

3-1-2012

# Transcript from Faculty Senate meeting March 1, 2012

Frank Bove

*University of Akron Main Campus, fbove@uakron.edu*

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

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

---

## Recommended Citation

Bove, Frank. "Transcript from Faculty Senate meeting March 1, 2012." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 1 Mar 2012. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/38>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

**DRAFT– Verbatim Transcript notes for *The University of Akron Chronicle***

**March 1, 2012 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, February 2, 2012 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Building (BCCE 201). Chair Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Of the current roster of sixty-eight Senators, 46 were present for this meeting. Senators J. Miller, Rostedt, Semilia and Vinnedge were absent with notice. Senators Apple, Chyi, S. Clark, Cushing, Douth, Hamed, Kimble, Lyndall, C. Miller, Queener, Ramcharran, Sancaktar, Srviatsan, Thomas, Webb and Zhe were absent without notice.

**I. Approval of the Agenda –**

Chair Sterns – We have a quorum present so I will call the meeting to order. I'm we all were stimulated by coming down here, it's the Northeast Ohio we know and love. A little gusty a little cold, gives us vitality. Let me begin the meeting by asking for a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Senator ?: So moved.

Senator: Second.

Chair Sterns: Okay, all in favor please say aye. (aye)

**II. Approval of the Minutes -**

**Chair Sterns** – Minutes to consider? Okay.

**II. Chairman's Remarks and Opening Comments –**

Chair Sterns: Let me just say that we are at a very interesting point in time in our work, one of the things you're going to hear today is the report of the General Education Committee, Dr. Subich has been kind enough to come and give us an up to date report in some detail you'll also find a document in your packet or on the table General Education Learning Outcomes. I must

have the only printer in the university that couldn't handle that cover because mine came out really weird. I tried a number of times so there's a message in there somewhere. In any case I also want to point out to you that I think that there was a major university digest today showing us what was happening with the Higher Learning Commission so there is more information about that that is emerging. We have many many issues that are in movement I think some people have been concerned because we're still having some hangovers from the old curriculum approval storage device processing and the new. So did we yet find out what happened to that? There are a couple of proposals that we know are in limbo. That they were sent, they got an indication back that it was approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we are no longer in that process so I guess the thing were all learning is the program is an improvement but since it's not fully done yet we're still having many challenges. I've seen everything from scathing memos all the way to congratulatory memos so there's a whole spectrum of opinion regarding what's happening but I think if we give our staff a little more time to further work on this it will come to fruition. But at the same time all those very negative ones I just forward them to whoever and hope that they will be taken care of. If there's still concern and you feel you are having some major problems please contact me and I'll be happy to see what I can do to help. We have one obituary that has been presented to us today and this Dr. Albert Korsok, who was an associate professor emeritus of geography who died February 3 and services were held February 6 in Willoughby. He joined The University of Akron in 1968 and retired in 1983. He earned a B.S. at Case Western Reserve University, an M.A. at Northwestern University and a Ph.D. at the University of Illinois in 1960. Is there anyone in the Senate who is familiar with this gentleman? Okay if we would all please rise in a moment of silence in his memory. (Senate observed moment of silence) thank you very much. We are now ready for reports, we will start with the report of the Executive Committee.

## **Reports**

**Executive Committee** – Frank Bove – Thank you Chair Sterns. Good afternoon senators. On February 16<sup>th</sup> the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met to prepare for our meeting with the President and the Provost later that afternoon. At that meeting several important issues were discussed. President Proenza reported on a meeting of the Inter-University Council and it appears that the capital budget for The University of Akron will be 17 million. Other topics

included developing policies regarding degree attainment and commercialization of products. There was also a discussion of legislation regarding granting student trustees greater participation in Board of Trustees meetings including attendance at executive session and voting related issues. The acquisition of Central Hower is under negotiation. President Proenza testified before the legislature regarding a bill to facilitate universities having priority to acquire school buildings if they become available. The ad hoc committee regarding the Summit College and Criminal Justice degree was reported on, selection of the committee members was reported by committee chair Bill Rich. Reaction to the Sasaki suggestions and the role of faculty, if there was a discussion regarding the planning process that Sasaki is conducting. A concern expressed by the Executive Committee was the need for more faculty involvement in making decisions regarding planning and priority setting that directly affects faculty in terms of offices, labs, classrooms etc. at department levels. There was also a discussion and also an overview of the higher learning commission process. Associate Provost Rex Ramsier and Elizabeth Riley provided an overview of the Higher Learning commissions process. A steering committee is being appointed and writing teams are being assigned. There was discussion regarding the process and the need for volunteers to increase faculty involvement, a major component of the self study includes student performance issues such as problems and solutions, student learning outcome and numerous other areas covering the last ten year period. The result of the discussion regarding the general education committee and today we'll be seeing a report by Dean Linda Subich. The results of a discussion about the committee work going on with the e-learning and the Pearson product, Wayne faculty integration was also discussed with the change in leadership at the Wayne campus that issue may have to sit for awhile before further discussion. And also we discussed a little bit about the dissemination plans for Vision 2020 and we'll be hearing more about this in the very near future. The Faculty Senate was also invited to cohost the Provost's State of Academic Affairs address on March 21<sup>st</sup> in Simmons Hall room 111, I hope that all of you have the opportunity to attend. The Executive Committee met again on February 22<sup>nd</sup> to handle regular business and to prepare the agenda for today's meeting. Some of the business included calling into action the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to investigate a grievance, the EC also referred a proposed Senate bylaw change from the ad hoc Accessibility Committee to the Reference Committee for review before it comes to this body for action. The EC also finalized the appointments to the ad hoc committee to review the Criminal Justice

programs and the role of Summit College. Those committee members are as follows: the chair will be Bill Rich as we did already know and the members of the committee will be Shiva Sastry and Marlene Huff. Senators thank you very much for your service to the Senate and the University and this concludes my report. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Are there any additions or corrections? If not then can we have a motion for the approval of the minutes? Oh, we accept it then. We do not need a vote on accepting the?? Okay, rolling right along. Let me call upon President Proenza for remarks from the President.

### **Remarks of the President**

President Proenza: Thank you Mr. Chairman and good afternoon colleagues. Let me begin by thanking Chair Sterns for joining me yesterday and the night before in Washington at a meeting of the Government University Initiative Roundtable on Academies which put on a very stimulating forum on challenges and opportunities of serving an aging population. As you might expect, Harvey is an expert in this area and I was pleased that several of his papers were chosen to be included in the proceedings of that but I think most importantly I'm going to ask Harvey to brief you at an appropriate time on some of what we've learned and some of which of course he has long known because I think it highlights some of what is happening not only nationally but internationally and most importantly with regard to university I think it highlights some opportunities for us to take advantage of some strengths that we've built over the years and to explore opportunities both in terms of engaging with appropriate segments of our population and serving them better in terms of offerings that might be appropriate. I also suggested to Harvey that we invite one of the participants there, Ken Dikewald who gave a very stimulating and comprehensive overview of some of the issues and I think we would all benefit from hearing that there are also many references that he might wish to share with you not only from those proceedings but also from the literature my own favorite happens to be a fairly recent I believe a couple of years ago a global review that appeared in the Journal of Foreign Affairs so thank you Harvey for joining me and I hope you found as stimulating as I did.

Secondly, several of us have just come from the Mayor's State of the City address which was very positive and I want to just highlight the fact that he ended his presentation by recognizing

the significant efforts of the university and partnership with the city and the partnership with the Akron Public Schools to advance the educational attainment of our colleagues in Akron and Northeast Ohio. He particularly singled out for recognition the early college program which as you may know wound up being the either the 26<sup>h</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup> ranked program in the state among 700 high schools for this program. As you know this is a framework by which students in high school are able to take college courses and many of them therefore come to the university with already two years of college credit accomplished and this is a tremendous achievement. Not only is it so highly ranked in the state and within Summit County it is second only to Hudson High School which as you may know of course has the benefit of a very high income rates and very high levels of parental support for education in that regard so he as you know has been a champion for advancing the educational attainment of our community as arguably the very best tool that the community has for advancing its long term future and I hope that all of us will be willing to join in if some new proposals come forward such as that that he had advanced some years ago about leasing a public entity to support the kind of scholarship support that would be needed. So I think there are a great many opportunities there. No surprise to you of course he highlighted the innovative that we're taking with the Akron Public Schools for the possible acquisition of Central Hower high school which Frank reported to you briefly. We did testify on this matter and appears to be gaining widespread support in general and we hope that it will be enacted into legislation because what we intend to do together with the Akron Public Schools is to in effect utilize scholarships as a means to enable us to acquire that building but more importantly is the message being sent through the scholarship program to the student of Akron and of course to facilitate their engaging in college work. This is a program not unlike others throughout the country, it is of course focused on the Akron Public Schools for obvious reasons but anywhere that such programs have been enacted it has certainly proved as a tremendous incentive on students themselves, upon their parents, upon their teachers, upon their schools and of course if the students attain a level of achievement worthy therefore of our offering them scholarship they need to maintain a certain grade point average for them to sustain the scholarship and this again results in an incentive to the student, to their parents, in ourselves as a university as a faculty etc to continue that so I was pleased that he chose to highlight and parenthetically of course we're moving forward with the Akron Public Schools to initiate a STEM focused high school this fall and this will be a follow-on to the STEM middle school that

we initiated also in partnership with the National Inventor's Hall of Fame it will be the continuation of that exciting program which also has received rave reviews despite the fact that students are not specifically chosen for their achievement rather they are chosen at random and given an opportunity to participate and it's the high expectations that enable them to succeed. I'll be continuing that conversation and I apologize that I can't stay because I have a meeting with the mayor and the county executive CEO at four o'clock. As Dr. Bove reported to you the capital budget proposal to the governor has been approved, this was a new format which enabled the inter-university council to collaborate together this process has been widely recognized by editorial boards by the governor's office etc and I think my colleagues who served on that panel and my colleagues here at the university who helped put together that process Mr. Curtis, the Provost, Mr. Cummins and others and I'm sure that many of you participated in our deliberations. This of course awaits the approval of the legislature itself but let me just say that it was a fair process that the distribution is not unlike in previous years with another type of formula but it reflects a deliberation of things that are needed from a priority perspective, from a collaborative perspective and from a repair and renovation perspective so it's a good thing. I mentioned the forum at the national academies that Harvey and I were at the last couple of days, just let me mention that there's a couple of other things that are happening as a result of their graciously inviting me to do a number of things; so the revenue and industry roundtable on which I serve held that forum on Saturday they've invited me to go to Prague for a joint U.S./Czech republic comparative innovation where they've asked me to again present the Akron model and how this is affecting university renovation in the country and how it might be emulated elsewhere. As you may have read that the academy has also appointed me to the science technology and economic policy board and I'll report on that at a future time. It also asked me to participate in a panel that's been charged with evaluating the manufacturing extension program of the national institutes of standards and technology, there are three Ohioans on that panel, myself, Mr. Jim Griffith is CEO of Timken and Susan, a senior moment I forgot her name but she's a senior economist at Western Reserve Universities but the point of my telling you that is more importantly to indicate that they want to come to Akron on March 26<sup>th</sup> and explore not only what we're doing in supporting manufacturing activities and the kind of resources that we inject into the economy but to have occasion to see some companies here and to learn about how we are working with some of those companies so some of you will receive

it's by invitation only but I certainly will arrange for about 10 or more of our colleagues to have occasion to partake of that important process that hopefully will result in strengthening the enhancement of this very well known and already highly successful manufacturing extension program in Northeast Ohio we know that as MAGNET is an acronym for manufacturing something I always forget. Importantly this afternoon begins the Women's History Month so I hope you'll engage in some of the activities that are coming forward and in keeping with how Frank ended his own report let me extend my thanks to you because everyday I am particularly delighted not only in hearing about the achievements of you our faculty but especially delighted to hear about you continue to enable our students to distinguish themselves through substantial achievements in various competitions and accomplishments and I hope Mary Beth you and your colleagues will have occasion to highlight some of those for the Senate just a day or two ago students in our Entrepreneurship program collaborated with the Austin BioInnovation Institute, won a very significant award that please relate on that. Again I have to leave in a few minutes for the meeting with the mayor but I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. Mr. Chairman that completes my report.

Chair Sterns: Thank you Mr. President. Are there questions for the President? Senator Mancke.

Senator Mancke: I appreciate all your doing and I appreciate the Akron model from one perspective but last week the department chairs and the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences were told that we needed to plan for a 3-6% budget cut. And when I was told this in a meeting I started asking questions and looking for figures. And so I put some figures together and I'll just give you this, is it okay to. And in the College of Arts and Sciences in 2008 when our enrollment starting going up significantly our budget was approximately \$26.5 million. It is now approximately \$26 million. In other words we have had a flat budget, actually slightly declining by about \$400,000 during that same period of time our enrollment went up by 15%, from 250,000 student credit hours to 291,000 student credit hours. That meant that our cost of producing student credit hours went from \$105 dollars per student credit hour to \$89 dollars per student credit hour. But we've received no money so during this whole period when the university student enrollment was increasing the budget in the College of Arts and Sciences declined so we have effectively made a contribution over the past four years of 15% decline in



our budget. Okay, if we actually estimated what our student credit hour production was in dollars of 105 what our budget now should be approximately 25 million more than we have right now. I don't know where the money is going. Because we have had a 40-50 million dollar increase in revenues if you looked at what the College of Arts and Sciences return on investment is, we get about twenty-cents back. Supposedly for the academic programs in the university it is forty-cents. So we are getting half what the university average is. And we are told by the Provost that we should be sixty-cent return on our investment, that the standard is that 60% goes back into academic programs. For the College of Arts and Sciences 20% is going back and we are asked to make another cut. We may have an Akron Advantage but in the College of Arts and Sciences it is not an advantage, it is an advantage to the other programs in the university that are bilking us as if we were in a plantation economy. We should not be in a plantation economy, as a historian I can tell you if this continues we will have serious problems, we already do we should not put with this.

President Proenza: thank you Elizabeth and first of all, these are the kinds of questions we need to ask quite openly and vigorously because they are important to the well-being of the university as a whole. Let me first indicate that I've asked the Provost and our Chief Financial Officer David Cummins to address some of this more fully, but let me make some broad comments here while I have a little bit of time. First of all the request was for a planning of scenarios because last year we failed to do some of this planning and anticipated a much higher enrollment than we in fact achieved and as a result we're having to make some late adjustments to ensure that we have a balanced budget this year so we want to go into next year with a little bit broader planning scenario. Secondly the Provost and others have been asked to explore the very issues that you have raised recognizing that I have to tell you that the last time we asked about return on investment it was not a happy occasion because there are many factors that go into the overall operations of the university and many of your colleagues would be hugely disenfranchised if we went to every top on its own bottom. Not that we don't have to continue to make appropriate plans to reward the kind of changes that you have seen for example in the College of Arts and Sciences, substantial improvements. We also must be cognizant to the fact that in moving through this year we had to absorb a 20% decrease in state funding which wasn't particularly

helpful in the process but anyway, more detail is coming and going to emerge so Mr. Provost feel free to call upon me later and thank you for very detailed question and analysis.

Chair Sterns: Senator Bouchard.

Senator Bouchard: I was actually going to ask a simplified version of Senator Mancke's question.

Chair Sterns: Senator Speers.

Senator Speers: What exacerbates Elizabeth's problem is that the College of Creative and Professional Arts is now going to be put into Arts and Sciences, I don't know if your figures Elizabeth take that into account but as we know on the plantation when dancers and singers come they don't pay for themselves in fact they bring very little money with them so as you do those figures you'll have to after end student ration people who don't normally do one on one so that makes it even worse. So I don't consider it a reward I consider it providing for us but we're not being rewarded we just need divisions cause as you point out, students are being recognized and two of our students are going to the Kennedy Center in April as part of the Gospel According to Tammy Faye and they'll have an opportunity to represent our university there.

President Proenza: Yes, thank you Susan and again the Provost is going to be working with the Deans and all of you here on a concept of a unit analysis to try to get at the kind of questions that both of you have raised.

Chair Sterns: Anyone else? Senator Ducharme.

Senator Ducharme: Yes, maybe still to me a more simplified version of the question and maybe the request. The provost last month gave us a one pair of statistics of the amount of revenue used in administration vs. used under the Provost for two years, it was a qualified in some ways but it was a breakdown of 48% used by administration 52% for running the university another year 44% and 56%. To a typical faculty member that seems very very top-heavy use of money and I

guess together with the point that Elizabeth was making that for my numbers that I hear there's a 50 million dollar increase in revenue from 2008 to 2012, and my simplified question would be what I think we're asking or could really simplified the answer if you would ask each of the vice presidents to do just a summary of hires and salaries in the budget for each of their units I think that would be, to me, a really simplified way of where did 50 million dollars go.

President Proenza: I'm happy to have that I think that's fully included in the unit analysis concept that the Provost will discuss with you. Please also do remember that some of that increase in revenue was accompanied by significant reductions in other revenues to the university and actually my comment about the meeting that Harvey and I were in recently was to try to again remind us colleagues that in the end result we have to take care of ourselves. The state very clearly has said that they're just not going to be responsible for the old contract about supporting education they're just not. What is more our President, President Obama has quote "put us on notice". I find some of the ideas are a little bit problematic and distinct because there's such differences amongst states. You've got some states that support higher education, public higher education in the old way that is providing 70-75% of the cost therefore the students bear only 20-25% of the cost whereas there are other states such as Vermont that is not only the reverse but to the extreme where the state because of a very small population base can provide only about 5% of the cost of a public higher education and students in those states have to provide for the other 95% and indeed if I'm not mistaken Vermont is still the state where tuition is the highest. So how can you on a rational basis, on a national basis, have some metric that assesses whether one state is raising tuition quote "more than it should". I don't know how you address that question without taking into account that huge span of differences in support. So I urge us to understand and again the issue about the challenges of an aging population is for us to discover in a much more appropriately allocated way the end result ways to find new revenues and use effectively and appropriately and to all of our satisfactions.

Senator Ducharme: Could I get just one follow-up question? So I agree and you know what I don't know about different states and revenues and so but the analogy that I use is just in our business, in our shop here right that if the analogy is that we have a feed the children foundation and I want to give money to feed the children but then I find out that the money I give if 48% of

that goes to the administrator unit of feed the children and then when they run short of money they take money away from food for the children then this is something is out of whack here and that's the sort of concept I have in mind is that a problem here?

President Proenza: That's a very good question and it doesn't just have a standard off the cuff simple answer. There's several things to consider. We have a much larger segment of overhead requirements, it's roughly 46-48% that you referred to so all the utilities, all the healthcare costs, all the etc, etc, etc they're huge things that need to be considered and for better or for worse colleagues for the past three decades and that's in my experience and forgive me I'm cheating a little bit I think it's a little bit longer, on an annual basis we have been receiving what is in the trade referred to as unfunded mandates. Things that were expected to do because the government requires it and they don't pay for it, we have to. So the end result I invite you and I appreciate the questions for example to Elizabeth's good points here we have been telling the state that we are doing more with less, not just less state money but less money per student. Thanks to Dr. Midha who's back in the back and his excellent analytical capabilities we've demonstrated quite effectively that the rate of rise of our tuition in Ohio is really very modest about 1.5% in real dollars, secondly we've demonstrated quite convincingly that the actual amount of money available to us, that's tuition plus state support is actually declined during this period of time much as you've analyzed for the College of Arts and Sciences. So we're all in this together we have a number of programs such as those that Susan indicates and some of the science programs which are higher cost than other have some programs that attract more students, we can't just say okay we're going to give all the money to this and that because otherwise we lose a lot the things that make us what we are as The University of Akron but we have to do better both in understanding what our budget constraints and if you wish the last time I used this term I got chastised, fixed cost cause fixed costs continue to increase how can they be fixed? Well it means that they're things you can't avoid like energy and healthcare and things of that sort those things we have to deal with and pay. So let's continue asking these questions over the last week and a half the Provost and the deans have found a melioration to the current situation and looking forward and again these are planning scenarios not mandates, if we need to do what we're setting out to do and meet our enrollment projections and assuming the state

doesn't do something else, we probably won't have to enact any budget cuts but you know cross your fingers.

Chair Sterns: Senator Mancke.

Senator Mancke: The College of Arts and Sciences has suffered over a 15% budget cut over the last four years. That is my point, we have already suffered a budget cut in a period of rising revenues. We need to know where the money is going, we don't need to be told we need to think about it, if we do not get the figures if we do not know those numbers are if there are parts of the university about which we can not ask for the numbers then we do not have transparency. We need to know what those numbers are, we need to know what the unit budget is for all the parts of the university because we can't analyze it, we can't talk about it if you give us an injunction to think about it, to analyze it, to look at it carefully then you have to be prepared to produce the budget figures that allow us to think about it, analyze it, look at it carefully without those numbers you're injunctions are empty words.

President Proenza: Those numbers are publically available, you're welcome to have at it and ask any question you want. Okay?

Chair Sterns: Anyone else? Now at this meeting the President and I learned about calorie restricting diets leading to longevity but I don't think it's a good idea for higher education.

President Proenza: And I would agree with you and I've also had a hard time suggesting a starvation diet to myself.

Chair Sterns: My response to this is that with our sister or brother organization the Council, we're starting to get reports from the budget committee, we have the opportunity to really have a full discussions of the budget process in a way that we have not had in many many years on this campus. This reminds us that we need to have information and we need to know what's happening. I think the motivation for this is because we all care about what we're doing.

President Proenza: Colleagues again thank you very much.

Chair Sterns: Thank you. Well remarks from the Provost. I don't know if you're watching the Prime Minister forums in the UK, where they have the question and answer period on the BBC.

**Remarks of the Provost -** Provost Sherman: Good afternoon, it's actually interesting that I heard earlier the comment about our collective success because what I wrote down actually sitting here before the conversation, my comments were going to reflect the success of the collective is what will assure the success of the university and that is what will distinguish us so I think that's a theme that through shared information, open discussion, dialogue and deliberation that we can advance the institution in ways as of yet undiscovered and that will be very refreshing. First let me comment on the Higher Learning Commission. The accreditation site visit, it'll take place in March 2013 as we've indicated the self-study steering committee is in place, has been meeting over the last several weeks. You may recall we started the process last year but then HLC adjusted the process and we had to go into a holding pattern pending the finalization of the approach to be taken. We readjusted the steering committee, we are also now identifying writing team leaders and we're forming writing teams and they'll begin drafting our self-study over the next several months. Obviously several constituencies will be involved in reviewing those documents as they emerge. There were communications to campus this week stressing the importance of the process and we did ask for additional participants and if you want additional information it's [www.uakron.edu/hlc](http://www.uakron.edu/hlc). Obviously we're going to need to facilitate and foster very broad collaborations, discussions, deliberation at the faculty, the staff, the student levels and collaboration so that when the accreditation team interacts with us as an institution we can present an institutional perspective that is worthy of what this institution represents to Northeastern Ohio, the state and the nation.

The President mentioned and the deans have had different discussions with department chairs and faculty about budgets and different fiscal years, let me start with the current fiscal year which is fiscal year 12. you'll recall that the last 18 months we've been analyzing our student academic success data and from that perspective we landed on the most important metric related to graduation rates is persistence. I guess I would say that the analysis of that data that led us to

where we were headed was student success also suggest that the approach to projecting future budgets based upon enrollment were not accurate. Because they didn't take into account so to speak, the students who are here for a very short period of time. We were not able to adjust things for the fiscal year 12 budget because of the time lag, we will be able to make adjustments for future projections but given the fact that over the last three years a higher percentage of preparatory students were admitted to the university we had the consequence of this fiscal year having a budget that didn't meet projections because enrollment did not reach projections. We projected a 3.5% increase in enrollment, the increase in enrollment came in at 1.5%. We interacted with the deans and you participated in trying to assure persistence from autumn to spring by interacting with 5-6,000 students, we still were low relative to last year. I did indicate to this group and consistently with the CFO Cummins to the Board, to the deans and more recently CFO Cummins to the University Council that we are running for the fiscal year 12 budget about 8 million dollars short, we have about an 8 million dollar imbalance. What I can tell you is that we will balance the budget in a way that allows us to diligently continue to pursue the Vision 2020, that will allow us to continue to pursue faculty that have been approved for the faculty position allocations that are currently in place, indicating a full commitment institutionally to faculty hiring and that as the President indicated earlier as was mentioned previously you know will begin undertaking complete unit budget allocation analysis that will compare our budget allocations to benchmark also will be reviewed from a historical perspective but the unique attribute of doing analysis such as this is that all expenditures of those units also get associated with those units so that the unit revenue to expenditure framework is a point of view that will be brought into this allocation. That is really what needs to set the stage for moving into a budget system so we'll pursuing that. The bottom line is that the 8 million dollar projected imbalance will be covered by as we've indicated before, we didn't send out the extra 1.5% we pulled back going into fiscal year 12 which was about 2 million dollars you know going into 12 we put 2.3 million dollars for strategic investment. The Board of Trustees did not endorse Vision 2020 and that strategic investment until beginning fiscal year 13, that 2 million dollars plus the 2 million dollars that I've just mentioned is 4 million dollars, that will help balance this budget. What I can tell you now is that that 2 million dollar strategic investment that will be in future budgets will be protected from any kind of reallocation such as what were discussion today. WE also anticipate based upon the trajectory of our current spending over the

next four months because utilities are running at a lower rate than was expected, healthcare costs are running at a little lower rate than expected and our pay out in compensation is running a little bit lower than expected, we anticipate a natural under spend of the budget by about as David has indicated, about 4 million dollars. So if you put those three things together we will have a balanced budget for fiscal year 12. Now fiscal year 13, the analysis that we've asked the deans and the vice presidents to undertake are two scenarios; obviously one would be flat. The other one is a 3% reduction and the other one is a 6% reduction. Again these are scenarios that are being developed in consideration of developing a full budget for fiscal year 13. What I can tell you is that in developing the fiscal year 13 budget it will be predicated upon the state allowed tuition increase at least in terms of analyzing a projected budget. We have to do a zero increase, we have to do a 3% tuition increase which is what the state maximum is allowed. So those are the two scenarios we were going to do in the budget process. Right now we're anticipating flat enrollment but with flat enrollment will come improvement in the student academic profile so as you recall we're working over the next four years or so to reduce the number of student admitted to The University of Akron in the preparatory category, that's about 300 students going into fiscal year 13 and you also recall there was an adjustment to the readmission process or policy that defers individuals from returning to the university after dismissal for two semesters. It used to be one semester. That will account for about 200 fewer students. So those factors are in a sense what will contribute to at least a flat budget or a flat projection because we'll counter it by what I'll mention in just a minute. Hopefully the success of our yield activities. Okay, so back to the fiscal year 13 budget. 0%, 3/5% tuition increase, no change in enrollment, flat enrollment, increased student academic profile. We will pursue the assuring academic excellence strategy which is the 2 million dollar allocation and each year for ten years investment in those four areas of research focus. The academic mission of the university that is the success of the colleges, that will remain the top priority in the budget process. Ahead of finalizing the fiscal 13 budget I'm indicating with the concurrence of the CFO to the dean of the graduate school to alert the colleges that we are authorizing the same level of GA stipends for fiscal year 13 as exist for fiscal year 12. We had originally said there was going to be a 10% holdback, that 10% is now being released so we will alert the deans to that later today.



Changing topics, let's go to summer faculty research grants as that has been a question at previous meetings and some e-mails. I can tell you right now that we have restored the summer faculty research grant budget to \$140,000 for sure, so that is the allocation that was in fiscal year 10, as we've interacted we'll look at what this allocation might be for fiscal year 13. What I would do and what I understand from interacting with Dean Midha and a couple of other deans the year before last when additional funds were required for this program and interaction with the deans apparently produced some additional funds

Senator Bouchard: A few thousand.

Provost Sherman: To support the program so I'd be more than happy to engage in a conversation with you or the committee and appropriate deans to deliberate how we might be further able to support that program. From an e-learning perspective, you're familiar from the report or the presentation that was given a couple of weeks ago on e-learning activity and Professor Lillie has reported and we keep the Faculty Senate Executive Committee up to speed on that progress, basically we're still in an exploratory status with Pearson, we're evaluating the success of the current pilot project, I think there's five or six committees that are interacting with the steering committee upon which members designated from Faculty Senate exist and we'll look forward to the results of that work in helping guide our decisions related to e-learning through Pearson a possible Pearson platform. In January having interacted with the deans we presented some strategies to the Board of Trustees and I mentioned these at the last meeting for summer for enrollment I'll again remind you that we're going to pursue about eight strategies for which the targeted students have the potential to improve either progress towards degree or improve persistence of students coming to The University of Akron. In other words to the benefit our of long-term academic health and financial wellbeing. We've done a cost to benefit analysis of these eight initiatives and indentified the overall program to be worthy of pursuit and in addition about the 11,000 students and 66,000 credit hours that typically occur in the summer these specified programs will focus on about 1400 or 1500 students generating about 9-10,000 credit hours. our real opportunity is associated with the autumn 2012 enrollment. Our greatest opportunity is associated with autumn 2012 enrollment, not only from the perspective of persistence of academically successful students this spring to next fall but the admission to this

university of academically qualified and prepared students. We've been interacting with the dean, we've been interacting with the Board of Trustees on how to ameliorate that we're not going to bring in 300 preparatory students and we'll have 200 students deficit so to speak from the readmission policy. The objective for autumn 2012 is to yield approximately 400 more students than the projected reduction. That is the projected reduction and the number of preparatory and readmitted students who have been dismissed. So in other words, we're going to attempt to have a net gain of 400 students above the 800 students that we will not have here. Again the focus will be on more academically prepared students. So what does this mean? This means that we need to yield more of the students who are better academically prepared that we have actually admitted to the university. They have not committed to us yet by having paid their \$100 fee that in a sense indicates they are committed to us. The office of Admissions has always interacted with colleges with regard to the students who at this stage of the game have not yet committed, that is why admission in the last several weeks and I think finishing up the end of either this week or next week will have had interactions with each college with regards to the list of students that have applied to the college who are academically prepared, who've been admitted who have not yet confirmed. And I encourage us to do everything we can to have the right kind of interactions with those students to bring them to this campus. So if you're asked and I'll be making phone calls as well to connect with students who have not yet committed. Please take advantage of that opportunity if your time permits because we do know that once a student has a connection with a faculty member their likelihood of coming here likely should be the case is to come here so the extent to which we can create those positive interactions is what I think will help us buffer in a sense this kind of period where we're shifting our academic profile. I can tell you that independent of yielding new first quarter freshmen we will looking at a diligent of our recruiting additional adult students, recruiting additional veterans, focusing on students who have dropped out who have coming back the potential to finish, international students so there will be a focus on those students by the institutional offices that directly focus on those student profiles. So your help along with the diligence of those offices that focus on those students is what I think what will bring us greater success and yield. As of right now our applications are 4% higher than last year with a higher proportion admitted with ACT scores of 24 or higher, that's good news. That means we have more students applied and admitted who are going to be successful at The University of Akron. Those are the students we need to yield.

We've had additional transfer applications that are 14% higher than last year, representing another opportunity and please recall with regard to transfer students, this year we did not admit in the spring transfer students who applied who were on probation at the institute they were coming from. In spite of that we still had a net positive of transfers in the spring of about 20. So we had a net 70 increase of transfer students in the spring, so we can do this. And it can be successful and that is what is the very very very good news.

I wanted to let you know I'll have the wonderful experience and occasion to greet our part-time faculty this evening, we're holding a reception for them prior to the Fiddler on the Roof Broadway Series and their invited and have tickets to enjoy the Broadway Series following that reception so that is one outreach effort we're making for part-time faculty I reported at the last meeting that the laptop will result in part-time faculty having upgraded computers as well and we will be interacting with the deans about the part-time space issue that was brought to our attention earlier. Again I think this is a good indication of the success of the university is dependent on the success of the collective and that that is what will make this university distinct. I enjoy the opportunity to assist all of us cause we're all in this together to make this a successful journey. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much. Are there questions for the Provost? Senator Bouchard.

Senator Bouchard: Start by thanking you for finding some money for faculty research, cause that really makes it such important program.

Provost Sherman: Soon to effective from the data that we have.

Senator Bouchard: I was going to ask you, I was also glad to hear that you've restored the funding for the grad school stipends, because this has been an issue for at least a dozen years, I was in graduate for eight years so I know about this. Routinely, every single year we'd be told that we're going to get either a 10-20% cut in GA funding. Then at the end of May the money would be restored, of course it was too late because all of the students we would have wanted to attract would have gone elsewhere so we get the rejects. And we don't want to consolation prize

we want to a strong program and so I'm pleased that it worked out earlier this year and do you think that going forward in future years that we're going to be able to avoid that step where we get a cut and then have it restored?

Provost Sherman: Absolutely.

Senator Bouchard: Okay.

Provost Sherman: When the CFO and I spoke about this this morning, he was asking why do we do that? Well, because of the answer to that question we not pursue that tactic in the future. For this very reason, we want the very best graduate students to come to The University of Akron.

Chair Sterns: Senator Webb.

Senator Webb: A couple of weeks one of my students brought me a book, it was called The Death of the Faculty by Benjamin Ginsberg. And Ginsberg is doing a study nationwide to look to see what's been happening in terms of cost in higher education. He said that during the time of my teaching would have been in the 1970's, cost of keeping faculty in place has risen 50% and the cost of keeping the administration and their staff in place has risen 300% has that been true at The University of Akron in your opinion. (end of tape)

Provost Sherman: That's a great question. We can analyze that with regard to the budget questions David and I have been working on in a sense a budget presentation. He is going to do a budget presentation for the Board following their full meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup>. We anticipate adjusting that to integrate into it the academic side of the house so to speak; student credit hours, instruction, head count, FTE and all of those sorts of things. And we have discussed turning that into a presentation that could be presented here, we talked about doing a public forum or two like we did on student and academic success. Our intent fully is to answer and address the questions that have been asked that were asked earlier in the day. I can tell you that when I arrived we sliced and diced the data and Dean Midha was involved in this, every possible way we could for me to understand the condition, the budgetary conditions of the university upon my arrival.

What I concluded was that was the starting point. To me, it was important to know how we got to that point but for me it was important to decide how to adjust in such a way that the trajectory changes and that is why I reported at the last meeting that as we were trying to move the proportion of the budget to the academic side of the house that the data indicated that we had made some progress and we believe that is the intent of the budgetary strategy that is to move more of the institutional base budget to the academic side of the house. That is already happening in ways that may not be apparent. More faculty at a greater institutional cost have been allocated to the colleges to serve. The completion of those searches in effect has the effect of that shift. The reductions that we took going into fiscal year 12 were differentiated between academic support units and was it 60/40 or 70/30? It was differentiated so those reductions were differentiated, that will help with the shift. So just about every tactic and strategy we're putting in place I am trying to diligently apply the principle of the hat, the outcome should help move us toward shifting the base budget in the institution. I can't do anything about what some of the fixed costs are, in terms of what the institutional debt is, we can figure out how to pay down the debts sooner or to create the opportunity to secure additional bonds albeit to incur greater debt but to focus those bonds on academic buildings. So I think we are making some progress as I indicated at the previous meeting in shifting the base budget and I'm sure that the presentation that we'll be putting together will result in a very good conversation about the institutional budget.

Chair Sterns: Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson: I had a couple questions and what you said sort of added a couple more. The first is on your budget and I've been talking to the University Council folk on the budget committee and your talking here now about a unit budget, I'm not at all sure I know what a unit budget is.

Provost Sherman: Like the Presidential area is a unit.

Senator Erickson: Oh, okay, alright. Then because as an economist it seems to me and I quote Professor Aronberg who is also a CFO at Cornell, that how we do budgeting at universities is

usually is not really very effective at getting functional analysis because you have to base your actual reallocation of resources across function because you need to talk about not only about units but about the function and how to get a certain function effectively and of course in this institution it's education that is the function and the rest of it goes from there. So that's number one. Number two on that one would be if it's unit cost if it's each unit then there are a whole lot of non-academic units now I'm assuming at least from what you've been telling us that all the units give up 3-6% but if you're trying to...

Provost Sherman: No we didn't say that.

Senator Erickson: You didn't?

Provost Sherman: We said we're modeling 3-6% which  
(talking over each other)

Senator Erickson: Modeling 3 and 6 in only academic units?

Provost Sherman: Oh yes.

Senator Erickson: Cause you see if the other units you're trying to shift the resources of one to another then it would seem to me that you would ask the non-academic units if you're trying to get a 60/40 they would have a larger cut.

Provost Sherman: Yeah, what I said is you can continue to count on that being the outcome of these types of processes.

Senator Erickson: So they get the 6% and we might get the 0%?

Provost Sherman: But it will be differential. Maybe that's the whole point, it will be differentiated so we can do the shift. That's the intention.

Senator Erickson: Second thing that I just wanted to comment on is that I appreciate when we talked about this through EC that you were going to be able to make the budget data spreadsheets available to the budget committee so they could do their own breakdown because it would be extraordinarily difficult and a number of us have had that experience of trying to interpret what on earth the numbers the way they're aggregated and I appreciate you doing that. The third one would be the 2013 budget now you've been talking about it as if it's about to be completed, it's not I was wondering about that because it would seem to me as someone who helped develop the regional bylaws for the UC and in the documents on which UC is based that is one of the major roles of the UC budget committee is to work on developing the budget and would be so some of the details that you're talking about and the reason for going one way or another it would seem to me would be what they would be talking about is that happening, we haven't had a report from them that included that yet.

Provost Sherman: I don't know when they're meeting or the frequency of the meeting is but I'm anticipating that is the kind of discussion CFO Cummins would be having so I don't know, he's here if you would care for him to comment on that.

Chair Sterns: Would you like to make a comment?

CFO Cummins: I can. The instructions, the budget instructions went out a week or so ago about a week or so ago. We had briefed the University Council committee and that memo as it was going out but the unit have till mid-March to submit their what we asked for, their requests, these scenarios of a 3% and 6% reduction. And so we will then take that information and summarize it and share it with a handful of different groups, Council of Deans, UC budget group, Vice Presidents so there will be a process by which we will share the information and get feedback from all these different groups on what they think they need. As far as what are the ramifications of one scenario versus another. So the reason there has been conversation, it's been pretty global because we don't have the information at the unit level yet.

Senator Erickson: But some of the analysis that we've been talking about today and the kinds of questions and the kinds of ways of dealing with it would be part of, I mean there's various ways

of saying do you like this, do you like that, do you like the other but it's not oh wait a minute we need to shift this to here to here and to look at objectives and the whole and as I understood it it is the role of the University budget committee to provide a super major not just a little old on the surface advisory but more than when had it part of the Faculty Senate when we were doing it someone else was doing it and they were ships passing in the night as I understand it the role of the budget committee is in fact to have a serious input into this whole process am I correct?

CFO Cummins: Yeah, they will have yes. We plan to engage them in that conversation when we have the data, I shouldn't say data, when we have the numbers available to share with them. There was a lot of discussion at the last meeting about their role as far as the final decisions, they are one constituency that will play a role in advising on the budget.

Senator Erickson: Whoa whoa whoa. They are not one constituency though I really do want to say that as a university council, as someone who is on the larger committee and someone who has been involved for the last years in the whole process of coming up with University Council. University Council represents all the constituencies at the university, is that not true Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: That is my understanding.

Senator Erickson: It is all of them, it is not the Faculty Senate, it has senators, it has contract professionals, it has staff, it has students, it has vice presidents, it has members of the Council of Deans it is going to be the unitary the uniting committee. The whole idea was that it would be that so I'm not at this stage going to have great arguments about the role but I want to say as somebody who helped write the guidelines that that was meant to be the role that they should be the major integrative body of course it has to be done by the President and the Board of Trustees, but that was the role of the budget committee it was not be, it's not one constituency though I want you to understand that.



Provost Sherman: So I think CFO Cummins is saying that they will be in the process develop the budget and I think I understand they are developing a sequence of reading of topics to understand to involve the committee in the process that you're describing.

Senator Erickson: The last comment I had was relating to the summer program and the concern you having and we all understand that the money from the summer program is really important is that not so. And you talked about there being I think cost analysis of ways of having summer enrollment I was not clear to me.

Provost Sherman: Of those programs we did an analysis of how much tuition and subsidy would be generated versus what the cost of delivering those programs would be and as a total just on the basis of that that collection of programs is reasonable to pursue.

Senator Erickson: Cause I was wondering whether this was the basis of the decision to go 3-5-5 that is the 3-week.

Provost Sherman: No this has no bearing on that, that was all decided before this was even planned. The 3-5-5 was a function of interactions with the AAUP through whatever the process is to schedule.

Senator Erikcson: So you're saying it was part of the contract process, not one that was to do with the budget and what might be the way of getting the most students.

Provost Sherman: The way of getting the most students, delivering the summer programs had nothing to do with the discussion about the schedule. The schedule happened way before we started. They were two separate things.

Senator Erickson: A different whole aspect to how it's decided.

Provost Sherman: That's correct, they were two separate things. It just happens that the schedule that was decided on was creates the opportunity for these 3-week courses.

Senator Erickson: Why I was asking that question was we were talking about the programs and that there may be a cut and I wondered if there was a cost analysis of the 3-5 versus but that's not part of the analysis.

Provost Sherman: No we estimated what the faculty cost would likely be for the 3-week program, what the tuition and subsidy revenue would look like, does it look like that makes sense?

Senator Erickson: Then it was involved what would happen if it didn't make sense?

Provost Sherman: I don't know.

Senator Erickson: Okay.

Chair Sterns: Permission for Dean Midha to speak. Thank you Senator Erickson.

Dean Midha: If I may address the summer schedule was rescheduled what we have so that we can be on the same calendar as the Kent State is and the Cleveland State is because some of our classes our students take classes there and there and our intent is to increase the enrollment in the summer classes, our enrollment has been flat this year so it was important to see if we can increase it there. And I want to comment about exercise of 3% versus 6% given what I have done in the colleges we're only looking at 3% exercise because of our non-personnel budget is only 5% in the college there so I don't have you option to consider 6% there I just want to let you know since are concerned that we'll be cutting that budget there, I don't have that even if I want to take all the money there. That is why we're looking into all different categories there that where it is possible to cut the budget if we can so whether I'll be able to give back 3% or not has to be seen because we are looking at what is our overhead cost in the college and our overhead cost in the College of Arts and Sciences is 5.1% and in the CPA side because of the disciplines there it is 6.3% there, but it will vary from unit to unit, the unit analysis will have to do that anyway.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much. We have, Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I wasn't sure as to whether or not we should speak much if at all about the role of University Council but it has come up a couple of times so it occurred to me that it might be wise just to say a word or two about where things stand in that regard. Before I do that just a couple of comments, not really questions about you had said and what's been happening recently and what you had said Chair Sterns about the e-mail digest and the list of people who are on the steering committee and I've counted two faculty, yourself Chair Sterns and Rudy Fenwick. The rest of the people I'm sure who all seem to be staff or administrator, students or other roles, fifteen or so folks in that regard. That seems to me to be a substantial change from the last time we did this where I think we were either a majority or close to a majority of faculty on that particular body. That just is an observation that's such a balance could change the focus of the report and it's also one more indication of the marginalization of the faculty in my view. Second comment, is you spoke about changing the dismissal policy from one semester to two, I don't recall that coming to the Faculty Senate for it's input, review and perhaps approval, perhaps not necessary but it seems to me that that's an academic issue that should have come to us and every time we allow that thing to happen which is as far as Chair Sterns and some members of the Executive Committee are concerned for me is a broken record, we give up a little more of our role as faculty. It's a minor point perhaps in the great scheme of things, it's nice to have the more money for the research that's wonderful, but this is also an important part of what we as faculty ought to be doing. The e-learning is in particular from where I sit is a fairly bright light that there has been some listening and concern from folks, there has been the opportunity for Faculty Senate involvement and I think fairly substantial Faculty Senate involvement. You may have received from me via the Faculty Senate listserv a few days ago some information regarding a recent Inside Higher Education story regarding University of Maryland, University College and it's experience with some of these issues. That was I was asked why did I send that out, because it seemed like it might be negative. I said well it's because we want to be transparent, we want to avoid mistakes other people may have made. So that is an area where we are sort of maintaining a substantial role and I want to thank all of those folks who've been involved in that. You ask us to connect with students and I think that's extra and I think that's a

wonderful thing and I also know that in the past year that I have been responsible for my college for more than 1100 student credit hours and that's not in the situation where we have 300 students in a class and I've been involved in other things as well and with that in mind Senator Mancke's comments had some resonance with me in that regard. Finally, in comments the ACTs over 24, I mean I like high ACTs I think that's one of the things that we look at but I was thinking again to what extent were the faculty involved in this and I was thinking again what about the Senate? What about students with disabilities? The ACT scores of 24 or higher are not necessarily indicative of the success of a person, there might be other ways in which that could occur. There may be other ways in which we may want to look at it as well and I recognize you can't answer all of those things and I just want to make these comments for the sake of sort of getting them off my chest. With regard to the University Council situation, I would say that at the last Steering Committee meeting we did have a discussion about just what Senator Erickson has discussed, we did feel some of us who were heavily involved with it that the role of University Council and the role of the committees was to be substantively involved in creating policy that would be then be approved up the ranks to the Board of Trustees. It was not to make policy independently it was to recommend it to the Board of Trustees and then the secondary role would be to help to oversee how that policy was carried out. The white paper that came out in August has a slightly different perspective on it and there were some other things that are occurring during this the implementation of the University Council in which these questions need to be raised and they need to be discussed so everybody understands what is going on. I know there is, there are some on the Steering Committee who feel that the role of the University Council ought to be basically and solely advisory and to find ways to do what the administrator want to have done. I think that's certainly a corporate model and maybe it's what we'll end up doing as faculty in another 10 or 15 years but at this point it still strikes me as sort of reducing the role of faculty, reducing the input of faculty and of others into this process so shared governance to me means more than just having the opportunity to give feedback to something that may have already been decided or may be well you can do this or you can do this it also involves having some unique and other ways of being involved in this kind of discussion and in the success of this university, it's now my 16<sup>th</sup> year here, I know there are people who've been around a whole lot longer and have contributed massively but I'm starting to feel like this is my university too and I would really like to be involved in it and I have in ways that I think are

going to be helpful and I also try to be involved in it in ways that are going to strengthen the role of the faculty and Faculty Senate because I think that collectively the role of Faculty Senate is vitally important, it's not that it's only faculty who should have a say it's not only students, it's that the Senate should have a role and the collective responsibility that we have the more that we give up, the more we say "oh well that's just the way it is", the more in the long reduced and we will wake up in time but it may be too late. Finally, I also want to say one other thing, I know we have a report coming from Linda Subich that's another area of bright light where I think there's been some real effort to involve us and to really have some substantial ways that we're involved in that so I don't want to just rant about what the problems are, I want to point out that there's some issues that are very positive from my point of view but it seems as if this would be a good time to unite some of the issues with regard to University Council and some of the ways in which the bodies work together and finally I know you Mr. Provost have been working very hard to make this into a better process and a better university and so part of my comments are partly in the light of maybe if I speak out that will make a difference, thank you.

Chair Sterns: I can just say that in the last HLC committee meeting we just found out who are going to be the writer team leaders number one and number two, the two faculty that you mentioned on that list said exactly what you said we need more faculty involved which is one of the reasons why that e-mail digest went out asking for volunteers so but your point is well taken. And the other thing is I would agree with Senator Lillie that changes in academic requirements are academic decision making and do need to come to the Senate. So that's very clear. Senator Speers.

Senator Speers: I know we've added a couple of Vice Presidents in the last several years and I'm assuming that every time we add one there's some kind of budget whether it's through marketing vice presidents will need obviously a budget and we have a budget for advertising. We also obviously have a budget for the grounds and I really appreciate them, my question is can you just as our let everybody put academics and maybe they are there already but the top priority and therefore when cuts are considered just say you know we won't be taking any cuts for academic, we can't take anymore, we're at bare bones as it is. Or does everybody just evenly across the board get the same cuts as far as their areas are concerned?

Provost Sherman: I think I've made it clear and I'll make it clear again, that every decision we're making is a decision to move more money to the academic side of the house. And that's what I'm trying to demonstrate to you when I give you updates on what the budget looks like. Moving into this unit allocation budget process assessment is really the first step that we need to take in making a wholesale base budget adjustment, that means pulling money out of a unit and putting it into an entirely different unit. Or within a unit moving money around. In a sense that is the penultimate step to do that, the most drastic in a sense of adjusting one can do in the mean time the decisions will proceed in such a way that they hold as the primary focus of this institution academic excellence.

Senator Speers: thank you.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much. I'm going to because of what we have to accomplish today, I'm going to say that we will move on.

Provost Sherman: Can I comment on just a couple of things?

Chair Sterns: Go right ahead.

Provost Sherman: I mean I appreciate Senator Lillie's comments and I certainly hope that everybody sees that I am for engaging the faculty as much as possible in any and all activities and there is never and will never be any intent to marginalize faculty period. If that is the perception then that is what I need to hear which is what I take Senator Lillie's comments as. Consequently, we must have missed a step in interacting with Faculty Senate Executive Committee on having enough faculty on the steering committee. You know we've tried to do everything the Faculty Senate Executive Committee before we move the agenda forward. We missed that step, we apologize, we're rectifying it, we're asking for more faculty. We work with Faculty Senate Executive Committee to move to the e-learning analysis and that was very effective I think and we have to await what the outcome of those deliberations are, the readmit after probation or failed performance is within the rules the purview of the deans. What was not

happening at this university was a consistent policy across the institution to better serve our students. Students were being readmitted without no possible of success. We brought that into the center and we said we're now applying institutionally through the deans a uniform process that optimizes student success. The institution has on the books already the ability to make decisions about admitting students on the basis of the condition of their ability to succeed here. That is why we changed the practice of not admitting students transferring here on probation from somewhere else that on the basis of all the evidence shows they would not be successful here. That was within the rules, the ACT score shifting again is within the rules is as a consequence of two public forums where there was endorsement by the collective of those forums to change our path to change to our inclusive excellence for pathways to academic success strategy. If you would like us to take different steps to move these agendas please let me know because I'll adjust. And I do think we're heading in a remarkably great direction institutionally with the adjustments that we've been able to make in a really relatively short period of time and even you all are to be commended for that for the institution heading in that direction.

Chair Sterns: I feel there are a number of business items that we must deal with so thank you very much.

Senator Speers: Can I just ask real quick are we an open institution that is required to take anybody or not?

Provost Sherman: No we're not. That is the point. The point is the law allows us to make distinctions in who we admit and our own rules allow that to happen. Institutionally in the past we have not. We can do the presentation again to update everybody.

Chair Sterns: No I think for any of us who have been on the campus for long period of time designations by the Board of Regents of what campuses are going to be involved in open admission has evolved so I think many of us who have been here for a very long time always thought of ourselves as an open admission university, we have come to find out that that is not

the case. Okay we're going to some quick business here because I do want people to have an opportunity to hear Dean Subich.

### **Committee Reports**

Chair Sterns: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities there was a case and the committee has been called. When a case is called the Executive Committee the only action that we take is to convene the committee, we do not look at the merits of what is involved or anything that has happened. Anything from Graduate Council? Go ahead. Lin go ahead please.

Senator Chyi: We met on the 28<sup>th</sup> at 10 o'clock and we had a short meeting only last for half an hour. The major things are a report by Dr. Tausig talking about RFP from Provost's Office an interdisciplinary area and future federal funding trend and interdisciplinary areas. He's also talking about their increasing undergraduate recruitment budget but (could not hear). Then we went to deal with routine business with faculty and of course the Provost. One of interesting things for the Provost to hear is the Council decided to send a resolution to Provost Office requesting not to touch graduate stipend but Senator Bouchard mentioned earlier. I think the exact wording is still being worked out by the Chair, Professor Erickson and will be delivered to the Provost Office in the near future.

Chair Sterns: Okay, thank you. Academic Policies Committee? There were a whole list of things circulated to the senators, no Academic Policies Committee go right ahead.

Senator Rich: The College of Health Professions has reported to Academic Policies Committee and provided documentation on the college's mission and vision statements. Committee recommendations, governance, curriculum, RTP practices, standards and procedures is what's meant. APC is satisfied that the College of Health Professions progress to date. APC expects the college to complete the required work in time for the Senate to give it's final approval by the end of the academic year.



Chair Sterns: Senator Huff.

Senator Huff: What are the specific items that are needed to complete before the Senate gives the final approval?

Senator Rich: Well those are in the resolution this past spring, those are not something we should probably take up Senate time with, we can confer afterward about it. And I don't have the resolution in front of me.

Chair Sterns: What Senator Rich is saying is that there a number of specifications in the resolution that we passed earlier this year and that some are still in progress is what that is about. Okay.

Senator Mancke: The Curriculum Review Committee is presenting 90 curriculum proposals, you all received two copies, once last week and once today of the list of 90 proposals that have gone through all the stages of university review and they're now available for approval by the Senate. Because this is a committee report to the Senate I don't believe it needs a motion to be approved.

Senator Rich: It is a motion.

Senator Mancke: The committee report is a motion.

Chair Sterns: Senator Koskey.

Senator Koskey: And Heather I know that I spoke to you but there are about 10 proposals that were from Educational Foundations and Leadership from the College of Education for the assessment and evaluation program to be approved online that were sitting in Faculty Senate since November and the system still says that they're sitting with Faculty Senate since then and I know Dr. Kushner-Benson who's the originator of that set of proposals mailed Chair Sterns, I don't know if you got a chance to see that e-mail today.

Chair Sterns: I already responded back to it.

Senator Koskey: I don't know if you could speak to that.

Senator Mancke: We pulled everything that was ready to go so I will personally go in and look at what the status of those courses are, I'm on the Curriculum Review Committee I will look at that and if everything looks okay we'll bring it to the next Senate meeting. We can't do anything else at this time and I'll let you know, can you send me an e-mail by chance and let me know what your concern is and we'll try to get it rectified as soon as possible. Thank you for bringing that up.

Chair Sterns: We have all of these proposals that have been approved by the committee ready for a vote by the Senate. Are we ready for a vote? Okay, all in favor please say "aye". (aye) Any opposed? (none) And our apologies for, I did call back to say that we will be investigating it, we think it may be in the old system and so it couldn't help it, it started in the old system it was there, now it's sitting in the new system. And we're trying to find out. This is not a personal attack on your department. We're trying to solve that for you. Okay, Distance Learning Committee. Anything? URC? GEAC? Okay. Athletic Committee, anything.

Senator Ducharme: We've had several meetings and we're about ready to be able to put together a report to submit by next time.

Chair Sterns: Okay, thank you. I think we want to now go to the ad hoc Committee Summit College.

Senator Rich: Nothing to report.

Chair Sterns: Nothing to report, okay. Any other committee reports to come forward? Yes.

Senator Osorio: The Committee on Part-time Issues met to discuss the Pearson initiative and we're concerned with the fact that a significant number of adjunct faculty will be teaching the Pearson online programs however, we also understand that technology is quite important for teaching these kinds of courses and having adjunct faculty do not have those kinds of, that kind of technology at their disposal to be able to teach it in a way toward student success. So we have are requesting that the Pearson in this case the contract committee, if that is the committee that makes this kind of budgetary consideration, consider the situation of laptop and supporting technology for adjunct faculty that would be part-time faculty that would be teaching these online course to ensure student success, that it is done properly to teach using that 21 century technology.

Chair Sterns: Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: Yes, being on the Steering Committee received some information yesterday that relates tangentially to what you say. There is in the business this evaluation right now, the assumption that computer and related technology needs for new hires needs to be considered and I think you've added an important aspect.

Chair Sterns: Okay if there's no further business I'd like to...

Senator Speers: Ad hoc interdisciplinary committee is presenting a film on campus next week called Connected, it'll be at the Gardner Student Center for four days, on Monday evening the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Creative and Professional Arts are celebrating their combination and this particular film called Connected is about the technology age and how it's influencing our society today and also the melding and necessity if you will, the arts and sciences which the Provost has been pushing interdisciplinary studies in various areas and so thanks to Dean Midha we are going to have a celebration on Monday night at 5 o'clock in the EJ Thomas Stage Door.

Chair Sterns: Thank you all for your cooperation, let me call on Linda Subich who is going to quickly, I think if you need a little more time we can be a little flexible.

Dean Subich: Thank you, thank you for inviting me to report on what the General Education Review Committee has been working on over the past months. The detailed of our learning outcome document was up here, I think most people grabbed it when they came in, I wanted to talk a little bit about the process and I think I will go heavy on the process, given the limited time and can certainly answer questions about the outcomes but may go through that a little more quickly because that is in much detail in that document. I want to acknowledge the committee and it is a vast majority of the committee are faculty members. We have worked together very effectively and have had fabulous interactions and it's a large committee as you can see it represents I think a vast diversity of the university and I feel very privileged to have worked with them and we worked very collegially together the entire time and I look forward to that continuing as we move along on our efforts. The committee's charge was to examine policy and research and practice relevance to the revision of the university's general education curriculum. So we have taken that charge very seriously, we have looked at best practices, we have looked at the research, we have looked at the documents from national bodies to look at what people are saying is wrong with higher education today, what needs to change in higher education today and what do we need to be continuing to do. We have used that documentation we have discussed it with one another and we are using that to recommend our changes, we have started our processes talking about learning outcomes and as we talked about learning outcomes for baccalaureate education we found ourselves unable to talk about general education without considering it in the context of the overall baccalaureate. As it should be and I think we have a great united front on the committee and I'm hoping others will agree with this idea that baccalaureate education, a general education should be embedded in and permeate through the entire baccalaureate education. So we've been using this graphic I know David Carrey is continuing to work on this graphic to make it more representative but we're thinking about the baccalaureate education as encompassing both broad and deep knowledge and skills. I think often times the conceptualization of general education is that it is broad knowledge and skills that occur early in the curriculum for the student and then we move on to the heart of the matter, the major programs, minor programs, etc. We are conceptualizing a little bit differently, we are thinking about general education as something that does encompass foundational skills and knowledge but those foundational skills and knowledge very directly inform the entire baccalaureate degree,

we're also considering the fact that the deep skills and knowledge program related major knowledge should start early, students need to we talk about student success and wanting to enhance that and one of the things that seems to be effective is connecting students as early as is possible to the areas that they are interested in. So we are seeing our model of the baccalaureate degree as more of an integration of foundational skills to be sure as you can see if you look at the handout but also those skills should work their way through the curriculum. We are conceptualizing this model as incorporating a capstone experience and I know many programs already have capstone experiences of some kind, whether it's a class or a project or an experience whatever it would be. Some don't and I think most of the literature that is out there about effective baccalaureate education suggests that there should be some integrated capstone experience some type and it varies by discipline and by area, to really finish off in a coherent way the baccalaureate degree. So we are envisioning the student that comes through this baccalaureate model as someone who has come to appreciate lifelong learning and as someone who will be able to take in information, understand problems that are presented to him or her over their life course, analyze that information be able to plan an approach or response and carry through, follow through on that. To be an effective citizen of the world. So that is our overarching goal.

Okay, so we're learning outcomes. So of our assumptions of our learning outcomes and I've already starting talking about some of these the fact that they will start at the foundational level and will be expanded and built upon throughout the baccalaureate degree. One of the assumptions that we are making is that learning outcome must be measurable. And really this report is really about the learning outcome that we are proposing at this point for comment and your reactions. We have had some discussion on the committee and I've certainly had comments from others about your talking about baccalaureate education what about the associate degrees at The University of Akron, that has been a concern. We debated this quite thoroughly in the committee I think and our conceptualization about associate degrees is that associate degree education falls under the baccalaureate umbrella and as such some subset of experiences that would be defined through our learning outcomes would be element to the associate degrees. We have not gotten to the point of operationalizing a model for implementation of these learning outcomes yet, I really cannot speak to that at this point because it remains under process of the

committee. But that is something that has come up and so I wanted to mention that. Assessment of outcomes is critical, we know that as we talk about the HLC we know that assessment is an important part of any institutions functioning we also know that we haven't as good of a job on that perhaps as we probably should have. We would like to build and this is our intent, we are building into our general education it is important to differentiate assessment of students with assessment of the institution. Faculty assess students. When faculty certify that students pass courses or experiences or whatever that are related to general education or anything else that means that students have reached a competency. That is as it has always been. Institutional assessment for purposes of accreditation or other kinds of reviews are I think somewhat different we absolutely cannot assess every single student, we cannot look at everything so our thoughts about institutional assessment and contributing to that effort is that there should be documents or products of some sort that can be collected and sampled at a future date as related to the learning outcome so that is built into the system it should be onerous it should not be troublesome for faculty, it should be something that's a very simple automatic process again and I cannot give you any further details of what that might look like, those are still under development.

Alright the four basic learning outcomes, we have distilled down and discussed these are the four general areas of learning outcomes; you may say these don't look very some of these look very familiar and I think that they are and that's as it should be. Communication skills and information literacy is the first learning outcome that I'll mention I give you some examples and there are much more detail and again we had subcommittees of experts in the different areas working on these learning outcomes defining the elements of them, some of the examples a student's ability to understand and use context and purpose whether it's written communication or oral communication, use of credible sources, using appropriate conventions again whether written or oral communications, using information in a responsible legal and ethical way. So these are some examples of the communication learning outcomes that we would expect students to develop at a foundational level and then to work on and deepen and develop throughout their disciplinary area and up through the entire baccalaureate degree. We all, well many of us anyway, we are very familiar with the concept writing across the curriculum that was a real initiative of this university we should be doing that. Second learning outcome is critical thinking, complex reasoning skills. This has been conceptualized by this subcommittee and has

been accepted by the entire committee as encompassing two major parts, one is the ability to create reasoned arguments and also to evaluate the reasonableness of arguments that one receives from others, which is a very timely kind of a skill. Also the ability to employ appropriate analysis of qualitative, quantitative and normative information. The latter needs perhaps a little more detail and again there's even more detail in the document. Most I guess would be familiar being general education terms in the explanation of the quantitative information, the qualitative and normative information equally important types of information for students, for citizens of the world to evaluate character and capacity assessments, the nature of things and what they can do, where nature of individuals and what they can do, prescriptive/postscriptive claims, again the idea here is evaluating interpreting being able to discuss these different kinds of information understanding the value that they give us and how to critique them. So these would be the critical thinking. What is sometimes referred to as a disciplinary knowledge distribution environment a broad exposure for all students to natural sciences, social sciences, the arts and the humanities. That is something that is in our current system it is carried through in our recommendation for learning outcomes for the new general education outcomes, knowledge of the major concepts, findings, theories in a particular discipline in their area, knowing how to find information, information exists very differently across disciplinary areas. Understanding cultural, technical or scientific kinds of issues with information. The piece that we're perhaps adding or maybe emphasizing more is the idea of not only knowing about the information in the area but also how that information how that knowledge is created because the methods of knowledge creation vary dramatically across those four disciplinary areas so we would argue that students need to walk away with not only an appreciation of knowledge and an appreciation of the different areas but also an appreciating how information is created, how knowledge is created in those areas and being able to solve problems in these areas is appropriate and again you can see some of these ideas tie right back into critical thinking and the different types of information and also being able to communicate appropriately which ties back into the first one.

And then finally I think the last of learning outcomes is perhaps the most innovative and this is the idea of developing students who will be competent in knowledge and skills that promote social, personal and environmental responsibility and again we've had some really very rich conversation in the committee on this topic, we have emphasized in this fourth learning outcome

the idea that awareness and knowledge of diversity and the multiple dimensions of diversity are critical here and also awareness and responsibility concerns of citizenship. We think it's important that students be exposed and aware of not only diversity in the United States which is critical but also international so cross-cultural differences from within and outside the United States knowing how diversity impacts knowledge, knowing how it impacts the application of knowledge and also being the ability to work successfully in diverse teams. That would be the first prong of this learning outcome. And the second is responsible citizenship and this has changed this focus is crucially important perhaps more critically important than when the previous general education curriculum was developed the idea of students being prepared in a lifetime manner to be global citizens and so this means understanding the national and global citizenship issues. Understanding the constitutional use of power, the legal, ethical, constitutional use of power. Understanding personal health and its maintenance. Understanding finances and with the implications. Understanding the fragility of our environment and what each of us can do to maintain and sustain our environment so all of these pieces I think are somewhat new, maybe not completely new but somewhat new to this version of our learning outcomes and we are looking forward to as we work towards how to operationalize these outcomes. I can share with you very quickly and I appreciate your kindness in staying the next steps I am hoping that the Senate will convene a couple of campus forums, I'm also visiting each college and presenting on these learning outcomes and taking questions and comments, we are interested, very very interested in getting feedback and getting comments and getting recommendations, observations about what we have thus far. We have talked all along about the importance of gathering that information along the way so we don't go down the path that later on someone raises a critical issue that we've overlooked so I think we've got faculty on the committees, a number of the members who were here are here, but we need the input of the faculty and we need to move forward together on this. We are currently in the process as I said of working on how these outcomes might be assessed, how they might be implemented and so if there are ideas or thoughts about that I would welcome them. We could talk now or please my e-mail easy, [subich@uakron.edu](mailto:subich@uakron.edu), you can e-mail me, grab me, call me, whatever and I'm really looking forward to feedback.



Chair Sterns: Are there any pressing questions that anyone would like to? I'd like to see some of our political candidates go through some of these.

Dean Subich: My thought too yes.

Chair Sterns: If not Linda thank you so much for the report, it's very appreciated.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Sterns: We have a motion for adjournment (motion by Friberg, 2<sup>ND</sup> by Hajjafar) All in favor? (motion passed)

**The meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm**

*Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney*