarding implementation of college strategic plans and allocation of additional full-time faculty position; the strategic planning process for University Libraries, Graduate School, and Honors' College; a search to replace the Dean of the University of Libraries who announced she'll retire effective June 30th. We also discussed progress on Zook Hall construction; key hiring in key programs on campus for the Center for Data Science and Information Technology-those are statistics, computer science and math. The Center for Experiential Learning, Entrepreneurship and Civic Engagement; the Corps of Cadets and the Leadership Academy and the goal to have 100 in the Core of Cadets by Fall; the evaluation data for the Success Coaches; and the current enrollment data.
The EC asked about the status of and process for reactivating the suspended and revised theater BA program; the Association of Governing Boards Consultant visit and subsequent recommendations; the President's discussions with Higher Education Partners, although specifics could not be shared due to a non-disclosure agreement; and whether an 8-week summer course can be offered by combining the 3-week intercession and the first 5-week summer session.
The EC next met on January 28th for regular senate business and to prepare for the Agenda for the upcoming faculty senate meeting. The EC made two Committee
appointments: Steven Chuang from Polymer Science was appointed to the Faculty Research Committee; Jeanne-Helene Roy was appointed to the Reference Committee.

The EC discussed the following topics:

Recommendations of the Association of Governing Board consultant: a red-lined version of the UC Bylaws has been distributed to the Board of Trustees. After the Board of Trustees provides reactions and possible revisions, the latest red-lined version will be given to University Council for consideration.

Graduate assistantships and a new model for admissions and funding was discussed. The conversations with Higher Education Partners was discussed and some EC members voiced concerns about non-disclosure.

The EC also decided to distribute the resolution of the ad hoc committee to consider a Vote of No Confidence in President Scarborough on the UA-faculty listserv so that the faculty would have an opportunity to review it and contact their senators if they wished to prior to the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

This concludes the Executive Committee's report.

CHAIR RICH: Any questions for Secretary Schulze about the Executive Committee report? Senator Lillie

SENATOR LILLIE: I heard the word non-disclosure come up a couple of times. I wonder if it would be possible in a few words -- I know we have a lot to do -- to explain what that's about.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: The President was unable to discuss specific conversation due to a non-disclosure agreement that they asked him to sign.

CHAIR RICH: And that he said he did sign.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: And that he did sign. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Any other questions for Secretary Schulze about the Executive Committee report?

The next item on the Agenda is the remarks of the President. President Scarborough.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Chair Rich.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you again once today. I think what I would like to do is give you an update on some of the initiatives on which we’re working. Probably the easiest way to do that would be to ask you to take out the handout that was given out, and at the end of my comments I would be happy to answer any questions you have. The current priority is to look at the first two pages entitled First Year Timeline and Second Year Timeline. Most of the people in the room have seen both of these slides as we have worked through the two-year period.

Of course the first year really focused on the diagnosing of the financial condition and the enrollment market for the University, working on the college strategic plans, working to develop University-wide initiatives, and then the end of the first year was developing that first very difficult budget.

The second year was all about initially implementing the new budget, implementing some of the new University-level initiatives funded by the budget, hiring a new individual to lead the athletics program, some new marketing initiative, a faculty hiring phase one, which was really essentially the second group of hirings.
There was an initial group of hirings in the first year that we characterized as emergency hirings. This is the second group of hirings. Then we also held a number of community meetings with key constituency groups within the community groups explaining budget cuts we made. In the October through December time period communication was really the emphasis, starting with the State of the University address in October, the new Lebron James marketing video. Also during that period we submitted our capital request to the state for the biannual capital funding, which hopefully they'll begin to look at in the April, May timeframe. We continued to work on the non-academic colleges, their strategic plans; Honors, Graduate School, Division of Libraries, and then also during that time we began approving additional faculty hirings that were of the more strategic nature.

We now enter the third quarter of the second year and we'll begin to work on next year, the 2016/17 budget. Student recruitment, of course, becomes a huge priority during this period of time. We have had a donor step forward to help and make minor improvements to the JAR facility. We have had a wonderful day yesterday with the donor rolling out the new named Honors College. As has been reported, we have a number of conversations with potential partners to strengthen our satellite campus network. We're engaged and made significant progress through collective bargaining in the last few months, and we're very hopeful to get the University Council Bylaws approved and through the Board -- or at least to the Board -- during this period of time.

Before the end of the second year, we continue to have primarily due to significant retirements and other changes some key positions to fill, the Director of Development, Director of Facilities, Dean of Engineering, Provost, General Counsel, Vice President of Innovation and Economic Development, Dean of Libraries and Dean of Wayne College. We have a number of significant leadership positions to fill.

On the next page: It is not that we have stockpiled the positions, we have broad new leaders. On the left hand, those are those that were brought from outside of the institution. On the right-hand side is the description of those people that we promoted internally.

On the next page there is -- some of you may know Professor Rumelt at UCLA who wrote the book Good Strategy, Bad Strategy. The essence of his book is that good strategy, good strategic plans, solve big problems to allow the institutions to move forward. The reason I mention that, when I arrived there were two big problems that the Board asked me to try to solve. One was the financial condition of the University -- we talked a lot about that.

The next two graphics are both national and state graphics that just give those who have not seen this before a sense of where our financial condition is. You can study that at some period.

The next two pages entitled summary of financial condition was the first slide that I presented to the Board after analyzing our financial condition as of June 30, 2014. Again, this -- many people would want to know where did the 60 million issue come from? It is essentially the fourth bullet point, the operating expenses too high by 20 million and the fifth bullet point, need 10 million for strategic initiative poll, and next to the last, capital expenditures are too low by 30 million. That's the essential elements
of the $60 million issue.

The second issue they asked me to try to solve is the persistent enrollment declines we have experienced. The graphic showing the enrollment in 2011 at 29 roughly 700 and the Fall of 2015, down to 25,000. It really -- if I could only show one slide to a room saying what is your biggest challenge that you must overcome, it is this trend. It is this trend. This trend I think is the result of three primary factors. One of which is illustrated on the next page. One is population demographics. The second piece of it is the fact that we're no longer open admission. Beginning in 2010 or '11 I believe is when we stopped admitting students with an ACT of 15 or less. That contributed to it. The third element I think is just a dynamic competitive environment. That contributes to this trend.

The next two pages, kind of shows you the population demographic issue. If we do nothing different, the predictable trend is continued enrollment through 2025, just in the population demographics, if we do nothing different. Of course we want to do something different, we don't want that trend to continue to decline. We can't have that trend continue to decline given the debt, fixed costs that we have.

The way to overcome that, I believe, is to leverage existing strengths, which is the reason the next slide is important, and then also to respond to market demand that is unmet which is the purpose of the slide entitled demand, what do people want.

The next slide, simply a reminder -- at the end of my Doctoral program I asked what did I really learn? What were the principles this training provided me in strategy? The five takeaways were that leadership matters, and it matters at all levels of an organization; teamwork matters, how well do people work together; strategy matters, what will you do to change outcomes. How well do you implement that strategy and how quickly do you implement?

Really what the literature shows, it may be the only real sustainable competitive advantage today is speed with which how -- when one thinks about how easy it is to copycat these days, the one competitive advantage is your ability to stay in front of the innovation curve.

As we begin the budget process the slide entitled Higher Ed Key Success Factors is what we had on our table when we said what is it that we want to make sure that this budget continues to invest and invest strongly in. Those things that aren't represented then became candidates for budget cuts.

A reminder, we developed each of the colleges' strategic plans and the University developed new initiatives, and then we also looked at what can we do at the industry or sector level, particularly through partnerships, to change our dynamic.

The picture with all of the graphic elements on it, it says $60 Million Solution Over 3 Years is an overview of the University-wide initiatives. What we don't see is what each college is doing, which is as important, if not more important, than what the University does.

This gives you a vision of what is the University trying to do to supplement what's happening at the college level.

At the center of this page is the main campus, we're sitting at 23,313 students. What is interesting about that, I am told that the Kent State main campus is actually
much smaller than the University of Akron main campus. Their total enrollment is over 15,000 higher because of the significant strength of the satellite campus network. You can see that our satellite campus network of five entities ranges in student enrollment from a whopping 10 students last fall to a total of 2248 in Orrville, Ohio, Wayne College. Our satellite campus structure is immature, fairly, compared to other satellite campus structures even in Northeast Ohio.

One of the early things we did, invest significantly in the College Credit Plus programs. We have seen significant growth in the number of high schools and school districts with which we now have duel enrollment relationships. That's to protect the pipeline that's fed the University in our satellite campuses. On the top hand right, you notice we tried to think in terms of what is the -- what would help our ability to recruit from further distance.

If the pie is shrinking locally, what can we do to create a value proposition for the University of Akron in markets like Chicago, Detroit? We thought to focus on our historical learning, our connecting to local industry and ability to use technology and to teach our students to be prepared to use the technology that's important in their careers. And that the appropriate peer aspiration institution may be to try to emulate the enrollment pool that a Georgia Tech, Virginia Tech could have to enable us to recruit from further distance.

The Board said what will we do to leverage the strengths at the University level? We have listed there below the Center for Experiential Learning, which had a nice event last night, the new Center for Data Science and IT, which I think is now up and going, the new National Center for Choreography with Dance Cleveland in the foundation there, it a Corp of Cadets and Leadership Academy, the new low-cost General Education, trying to stop losing enrollment to community colleges due to pricing, and the helping of retention, the new Success Coaches for new students.

This was a listing of the major University initiatives to try to leverage our historical strength. Again, to spread word of the University of Akron we thought it wise to partner with the one person that most people associate with Akron, Ohio, so the new relationship with Lebron James Family Foundation for the next five years. We think that the new strategic plan around the Honors' College and the naming and the gifting around that is the beginning of an enrollment initiative to continue that great growth we have experienced there in the last two years.

The Williams' Honors College become a key new strategy to recruit and to retain greater numbers of well-prepared students.

We have also talked about the need to create more of a national University, our ability to reach into other geographies and to extend that satellite campus network to places other than simply Northeast Ohio. So a number of the partnership conversations that we're engaged in are partnership conversations about how to do that, how to extend our reach and our ability to educate and reach more non-traditional students.

The Honors' scholar strategy is great in terms of attracting people in the main campus, serving traditional constitutes, and the satellite structure is instrumentally growing our enrollments to non-traditional students and ultimately international.

Lastly, in terms of addressing the financial challenges:
Our best guess in terms of how we will do that over a 3-year period would include the $15 million of position eliminations that have already occurred; the potential 3 million in cost savings to the collective bargaining process; as much as 7 million in selective areas of price increases in the University; the $1 million legislative change to help us with a surcharge that only the University of Akron pay, no other University. There is a bill pending to help us do that currently.

Program eliminations and central cost reductions that were already included in the first budget that we're living under now, and then the last piece frankly is the -- what we need, to solve the $60 million problem from not just stabilizing enrollment but through enrollment increases. So that's our goal over a three-year-old period, not to just stabilize that, but to begin to turn it upwards.

Lastly, simply, the comment that, you know, we do have a vision of a beautiful main campus with great faculty and staff. We have a vision of satellite campuses that are serving non-traditional students. We have a vision of maintaining our historical world class status in polymers. We have the vision of adding more elements to campus life through Corp of Cadets and other student organizations where a lot of people have a great extracurricular experience.

The last point which is something that I have said for years, what I have always found that works in organizations, especially organizations going through change, is to learn how to make teamwork work. That's especially difficult at a University environment, a spirit of shared governance where there is a purposeful kind of tension built in the system to balance power, and I think we struggle with that. We understand that. If you get it right, get the teamwork right, you add to that a good direction, a good strategy to resource allocation tied to strategy. Communicate the best we can, we have the best chance of not only solving the two problems, but continuing to evolve the University of Akron to something that we can be proud of.

That concludes my report.
CHAIR RICH: Thank you.
Are there any questions for the president?
Senator Allen.
SENATOR ALLEN: Chairman Rich, at the Grad Council meeting this month there was a consultant firm to work on figuring out ways of essentially making more money off the grad school. What we were hoping to do to get from President Scarborough was to find what the expectations were for the consultant, and how much of this decision making would now occur on the University side, particularly with shared governance with faculty.

CHAIR RICH: Let me add just by way of a little background, that the question of how to differentiate between traditional research oriented mostly graduate master’s programs really we're talking about I think, and more professionally oriented master’s programs. It was a question that as I understand it was the Graduate Council and subcommittee of the Graduate Council was asked to address, and then as I understand it a consultant was brought in and spoke to the Graduate Council recently and I think that's -- am I correct in thinking, Senator Allen, that's the background of your question?

SENATOR ALLEN: Now it is decided that next year things will be the same.
Our question really is what about next year, and will the consulting firm be making those decisions or will the faculty be part of that decision making as well?

PRESIDENT: A great question.

I think what began the conversation is the reality, the projections that Graduate Education will actually grow faster than Undergraduate Education. Undergraduate Education has matured but the real growth in degrees being sought and awarded in the Master’s and the doctoral level.

So given that reality, given where we are with overall enrollment and financial condition, the question was how do we take advantage of that growing trend? So our enrollment management group and the graduate school brought in a group from Atlanta believe called Ruffalo Noel Levitz -- many of you are familiar with that -- to help us study that question.

What they concluded was that we have good growth in graduate programs, but our revenue is far below what they have seen at other institutions. And the reason for that is extraordinary high number of graduate assistantships that we award, thereby not collecting revenue and paying a stipend on top of that.

What we asked are the Graduate Council to do is help to us rationalize that system, work with the consultant we brought in -- they're great with data -- help us conclude whether or not we have a rational system that will allow us to sustain this predicted growth at the Master’s and doctoral level, again, because it helps solve both of our problems.

So very quickly, you know, we have different types of GAs. We have the Ph.D. GA, okay, we have on the other extreme, we have a lot of administrative GAs, that's like the rec center, student union, athletics. Then we have in the middle a group of Master’s level GAs, and then even within that category you have Master’s programs that are primarily research based and others that are primarily professional programs.

We give -- we were awarding an extraordinary number of graduate assistantships. When I met with the Council, I said this is completely in line with what all of higher education does, don't really worry about this.

There is actually a small category in here of professional doctoral programs too.

On the other end of the extreme though, you know, we're simply -- we're awarding a graduate assistantships, total free tuition, and a stipend for someone that's really nothing more than an hourly worker in these areas. We should revisit this. You know, should we continue to award full-graduate assistantship for just working in these areas, or should we go to a rate per hour, and then a financial aid package that's based on financial need? Would that be better than awarding a total graduate assistantship simply because you work in one of these areas?

Okay. Obviously economically this helps us bring in additional net revenue under this model, revenue that we need to pay for graduate education.

Again, in the master’s level program, you know, we noted it is unusual to have large numbers of GAs in professional master’s programs, not so in research.

Okay.

But, we -- what we have asked the Graduate Council to do is simply to rationalize this, look at this, study it, come back to us, say what is the model that makes sense for
our University given our needs, given the challenges we're trying to solve. And so what we have done is we have held harmless existing GAs, we have held harmless for next year. We're giving the Graduate Council more time to study the issue and come back with a rationalized solution to our dilemma.

At the moment, the consultant says that we're an outlier. Is there a good reason or not a good reason for that?

CHAIR RICH: I wonder if you can say more about the role of the consultant, what it is or will be.

PRESIDENT: To simply be an expert. To be the person who has the benchmark to other institutions to suggest to us things that have worked at other universities. They're there to be the expert consultant.

CHAIR RICH: The expectation then is that the proposed plan for rationalizing this will come from the Graduate Council?

PRESIDENT: To the Graduate Council Dean, and they have a responsibility to Faculty Senate

CHAIR RICH: They report to the Faculty Senate and we report to you.

Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: A quick follow-up on that issue.

I was in the meeting in the Graduate Council when the consultant came. My understanding from what he said, is that the experience was largely in the undergraduate population and that the other experience was limited. I'm wondering what in the experience motivates us to work with them and not somebody else and how do we talk about this?

PRESIDENT: I'm familiar with them because they have been around for at least 30 years, maybe 40. They're the acknowledged kind of leader in enrollment management and financial aid leveraging. It is the firm that our enrollment management graduate school selected, and when I heard that they had selected them I thought, well, that makes sense, they're probably the best known name in these types of issues. They're either going to be helpful or not helpful. It will be up to the group to determine how helpful they'll be.

SENATOR SASTRY: Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Gatzia.

SENATOR GATZIA: I wanted to ask about the HLC report. He made comments at some point, maybe a couple of weeks ago that the assessment report was very positive, and I was wondering whether -- when the report will be made available to the faculty.

PRESIDENT: I'm sure the Provost that speaks after I do will have detailed information. He's the point person on this particular issue. My understanding is that the report that came back did not require an interim visit or a follow-up. It is built into the next regularly scheduled accreditation visit which is about the best outcome which we could have hoped for or expected at that point. He'll be able to speak more specifically if I can ask you to ask that same question to the Provost.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions.

Senator Howley.

SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes, Chairman Rich, I'm wondering if the President could
explain a little bit about the “Hub & Spoke Blended Learning” and how it appears to be associated with Wayne College.

PRESIDENT: Wayne College is the University's only state-approved regional branch campus. The concept is to have other regionally state-approved regional branch campuses located ideally throughout the country if we could find the ability to do that. That's the reason why it is associated with Wayne College.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Braun.
SENATOR BRAUN: My question refers to you're talking about the satellite campuses. Are there any plans for looking at international satellite campuses; and if there are, do you have any comments or potential costs related to that?

PRESIDENT: Yes.
The Board has asked for a strategy pertaining to increasing the number of international students at the University of Akron. I have asked them to delay that request for the moment until we complete some of the ongoing conversations that we have that are focused currently on the United States. Depending on the outcome of those conversations, they could then inform what is possible, but the idea of an international branch campus has been around a long time. The Universities that you probably know, that I know that have them and they continue to be developed and we would certainly be open to them.

As you know, we have many partnerships with universities. That model has existed here for a long time. We're not closing the door on the idea of a branch campus. It is not the current focus at the moment.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the President?
Senator Klein.
SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chair Rich.
I was wondering if the President could comment on the decline in student enrollment a bit further. Are those the only factors that you believe are involved, the ones you just mentioned when discussing the slides?

PRESIDENT: No, I don't. My guess is there are many factors. In the many conversations that I have had with people those are the ones that are mentioned most often, certainly it differs by program and college. Again as I have said many times, going on to legal education, the law school, it is very different than what's going on in, say, enrollment patterns in the College of Education. Every college has a slightly unique, different enrollment pattern. When you look at the totality of what's happening, you see the same trends at many universities throughout the Midwest and the Northeast. You see a lot of universities in the Midwest, particular that I'm familiar with, the small liberal arts colleges, for example, that are in real financial struggle in large part I think because of some of the same factors; demographics, increasing competition. Of course in our case, more limited enrollment, I’m not sure that that would apply to them. No. I'm sure that there are other factors that are unique to each of the colleges as well.

So for example, in the College of Education we know the reason why the master’s level enrollments are dropping, there is not the incentives there once were for a teacher to earn a Master’s degree. In Law School we know there aren't jobs in the law firms that there once were. So it is a national enrollment trend. In totality, our pattern
very much reflects a public university enrollment trend in the Midwest.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Chair Rich, I would just like to bring out the point about satellite campuses, if I might.

The University of Akron had an opportunity in the late '60s and early '70s to create multiple satellite campuses, and our administration at that time chose not to do that. In fact, even the development of Wayne was kind of hoisted on the University of Akron because of the fact that we had no branch campuses. I just want to point out that that was a decision made by leadership in an earlier time period based on what they thought was best for the University. It is obvious that having satellite campuses makes a great deal of sense in terms of today's world. I don't know if President Scarborough was fully aware of that history that we passed up on many opportunities at that time.

PRESIDENT: I appreciate that. I wasn't familiar with that. Another part of our history though that someone shared with me recently, I'm sure the good senator could add too, historically a great strength of the University was its evening school. The attention, the devotion to non-traditional students, and I have heard many people here that have been here many decades lament the fact that we slipped with regard to that particular strength. It is the future. We know that. That's not a case I need to make to this group.

CHAIR RICH: Are there other questions for the President?

Senator Hallett.

SENATOR HALLETT: I realize that your slide on demand for what do people want, you don't have a lot of room here. I did want to point out that in language pathology in the College of Health Professionals we have 380 graduate students for every year. We have 40 in the non-traditional and 40 in the distance program, and we have over 300 applicants each year for just the 40 slots for the on campus and at least that for the distance. I just want to point out that would be something that maybe we would want to add to that.

The second question is that several times in my field, in audiology and also speech pathology, we have had ideas for clinics at Lakewood, other satellite campuses, parent programs, training program. I was just wondering, is there anyone that we could consult with or talk to that may be interested in any services that we might provide?

PRESIDENT: Absolutely. If you'll contact our Provost, he'll put you in touch with the right person to help do that. We need those ideas right now. Especially some of these partnerships that we're looking at, it may help us to have some of the capital that we need to make the new programs work.

CHAIR RICH: Are there other questions for the President?

Thank you, Mr. President

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR RICH: Next on the Agenda is remarks of the Interim Senior Vice President and Provost. Mr. Ramsier, Mr. Provost, welcome you to your new position.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: It is your first appearance since it happened.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I concur. I am the Interim Provost currently.
CHAIR RICH: I mentioned that.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you. Thank you for taking the time to come out today. I know you have a lot on the agenda, a lot of important business. A couple of things I would like to relay: First of all, I'm happy to serve as Interim Provost. I'll do my best to make the case for good academic arguments and see where we go with that. That's my job.
A couple of things we should -- I would like to reiterate, some good news in the last couple of weeks since I started basically a few weeks ago: We have allocated, you know, full funding to the colleges for graduate assistantships for next academic year, funding from the grad school for GAs. So you don't need to worry about it.
I think it's a good process to have the grad council discussing these issues and looking at maybe there is ways to change to do a better job. Professional development leaves were announced to the deans yesterday. We were able to fund 59% of the requests this year. That's up from the past several years. I think that's a positive sign. You will get letters. They were send out today. We have posted the Assessment Associate Provost for the main campus. This is a very important position for the campus. As far as assessment for student learning, it is critical, it is an expectation, as well as, of course, a requirement for our accreditation. We have people like Senator Hausknecht serving on the Committee, Senator Miller, others. We'll have a good process hopefully. That person will report directly to the Provost.
Last, I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that phase 1 faculty hiring positions that were approved in the Fall, the 55 -- I believe the Law School was already filled, at least three of the tenured track lines. And this week I began interviewing candidates that have been coming in for the positions in the College of Business Administration. I have made a commitment to interview every faculty candidate that's here for a tenure track position or one of the open positions which may end up being tenure track or non-tenure track.
I have had four interview this week -- one last week, three this week. They were all excellent. I'm very impressed. The College of Business Administration, keep up the good work. We have a Phase II faculty hiring process in play now. As of yesterday we sent out an updated list to the Deans with instructions, and every one of these has instructions. The Dean should relay and forward this to the chairs and the directors, that should be forwarded to the faculty. Everybody should know what's going on.
As of yesterday, I think we had 118 new requests from the colleges. Mostly for faculty, a few staff, contract professionals, a few. About 62 of them have already been approved.
Now, qualifying that by those are mostly non-tenure track positions to replace current visiting faculty: The goal here is not to change the ratio of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. What we have to think about -- and everyone needs to know -- last year and this year we have more than 100 full-time visiting faculty. They count. They're all teaching a lot of students. The process is if deans know that they're going to need to renew that position to do the same work next year, there is no reason to continue people as visiting. The plan is to post bargaining unit positions in their
place. It can be tenure track. Many come in non-tenure track. They're approved. They're in the anticipate budget. We'll post them and do the search. A lot of search requests are coming in. The remaining whatever 18 minus 62 -- where is our mathematicians -- they're under review and more will come.

Please know we're doing our best to hire as many faculty as we can. There will be a point at which the money will run out. We will continue to do our best, and this is driven by what I'm calling a real needs assessment. It is an academic decision. Where do we need the faculty the most and for what? Chairs and deans need to make their case. We will listen to every single one, mission-driven by needs of the unit. Somebody in the end has to prioritize the list, and that's going to fall on me.

If you don't like the prioritization of the list in the end, you can blame me. I may not be around all that long, but for now I'm the one that it falls on. You need to work with your chairs and your directors and make the case, have them make the case to the dean, the dean in a meeting in your department. If you don't think they're listening to you, have them come and make the case to the Provost's office who will do our best to fund positions that seem to make the most sense where there is a demonstrated need.

Please work with us on this to help rebuild some trust on this campus which is what we're lacking, and it is big time we're lacking. We have a chance to change that -- at least for the time being -- so I ask you to work with me on this. Okay. You have to start somewhere. I'll do the same. Those are my remarks.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you, Mr. Provost. I had asked the President to update us on the status of the search for a new Senior Vice President and Provost, and I think he must have just forgotten to do it. I don't know whether you're in a position to do that.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I can tell you what I know.

CHAIR RICH: Don't tell us what you don't know.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: How do you know I don't do that all the time?

CHAIR RICH: You may.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: What I know, the Board has decided to do a search for a new Provost, this semester, and also for General Counsel. The Board will be the search committee as by rule for the Provost position. I know they have engaged with a search firm, and what I heard was the person that works directly with the Board has been ill, and it is slower than they thought, but there will be a posted real search for a real Provost. I do not know what the position description will look like. If the position description looks like somebody like me, I might apply or I may not.

I still have my current job as Senior Vice Provost. I'm going to do that work as well as fill in for the Provost until the time comes when there is a Provost announced.

CHAIR RICH: Senator, come to order please.

If you wish to be recognized, please seek the floor first.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I hope that answers the question.

As far as I know the plan is the same, but delayed a bit by some illness on the search firm's side.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Braun, did you wish to ask a question?

SENATOR BRAUN: You are going to approve the work done by the Senior Vice Provost?
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, Senator Braun is very bright.
CHAIR RICH: I took that to be a rhetorical question.
Senator Gatzia.
SENATOR GATZIA: The Higher Learning Commission, I was hoping you could enlighten us since the question was referred to you.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: What the president said is true. The Higher Learning Commission, final result of our last focus visit was no extra monitoring, no more monitoring report, no more -- not another focus visit, but simply to move those two topics, governance and assessment, to be focal points of the next visit which in general terms always is. Any time there is an action that's off cycle in Higher Learning Commission, the next team to come visit always looks at those same issues.
    What we have is what's called an embedded monitoring report. We don't have to have a separate process or a separate report for those two topics. We simply write our comprehensive visit report and embed and make sure that we call out the specific -- the specific two points so you have an embedded monitoring. That's -- that's consistent with HLC's new practice.
    It is easier on the campuses and on HLC, they don't have to send another team or a separate set of reports to read. I should remind the senators in particular that our next visit from Higher Learning Commission is Valentine's Day next year. One year pretty much from today. We have a lot of work to do, and we're going to have to get started on that work. I'll ask the chairman to encourage the senators to work with us on this. We have a comprehensive visit. This is a part of the new process. It used to be every 10 years, the process now is years 4 and 10, and next Valentine's Day, after this one -- and there is one this month, I better remember -- we need to be prepared.
    Governance is a big issue. What the Senate does today, what the Senate does next month, it will matter. It matters for the campus independent of accreditation, but also matters for accreditation. I will need faculty assistance to make sure that we get the work done. Assessment is key. I really want to thank the faculty and senators serving on the Assessment Committee search for the new associate Provost. It is critical. Governance is the other piece and the comprehensive, it is about everything. There will be a lot of opportunity for people to help, if they're so inclined.
CHAIR RICH: Senator Sastry
SENATOR SASTRY: A follow-up question on the HLC issue.
In our Budget Finance Committee meeting yesterday we were advised that this last number here, 1.0 was a concern because we are below the threshold for HLC watch.
Do you know something else about this?
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I would be happy to answer, and I think I owe Senator Gatzia a direct answer. All of the documents we receive from HLC and sent back are all on the Provost -- type accreditation on UA website, or HLC, it should go to the accreditation main page. Every single document is there. For reasons of transparency -- campuses don't have to post these documents. I have taken it upon myself as Interim Provost or Senior Vice Provost to post them all. Every response, everything we shared with HLC back and forth is publicly posted for anyone in the world to see. Can't be more transparent than that. That's where they are, where they're at.
To answer your question, for public institution, first of all, that slide. It is the KPMG composite financial index. It is the financial indicator that the higher learning commission uses to gauge the financial stability of campuses. Privateer institutions have a different scale than public institutions. We're a public institution. The scale goes from 1.1 to 10. If you're at 1.1 to 10 HLC doesn't bother you. If you go below 1.1, you flag what's called a financial indicator. If that slide is true, if the audited financials come out that we have a score of 1.0, we will receive a Higher Learning Commission letter, a financial indicator letter and will have to write a report to explain why we're in such a situation, what we're going to do to fix it. That will be reviewed by a financial indicator panel, a staff review at HLC, and I serve -- as some senators know -- I serve on many HLC bodies now, and there is financial indicator panels and non-financial indicator panels. So the financial indicator panels are generally CFO, CPA, people that most understand the financial side of Higher Ed. We're going to that metric in not -- not in good shape.

CHAIR RICH: I believe you misspoke, I believe the scale was 0 to 10
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: It is negative. Sorry. From 1.1 to 10 you're not in trouble. The scale actually goes negative
CHAIR RICH: How far?
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I don't know. I think negative infinity and positive infinity are somehow connected. We have the mathematicians to explain. Negative is not good
CHAIR RICH: Okay. It goes from somewhere below 0 to 10.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Getting below 1.1 is a problem. We were below that a few years back you see on the slide. We're not in a stable situation.
CHAIR RICH: Are there other questions for the Provost?
Senator Lillie.
SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you.
In the Interim Provost capacity as cochair of the University Council and in the context of governance I wonder if we can hear a bit more about what's happening with what I heard briefly through the Executive Committee report, it was a red-lined version of the proposed UA bylaws. That's all I have heard so far. I know that we're in a State of flux in terms of the University Council Leadership, so on. I thought I would take that advantage to ask if you could bring us up to date on that from that perspective. I believe it was from UC, not UA. The UC of UA.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Happy to, Mr. Chairman.
The consultants did respond back with what I would consider not a report but with suggestions to changes to the bylaws. Our office put that together in the form of a red-lined current bylaws and a red-lined version. It is obvious to see where the suggested changes would be. That was shared with Board members through the Board Secretary office. Our office has asked that any feedback that they have whether they like the suggested changes or not, have additional changes, whatever the feedback may be, be provided to our office by next Wednesday’s board meeting. I will collect that information, the feedback, bring it to the University Council per the President's instructions, and we'll have a discussion where we'll discuss what the suggestions are from the consultants, what suggestions may come from Board members, they may not
like the consultant's suggestions, et cetera. We'll discuss it. What I would hope is that we'll bring back what we feel to be, the University Council feels to be, you know, the best case scenario considering these suggested changes, and have the Board approve it at the June meeting so it takes effect July 1. That would be my -- that's my recommendation to the Board.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you.
CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the Provost? Senator Bouchard.
SENATOR BOUCHARD: This is in the area of rebuilding trust, and what I have heard from several people in Arts and Sciences, as of course we all know there were start-up funds that were not able to be given out to everybody right away, and the people who had gotten start-up funds or IDC funds had understood that they were to be given to them sort of in groups, and if they didn't quite use some in one year at least they could still use it next year when they perhaps would get the next batch, and then the half from this year and all from next year together would be able to make a real contribution. Yet, last week in Arts and Sciences everyone who had start-up funds in IDC funds were told that anything that was not used at the end of a calendar year would be swept and that there would be no possibility of getting any advance on money that they had been promised even if they could make a good case for getting the funds by an advance. Since this was different from what they had all understood a few months ago, I wonder if you can address this

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I'll certainly try. It is my understanding that we have a plan with all the faculty that has start-up funds. It is my understanding that that plan has been agreed to by the individual faculty about the plan of how we'll rollout the money. I'm looking at Dean Amis here. He's now Vice Provost, according to our office, for Research. He's the one that's working on the plans.
As far as I know, there isn't any problem with the start-up part. IDC is a separate category. Let's hold that back.
May I ask to recognize Dean Amis about the start-up?
CHAIR RICH: Dean Amis.
DEAN AMIS: The start-up dollars, the totals, they were provided to each of the colleges that had faculty that had start-up remaining, all of the dollars that had been allocated and not yet spent. Each college was asked to produce, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Polymer Science, they were asked to provide plans that took those funds and distributed them over the next three fiscal years as evenly as they could. That's because of the cash flow issues. We can't afford to have everyone spend all of the start-up money -- you know, race to the bank to spend all of that money.
In order to make sure that we don't then just perpetuate this as we have been doing, we also told people that they needed to put the plans together with the intention to spend them, and that we needed to know how much they were going to spend this year. Because that money that's now being allocated for this year, if it isn't spent this year, it means that somebody else is not going to be able to spend some other money going forward. Just in order to give fiscal stability to the start-ups -- this is $15 million of start-up that was allocated, and some of it goes back to 2003. People who have had start-up funds for quite a few years. The letters that go out to people say that the
spending should occur within three years. In all cases we have given people way more than three years. This is what we put out as the new policy. Within individual colleges, there may have been some faculty who had agreed to a plan that wasn't quite their optimum in order to get this distribution. I believe that the deans and their associate deans have worked with the faculty as best they could to set up those plans. I don't believe that anyone who was owed start-up funds has not received those funds allocated out to them.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I was going to say this, I have seen the e-mail from the Dean of Arts and Sciences saying that the funds were going to be swept. If this is a mistake for how the University plan is to be carried out, I think it should be corrected.

DEAN AMIS: It is not a mistake. The agreement is that we had -- that we needed to budget those funds within the year. That's what people have said that they wished to spend in each of those years. In order to have some stability to the financial process we have said that that's when they need to be spent.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: The simple way I think about this -- you can blame me for being simple sometimes -- when we budget for something, the whole point, you're supposed to spend the money when you thought you would spend it. That's not been the budgeting practice on this campus. That's why we're in such a hard -- we're in such a rough position right now.

You may wonder how we have 100 visiting faculty. It is because we never used to budget for them, ever. We had complete discretion in our office to approve visiting faculty on a dime like that. They were never funded -- never in the budget. You'll never find a budget previous to fiscal years prior to this with visiting faculty lines because we had carryover. We had carryover that we were allowed to spend up until this year. The carryover is one of the biggest issues we have on this campus.

We were able to do things because of the carryover. The carryover really wasn't real. The carryover was that we budgeted to hire certain number of faculty, but we were not able to fill all the positions. So we got to keep that extra money. We call that carryover. We could use it for anything we wanted. That's what got us in this situation in my opinion. I'm not a budget person. Having a plan where people know they have their money, but now they have to stick to the plan, I think that's a reasonable expectation. Nobody lost their money, but if they don't follow the plan eventually -- we can't let this continue for 13 years. I just heard that isn't the proper way of doing business. Hopefully those faculty will spend all the money that we owe them for good purposes.

And now the IDC is a separate issue. We haven't talked about that yet. We're now working on -- we're now working on a similar type of plan for what we're doing about the indirect costs recovery. For faculty that generate certain kinds of grants there is a percentage of that money that comes back into a faculty IDC account that they control and used to be able to spend at will. Again, carryover. I have an IDC account with 10,000 in it. I haven't had a grant since 2005 maybe. I still have the money. I could spend it any time I wanted. If we all went and did that tomorrow, in the past budget, there wouldn't be enough money because it wasn't budgeted to be spent now. The IDC
has to have a similar process. I have asked -- I have talked to Nathan and as of yesterday the plan is I'll give a list of all of the people that have IDC funds, all of the faculty and go one at a time, top to bottom, who has the most money are most affected by the money being there and can't spend it right now, and work our way down to make sure we're not damaging faculty research programs. IDC moneys have a purpose. I know that. I know what faculty use them for. I know why they save them. Okay.

It is earned money in the faculty's perspective, and they save the money for the day they need it, when the grant runs out, the grad student needs to be paid until the next grant comes in, very logical, very defensible. From a budgetary perspective it looks like a big unfunded liability for the current fiscal year so we have to have a plan. Once we have a plan we will implement the plan to stick to it would be my goal. Hopefully that answers Senator Bouchard's multipoint question.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Braun.

SENATOR BRAUN: Perhaps you and I had discussions about this, I would like to add something to this. This goes both for IDC funds and for the start-up funds, the idea is to spend this money responsibly, not in a hurry to just spend it. Okay. I personally have somewhere around 14-15,000. I use this money exactly for the purposes that you mentioned. If you're going to force me to spend them this year, I cannot spend it responsibly. I think making the decision -- when you earn this money, this money basically has to be put in your drawer to be there not to look like an unfunded or to consider it as a carryover. It is money that physically came in and has been assigned to you. Why all of a sudden is that being swept away because you didn't spend it? To me, it doesn't make any sense. From good research point of view, it doesn't make any sense, and I have done this for 37 years, and it is much more beneficial to have the money to spend them when you need it than not. Now, if you don't have any students, if there are extenuating circumstances, if you don't have any students, don't do any research, if you don't publish any papers, if you don't write any proposal, if you don't go anywhere, then you have the $10,000 that you talked about, maybe then it should be taken away because you're not doing anything with that. If you keep doing work and you keep that money as rainy day fund to be taken away from you just because you didn't spend them this year, it is not good budgeting, it is not good administration, it is not good philosophy.

It cannot be -- I mean, you can justify it because you have the power, but you can't justify it just because it is so- it is not so. I'm pretty sure that anybody around this room who has this kind of money knows exactly what I'm talking about, and I don't think you're going to find -- maybe you should take a poll about doing that and see how many people would agree with the philosophy that you proposed and you're not going to find any then, what happens to democracy?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that Senator Braun heard what I intended to say. I didn't say anyone was taking the money. What I said was we need to have an individualized plan for each person to spend the money. I agree that the money has to be spent wisely. The last thing we would want to do is tell everybody to spend it right away. We don't have the money to cover it. We don't want to spend it this year. The run on the bank is what was being alluded to by the dean as
well. We have to have a plan to spend the money, and it has to be done for purposes that make good sense, not just spend it to spend it.

SENATOR BRAUN: My point is there is no philosophical situation to swipe the money away because they're not being spent in one budge year is what I'm trying to say.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I would like to call on Dean Amos again
CHAIR RICH: Chair recognizes Dean Amos.
DEAN AMIS: I agree with you 100% on the IDC.
On the start-up the purpose of start-up is to get people started.
SENATOR BRAUN: I agree.
DEAN AMIS: Not an endowment that lasts forever.
If someone hasn't started, then we shouldn't just keep that money sitting there waiting. IDC is earned and should have -- should be used effectively and for important things. Certainly there are other models that do this at Case -- they have a model where they use a 3-year rolling average, they budget a certain amount into that for people that generate IDC and they expect that people will use -- I have been told -- they expect people will use that IDC in that period. It -- it is predictable. You can know how much you'll have that year and you can spend it that year. It is -- I think that there are also, as was just alluded to, there are also models where you have a bridge fund, gap fund, type of mechanism to help people out that are between grants. But that can be a shared risk pool also at the University level, and that certainly is what I'm trying to advocate for, is that we instead of having everybody keep their little spring fund, that we actually have a rainy day fund that we use in an impactful way.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: To reiterate, again, there is no plan to my knowledge to sweep IDC funds.
SENIOR BRAUN: Okay
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: We need a plan to spend it in a wise manner, an individualized plan.
CHAIR RICH: I have to say, I'm a little confused now having listened to all of this. I thought I heard it said that if the money were not spent as planned within a year that it would be lost to the faculty member.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: That's a start-up plan.
Am I correct?
CHAIR RICH: Alright.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: There is no current IDC plan other than everything is frozen and people were given I think 1,000 each, but the money is in the account but they're not -- they don't have the authority to spend from it until we come up with a plan.

DEAN AMOS: Carryover items.
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Current year you can spend.
CHAIR RICH: The IDC, concerning that, the mechanism is still under development, is that correct?
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yes.
CHAIR RICH: And has the Case model, Case Western Reserve University model,
been rejected in favor of something else?

DEAN AMIS: I'm collecting information and trying to provide alternative ways of thinking.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I have asked Dean Amos to get me the different versions of how this is done elsewhere.

He took the heavy lifting part on the start-up plan with a budget office. I have decided that I will take the IDC part with the budget office once I get the input from him.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: Thank you, Chairman.

This may be because I'm not a fiscal person either, but the money was actually there, right? The government in my case, NSF, gave the University money as IDC, part of that was then redistributed, the University to this person to that -- the money was there somewhere at some point. But now you're -- I'm kind of hearing that it is not there.

Where did the money go if it was distributed to me, but it is not really there because I can't spend it? Where did it go? Do we not -- do we not know savings accounts? I just don't -- I don't know where the University -- how that all works.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm as bewildered as Senator Willits. We do not have what we colloquially consider to be a savings account the way I understand a savings account, where I think if the money is there and I can go to the bank, I can get my money. There have been times in U.S. history when that didn't work. That's the situation that we're in. If everybody spent what they have in their budget, I don't think we could make payroll is my personal feelings. We need to plan, and that's where the faculty are affected the most with these kinds of funds. The issue is all the way to the top budget. The lack of planning -- scratch your head asking how can we hire 100 full-time faculty visitors and have not budgeted for it. Millions of dollars just miraculously appeared in paychecks. It is because of the way we used to budget. Now the budgeting process will be much better in my opinion, but this is the part where the transition goes from having a free for all where we could do anything like that to now we have to have budgeted for it this year or you can't do it and that's hard -- that's hard to take because it used to be a lot more freedom.

For those of us that felt we exercised that freedom wisely, we're upset about the freeze. If anyone in the room thinks some of that freedom has been exercised unwisely in a different part of the campus, you should be glad there's a freeze because now everybody is under the same rules. That's a good start to rebuild in my opinion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR RICH: I would add, regarding Senator Willits' question that money is spongeable. It is not -- it is not the money you're talking about, it never was segregated. Ultimately, of course, it was spent on other things.

Are there other questions? Yes, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would like to go back and address a point about the start-ups, the start-up moneys. I don't know what is happening in other departments, but I will give you an example of something that's happening frequently in the Department of Polymer Science. A new faculty member came with a start-up package that has the contingency in the start-up agreement that
the moneys have to be spent within three years, first year, second year, third year, but that's a bit difficult really in essence to affect. I'll give you two examples: One, a few faculty members coming to the department are going to take necessarily a very long time to establish the laboratory in the way that would be responsible and in a way that would be effective for research going forward. Right away, there is going to be a good lag in terms of spending the first year's start-up moneys. It takes a long time to try to find a post-doc, it take as very long time to try to find graduate students, all of that delays the first year of funding, and I'm certain that in most cases with responsible faculty members the moneys really are being spent carefully and judiciously, but slowly. At the end of the first year, I'm certain that there will be moneys leftover for good reason. They cannot be swept. They cannot disappear. That subverts the entire rationale in providing start-up moneys.

Those moneys carry over to the second year, then the faculty member has a very, very good idea of what the laboratory is looking like, what equipment to purchase, what post-docs to hire, what graduate students to hire. I think that the methodology here is good in terms of the concept but in terms of the practice, it is very, very disastrous and needs to be thought out individually and with much, much, much more flexibility than sweeping the money at a given date that hasn't been spent.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Landis, I may be confused again here. We'll find out in a moment. I thought I heard that with regard to the start-up there was not a one-year period, but rather a three-year period to spend it?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: The new faculty hires, the letters of offer with start-up, they receive 50% of the package in the first year, 30% the second, 20% in the third. That's been the standard for many years. Senator Landis' comments are valid. Setting up a lab can take time. The start-up plan that we're speaking of today is for faculty who were hired last year or years prior. They have already had at least one and a half full academic years and more, so we're talking about money that's been allocated years ago that still hasn't been spent, $15 million. New faculty hires are a different issue. There will be new faculty, new tenured-track faculty, and there are four positions I believe allocated to your college, Senator Landis, and all have start-up packages. They'll start the new wave of people with brand-new start-up offers. If there's a reason to not have a three-year or to change the ratios of maybe 30, 35, 30, something like that, I think that's certainly that we can discuss. It has been 50/30/20 only because primarily at least in my recollection when I review statements of interest, research plans of faculty who are applying for jobs, many of them come with an equipment list attached to their CV, this is what I want. Here is why I need $483,000. Those orders can be placed relatively quickly assuming we build them a lab, which always isn't the case. Going forward, we can change how we do this with respect to Senator Landis' comments. Well taken. Dean Amis knows what he's doing in this regard. We'll get it right going forward in my opinion.

CHAIR RICH: I have one more question then for the new faculty hires. The start-up funding, if it is a -- what did you say, 50 --

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: 50/30/20

CHAIR RICH: What happens if they don't spend all of the 50% in the first year?
INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: That's the senator's question. In the past they have been allowed to keep it and roll it for 13 years we have heard.

CHAIR RICH: So what is the plan now for that?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I haven't talked about the plan for next year yet. Again, I look to the dean.

DEAN AMIS: So we're developing that plan now. In principle I don't disagree with what Senator Landis said. In the past, it hasn't been a problem, the 50/30/20 because people don't worry about it, and they have been able -- that's part of the don't worry about it, it is -- it has to be modified to worry about it a little bit, try harder. Both because we want people to get started and get their lab going and bring in external funding to keep it going. I will say everybody has had -- nobody has been forced to spend in less than four years. The people that started last year, actually made an exception for them in this three-year plan. They were told if they have money in the fourth year -- very few people, there are two, two with start-up packages -- they were told if they have money left in the third year that we'll let them take a fourth year because everybody else has gotten that. We do have to have a plan going forward. My recommendation will be that we do the three-year plan with the fourth year and some moderate ability to carry forward. There is no reason why it has to be 50/30/20. No reason.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Braun.

SENATOR BRAUN: I have one more comment. I want to join my comments to Professor Landis. I think, Rex, you're familiar with the case in mechanical engineering for two years to build the lab. I think the name of the game here should be, if you have these rules, you should be flexible in it in which case you'll consider case by case the merits of each case. If a guy took two years to build a lab, but there is a lab that took two years for a faculty, a very capable faculty, a mechanical guy, I have to tell you, he's looking around. I think we do not want to lose people like him. He's a very active guy, very aggressive guy, it would be a big disservice for the University to lose this guy. The fact that he would be threatened to lose his funds would be the last straw. I think that every case has to be considered on its own merits rather than having a very rigid policy.

CHAIR RICH: Bear in mind that we have other business to transact. Are there any other truly pressing questions for the Provost? Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: There is another issue that I think everybody should know and I would like to see what your plans are. For the Budget and Financial Committee we were advised that the plan for the start-up is the way it is because to spend it, we can manage the funds carefully with the plan, but that doesn't account for new start-up packages being offered for colleges, and so the issue becomes the following: If a particular college, the College of Engineering decides to hire 10 people, a million dollars in start-up packages, the question is, is the impact of that going to be spread to all of the colleges or localized to the college that's doing the behavior?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: That's a very good question, Mr. Chairman. It points to the issue that I think I keep alluding back to. The way we used to budget here we do a faculty hire, what we would approve is the salary line, certain salary. We did not budget for the cost of the search for advertising, for travel, for hospitality. We did
not budget for relocation expenses. We did not budget for permanent residency petitions for international faculty. We did not budget for anything except the salary line, including the start-up. We didn't budget for it. We have a problem and now we have a chance to fix it. New faculty coming in, the start-ups, it has to be budgeted for. We haven't done that in the past because we had carryover. No one ran on the bank, therefore we never saw the problem until we have lost 5,000 students in the last five years. I'll tell you an easy way to do the math: An undergraduate is 12 grand a year, 500 a credit hour, 24 credit hours, 5,000 times 12,000 is 60 million, it is that simple. When you have lots of money floating around you don't have to worry about the 750,000 for this person or the 8,000 or the $800 for a trip. Now everything matters. We'll have a plan for the new faculty that will be hired with start-up. We discussed today, we have two positions. First of all, the first person that's been hired, he's here. The first rehire, she's here on the faculty. We have two positions that were not successfully searched for last year. They're back on, being searched for. Today we went through with the budget office with the dean and wrote down here is what we're going to need for the start-up, put it in fiscal '17, '18, '19, using the 50/30/20 which can be modified in necessary. That's the way you plan. That's the way you make sure that you hold to your promise to people individually and campus wide. That's sort of the way we're going to run this place from now on -- at least for the next six months or so. After today, it may be one month. I have to say one thing.

You realize that it has been in this last hour three times I have had to ask someone else for help. I don't do it all, unlike what people think.

CHAIR RICH: You do more of it than anyone would believe.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: We have a team we're building to support academics. That's critical for you to know. We will get it right if we stick to the plan. We'll get through these hiccups, the bumps, when they're behind you, you get them behind you. You drive over the speed bumps -- I used to do it fast, then the muffler fell off -- you get them behind you and move on. My plan is not to take up all the time so you can't have a vote today. I think this is a healthy discussion.

CHAIR RICH: Again, bearing in mind the need go to other business, is there any other truly pressing questions? Senator Braun.

SENATOR BRAUN: I have a very short one.

CHAIR RICH: This is your last one.

SENATOR BRAUN: In terms of budgeting you're talking about the new hires that you didn't budget for visit, travel, all those. Those are paid out by the department’s money, every single time. At least in our department, it was always paid by the departmental budget. It didn't come from the -- from a central unit. It was paid for.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: That's a statement.

CHAIR RICH: It is. Thank you. I do want to express my personal appreciation for your willingness to take on your new responsibilities in addition to the transition you're having.

(Applause.)

CHAIR RICH: And for your dedication to this University.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you.
CHAIR RICH: Next we have Committee reports, two of them. The first is a report of the ad hoc Committee of Chairs of the General Education Learning Outcome Committees.

Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIFGA: Thank you, Chair Rich.

More of an informative report today. The foundation's subcommittee has completed its work. We managed to do that at the end of -- beginning of this academic year. The Disciplinary Outcome Committees, I believe they have all finished their work with it. So those courses are -- have the existing courses that have been -- that have applied to be in the new Gen Ed learning program satisfying those -- is it three? Yeah, yeah -- the three learning outcomes, the learning outcome three section, have been approved or not, you know, as the case may be, that communication has finished.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Saliga, pardon the interruption, I thought I saw that Chair from the Natural Science Committee indicating their work had not yet been completed, but expected to be complete later this spring?

SENATOR SALIGA: I don't recall seeing that one. That does not mean that it was not there.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I saw it.

SENATOR SALIGA: I thought they were complete or almost complete with it.

The call has gone out for three of the four tagged courses, the ones that were in the learning outcome four if any of you remember or have this memorized like I feel that I do, domestic diversity, global diversity and the name, why we called it this name which I can't remember, I don't know, but basically social issues -- complex issues -- yeah. Those three, they went out. Those proposals are due in to various committees by March 4th. In the letter I had the Monday and in the e-mail I put the 4th. It is the 4th. We'll do that. That e-mail I haven't gotten out.

For the critical thinking tag, that Committee is still working on its template and in particular instructions. It feels like it is going to be more of a text-returned form instead of as easy as the others. I'm hoping we'll have that out to everyone by the end of next week. Hoping. The Committee of Chairs, all the Chairs have agreed to serve for next year. As we turn everything over to GIAC we'll have some knowledge of the new system there. With that in mind, I believe that the Chairs Committee itself will no longer be meeting alone. We'll be meeting with GIAC, with five other members other than the Chairs. It is probably what's going to happen through here so the next report could be coming in that way.

The last thing with it, we have discussed the implementations. If we look in the plan, the implementation plan is that once all eight Committees have finished their work that we'll implement the new program. Some discussion has been made with others and we as a Committee will be discussing this next Friday about if we can rollout the first half, the foundations, the disciplinary learning before the tag Committees actually finish, those would be ready to go come the fall. Students should not be in a position to take any of the tagged courses until their sophomore year any way the way they're set up. They're wanting to be a 200 level course on so there is some discussion that's going to go on there, and we may have a resolution next month to consider a change in that.
CHAIR RICH: Thank you, Senator Saliga. The next item of business is the report of the ad hoc Committee on a No Confidence Vote.

Senator Coffey, would you please present the report.

SENATOR COFFEY: Yes.

Would you like me to read the report or is it just -- the resolution itself?

CHAIR RICH: Please report on when it was -- when it was adopted by the Committee and the vote.

SENATOR COFFEY: So I was the Chair of the no confidence resolution. We met in December. We met twice in January. We also met on Monday night, a long session Monday night. We just -- I'll keep it very brief -- we debated a number of different points and we wrote a resolution that has been distributed to the entire -- a preamble, the resolution that's been distributed to all of the faculty on campus. Just very briefly, I wanted to thank the various Committee members. I got to meet a lot of great people. We did not -- we took this very seriously. We deliberated. We really looked at every single item, and we didn't agree on writing the final draft until we felt like we could sit down or we could -- stand up, excuse me, backing up every single sentence that's in this. So we -- I think this represents a tremendous amount of work, a tremendous amount of patience, a tremendous amount of compromise. So I don't take up the full Senate's time, I won't read the entire preamble, let me just read the final resolution.

CHAIR RICH: Do so. It has been distributed in writing to every member of this body and, in fact, many more.

SENATOR COFFEY: If you don't mind, the resolution: “Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Akron has no confidence in the policies of the current administration and the ability of President Scarborough to lead the University of Akron.”

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. The motion is before the body.

Before we proceed to debate the substance of the motion, there is one matter of form I think we need to address. As your Chair, I'm firmly of the view that our resolutions should be nothing if not grammatically correct. In the fourth clause of the preamble which begins whereas the reputation and the operation of the University, there is a subject verb disagreement. Is there any objection to changing the word has to have so that it agrees with the plural subject of the sentence? I hear no such objection so it is amended by unanimous consent. Thank you. Is there debate on the motion?

Senator Sastry


CHAIR RICH: A reference to the footnote? Is that correct, Senator Coffey?

SENATOR COFFEY: Can you point me closer?

SENATOR SASTRY: Page 3, footnote number 6.

SENATOR COFFEY: Yes.

CHAIR RICH: Any objection to making those corrections to the year from 2016 to 2015? By unanimous consent those amendments are made.
Senator Matejkovic.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: Chair Rich, colleagues, I was a member of the Committee drafting the resolution. I agree with Senator Coffey's observation. This was a great group of people. We had a lot of debate. We disagreed over a number of things without being disagreeable. It was a great professional experience. I was a dissenting vote. I voted not to recommend this resolution to the Senate and I want to spend a few minutes telling you why.

CHAIR RICH: Just to interrupt a second. I did ask and did not hear a report of the vote.

SENATOR COFFEY: It was 6-1 in favor of the resolution.

CHAIR RICH: You may proceed.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: First, I want to make the observation that I'm deeply committed to this University. I started here in high school. I got my undergraduate degree, my law degree here. I spent 10 years of here as a student before I took advantage of a wonderful education at a reasonable price. You used to have to dodge cars getting in between the library and Zook Hall, whatever the hall was, to where we have this great green space, a true University. I love this place. It is one of the reasons I came back. I think there have been a couple of big mistakes that have been made by this administration. I don't think anyone will disagree with me about that. The big mistakes that I see are the attempt at renaming or rebranding the University. Okay. I think that was a horrible idea. I think that this University has built a reputation as a University of Akron and that should remain the University of Akron. I remember reading when Allan Mulally took over Ford and one of the first questions he asked is what happened to the brand name Taurus? When the engineer said well the old Taurus was ugly so we got rid of the name, he said wouldn't you be better off just changing the car? So I think that the brand, the University of Akron, is something that has a tremendous value and I disagree with the attempt to rename or rebrand the University.

Having said that, it's not just President Scarborough that was behind this. If I assume -- if I assume -- it was his idea and he was a motivating factor behind it, folks, the Board of Trustees jumped on board, and not just the Board of Trustees, I remember the video we watched as they rolled it out, there were a number of current faculty members in that video. So this is not something that just came out of the view that he did on his own. There were other people involved in that. The other big mistake, the one that angers me more than the rebranding attempt -- I understand trying to change things -- the cutting of the baseball team. We took a very successful baseball team, we had a lot of recognition in the MAC, a number of really dedicated students that were very proud to represent the University as members of the baseball team, and it wasn't just that the program was cut, it was the timing. The timing of that cut angers me deeply. But to this day, I can't say that that timing was a choice of Scott Scarborough, that he made. I don't know who did make it.

The no confidence vote that we're considering today, to my way of thinking is very, very significant and has lot of impact. It has been noted by our Interim Provost how significant this is, not just within the University, but within the community, and I think that we need to do this in a very careful, deliberative fashion, and I don't think
that what we have here justifies that. I mean, we talk about declining enrollment, well, the enrollment has been declining over the last, what, eight years according to the chart that's provided, and I can't pin all of that on Scott Scarborough. It has been something that's happened, and one of his charges as he said was to try to do something to turn that around. Whether he's doing the right things or not, only time will tell, but I don't think that he's responsible for the continued decline. We'll come back to that one.

The miscommunication on the budget, well, okay. Our Provost has talked about the fact that we have lost $60 million when we lost 5,000 students. There's a huge budget problem and we have changed the way we do budgeting. So yes, there have been some issues with regard to budgeting. During our first Committee meeting I asked Chair Rich, and correct me if I'm misstating this, whether or not the budgeting process was fair and accurate. And he thought it was a better process than before, and for the first time in his recollection, Faculty Senate actually had some representation in the budgeting process. When I asked him about some of the problems -- and I think I used the example of the lay-offs at E.J. Thomas -- he said not all of those could be laid at the foot of Scott Scarborough because they were people that did not get back to the budgeting people in response to the request for information when proposed budgets were sent out. I think the budgeting issue is something that's been around for a long time. We have talked about cuts for the last five, ten years. Reduction in services is listed in the resolution, and, yes, there have been. Yes, some important people have been let go, but unless there is evidence to my mind that those specific reductions were directed by the President of the University, I think that the issue lays somewhere else. And I realize the Harry Truman, the buck stops here, he has the ultimate responsibility, but the fact of the matter is, he's got to be able to delegate, he's got to be able to involve other people, just as Provost Ramsier had the Dean responding to questions, it is more than what President Scarborough does.

Declining donations and letters to the editor of the Akron Beacon Journal, that stuff, I looked at the citations here, it was very good. What were they about? The rebranding effort, which again, I think was a bad idea, but he wants to change things. I don't know if he went about it the right way. It is a mistake. The other thing that I noticed were letters about the band uniforms having Zips on them instead of Akron. Well, seems a marching band playing at the football games where the team is the Zips, I don't really have an issue with that. I'm not sure that that was a decision that was made by the President of the University either. Let's redesign the uniforms and put Zips on there instead of Akron, I'm not sure that's the case. Graduate research funding, I think we have heard a lot today about how the procedure has been changed. The procedure has been changed. It has been changed because it needed to be changed, because the budgeting process wasn't accurate and appropriate before. Shared governance issue, we have had discussions about University Council bylaws for years, long before Scarborough became president. These conversations were had under Luis Proenza, that's a non-issue, and in fact what we're hearing is that there may be a final resolution to that. I do have some issues. I do have some concerns. I do see some potential problems on the horizon. There's stuff that I have heard, and I have had conversations with people that have said well my kid is not going to Akron U because nobody is sure
what's going on there. I do have some issues that are on the horizon. I don't think at this point in time this resolution does anyone any service or justice. That's why I voted against recommending this and that's why I think that this resolution should not be adopted by the Senate. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you, Senator Matejkovic. Is there other debate on the motion? Other debate on the motion?

SENATOR COFFEY: A couple of points I want to respond to. I see a lot of students here, a lot of the students that have taken my classes. I know you personally. Let me give a philosophical viewpoint and give -- sort of explain some items in here again, as I said, I'm confident, I'm real confident I can back up every single thing in here, this is all -- I'm confident of that. You look at some of those enrollment declines, population cut, 5% with a potential of 30% we have a disconnect, we have a big disconnect. And where is it coming from? The top. The top students saying why they don't want to come here or they don't want to come here.

When I first came here I had a ton of contractors coming to the house, asking when I talk to them, where do you work, I work at the University of Akron, oh, I went there, they would -- in a self-deprecating way, they laugh about time there, my kid is going there. I heard that over and over again, my kid is going there, I'm proud of my kid for going there. You know what I hear now, I hear -- you all hear the same thing, no way I send my kid there now. No way do I send my kid there now. We see -- how about what's going on with Higher Education Partners? I sat through an executive meeting with the President and we asked that question, and we were told non-disclosure, can't talk to you, then the Devil Strip I read a day later all about it. Where do we find out about things? We find out about things in the newspaper. That's shared governance.

One of the younger faculty members like me -- I haven't lived through 30 years of this, I'm living at this now. I'm looking at this room. There won't be a Faculty Senate in 10 years because we lost 44 tenured faculty members and College of Arts and Sciences, number one item in our strategic plan wrote November, we can't teach students, we can't mentor students, students aren't going to want to come here and the thing -- the question is, if you don't take action, you don't take action. We can wait. Let's wait. Let's deal with it, wait until something really goes wrong. The argument for waiting is wrong. The argument for now is right. This is the time. We have an emergency on campus. Those enrollment numbers, that's the canary -- no, that's a bull in a coal mine. Things are wrong here.

Again, shared governance is being laughed at. I go to the meetings, and it is a joke. It is a smirk. Yes, this is the time. Things like baseball team, again, those are student-athletes. I'm not a big supporter of athletics because they -- you know, someone is in it, did it, the President approved it. This is an emergency. We have to take action because what's being reported in the press, that we support this, we're behind it. Our name was used last year that they support this. I don't support this. That's why I propose this and I'm -- I stand behind every item. If it were up to me, it would have gone a lot further. I made sure -- I made sure that everything in here was something we had consensus on. We stand behind this. Again, I appreciate the support of the students. I stand absolutely in favor of this. (Applause).
CHAIR RICH: Other debate on the motion?
Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would just like to add something to the discussion. That is that I'm a representative of my department. This is not a vote for or from me. I polled my faculty in the Department of Polymer Science. We had discussions. The vote that I cast here is a vote of the majority of the Department of Polymer Science. I will -- I guess I may reveal the vote from the Department of Polymer Science, Mr. Chair, may I do that?
CHAIR RICH: If you wish.

SENATOR LANDIS: We have a very good faculty. They're very thoughtful. They're very insightful. The vote in my department, 11 in favor of the resolution, 3 against, 4 abstained. That will be my vote, one vote in the debate that we have here and the vote that we have here. This is not my own vote, this is the vote of my faculty colleagues.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: I have two items, one is perhaps a parliamentary inquiry and you can take into consideration while I say the other comment. How does -- how may it be appropriate to ask what form the ballot should take? There's been discussion like some people about whether or not this vote should be taken by secret ballot. I'm going to defer that for the time being. The first time that I engaged in a protest was in April of 1968. I was shot at with a B.B. gun. As I said, when Senator Coffey was elected a couple of years ago, I looked just like him. I had that kind of passion, all of that kind of stuff. I appreciate it. I understand where it is coming from. We need it. I also happen to believe that while this may be -- this may be necessary, you know, to move forward, I think it is well written, I think it is supported. It may be that if it does pass, which I anticipate it will -- we'll see -- in the end if it does pass, that to some extent Scott Scarborough may unfortunately end up in the role of the scapegoat. This has been presented by one of the previous speakers, this didn't happen overnight. There have been a number of other times over the past eight, 10 years in which some of us have done our Cassandra act about saying, you know, if this happens, then the next thing will happen, and it has been a series of missed opportunities to stem the erosion of faculty governance which I think in theory is the most important part of this particular proposal and, in fact, should be considered to be the heart of the University.

Without substantive governance of the -- by the faculty and staff of a University, then I fear we will end up becoming very similar to a K-12 Education model where there is a principle who is a monarch and where, you know, the faculty, the teachers are given a lot of lip service and yet often will end up being forced to teach things that perhaps they don't necessarily agree with or they don't necessarily think is correct. I fear that kind of -- that kind of vocationalization of the University, for lack of a better word. In summary, I do support this particular motion with some reservations that I have tried to explain, and I hope that however we may -- however we may forward with this, we understand that it would be convenient but probably incorrect to blame everything that we see now on one person. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: In response to Senator Lillie's question on procedure, the ordinary
course we vote on motions by voice vote with a division of the house only if the voice vote is too close for me to call. I believe that that is the way we should proceed. If someone moves to vote by ballot, that is by secret ballot, then that motion is in order and will require a second and the majority to be adopted, but I must caution you that any member of the Senate could effectively defeat that motion even after it passes by calling for a roll call vote because under the Faculty Senate bylaws any member of this body is entitled to a roll call vote. So even if the majority vote, vote by secret ballot, if a single member of this body asks for a roll call vote, that's how we will vote. I recommend that we proceed by voice vote.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you for the clarification.

Senator Matejkovic.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: I request a roll call vote.

CHAIR RICH: That's how we'll vote. Is there any further debate on the motion?

Senator Morath.

SENATOR MORATH: Since I will have to announce my vote and everyone will hear it, I will be voting not as I like to vote, but as my constituent have asked me to vote. I'm a non-tenure track faculty member of the Law School. I have a long-term contract. I have heard from four faculty members, one asking me to vote yes on resolution, three asking me to vote no. I will be voting no just for that reason. My experience is very unique from my colleagues who are more secure and are paid more than I do. Because I represent them, that's how I'm voting not because I don't agree with the fact that this should be -- I'm voting for my people or my representatives, not for me.

CHAIR RICH: Further debate on the motion? If not, I take it you're ready to vote. The Secretary will call the role, when your name is called, please say either yes or no. Yes if you're in favor of the resolution. No if you're opposed to the resolution. If you wish to abstain, the proper way to indicate that is by voting present. So say present if you wish to abstain. If there is no response, it is inferred that you were absent. So Secretary, would you please call the role using both first and last names since in some cases the last name is ambiguous.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Phil Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIR RICH: Please, Madam Secretary, after the vote is announced of the individual announcing the vote, please say Senator Allen votes, in this case, yes just as a way of making sure that every vote is recorded accurately.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Allen votes yes.

Senator Roland Arter.

SENATOR ARTER: Yes.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Arter votes yes.

Senator Linda Barrett.

SENATOR BARRETT: Yes.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Barrett votes yes.

Senator Todd Blackledge.

SENATOR BLACKLEDGE: Yes.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Blackledge votes yes.
Senator Constance Bouchard.
SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Minel Braun.
SENATOR BRAUN: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Braun votes yes.
Senator Kathleen Clark.
SENATOR CLARK: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Clark votes yes.
Senator Daniel Coffey.
SENATOR COFFEY: Yes
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Coffey votes yes.
Senator Teresa Cutright.
SENATOR CUTRIGHT: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Cutright votes yes.
Senator Asoke Dey.
Senator Briyanna Elliott.
Senator Elizabeth Erickson.
SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes.
Senator Erickson votes yes.
Senator Kevin Feldt.
SENATOR FELDT: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Feldt votes yes.
Senator Kathryn Feltey.
SENATOR FELTEY: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Feltey votes yes.
Senator Jeffrey Franks.
SENATOR FRANKS: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Franks votes yes.
Senator Robert Gandee.
SPEAKER GANDEE: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Gandee votes yes.
Senator Dimitria Gatzia.
SENATOR GATZIA: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Gatzia votes yes.
Senator Marc Haas.
SENATOR HASS: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Marc Haas votes yes.
Senator Terry Hallett.
SENATOR HALLETT: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Hallett votes yes.
Senator Douglas Hausknecht.
SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Hausknecht votes yes.
Senator Gary Holliday.
Senator Heather Howley.
SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Howley votes yes.
Senator Travis Hreno.
SENATOR HRENO: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Hreno votes yes.
Senator John Huss.
Senator Sukanya Kemp
SENATOR KEMP: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Kemp votes yes.
Senator Lori Kidd.
SENATOR KIDD: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Kidd votes yes.
Senator Janet Klein.
SENATOR KLEIN: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Klein votes yes.
Senator William Landis.
SENATOR LANDIS: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Landis votes yes.
Senator Laurie Lashbrook.
SENATOR LASHBROOK: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Lashbrook votes yes.
Senator Timothy Lillie.
SENATOR LILLIE: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Lillie votes yes.
Senator Lynn McKnight.
SENATOR McKNIGHT: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator McKnight votes yes.
Senator Nidaa Makki.
SENATOR MAKKI: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Makki votes yes.
Senator John Matejkovic.
Senator Matejkovic: No.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Matejkovic votes no.
Senator Jon Miller
Senator Randall Mitchell.
SENATOR MITCHELL: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Mitchell votes yes.
Senator Joe Minocchi.
SENATOR MINOCCHI: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Minocchi votes yes.
Senator Morath.
SENATOR MORATH: No.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Morath votes no.
Senator E. Stewart Moritz.
Senator Stacy Nofziger.
SENATOR NOFZIGER: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Nofziger votes yes.
Senator Colin Onita.
Senator Shannon Osorio.
Senator Ron Otterstetter.
SENATOR OTTERSTETTER: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Otterstetter votes yes.
Senator Pechenuk.
SENATOR PECHENUK: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Pechenuk votes yes.
Senator Robert Pope.
SENATOR POPE: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Pope votes yes.
Senator Dane Quinn.
SENATOR QUINN: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Quinn votes yes.
Senator Neal Raber.
SENATOR RABER: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Raber votes yes.
Senator Jeffrey Riedl.
SENATOR RIEDL: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Riedl votes yes.
Senator Jeanne-Helene Roy.
SENATOR ROY: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Roy votes yes.
Senator Linda Saliga
SENATOR SALIGA: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Saliga votes yes.
Senator Anthony Samangy
SENATOR SAMANGY: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Samangy votes yes.
Senator Shivakumar Sastry.
SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Sastry votes yes.
Senator Marnie Saunders.
SENATOR SAUNDERS: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Saunders votes yes.
Senator Leann Schaeffer.
Senator Pamela Schulze votes yes.
Senator Robert M. Schwartz.
SENATOR SCHWARTZ: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Schwartz votes yes.
Senator Carrie Scotto.
SENATOR SCOTTO: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Scotto votes yes.
Senator Cassaundra Spaeder.
SENATOR SPAEDER: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Spaeder votes yes.
Senator T.S. Srivatsan.
SENATOR SRIVATSAN: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Srivatsan votes yes.
Senator Harvey Sterns.
SENATOR STERNS: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Sterns votes yes.
Senator Taylor Swift.
SENATOR SWIFT: Yes.
SECRETARY SCHULZE: Senator Swift votes yes.
Senator Rebecca Willits.
SENATOR WILLITS: Yes.
CHAIR RICH: With two dissenting votes the motion is adopted. I will not take time right now to do the tally of the affirmative votes. The next item on the agenda is the report of the Graduate Council Representatives. We have actually heard from the Graduate -- body will please come to order. We have actually heard from at least one of the Graduate Council representatives about Graduate Council business. Is there anything further from the Graduate Council? Representatives I mean.
SENATOR ALLEN: In my opinion the main issue was covered that we discussed.
SENATOR STERNS: My opinion as well.
CHAIR RICH: Is there a report from the University Council representatives?
SENATOR LILLIE: There was no meeting in the last month. There should be a meeting on Tuesday.
CHAIR RICH: For the record, that was Senator Lillie. Is there any new business to come before the body? Any new business? Anything for the good of the order?
Senator Quinn.
SENATOR QUINN: Thank you, Chair Rich. I was on the Committee, and I would like to just offer up that I certainly respect John's comments, and I don't feel like anyone won in this vote. (Applause.)
SENATOR QUINN: Going forward, we still have a job to do. We have to work with the administration. As the administration reaches out to work with us we need to be willing to put aside any differences that we have for the good of the University, for the good of our constituents and for the good of us all. Again, while there are certainly dissenting votes here, I respect the comments that he made, and I would like to urge us all to do our best to work on shared governance whenever that may come to us and whatever that may be. Thank you.
CHAIR RICH: Thank you, Senator Quinn. Anything else for the good of the order? If not, I declare this meeting adjourned.