

4-5-2012

Transcript from Faculty Senate meeting April 5, 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 April 5, 2012." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 5 Apr 2012. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/37>

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

**DRAFT– Verbatim Transcript notes for *The University of Akron Chronicle*
April 5, 2012 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, April 5, 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, 38 were present for this meeting. Senators Beneke, Gwinn, Koskey, Lazar, Raber and Semilia were absent with notice. Senators Barrett, Buldum, Chronister, Chushing, DiMarco, Doutt, Hamed, Kimble, Lyndall, C. Miller, Newton, Osorio, Prichard, Queener, Rostedt, Sancaktar, Schaeffer, Scotto, Srviatsan, Steer, Steiger, Thmoas, Woods and Zhe were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda –

Chair Sterns – Now that we have a quorum present I will call the Senate into session. Thank you all for being with us. Can I have a motion for the approval of the agenda as presented? (motion by Hajjafar) Approved by Dr. Hajjafar, seconded by Dr. Carr. All in favor please say aye. (aye) Any opposed? Thank you.

II. Approval of the Minutes -

Chair Sterns –

II. Chairman’s Remarks and Opening Comments –

Chair Sterns: Okay I’m just checking with Secretary Bove. We are in the process of catching up with minutes, you will see next week the November and December minutes and then we should be getting very close to being up to date. Let me start the Chairman’s remarks with some, I’d like to talk about a couple of our faculty colleagues who have passed away since the last time we met.

We have Bruce Landis, a part-time faculty member in the School of Communication, died Friday, March 16. He was 63. Landis earned a B.A in Speech in 1970, an M.A. in Rhetoric and

Communication in 1976 and a Ph.D. in Organizational Communication in 1982, all at Kent State University. He began teaching at The University of Akron in 1981. He held memberships in the National Communication Association, Central States Communication Association and the Rhetoric Society of America. The second individual is Dr. Ralph P. Hummel, professor emeritus of public administration and urban studies, died March 20 in Rockport, Maine. He was 74. Following a career in journalism that included positions at The Pontiac Press, The Detroit Times, The Washington Post and The New York Times, Hummel moved on to academia. After joining Fordham University in 1969 as an assistant professor in political science, he taught at several other schools, including the University of Oklahoma. He joined The University of Akron in August 1997 and retired in June 2008. After studying German and journalism at Wayne State University, where he earned a B.A. in 1959, he went on to earn an M.A. in political science in 1963, also at Wayne State. He earned a Ph.D. in politics at New York University in 1972. Would we all rise for a moment in memory of these two colleagues? (Senate observed moment of silence) Thank you very much.

I want to start with my Chair's remarks today because we are launching our election cycle of senators for the upcoming year, one of the discussion points we've had this past period of time was the fact that we, some of the numbers are going down. Some of the colleges are having fewer senators and one of the reasons for that is at the present time we actually seem to have many fewer full-time faculty. So I think one of the things that we wanted to call to everyone's attention is the fact that for various reasons we have probably fewer faculty than we've had in a long time. Some of that is due to retirements, some of that is due to not replacing positions but I think one of the things that we want to just mention to everyone is that we are down and that is of concern to us. And obviously we are finding ways of filling in but if you saw the Chronicle of Higher Education this last week, one of the major issues is the use of adjunct faculty which is not unique to our university it is one that is across the country and for those of us who are a little bit older the week before the Chronicle was devoted to the aging of faculty and if you remember the article they used as example a 69 year old professor at Cornell who had been when she came the youngest person in the department and was remarkable close for me because I'm exactly that age and I used to be indeed at one point the youngest person in my department and now I'm probably the oldest. The thing that I found rather an issue though is because the concern about how we

use senior faculty more effectively is a challenge for every institution in the United States. And I think in view of discussions that I've been having across campus with the president, with the Provost and with vice president Hoover I'm hoping that we are moving in a very intelligent way about how to use our faculty, how to create a meaningful transition, how to use talent in a positive way and not fall victim to ageism in our thinking. However, at the same time you know we want to be sure that we provide as many opportunities for new professionals to be launched in their careers. So I just thought because of these changing numbers and the fact that I'm sure that this is not news to anyone but when I saw the figures I was a bit surprised that we have many fewer full-time faculty so you know I'm supposed to make remarks so these are my remarks for today. Senator Speers.

Senator Speers: I'd like to comment on it simply because I already asked the Provost about two open positions and I was told that we had 80 of those filled.

Provost Sherman: In various process.

Senator Speers: Well the only suggestion I have is simply that whenever we have new tenure track positions added I know we will recognize them through the union as well as we'll recognize them at the beginning of the year when we introduce everybody but could we also and we do print them don't we? We do send around a notification that's what we can all look at yes, cause David said that we had over 70 faculty last year now we're in the low 60s.

Chair Sterns: So this is just something that is a part of our transformation over time, it's a challenge that I think as a university can be as planful and as positive about this and use this in many good ways and so I hope that we will find ways of supporting transitions and also opportunities for senior faculty both pre and post retirement as well as I said before opportunities for new professionals. So let me now turn to our Secretary who report on the doings of the Executive Committee.

Reports

Executive Committee – Frank Bove – Thank you Chair Sterns. Good afternoon senators. On March 15th the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met to prepare for a meeting with the President and the Provost that afternoon. The President briefed the EC on the budget presentation to the Board of Trustees and made assurances that the budget will be presented to the campus forums after approved by the Trustees feedback. Dean Midha then updated us on the program review for the over fifty centers and institutes on campus. The review will be completed by mid-summer and recommendations to the Provost by the fall semester. Senator Rich provided an update on the activities of the ad hoc committee on Summit College and Criminal Justice proposals. He reported that the committee was formed and are studying the background material and would be deliberating soon. Provost Sherman then shared his plans for assessing institutional effectiveness. It is currently complicated by the stalled development of the USO metrics due to the changeover of the Chancellor but the Provost strived to develop a baseline assessment of the university by compiling and comparing data from other institutions. Associate Provost Reilly next updated the committee on the effort to more thoroughly and consistently integrate at extended campuses. A task force is being assembled and the EC was asked to help identify faculty members to serve. Recommendations from this taskforce will be due by February 2013 for implementation by the 2013 fall semester. The EC met again on March 27th to handle regular Senate business and to prepare the agenda for today's meeting. They discussed the Senate composition in light of the new University Council. Today you will see several bylaw amendments proposed by the Faculty Senate Reference Committee, some of which are substantial changes to the composition of this body. The EC will ask the ad hoc Curriculum Software Review Committee to review the college processes in relation to the curriculum proposal system to assure that they are consistent with the University Rule on curricular changes. The remainder of the meeting focused on the current Faculty Senate elections, we have revised the reporting form to make the process more explicit and the results easier to record. The letters and forms have been distributed to the colleges and constituents facilitating the elections. Senators thank you very much for your service to the Senate and to the University. This concludes my report, I'd be happy to take any questions.

Chair Sterns: Are there any questions for Secretary Bove?

Secretary Bove: Thank you very much.

Chair Sterns: Now I'd like to call upon President Proenza for remarks from the President.

Remarks of the President

President Proenza: Thank you Mr. Chairman and appreciate the fact that you are thinking about the aging not only of our faculty but of the population and I again hope that we can work together Ken Dykewall as I recall and enjoy a broader conversation and might say Susan that knowing a little bit about Mexican history I know about keeping people's feet to the fire and I believe that Mike is feeling the heat.

Good afternoon colleagues. As I'm sure most of you recall at your last meeting some of you asked for some information relating to the university's budget as I mentioned audited financial reports are already available freely, you can find them on the university's website if you go to the Office of the Controller, find them under financial statements and of course they're also available as printed copies from the Controller's Office or the Auditor of State. However, both at that meeting and at University Council others of you have asked for some more specific question which are not immediately accessible in the audited financial statement and I want to tell you that these are being assembled and will be disseminated through the University Council governance process I'm assured at the beginning of the next meeting. Specifically I do want you to know that I've charged David Cummins, our Chief Financial Officer, and Chand Midha, our Dean of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and Associate Provost to work and to answer those questions then to prepare broader presentations as the Provost has indicated both at the University Council, to you as senators and to other appropriate groups and I believe the Provost will have some comment on the timeline for those.

Now I have very good confidence in David and in Chand, I think you all know them, and I believe that they will provide you with a very thorough and important information. I do want to remind you that Chand is not only a credentialed statistician and long time faculty member and former Faculty Senator but he has represented the university before a number of commissions and studies and frankly I'm very grateful that he's succeeded in his very busy schedule to attend

to this matter and many of you will recall that he developed a model which not only we have used to address faculty salaries and salary compression but which others have emulated in the process. So Chand thank you for that and sorry to load you up still but I know that will be most effective because I've certainly found that you make sense where others fear to tread or we found recently that the American Council on Education released some data which made public universities look awful and I asked Chand it seems to me that the ACE has confused percentages with actual dollar amounts because if you start with a very large number as you would with a private university and you increases it by a small percentage that may actually be a much larger dollar amount than if you take a small quantity and you increase by a very large percentage, obviously you need to do the math but indeed when he completed that we found that our colleagues at ACE we're a little bit embarrassed and retracted some of the comments that had been made so thank you again. And of course Mr. Cummins has already helped us to clarify some points and I've asked him to address the specific questions about the Arts and Sciences budget which he'll address or the Provost maybe will address a little later today. And I'll defer to them for the specific matters. And I hope that Mike will also provide you some details about the open forum that's coming up I think you said April 18th or something like that?

Provost Sherman: On the schedule for April 18th.

President Proenza: And others yet to be announced. Okay, you've also asked and in part Secretary Bove has mentioned that about program assessment and it is encompassing the academic support units, the process for addressing that is underway, the framework is being developed and I have again asked in this case our internal auditor and now senior colleague Nathan Mortimer to work with Rex Ramsier and again Chand Midha to address that matter so we again have a comprehensive review of all that we do and make adjustments they need. I've also asked Dr. Ramsier and Mark Tausig to expand our higher learning commission self-study to go beyond our assessment of student success in undergraduates to also include student success among our graduate students. And finally, in keeping with the question that was brought up last time and now, we are committed to significantly increasing the number of new tenure track faculty of course this will happen over time sorry, I wish we could do it overnight but doesn't work that way. And we will of course be influenced by program review, benchmarking data but

of course the realities of state budget and our own success but we'll strive to make as fast a process in that regard as we possibly can. So simply to summarize in the spirit of transparent and open communication and shared leadership, we are responding to your requests for information and you will be seeing that come forward as appropriate very very shortly.

But things go on and so let me just share a couple of points that are for your information. First of all tomorrow at 2 o'clock at Quaker Station our Quaker Station, we'll hold the annual university service awards and I hope that many of you will come and chose to support your colleagues or many of you may be in fact eligible for appropriate recognition tomorrow so I'll look forward to seeing you there. You probably heard but I do want to reiterate the very proud moment in our university last week when Dr. Judith Puskas in Engineering won one of only five General Electric Corporation 100,000 dollar awards for the health imagination cancer challenge which huge recognition those of you that know Judith please congratulate her again what you may not know is that there considerable amount of money I believe it was 10 million that will be behind that award to support the development of those technologies that those five individuals were chosen for it, so we hope indeed that Judith will be able to accelerate the process of that development we know how very important it is to help our women. You may not know that those five awards were chosen from more than 500 submissions and so that is a real recognition. Last week the university hosted a National Academies conference on the manufacturing extension partnership, perhaps you know that this is a national program from the national institutes of standards and technology and it is undergoing evaluation so a panel has appointed by the national academy of sciences and three of us in Northeast Ohio are privileged to serve on that panel and in part because of that and in part because of the important work that going on in an organization called Magnet and in several of our universities we were privileged to host that if you wish a field visit concentrating on Midwestern examples of the manufacturing extension program we hosted in our new national polymer innovation center which includes the significant manufacturing component and I can assure that all of our colleagues from across the country were much impressed and I think we stand in their appreciation for their visit.

Next Friday on Saturday April 13/14 our campus will host what is now the 5th annual Black Male Summit in our student union. The event grows and I want to compliment our Chief Diversity

Officer Lee Gill for the tremendous effort that is represented, the recognition that it continues to receive and I trust that all of you understand the importance of this particular activity. On April 24th the university will host the President's Forum on Inclusive Excellence, our guest speaker will be Dr. Gordon Gee, the President of The Ohio State University. If you don't know Gordon, please attend. He is a tremendously insightful and also very good and entertaining speaker and I think he will be valued by all of you. His topic will be the unique qualities of the millennial generation, that's at 11:30 at our student union ballroom. Finally colleagues, a reminder that on May 4th at Infocision Stadium we'll be holding our annual Founder's Day celebration which will obviously honor and commemorate the colleagues who'll retire as well as celebrate those that have gone before and laid the foundation for the university so those are just a few elements to share with you. Mr. Chairman that completes my report, I'll be happy to take any questions of course again work with you on the aging matter.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much Mr. President. Are there questions for the President?

Senator Speers: I feel very encouraged by your comments about the new faculty etc, but you mentioned about benchmarks and where the positions will go etc. And I can only speak for my program which was separate for so long, with so few, we had 8 we're down to three we have Masters it's slightly ridiculous. My question would be because of the AAUP our directors are considered administrative positions I believe. Because of programs, the academic programs so my question would be as you look at those 200 faculty the great hue and cry from me is always to get somebody from my field who has the authority and information and the knowledge to lead our department and yet that would be a director's position. Would that still be considered then part of the faculty new positions? We have had interims and desperately need leadership.

President Proenza: I appreciate that. Certainly there will be some directors or deans who are department heads who may be recruited who would be in an "administrative" capacity, but also serve as I do and as the Provost does and many others do serve in a faculty capacity.

Senator Speers: Okay good. The only other suggestion is that because it's the chicken and the egg around Christmas, which comes first or stronger problem, to get a new position or if so then we can't meet those benchmarks cause we're just so unable.

President Proenza: That's a good question and not one that's easily solved although we will have to make assessment colleagues and as we've said before there may be some programs that we simply sustain, others that may not continue but that we are creating an environment in which there will be an opportunity in which there will be interdisciplinary work to enable all of us to contribute and we will look to vacant vestments in those areas that can best serve at the needs of the overall university. I hope that might include what you expect but there will certainly be opportunities for you and your colleagues to continue to contribute.

Senator Speers: So if you get rid of the department you get an egg.

President Proenza: I'm sorry what?

Senator Speers: I'm sorry, chicken and the egg and now the egg is totally gone if you decide to get rid of it.

President Proenza: Well I don't know about that. Maybe a new egg.

Senator Speers: Support the arts!

Chair Sterns: Other questions? Yes. Senator Elliott.

Senator Elliott: You mentioned about making the data much more accessible and that sounds very good but I'm wondering about the timeline we should expect or request like that if it's going to be a week okay I get that but if it's a month, my attention span is not going to hold up.

President Proenza: Let me very candid. I've been waiting for some data for 14 years okay, so please bear with me okay? I am told that the first forum is scheduled for April 18, secondly and

more seriously frankly it depends on the way you ask the question. As I said there are some questions that I have been trying to answer since I've been here, maybe it wasn't that important, maybe it's just not there, I don't know. But please don't give up, some things may take a few minutes, some may take a week or two and some things might take hopefully less than 14 years.

Chair Sterns: Yes I'm sorry Senator Mancke.

Senator Mancke: I'm a little puzzled; the length of time that it takes because we were told in the fall I believe or maybe early winter that there was need for faculty to take a 25 million dollar cut and that was challenged. But it seems to me that would have been based on some kind of figures, so what were the figures that that was based on? We were then told that we needed to plan for 3% cut and a 6% cut conceivably that recommendation was based on some figures. But when we asked for those figures that substantiate that need those figures are not forthcoming. If those are working numbers for these recommendations for cuts or need to reallocate funds from one part of the university to another part of the university it seems to me that those recommendations that we get as raw numbers actually should be grounded in a set of statistics that could be presented and yet when we ask for those statistics we are then told that they're not ready for presentation and yet the demand that we plan for a 3% cut or a 6% cut is ready for presentation. If the 3% cut and 6% cut is ready for presentation the numbers that back them up should be ready for presentation.

President Proenza: Again thank you for your interest Elizabeth. Let me try to clarify, first of all an operative word in Elizabeth's comments is working, there's a lot of things that change from day to day and so they are working ideas. Secondly, it was not a recommendation for a 3 or 6% cut, there was a question to ask our colleagues in both academic and academic support units to explore what would happen if we find ourselves in a situation that come this fall as the result of a variety of factors we might need to make some budget reductions of that magnitude, we've not recommended that etc. Again you will be hearing in more detail over the next few weeks what our concerns are going forward and why it is prudent to explore those kinds of scenarios. It is my fervent hope that some of the things that we put in place may completely nullify those possibilities. More importantly and perhaps something that I will insist on from David and the

Provost is that ironically over the past 14 years that I've been here just about the time that we are feeling like our success and it does here and there and it has over many years but on many occasions what we find as we did this biennium that the state just pulls out 15% of the state appropriation. Wow, okay what do you do? So what I've asked is that as a matter of record in our planning scenarios, not a recommendation, that we annually plan for no less than a 10% reduction in state budget. If it doesn't happen then we got that money set aside, if it does we've planned for it. These are planning scenarios, it's prudent, it's appropriate and we will explore those. Anything else?

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much Mr. President. May I call upon Provost Sherman for his remarks.

Remarks of the Provost - Provost Sherman: Good afternoon colleagues. We've been talking about some forums related to the intersection of enrollment, planning and budget as it pertains to the institutional finances. This information will go out on e-mail digest but tentatively 4/18 at 3 o'clock in Kolbe, we're looking at 4/27 at 5 o'clock in Simmons and we're looking at 5/1 you can see multiple days, multiple times of the day to try to capture as many individuals as possible over these sessions. At one o'clock again in Simmons Hall. These will intersect conversations about financial and budgetary terminology, detailed financial information of the general fund, auxiliary expenditures by category including academic and academic support. As well as the appropriate contextual information that will you know explain how changes in revenue and expenditures have happened over time and what those changes were related to in terms of institutional priorities. Obviously we're also going to illustrate and assure that there's an understanding of the university finances such as debt services as well as the meaning of fund transfers within the budgetary process. Quite frankly what we need to do is change our budget terminology from one that is accounting terminology to one that is meaningful academic terminology so that we can understand how we're spending our money, how we're allocating our resources from the perspective of our academic priority. So part of the exercise and supporting David and Chand and putting the process together is really to create a contextual framework from an academic perspective that explains things as opposed to using accounting nomenclature to relate things. Obviously the University Council has been involved in requests for 10 years of

financial data. We're hoping I believe David that your committee will be seeing some of the 10 year data actually before this April 18th forum so Chair co-convenor Lillie we're anticipating being able to intersect that prior to these conversations. Again these conversations will be more expansive than just that 10 year data set, we create a contextual framework for the institutional budget, a component of which will be a 10 year reflection but components of which will also be a discussion of the fiscal '13 budget and other types of perspectives related to planning going forward on the basis of fiscal integrity, assuring academic excellence and achieving academic distinction. Obviously we're going to as open so we can be as responsive as possible to the insight and the framework of academic excellence that such a discussion at an academic level would produce so as to influence over time really the slope of the expenditure lines. Basically I'll say it again, I think I've said it before, over time revenues have gone up, expenditures have gone up, they've gone up. And they've gone up in a similar slope really across all units on campus. We will be and we are as you know bring in place practices and policies that will over time change the slopes of those lines and change the slopes of those lines in a strategic way that support, enhance our academic success and the success of our faculty, students and staff. Again as a part of the overall process the academic program review committee is reconvened, they'll over time finalize program recommendations such that across next year with regard to disinvest, maintaining or investing more money in academic programs we will have moved those discussions through the appropriate governance process. Again I'll be supporting the President's request to extend our assuring student success at the undergrad level to an examination of academic success by graduate students. So as the President indicated Dr. Tausig and Ramsier will be leading that exercise and if you can imagine the exercise we undertook that have led to our analysis of persistence at the undergrad level, that led to the pathways similar type of analysis will be undertaken at the graduate perspective so that we can discover the pathways for graduate student success. Similarly as the President indicated I'll be supporting as we all expect an academic support unit review process again led by Nathan Mortimer, supported by Rex Ramsier and Dean Midha that obviously will involve appropriate consultation in producing the framework for the evaluation and the process for evaluating such data. I would like to remind everybody that when we do move to a budget system an inherent component of a budget system is exactly that, academic program assessment on an annual basis in terms of distribution of additional revenue or the potential for reallocation of resources within academic support units

just as happens within academic units. I'm pleased that we'll be announcing in the next couple of days a question and answer session related to achieving distinction program, the request for proposals deadline as you know is May 18th as we're receiving questions we're posting answers to those questions on the website so if you want real-time kind of feedback with regard to questions we're receiving through the website we'll have an open forum where we'll be able to discuss questions and maybe we'll be able to realize things that otherwise we hadn't anticipated so that we could potentially make mid-course adjustments as necessary.

I want to thank everybody so much for your robust, relentless focus on supporting the institutional priorities especially for persistence in particularly for yield, obviously from those perspectives you know that we've developed a framework to improve increased summer enrollment by about 8,000 credit hours and we're actually seeing some early indications that we will have more students enrolled this summer generating additional credit hours allowing them to complete their academic program sooner or get fast starts on their academic programs. Again linked to student academic success. Right now summer head count is up about 6% and credit hours are up about 4.4% at the same date and time analysis from this year to last year. From a fall 2012 student enrollment perspective confirmations are holding steady compared to last year for emergent students and college ready students. But very importantly we're seeing a 12% increase in the number of confirmed students with ACT scores of 25 or higher. Again I'd like to point out that the deadline for confirmation on a national perspective is May 1st though everything that we can continue to do you know to yield additional well prepared and emergent students to The University of Akron the better for all of us in terms of teaching, learning and research. I guess I would clarify a couple of questions and comments that have been made today and been asked over the last several days. As I said in the state of academic affairs address we have 89 faculty positions that are in various stages of the search process, some of them joined us this past fall because those came out of searches that were in place the previous year or so but we released additional positions in November that brought the total up to 89. So even more faculty will be joining us this fall and depending on the timeline and that progress of the searches in our continuing commitment to supporting faculty hiring there will be more faculty joining us every year. So if you think about the achieving distinction program, the 2 million dollar investment every year for the next 10 years, I can assure you because that will be a totally transparent

program, that program will be netting new faculty. Again, those four areas of focus that clearly from your work working together from an interdisciplinary perspective will enhance the distinction of this university. Finally, I think as I indicated in my state of academic affairs address, we are on an extremely positive trajectory of success at The University of Akron and everything you're doing, everything our student and staff are doing, everything we will do will make even greater success an absolute reality. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much Mr. Provost. Are there any questions. Yes, Senator Bouchard.

Senator Bouchard: I'd like to follow up on a couple of comments that you made this in relation to Chair Sterns comments about our shrinking faculty. I'm very glad that we've got these 89 but as you say, some of them are already with us and we're down 60 or 70 full-time faculty compared to last year already. So if we're down already compared to last year with these 89 even all of those are filled this year and they join us in the fall that would just about bring us back to where we were last year with that net increase, in fact we're going to be down again next year because the figures that I've been hearing are 40 or 50 people are retiring or leaving or being lured away. And so we're going to be down again next year. And so I've actually got a two-part question. The first part is do we have an actual number that we're aiming at for total faculty and when you say 200 more or 120 more is this more than the minimum we've ever had, is it maximum that we've every had that was about 900 is it more than how many tenure track and faculty we have now, cause an awful lot of those full-timers are college lecturers which I know is not part of your goal for increasing, so do you have a number?

Provost Sherman: No, I don't think we want to shoot for a number. What I can tell you is that the achieving distinction program will be net new faculty doing research in those four areas. As I said in the state of academic affairs question and answer period I can't guarantee overall net new until we as colleagues are having discussions in such a way that we're discussing our personal and professional goals and aspirations such that in the context of assuring academic program excellence we can start including in the conversation exactly this framework of the potential for retirement within a particular you know timeframe so in a sense we can actually

feed into our decision making process how we plan to position the institution to fill that gap with regard to delivery of the academic program. So I guess what I would say is I would be hopeful let me say it this way, I would anticipate let's put it that way, I would anticipate that a year from now with what it is we're doing over the next year, that we'll have a much better ability to answer that question.

Senator Bouchard: Okay, I'm just worried that we'll 120 over say 500 tenure track faculty which is where we're heading at the moment which would be basically back to where we were 2 or 3 years ago, which doesn't really count as an increase.

Provost Sherman: All I can tell you is you know the past is not a predictor of the future and we're putting in place practices and principles that should make gains on this issue.

Senator Bouchard: Which, the second half of my question is, does the university have a policy on trying to make counter offers to good people who are being lured away because I know this is happening and we in History are losing two people here, we and English between us are losing 6 people due to retirements and lured away and it's just a lot of people for the two or three biggest departments on campus and yet what we're being told and what message that the faculty and the deans are being given is that a zero percent chance of a meaningful counter offer and the rationale that's given is that these are tight financial times. And yet it sort of strikes me as being penny-wise and pound-foolish and a lot of disciplines beginning assistant professors are actually paid more than our associates already here so it's not as though we're going to get a cheap replacement. And then in sciences you've got start up money you know half a million bucks for some of those fields that are going to have lay out again if your going to re-hire and this is especially scary given that we're also being told that there's no such thing anymore as a replacement line that everything has to be a new line and I don't know if it's hard for the money but it's kind of scary so anyway what I'm wondering is there a university policy on trying to make meaningful counter offers and if so what is the best way for a departments and deans to access this?

Provost Sherman: That's the question I wanted to answer. Basically within the collective bargaining agreement there is ability to make counter offers, how to make counter offers is the department chair is talking to the dean, the dean talking to the provost, and the provost interacting with the dean to make a decision. When those things happen, when those discussions occur.

Senator Bouchard: Okay, what happens if the answer is it's not going to happen.

Provost Sherman: What happens if the answer is it's not going to happen?

Senator Bouchard: That's what we've been getting.

Provost Sherman: Well then there should be a rationale for why the answer is it's not going to happen. But there should be a process in place that's followed. And the process is department chair to dean, dean to provost. If the provost receives the request the provost will respond to the request.

Senator Bouchard: I'm just telling the provost that the process may not be working.

Provost Sherman: Thank you very much and we'll have that conversation to clarify.

Senator Bouchard: Thank you.

Provost Sherman: Absolutely.

Chair Sterns: So far in the many years of observing these issues, I've seen us overreach. Typically we've not been as responsive as might be appropriate. You have an opportunity to look at that again. Those of us who have championed certain hires who've come to your office have been disappointed on a number of occasions. And Senator Elliott.

Senator Elliott: I've sort of been talking about this for awhile now. And I can offer a number to this conversation. I heard recently that the number of full-time faculty in the year 2000 was 675. And back in December I told you that the number of full-time faculty was 686 in December of 2011. And based on what Harvey's saying I'm going to guess it's not 686 any more. Okay, so that's a number without a lot of slope. Without a lot change. And so when you say okay we've gotta develop a whole management strategy and a protocol for hiring new people and getting all this done, it doesn't reflect the sense of urgency that I'm feeling about this and the reality of a number that's been 680 plus or minus 5 for 12 years. So just keep those numbers in mind.

Provost Sherman: Sure, absolutely. I mean when I arrived there were a significant number of faculty searches underway. One could have said under the current budgetary circumstances we're shutting them down. We did not do that. We could have even for this past year for fiscal year '12 not have offered up any additional faculty positions period. We added faculty positions to make it a total of 89. I mean we are doing, I am doing, and with my colleagues everything we reasonably can to facilitate faculty hiring. We put in place this 10-year program in which there will be transparency of increasing faculty numbers in this program. I'll also point out that there have been very significant improvements over the last couple of years and in the next year in faculty compensation. Money you know shifts around with regard to where the priorities are and quite frankly I think with all of the issues that intersect we've done a pretty darn good job in our overall priority which is to shift in a sense the institutional budget in ways that better support academic excellence. It's not going to happen overnight alls I can tell you that in promise is that this is where we will relentlessly focus on those three priorities of budgeting and you can be assured that the similar kind of perspective will be articulated through the budget process every year.

Chair Sterns: Senator Mancke.

Senator Mancke: I really appreciate your discussion, I want to apologize for misunderstanding you at your state of university. And I've also taken the President's injunction that we need to look at the numbers, we need to analyze them fairly seriously so I have here some institutional research numbers, I have here some Board of Regents numbers about tuition, about faculty/staff

lines etc. So I just want to suggest some of these because I think numbers get dropped, decontextualized, so in 2000 tuition per year, tuition and fees was \$3,980. So \$4,000, twenty dollars off from \$4,000. In 2011 it was \$9,247, so that's an increase of 232%. While it's a 132% from \$4,000. Over that same period of time there was an increase of student credit hours reduction of 40% from 232,000 to 326,000. So there was an increase of 40% in student credit hour production so the total revenue of the university increased significantly both with the increase in student credit hour production and the increase in tuition and fees. The faculty declined, the tenure-string faculty declined by 8. so we have a significant increase in productivity, we have a significant increase in tuition and fees, full-time faculty decline over the tenure-string faculty, there is actually an increase but from 728 to 781 but those are all in non-tenure-track lines. And so there has been no increase in tenure-string lines in fact there has been a decrease over the last decade. That is of great concern. In the times that this university has gone through accreditation reviews the accreditation reviews have consistently said that we need more full-time faculty lines but that is usually conveyed to me to mean tenure-string faculty lines. The administration has not responded to that need of the accreditation board over the past decade. Now that was before your time here, but there is a history of not allocating money. These are not numbers that I'm making up, these are numbers that you can get off the Board of Regents and off Institutional Research. At the same time, the non-academic, non-faculty lines have increased considerably okay? So there has been a huge increase in non-faculty positions and non-teaching positions but there has not been an increase in teaching positions except for non-tenure stream and part-time so that perhaps the revenue issue there has been money, there has simply not been a will to hire faculty, tenure-stream faculty. The other thing is that you say there is a desire to shift 2 million dollars a year, the faculty budget is approximately 50 million dollars a year. That comes out to 4%. 4% does not give me a lot of hope, 2 million dollars out of a 50 million dollar budget for faculty lines is 4%. So a 4% increase in faculty line budgets is not hopeful or actually moving up that tenure-stream faculty.

Provost Sherman: I appreciate all those perspectives. How do I respond to this?

Senator Mancke: Did I misunderstand the 2 million dollars a year?

Provost Sherman: Well the 2 million dollars a year is really projected to add net new faculty it's one mechanism to add new faculty to be focused from an interdisciplinary perspective on those four areas of investment; regional solutions, the human condition, medicine and health and relative technologies. So that is..

Senator Mancke: But it isn't the overall faculty is 4% of the faculty budget.

Provost Sherman: Let me finish. So that's 2 million dollars right? Every year if we maximize the investment in faculty as I just indicated we did, coming in we didn't eliminate any faculty positions that were allocated. This last fall we allocated additional faculty positions, that is adding a greater percentage of the budget to the academic side of the house. The three years of significant investment in faculty compensation in and of itself will shift more money to academic side of the house. The intersection of those practices over time will shift the institutional base budgets towards academic excellence, achieving academic distinction. It can't happen overnight but it's going to be an intersection of all those factors. Again, when we go into a budget system the whole base budget of the institution, that is the allocation of budgets to every unit will be evaluated. The academic program review and the academic support unit review process will help inform what the base budgets of the academic support and the academic unit should be also potentially creating an opportunity for a redistribution of base budgets across academic support and within academic and academic support. We're hoping to be able to if not implement but move into a simulation of a budget system in fiscal year 14. So I would contend if you put those five things together and we practice those things and we create over time policies that support those things we will achieve a transformation in the budget allocation of this institution over time, it's not going to be tomorrow, it's going to be across the sequence of some number of budget cycles.

Chair Sterns: And the big unknown which has to be factored in as well is how state teacher's retirement will formulate their retirement incentives and or their calculations to resolve that will be another factor. Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: Much as I appreciate Chair Sterns focus on his area of expertise, and his bringing STRS into this discussion, I've heard last month and this month some pretty specific requests that did seem to me to be asking for baselines, where are we starting from. And so far in this particular venue I really am not clear about where exactly those baselines are given the responses from the President and the Provost. But I do want to say that in regard to not this particular discussion but the larger discussion about the budget in general that you made reference to the University Council's meeting next week, the meeting is at 10.

Provost Sherman: The finance committee on the 17th.

Senator Lillie: The meeting of the University Council is at 10.

Provost Sherman: The meeting of the Business and Finance Committee of the University Council is the 17th.

Senator Lillie: And at the meeting next week one of the things that's going to be on the agenda is to ask the members of the Budget and Finance Committee where they are with regard to the request that came to them for the ten years of financial data that was requested by Dave Witt and that went through the University Council process.

Provost Sherman: And they'll be able to say on the 17th that they have it in their hands.

Senator Lillie: That's a baseline. And after quite a bit of effort, quite a bit of time and quite a bit of reminding and quite a bit of pushing that perhaps has been necessary but I think hasn't increased the level of trust between the faculty and the staff and the administration on this particular issue. The other thing is that there will be brought to the attention of University Council next Tuesday the results of a study by Dave Witt similar to the ones that you had just described basically is going to ask that there be some kind of a discussion data, recommendations about what to do with regard to the issue of the fact that the faculty ranks have not been growing, except of the expense of the tenure-stream faculty. So that also is I think, at least of part of its intent is to establish a baseline of data that we all can then look at. So that to me is something

we need to do, it's something we've been asking about for some time and it's something that I don't know if others have seen but I haven't seen it. We don't have at present a place in our agenda for a report from the University Council representatives, but I think perhaps in the future we may want to consider this as something we would add in. And I just want to take the opportunity right now since we are talking about these issues to just say that with regard to the university governance issue, the university governance process I think we have made progress, I think that there's a ways to go and I'm hoping that with this kind of discussion and debate and with the same kind of discussion and debate coming from other quarters we can begin to close the gap between sort of the gap of mistrust that has been there for too long. So baseline, where we started, what are we talking about, where are we moving from? That was Senator Bouchard's question. 120 new faculty, where are we starting from to get that 120? What is in that figure? I realize there is no way we're going to have 673 now and forever, that there are other things that may come in to effect that might, at least to some extent, make a number like that vary. But I think it is a legitimate question to get within 10 or 15 faculty members of saying this is a reasonable baseline and our 2 million dollars per year for the next 10 years is going to add to that baseline so that the 2 million dollars is over and above the replacements, the 2 million dollars is over and above people who are lured above. The 2 million dollars is over and above any kind of college lecturers who may for any reason need to be hired. And I think that's what I'm hearing, the kind of information that's being asked for with regard to the number of faculty and also with regard to some budget issues and questions we keep hearing that is coming and we still have yet to see it. Now I believe that your commitment (end of tape)

As the distinguished co-chair of the University Council is real. I think that in some minds there is a wondering about whether or not this is just one more way in which the faculty and others are being strung along. The proof of the pudding as they say is in the eating, and the proof of all this stuff that's been going along and the passions that have been raised and all of the questions and the mistrust and all for us will be in how we move forward from here. So I hope we can continue to do that and that we can find a way to make sure we aren't dancing around issues but talk about what they are. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: I think this is a good place to stop this discussion because we do have some business to conduct this afternoon. So those of you who are senators I'm sure that would like to say a few more things I think it's ten after four and we do have to do a number of reports.

Provost Sherman: Could I just say one more thing?

Chair Sterns: Sure.

Provost Sherman: Basically the President had said 14 years, I think several months is a major improvement over 14 years so frankly several months, 14 years, there should be a big trust factor there. I look forward to working with you on the University Council to address these issues and I think I said earlier I believe I'll feel much more comfortable a year from now and more specifically answering the questions about net something. Certainly at this point in time I don't think it's a viable discussion because we just know enough about ourselves in my opinion.

Senator Speers: May I offer just a quick solution and a comment. I don't know, but I had an opportunity to interview at NYU and I asked them about their issue, because it's across the country. They said that the way that they had solved was to contract professionals. Our contract professionals as you know are paid nothing, absolutely nothing. And the people that come in feel the tenuous situation that they're in and good people leave. But contract professionals can be given we know this from staff etc, but also faculty as contract professionals gives them more of the whole program, more levity and more stability. And you make a compromise, I think we're all after the same thing and that is the equity of the programs that we offer our students. And so given that maybe there's a compromise in not having money and not having the faculty we need, that we find a way to compromise that.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much.

Provost Sherman: Thank you. I appreciate your time.

Chair Sterns: I know we've devoted a lot of time to these discussions but I think they're coming at a critical time in our approach to faculty governance as you know this is one of the areas that we are still under review from the higher learning commission so what happens is really important in terms of how these things move forward.

Committee Reports

Chair Sterns: Let me just point out to you that we have a graduate council meeting minutes, do our representatives have anything that they want to say beyond the minutes? Okay, can I call upon the Academic Policies Committee? Associate Provost Ramsier. I'm sure you've missed these golden moments.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns. Academic Policies committee brings three items for your attention and consideration for approval today as committee reports. The first is in memo form, entitled Change in Responsibility for Degree Administration in the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences. This involves the courses that were in the Department of Geography now being moved to two other departments within A & S. Academic Policies Committee reviewed and discussed all the documentation which has also been provided to you and we have unanimously recommended this to the Senate forum for approval. This comes as a committee report and I'd ask for your consideration of an action.

Chair Sterns: Okay we have a report from the committee, does not require a second. Is there discussion? I see no discussion being brought forward so are we ready to vote? If so all in favor of resolution please say aye. (aye) Opposed? (none)

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you. Second item for your attention from Academic Policies Committee is in memo form entitled Updates on the Convergence of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences with Professional Arts. Once again Academic Policies Committee reviewed and discussed all the information we received some of which has been provided to you in advance. We have unanimously recommended to the Senate the final approval of the convergence of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences with the former College of Creative and Professional Arts.

Chair Sterns: Is there any discussion to this resolution? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: Simply a question, I had heard you say final, does this mean that all of the work that had been anticipated some time ago has been completed and so if we give our consent to this then it's done, the colleges are put together and what's left would be whatever it is to be done after the official process occurs? What I'm trying to say is there is nothing that would come back to us after this?

Associate Provost Ramsier: That is correct.

Chair Sterns: Senator Speers.

Senator Speers: I just want to say the same thing that I said going into this, that is that the College of Creative and Professional Arts is losing its identity and we think that it's a great disservice to the arts at this institution.

Chair Sterns: Other comments? If not are we ready for a vote? All in favor please say aye. (aye) Any opposed? (one nay from Senator Speers) Okay.

Associate Provost Ramsier: The third item from the Academic Policies Committee comes in a resolution format concerning a recommendation to establish the Institute for Leadership Advancement. Academic Policies Committee again has unanimously recommended the establishment of this institute within the College of Business Administration. We bring this to the Faculty Senate for your consideration for approval.

Chair Sterns: Is there any discussion? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I again just what I hope is a simple question. I really didn't get a chance to read through this I saw it today and I wondered if you could comment on the governance of this particular institute, will it be reported through a department, directly to the dean, directly to the

Provost's office, can you give some indication of how this will actually be operated in terms of governance and it may be here.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Yes, I'll actually read from the organizational and governance section four of the document that Academic Policies Committee received. "The Institute will be lead by director and steering committee comprised of key stakeholders which will include faculty, staff and external executives. The director will report directly to the dean of the College of Business Administration." And to add a little bit from the committee standpoint we received first request with proposal, we met with Dr. Steven Ash from the college, he came to the committee to explain the background and the ramifications and the need for this based on the answers he provided the college then provided this more lengthy written document with exactly these details in it that the committee wanted to see. We held a special meeting to entertain and discuss the specific details in order to bring it to your attention at this meeting. So the committee was unanimous in its support after receiving and understanding the background and expectations for this institute.

Senator Lillie: Do we have any other institutes or bodies on campus who have as part of their official operational structure and governance external folks, cause this includes external folks which I assume means people from outside the university.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Yes, external executives means executives in industry and business outside the university.

Senator Lillie: But they're specifically mentioned as part of the organizational structure and governance and I'm wondering if we have any other precedents or examples of the governance being handled including people from outside the university.

Chair Sterns: The answer is yes.

Senator Lillie: I can understand advisory what I'm talking about is governance.

Chair Sterns: Well we have adjunct fellows in the Lifespan Development and Gerontology that are officially appointed and are involved in the coordinating council of the institute. They've had some discussion about whether they have a vote or not.

Senator Lillie: And that's a perfect example of the question I'm asking.

Chair Sterns: University rules actually state that unless someone is full-time, they don't have full voting rights.

Associate Provost Ramsier: If I may clarify on specific point on this Section four of the document is entitled Organizational Structure and Governance. The first sentence "The Institute will be led by a director and advised by a steering committee comprised of key stakeholders which are the faculty, staff and external executives." So the intent here is that the director will be advised by a steering committee that includes external people. I read that as part of the organizational structure not the governance in that context.

Senator Lillie: So this, which is fine, this institute will have its decisions made by the director with the advice of these other folks and that will be reported to the dean for any final kind of consummation that needs to be done by the dean.

Associate Provost Ramsier: That's my understanding and the committee's understanding.

Chair Sterns: Vice Chair Rich would you kindly assume the chairmanship cause I would like to ask a couple of questions. Having been an institute director on this campus for 37 years..

Vice chair Rich: The Chair recognizes.

Chair Sterns: I understand that monies are being assigned as it presented in a budget here totaling to \$250,000. You have a 60 faculty involved institute on this campus which I've directed for all these years which has a total budget of \$8,000. So I just want to point that out

that this is an enormous amount of money being allocated for this enterprise. I support it, I just want to point out to you how shabbily other units are treated. I'm done.

Senator Ducharme: Harvey, so why do you support it?

Chair Sterns: Because I think that there's a specific contribution being made by outside company, we want to attract that kind of contribution to our campus, my personal statement should not be taken as a definitive, I'm just expressing personal frustration and I want to be a fair-minded colleague so I just want to point out to you that it's great when you have an outside kind of contribution but when you look at the fact that we have many other institutes that cannot afford to have administrative assistants when we've had them in the past. I mean the only I want to point out to everyone that this is a wonderful thing but why haven't proven entities been given similar consideration recently? And I'm out of order because. Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I just thank you for your comments Chair Sterns and I'm looking at the budget which I also hadn't seen before just now and noting that calls for hiring an institute director at \$60,000, is that position and maybe I've just made the assumption and it's wrong is that institute director a faculty member and where is the academic connection if we're going to have an institute housed in the College of Business Administration? Where is the academic connection for this particular institute and I would think it's ironic if this person is not going to be a faculty member in light of the discussion we've just had about other issues that relate to a number of faculty so on. So I guess my question, is this person going to be a faculty member and if not how does this relate to the academic, scholarly side of things and what is the purpose of this institute?

Associate Provost Ramsier: The documentation details even a job description, for the person that would be this director of this institute, these dollars, \$250,000 a year for four years are not University of Akron funds. They are donated by the JM Smucker Company to support this institute. The person that would be hired, the position requires a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration or a relevant field, it is not a faculty position. It's a director of an institute, on soft money, funded from outside. That is the intent of this proposal.

Senator Lillie: So this is basically going to be something that from the academic perspective will be under the control of the dean and that will be a day to day director.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Yes.

Chair Sterns: Senator Speers.

Senator Speers: Does it require resources as well as faculty some sources of space and things that we will be offering that maybe will detract from another educational aspect of the institution, so I just wondered if that has been taken into consideration too. Is the dean okay with this, he knows how this is going to work?

Chair Sterns: Well I think it's clear from the document that the institute will be partnering with the Honors College, I'm not questioning the efficacy and again I'm as chair I should not comment but I just I think the opportunity is an excellent opportunity which is why I support it.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Chair Sterns if I can answer the question directly, yes, physical facilities have been described in the written document. The institute will initially be housed in the 4th floor of the College of Business Administration in an available office. There are minimal costs for this space; for example a network installation and a computer. Academic Policies Committee did review, did ask questions, did interview and did receive additional information that enabled to unanimously recommend the establishment of this institute with external funding from an outside entity.

Chair Sterns: Senator Huff.

Senator Huff: I'm speaking for this because this is such an exciting endeavor and this is to promote leadership within our university for our students and certainly it should be a model that the rest of us should take, go for the money. We can do this.

Senator Speers: Is the \$250,000 annually? Or have they projected that this is going to be an ongoing thing that they will give this kind of soft money every year?

Associate Provost Ramsier: It has been committed, \$250,000 dollars per year for four years.

Chair Sterns: Further discussion. Senator Elliott.

Senator Elliott: Just a question. So is there any implication of continuation after the money dries up?

Associate Provost Ramsier: Yes I think you'll see in the documentation that the intent is of course to continue to self-sustained with additional dollars, maybe from the same company, but maybe from other partners in the community.

Senator Elliott: But still soft money?

Associate Provost Ramsier: Yes, that's the intent is for them to use this as an initial mechanism through which they can engage with other businesses in the community to generate more interest in the leadership development, in particular business leadership and other types of leadership in our students.

Chair Sterns: Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson: Yeah I would like to just follow up on that. I guess some of this I guess the things that are academic are already in place for example the one credit hour requirement for MBA students obviously would already be taught by this director who is already part of the program or is going to come in in the next year in curriculum changes.

Associate Provost Ramsier: These will all go through the curriculum process.

Senator Erickson.: And it will obviously have an academic connection.

Associate Provost Ramsier: There is an academic connection, that was spoken to first.

Senator Erickson: Also in the other part it says here a measure of support for ?? and then it says a resource of a relationship that will be able to include all students in some form of leadership, is that meant all students on campus or all students in the business school because it's clearly is an institute in the business school, which part was with Honors College if I remember correctly, am I correct?

Associate Provost Ramsier: At the initial outset it is certainly within the College of Business Administration, they have a partnership already with the Honors College, not just for Honors College of Business students but there would be an opportunity for other Honors students, if they were so inclined to get involved because the Honors College for example has the emerging leaders program. There may be some non-business majors in that program that would like to go for the half day workshop under this institute, so there is an opportunity not a requirement for students to be involved within the College of Business, some of them in the Honors College which has a broader disciplinary base of majors. If you extrapolate the wishes and the dreams of the College of Business faculty in this endeavor and they were able to raise the kind of money they think they could raise, there may be much more opportunity for students not in Honors to get engaged.

Senator Erickson: And outside the business school correct.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Yes, cause Honors is not just Business.

Chair Sterns: I would suggest you look at Dean Mugler's letter on the back.

Senator Erickson: Yes, and I'm saying well I guess I'm asking, it's an academic question, this would mean that as you very rightly ask us exactly what kind of activities were involved then if you were going outside the college outside the business college and you were wanting to involve other students you might want to also involve faculty outside the business school because it's not

the only, surely not the only college that would have the ability to provide inputs into a leadership program.

Associate Provost Ramsier: That's absolutely true and we discussed that. But that would come further down the road.

Senator Erickson: So at this point it is the business person but it is later would be expanded and they would have it all wider academic episode. Is that correct?

Associate Provost Ramsier: Presumably. Yes.

Chair Sterns: Further discussion, are we ready for a vote? All in favor please say aye. (aye)
Any opposed? (none)

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Curriculum Review Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Curriculum Review Committee brings a list of course proposals for which there were no objections filed in the system. I believe that this list was sent out to the listserv of senators, unfortunately it would not print out in readable manner to have handouts today so I hope and the committee hopes that you've been able to look at the list. We bring that list as a committee report of proposals that have gone all the way through the system with no objections and we bring that to your attention for your final approval.

Chair Sterns: I believe these proposals were sent to senators on March 29th? Any comments?
Okay, all in favor? One comment where? Oh, I'm sorry, Senator Schuller.

Senator Schuller: Just a general question, when the proposals are sent out to faculty for last minute comments or questions, what's the timeframe on that before they come to Faculty Senate?

Associate Provost Ramsier: The open window for university wide review and comment and open for objections is a two-week window in the system and after that window closes then Curriculum Review Committee pulls the curriculum proposals off that have no objections and brings them in this what I will call batch mode to the Senate for consideration. Now objections can be filed by other bodies throughout the process, it's not just during that open window that objections can be filed.

Senator Schuller: That question came up in University Review Committee this morning. I couldn't answer, now I can.

Chair Sterns: Okay, all in favor please say aye. (aye) Any opposed? (none)

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Okay, any report from GEAC? URC? DLC? Okay, let me now turn to the Reference Committee, Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: The Reference Committee met on March 29th, elected me Chair that's why I'm reporting to you and recommends to the Faculty Senate the amendments that have been distributed to all of you. They must lay over one month, they can't be voted on today, they can however be debated today. I will briefly summarize them although I sent a good summary with the actual proposal attached. But first I would like to acknowledge the valuable contributions of Senator Apple and Professor Morath to this work. There are a number of changes, some of which are substantive and others of which are less so. First of all, paragraph D-2 of the bylaws there's currently a conflict with paragraph F-2, the practice has been in accordance with paragraph F-2 with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee appoints the members of committees, both standing and ad hoc committees. I just happened to notice in working with this document on some of these other changes that it actually says that the Faculty Senate appoints members, non-senators to committees, I think that was just an error and it would be awfully hard for us as a large body to do that and to especially coordinate it with the Executive Committee

appointing the Senate members of the body I'm sure that wasn't intended so this would correct that so that it's clear that the members of the Executive Committee makes does all the committee assignments. Secondly, there is the addition of a standing ad hoc Accessibility Committee. This was recommended by the ad hoc Accessibility Committee that we now have, the committee concluded that there was a need for a permanent committee because there are issues that arise on a fairly regular basis concerning accessibility and disabilities in relation to academic programs and requirements. The third change and by the way when it comes time to vote on this in the next meeting we can divide these questions because of course there are very distinct questions in here. The third item is in paragraph F-3, currently the bylaws provide for two ex-officio memberships on the Reference Committee, one a representative of Human Resources and the other a representative of the Provost's Office. We haven't had such representatives and quite understandably because the sole purpose of the Reference Committee under the bylaws is to review legislation referred to it by the Faculty Senate to ascertain if it's drafted properly and does not conflict with existing rules and regulations or practices and we couldn't really see a reason for those particular offices to have representatives on this particular committee. The proposal is to eliminate the ex-officio memberships on the Reference Committee. Fourth would change several paragraphs as a result of which staff representation in the Faculty Senate would be eliminated as I indicated in the committee report, the e-mail. At one time the Faculty Senate had a significant role in university budgeting, in determining employee benefits and in other matters that transcended purely academic affairs. Those roles were amended by the Board of Trustees in the wake of the faculty vote to unionize and there is now a University Council to address those issues in which staff are represented in equal numbers to the faculty so the committee concluded that the rationale for including staff representatives in the Faculty Senate no longer exists and that that representation should be ended. The next change also alters several paragraphs the result would be to do likewise with respect to contract professionals, the rationale is the same as I noted in the e-mail nothing here precludes contract professionals from being appointed to Faculty Senate committees where they're expertise is relevant and the example that comes foremost to my mind is a member of the Academic Policies Committee is the service of representatives of Academic Advising on the committee which is quite invaluable. And that of course could continue. The sixth change would be paragraph H-1 this amendment would correct an omission that occurred inadvertently when retired faculty representatives were added to the

Faculty Senate there needed to be changes in two places, the change was only made in one place, this would make it in the other place. This is not substantive. Seventh we have a change to paragraph H-2-d this is just a non-substantive change that reflects the name change of Associated Student Government to Undergraduate Student Government and would clean up a little the language in that paragraph. Eighth, a change to paragraph H-6-a-4 this would eliminate some superfluous language this is not substantive and finally paragraph H-6-a-5 this proposed amendment would make it clear that tie votes are to be broken by random selection only when they're two candidates running for one seat that is where each has fallen one vote short of a majority when this was drafted originally I think no one was actually thinking about a possibility of multiple candidates or multiple seats being up where the people who tie aren't close to majority so this would make it clear that this only applies when there are two candidates running for one seat and they've tied and that means that they're each within one vote of a majority. That concludes the report of the Reference Committee.

Chair Sterns: Thank you Senator Rich. This of course serves as a first reading for bylaws changes, we will vote as Senator Rich pointed out next time. If I could now move to the report from the ad hoc Committee on Part-time Faculty. Is there anyone who'd like to speak to that?

Senator Cerrone: Just a brief update. The committee has put together a survey that's been distributed to the part-time faculty and we're currently receiving responses from that up until Friday so we'll be compiling the results from that at the next meeting.

Chair Sterns: Thank you. I'd like to point out that we have a report from the University Library Committee, we also have a report from Computing and Communications Technology Committee. Any comments on either one of these? Okay, is there anything to update the special committee on Summit College/Criminal Justice?

Senator Rich: No except let me clarify something, a misimpression that some people may have gotten from the Executive Committee report which said that we'll shortly begin deliberations. If deliberations are defined broadly to include hearing from the concerned parties then that's

correct but I wouldn't want people to think that we're at a stage of arriving at any decisions we will be hearing from the parties who are concerned shortly.

Chair Sterns: And the timetable because I know we were working with some specific dates in mind, what do you?

Senator Rich: We're going to try to get a proposal that can be voted on in our next meeting.

Chair Sterns: Okay because I have been barraged with concerns from numerous parties regarding how we are doing on that. I know it's important and I know we want to do it well, enough said I guess. Okay is there any further business to come before the body? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I just want to make a report with regard to the e-learning task forces and committees as you know I've been appointed to be the representative of the Senate to the E-learning Steering Committee there are a number of other senators and also perhaps non-senators who have been appointed to some of the task forces make up some of the business work of the e-learning committee so it's just a communication work team, curriculum focus, faculty focus, budget case. And we meet on a fairly regular basis as a steering committee to see where things are in regard, yesterday I received a number of reports that are that I have forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Senate and also to the other members representing the Senate on the other committees for their review and wanted to let you know that there are a number of two recommendations that are coming for Senate action that will relate to a curriculum to a possible curriculum change that would include some kind of a particular aspect of online quality standard course delivery and the proposal is that the Senate through its process recommend and put into place a process by which that quality standard can be ascertained. So those are coming for consideration of the Senate, they've been sent to the EC and I am sure the Executive Committee will determine which is the appropriate committee to send them to. If you would like I would be happy to send all this information that I have here with all the other recommendations, I'm not going to go over them because of the time but we can put that on Senate listserv and we can see these things. There are after extensive discussions they're basically a process is arranged by which recommendation will come to the steering committee, the steering committee will make

recommendations after good I think consideration. Those that relate to academics will go directly to the Faculty Senate process. Those that relate to operational issues will go to the Provost's office for disposition to the appropriate place. And some the Provost may send on to the Senate if he thinks that would be the appropriate place for them to be considered. So one of things that I wanted to point out that we are in a situation where these things are being sent to us directly so please to the extent you're interested in e-learning please pay as close attention as you can. One other thing that I've been asked to say is that and again you may have heard it already but it is that I'm not sure precisely where the decision process for whether or not the Pearson learning system will be used, Senator Clark may have some insights there because she's on the business case committee but the announcement that I've been asked to make is regardless of that decision the e-learning task force anticipates continuing because it's constituted to try to figure out how to bring e-learning to The University of Akron so I want you to be aware of that it's not simply Pearson but this larger scale. One other thing that might be helpful is that were a number of recommendations that came to the steering committee that we felt impacted the collective bargaining agreement, we actually instead of assuming it did we met and looked at the contract articles and we found to some extent some of the issues that were coming up to us had been anticipated by the contract at least in a very general sense so the recommendation there was to allow that process to take place. So please bear in mind that those of you who are in the collective bargaining group can access the contract, find out what it says about compensation, about online issues and I encourage you and urge you to do that because some of your questions if you have any may be answered by that.

Chair Sterns: Thank you Senator Lillie. Senator Clark.

Senator Clark: Just to share with the Senate what has happened on the business case committee at the invitation of Dr. Lillie. The business case committee is constructing models to answer the question whether or not the university can provide the services and the structure and the management of online learning at a cheaper or equal price that would cost to provide by Pearson. So the committee is not deciding whether or not Pearson is going to be our e-learning management system, it is going to be making a determination whether or not we can provide

those services at an equal or lesser cost and we will recommend to the steering committee one or the other scenario.

Chair Sterns: Other comments, questions? If not let's go to Good Of The Order.

Good of the Order

Chair Sterns: Frank you wanted to say something?

Senator Bove: Yes sir. On behalf of Senator Lazar who was unable to make the meeting today, in regards to the university library committee I have a quick announcement. The University Libraries has redesigned their website, they have placed a prototype website up on the servers and it's going to run for the rest of the semester in tandem with our current website. We invite all the faculty, all the staff, all the students to visit the new website and on every page there's a simple feedback form to provide your impressions of the website so I would really encourage you to promote this with your students and get your students on it. Please play around with the new website yourself, I think you'll find it much more intuitive and much more manageable and user friendly. A quick guide to the timeline is that we're going to keep them up for the rest of this semester and then we hope to implement it based on the feedback and the changes that we'll need to make early in the summer. So we want to really have it established and fixed in place so faculty can adjust their syllabi and whatever they need to in the classroom with the students so it's not a big shock come September or late August that oh my goodness the library's website has completely changed. You'll find a lot of things familiar with it, some new things and we invite all of your suggestions good, bad and ugly about the services because the library's website and the library personnel and the library's collection are here to serve the faculty and the students and that's what we aim to do and of course to get to it you simply just need to navigate to the current website and there is a big blue bar at the top that is a link to the new website and you should be able to find it very very easily. And if you're not sure of the university website it's uakron.edu/libraries and that will get you there. Thank you very much appreciate it.

Chair Sterns: Other statements for the good of the order. Senator Speers.

Senator Speers: The 1st Thursday in May is during finals week I assume we'll still meet here at 3?

Chair Sterns: Yes. Anything else? If not the Chair will entertain a motion for adjournment.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Senator Rich, 2nd by Senator Friberg.

Chair Sterns: Motion by Senator Rich, second, Senator Friberg. All in favor please say aye.
(aye)

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney