

10-6-2011

Faculty Senate Chronicle for October 6, 2011

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. "Faculty Senate Chronicle for October 6, 2011." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 6 Oct 2011. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/47>

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

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 6, 2011

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, October 6, 2011 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, 52 were present for this meeting. Senators Douth, Friberg, Huff, Rostedt and Steer were absent with notice. Senators Elliott, Gwinn, Hamed, Kimble, Lyndall, C. Miller, Mukherjee, Quieener, Thomas, and Zhe were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda - Chair Sterns called for a motion to approve the agenda. **The motion was made, seconded, and approved.**

II. Approval of the Minutes - Chair Sterns: In terms of actions on minutes, we now have two sets of minutes for us. We have the Chronicle of March 3, 2011 and September 1, 2011. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes?

Chair Sterns called for a motion to approve the minutes of March 3, 2011. **The motion was made, seconded, and approved.**

Chair Sterns called for a motion to approve the minutes of September 1, 2011. **The motion was made, seconded, and approved.**

III. Chairman's Remarks and Opening Comments - Chair Sterns: In reading these two different sets of minutes, seeing what was going on last March and then looking at what's happening in our September minutes you can see a real flow of opportunities fulfilled in some respect, because a number of things that we were deliberating back in March have come to fruition. I want to say that one of the things I'd like to highlight in my remarks today is the importance of the processes that we go through here in the Senate. Many people have commented about why we go through all these careful committees and the committee work; why we have formal resolutions; why we insist that we go through careful processes. The reason for that is to have the appropriate checks and balances and we want to maintain the authority of the

Faculty Senate. We want to make sure that there is appropriate deliberation by faculty on all issues brought to the Senate. We want to be sure that there are checks and balances so that if something goes awry there is an opportunity to correct it. If we don't have those kinds of checks and balances, there can be abuses and missteps. So I just want to emphasize why we go through endless arguments about this or that, but I think it's important because it is critical that the faculty have full participation and maintain their rights in decision making. It also provides the right directions for us to communicate to our leadership.

IV. Special Announcements - Senator DiMarco: Dr. Patricia A. Galon, associate professor in the College of Nursing, passed away earlier today. She was 58.

Galon joined the nursing faculty in 2006, shortly after earning her Ph.D. from UA.

Galon's research focused on quality-of-life issues for people with serious and persistent mental illness, coercion in mental health treatment and the physical health of persons with cognitive impairment.

Galon presented her research at statewide and national conferences. Her research was published in Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, New Directions in Mental Health and in the Anthology of Psychiatric Ethics.

Galon was a certified adult psychiatric clinical nurse specialist. She was past president of the Ohio Association of Advanced Practice Nurses and had served on the Patient Centered Medical Home Taskforce of the Ohio Healthcare Quality and Coverage Council.

Before joining the University, Dr. Galon worked as a clinician, administrator and educator in both the private and public sectors. She earned her undergraduate degree in nursing from St. John College of Cleveland, an MSN in adult psychiatric nursing from the University of Cincinnati, an M.A. in bioethics and philosophy from Cleveland State University and a Ph.D. in nursing from UA.

Chair Sterns: Thank you, Senator DiMarco. Let us all rise for a moment of silence in memory of our departed colleague. (Senate observed moment of silence)

Senator Speers: I am sorry, we in Theatre are very emotional and I'd like to toast, a proverbial toast to Steve Jobs who has affected all of our careers. To Steve Jobs, hey hey!

V. Reports

Executive Committee - Frank Bove: Thank you Chair Sterns. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee had a very active schedule this past month. Members of the EC met with the President and the Provost on September 15th. Due to his rigorous schedule, the President had to leave early; but did engage the EC in a frank discussion regarding several issues impacting higher education in the state and at our university. Those issues included the state-level discussions for defining enterprise universities, the UA and The Timken Company open-innovation agreement to accelerate technology development, a visit from Pearson to explore the possibility of UA as an integrator university, as well as the new appointment of Roland Bauer to our Board of Trustees.

As the President parted company, the conversation continued with the Provost regarding the ongoing college convergences. He assured the EC that the Deans will report on the progress to the Senate at regular intervals. The Provost discussed the current program review and encouraged faculty to react to the Capacity Analysis Reports that have been distributed through the Deans. The Provost also shared the organizational chart of the Office of Academic Affairs with the EC and noted that there will soon be another iteration with a new structure that includes fewer direct reports to the Provost. At this point the Provost then invited Associate Provost Ramsier to present to the committee his preliminary findings regarding the UA student profile. After the presentation, it was agreed that the Senate and the Office of Academic Affairs would co-sponsor public forums to present this data to the university community. I hope you all had an opportunity to attend one of the two sessions this week.

The committee also held three regular meetings. On September 21st the EC met to review and finalize the remaining senate committee appointments. On September 29th we met to prepare the agenda for today's meeting as well as to certify some remaining senate election results. Finally, on October 4th, the EC met to review faculty requests for appointment to the nine standing

committees of the University Council. We will have the chance to share the appointments with you following the conclusion of today's elections for faculty representation on University Council. (see <http://www.uakron.edu/dotAsset/2241565.pdf>)

There are a few comments that I wanted to make before we went forward. I ask for everyone's cooperation in a few things when we are conducting business in the Senate. All motions from committees need to be provided in writing before the start of the meeting, so that we have an accurate record of what the proposal is. Motions that come from the floor during the meeting should be stated very clearly to the Chair. The Chair will restate the motion so that we are assured to have an accurate record of exactly what it is that is voted on. The Chair will state the outcome of all votes, once again to ensure that we have accuracy in recording what the outcome of the vote was. I'm going to make a request that everyone speak only when they're recognized by the Chair and that when they are recognized they will stand and speak clearly, addressing the Chair rather than the members of the Senate or the guests of the Senate. And finally, please be mindful of your proximity to the microphones. Thank you very much; that concludes my report.

Chair Sterns: Just a comment, you will find as part of your reports today two reports on the convergences of the colleges, one for the College of Arts and Sciences from John Zipp and the second from Roberta DePompeii. Those are the ongoing reports of the convergences. If there are any questions about that you can certainly bring them up.

At this time I would like to call upon David Cummins who is going to be presenting today on the budget updates for the university. As UA's Vice President for Finance and Chief Fiscal Officer, David Cummins oversees fiscal operations, financial planning and budgeting, treasury services, student financial services, purchasing, parking, and dining services. So that tells you that this is certainly a critical role and he will be presenting today instead of the Provost although Provost Sherman will be joining us later for discussion. David, welcome and thank you for coming to the Senate today.

David Cummins: Thank you. I was going to go over quickly the presentation that was done for our Board at their August 3rd meeting, which is the meeting at which they approved the fiscal '12

budget. It's a fairly compact presentation it won't take long then I can take any questions. The first page gives you a sense of our general fund revenues and how they make up the total pie. And the walk away from that is that tuition fees is 69%, state appropriations is 29%. Two interesting facts to keep in mind are that the state appropriations, as a part of our budget, continues to decline, but those two items are 92% of our budget so at the time we are fairly dependent on the tuition. The general fund covers our academic expenses, public service, student services and so on. Generally the auxiliary services are outside of the general fund as well as our capital projects.

The next slide is essentially the same presentation looking at the expenditure side. What you see there is that the significant part of our budget is compensation, when you think in terms of salaries plus benefits. So those two biggest slices are salaries and benefits which total 57% of the total budget. Scholarships around 10%, you can see the list going down in declining order. But it's fairly normal for the majority of our budget to be going towards compensation. Education continues to be a labor intensive business and essentially is what that reflects.

The next slide is a different presentation, but this is something The University of Akron has tracked for a long time going back to 1987. Essentially, it's highlighting that's state support overall continues to decline as part of our budget, and tuition and fees is making up that difference. And so we reached the point in fiscal '12 where state support is about 25% and tuition and fees is 75%. When you isolate just the state support plus the tuition and fees of that 92%, only a quarter of it nowadays is from the state having fallen dramatically, having started at 67% starting in 1987. It's a national trend but as part of our budget process we did look at it a little more closely. This is a trend that's more pronounced in Ohio than most states. But it is something that is happening throughout the country, unfortunately.

I'll get a little bit into budget recommendations. What we talked to the Board about as we developed our budget, you know from the earliest conversations, was identifying our major priorities. I'm sure you had all heard both here and in the news about the significant cuts at the state level. When all is said and done, we were cut about 15 million dollars which reflects about 14% of the state appropriations we had received the prior year. But in that process we were

authorized to increase tuition and fees up to 3 ½ % which we did do. We made an assumption that our enrollment growth would continue fairly consistent with how it's been the last couple of years. We used a 3 ½% assumption. But in the process you know it's important at a time like this to avoid the temptation to just strictly go to incremental budgeting and look at a 15 million cut and figure out how we cut everything the same amount. We tried to be strategic in our thinking and we talked to the Board throughout the process about three priorities, three overarching principles: excellence in capacity assurance, making strategic investments and protecting our fiscal integrity. And so we made some decisions to reflect that. One of the things we did the last time was at 8.4 million dollars, a major decision point as well. Rather than strictly balance to the reduced state appropriations, we did make the decision to carry over 8.4 million dollars fiscal '11 to fiscal '12 into our fiscal '12 budget and balance that. What we end up doing is essentially taking two years to balance, taking into account the state cut. We expect the state cut funding to be fairly stable, next year up very slightly. So we're essentially using the biennium that makes fiscal '12 and fiscal '13 balance the budget and absorb the reduction that the state has provided.

Now beyond those items, the \$8.4 million carryover and dealing with the other cuts, we are doing some reallocations both to balance and to provide a little bit of funding we can reinvest in other priorities. And that makes a reference to it there, all in all there's about 11 million dollars in reallocations we're doing. We're looking at the colleges to give us about 2% reduction, the academic support units about 4% reduction. We took another five that comes to about six million dollars. We took another five million from centralized line items where we could identify some areas we could cut back to come up with about 11 million dollars and that 11 million dollars plus an 8.4 carryover to balance for the state cut and to invest in some priorities going forward. The strategic investments we're going to make have to fall in these areas of meeting our strategic plan priorities, allowing us to absorb enrollment growth as it occurs, and we also looked at growth in budget over years determining how much we should move between different areas.

So, we were able to identify about 20 million dollars in the budget for these three overriding principles. We ended up spending about 51% of it in capacity and excellence assurance which means we want to make sure we're making investments that allow us to serve students as well as

possible and absorb any enrollment growth that were experiencing. About 39% or about 4 million dollars is strategic investments, one of the highest profiles of those strategic investments is an effort to increase the number of faculty in targeted areas, especially assist in moving to our full time faculty, identify areas where we have good opportunities for improving our research production and so on. That process is underway as most of you might know. And then two million dollars was indentified for fiscal integrity which essentially means we need to make sure we're protecting our reserves. We need to make sure that we're making investments in our physical plant which quite frankly we're doing very modestly at the current time. Normally, we're dependent on state funding but there was no capital bill this past biennium. Normally, every two years they do a capital bill at the state level. And of course another source we've used in the past is debt, but we do have a significant capital plan for the facilities that we need to maintain and invest.

I think I got ahead of myself a little bit, but in capacity and excellence assurance, how did we spend that 51%? We need to add some money to some outreach functions we are doing. We added some graduate student fee remissions for fiscal '12. In strategic investments we did increase one of our scholarship lines. We're trying to address retention by targeting students that are successful here. Maybe when they entered the university, they did not have the opportunity to receive scholarships. Based on their performance they could become eligible for scholarships, but the focus of it essentially is to ensure that we're attracting quality students and helping them with their retention in the university. I referenced already the increase in full-time faculty and also put a little money, additional money into start up funds for core faculty. And fiscal integrity, as I said we put a little bit of money into facilities, literally, a million dollars and we're also focusing on trying to build our reserves.

Ohio Senate Bill 6 includes an accountability requirement. it's been in place since about the late, mid 90's, and each public higher education institution has to meet it. We meet it, there's no issue there, but it is sort of a top of mind measure used at the state level that we always have to track and be sure that we're cognizant of. When you increase reserves and so on it helps with those measures. So again we put in \$20 million and now we're in the process of talking to each

college and department throughout the university about what our options are for dealing with up to a two to a four percent reallocation that I referenced in an earlier slide.

At the same time in the Office of Academic Affairs, they are reviewing some of the strategic priorities and requests from the colleges to help identify where we might be able to invest in additional faculty and so on. So this process is sort of a two-prong approach going on at the same time. We hope to finish the evaluation of reallocations this month. I think identifying where we're going to make the strategic investments is going to go on throughout this calendar year, if I remember correctly.

This was just a slide we showed to the Board to sort of send home the message that we are thinking about opportunities to generate significant savings. We don't want to be in a position where every year we're looking to nip and tuck a two to four percent reallocation from each department. We need to be a little more strategic and think a little more globally.

One area where we have had a little success is containing costs in the healthcare benefits area. And there's a number of things that played into this including the fact that we did go to self-insurance this year, we reduced our options by one plan, and we made some changes in spousal carve-out which that will affect this year as a change for the Medicare last year. There was the audit that was done to make sure we're covering those who are eligible and the accumulation of those events we actually reduced our cost which is very rare, quite frankly, in the health industry these days. That's not to say that it's necessarily sustainable, but it is something that we ended up doing with some of those savings; namely, we've created a reserve earmarked strictly for health insurance. So if we were to face some volatility in the near future with our health insurance costs, we have a reserve that will help protect us.

The point of it though is that our work is not done. That's one example. We are starting to look more and more at utility costs, how to manage utility costs, but we're trying to think through big ticket items. There may be opportunities to control our costs, because we carried 8.4 million dollars into this budget. We're working through the balancing process and as you know there is no reason to anticipate that we're going to be doing much better at the state level going forward.

That's sort of a quick thumbnail sketch of the conversations at the Board level, but that's what led to them eventually approving the fiscal '12 budget at the August 3rd Board meeting.

Chair Sterns: Are there any questions?

Senator Speers: The elephant in the room may be the 99% that are protesting it in various city streets. I can tell you that our students are not getting jobs as they graduate and they will tell you themselves. I would like to say that everybody in this room, administrators and faculty, do an amazingly good job, but we may have to look at a freeze at some mid-level management or upper management. I don't know that that would amount to a hill of beans, but there is a real anger about where our young people are right now, graduating with no jobs, good educations and we are in that business. And so I do not envy you your job. Everything that you've reported says that we are taking all of these things into consideration, but being the bottom rung is really, really tough.

Senator Bouchard: I just wanted to have you clarify a point. You commented on increasing full-time faculty, which I think we all love as an idea. Do you mean full-time, tenure-track faculty?

David Cummins: I think we're talking tenure track, you know trying to be strategic and identify the areas where the needs and opportunities are greatest from a university perspective, but we're talking permanent faculty positions.

Senator Lazar: Thank you and would it be possible to have an update when the strategic investments are decided; may we have a follow up presentation to discuss how those investments are made?

Provost Sherman: Of course.

Senator Hulstrum: I just learned that Issue 2 may change our financial picture.

David Cummins: Not in the short run; it should not impact our budget. It will not force us to go back and rethink anything. What it means in the long term? As we're working through these reallocations, we're at the beginning of a new calendar year and our focus is for fiscal '13 already.

Remarks of the President - President Proenza: Much of what Mr. Cummins and Provost Sherman have been able to work out with the help of the deans and all of you is really a positive picture in spite of what appears to be massive reallocation. We're still in a lot better shape than we might have been given the fact that the state effectively took away 15 million dollars and that is a testament to the success that we're having as a result of the work that each and everyone of you do. As I have often said, the end result, colleagues, is that the state is becoming a smaller and smaller fraction of our total budget and that means that we are increasingly in stronger control of our own destiny. It'll be up to us in large measure to assure our own success and that I believe we are doing in great way and so let me share a couple of thoughts.

First of all I can't resist offering a comment that this is a beautiful day in Northeast Ohio. I wish we were all outside and I hope you will quickly find a way to enjoy it after the meeting and enjoy some of that sunshine that will soon turn to into what we used to call in Alaska, termination dust or snow.

What I thought I would do this afternoon is just share a couple of thoughts. I began a couple of months ago to share with our trustees some of the broader pressing issues that are facing higher education here and abroad. And indeed about two months ago at the last not the immediate last but the previous Board meeting I talked about the fact that we are seeing a great deal of criticism about our industry, higher education. We're seeing it in the press. We've seen it in the Congress. We're seeing it in Columbus and across all the state capitals. We're seeing it from a variety of perspectives, some of it reflects, as all of you know, the sense that many people have about the difficulties in the economy. It is indeed daunting in many cases and in many other aspects it helps to some parts of the economy and in some respects a great deal of the economy is doing very well. It also helps to reflect that a great many of our students are finding very, very good jobs if some I understand are not. But these are cycles that we go through. And so, too, is the

criticism that we are seeing of higher education. Those of you that have a few gray hairs like I do, perhaps remember some of the criticism that was the 70's and the early 80's. Indeed, across every set of historic periods there have been many analogous times and books that you can point to, *The Hollow Men* and others of that sort come to mind. And yet there are important books that continue to be published that bring to mind a much more balanced picture of what is happening in America and in higher education. Certainly we invite you to read more broadly and to examine carefully all that is being written and not simply believe that which is so easy to allege in the press and which the press is so easy to pick up and suggest as if it were the truth. The truth usually is far more nuanced and there are typically always two sides to every story.

Likewise in recent months, and when I addressed the Trustees at the most recent meeting, is the fact that whether we like it or not there are two industries in America, education and healthcare that are under increased duress. Not only because people are finding a lot of things to criticize about us and about our colleagues in healthcare, but because these two elements in our society are regrettably beginning to consume larger fractions of the gross domestic products and in the minds of some analysts to potentially begin to approach an unsustainable increase in the cost associated with those two very important functions in our society. As my colleague Mr. Mallo likes to say, reasonable minds can differ but the fact is that in both education and healthcare we have yet to reach that ceiling of elasticity. Obviously, we are blessed in this country and in others by having a very robust system for putting us in the pursuit of our health and in helping those who might otherwise be really damaged by the advent of unforeseen circumstances. You are no doubt aware that our country spends more per capita on education than any other country, and just as it is in healthcare, not the best performance across the world. In higher education we were, a few years ago when I began speaking about these topics to you, third in the percentage of our population that attained a higher education degree. We've now dropped to seven or eight. I believe the latest OACD report suggested that we might actually be twelfth in participating in creating a tertiary education degree. In K-12 we've dropped virtually to the bottom. Many of you who've studied this would know the details. I certainly commend the OADC to your attention and to your review because they are daunting and also I would recommend to your attention the most recent review by the Academy of Arts and Sciences, the report is titled *Rising Above the Gathering Storm Revisited, 2010*, out this past year. What that means is that there will

be a lot of factors pressing upon us and again, whether we like it or not, healthcare and education, so called *eds and meds* in our society, which at the one hand are becoming the anchor institutions for most metropolitan economies are at the same time being challenged by the changing nature of the economy itself and by the changing nature of the technologies that are being brought to bear to support either healthcare or education.

And I know some of you will remember that I shared with you some years ago an article that appeared in *Science Magazine* by a Columbian University professor, Ellie Nole, where he very clearly stated there that for any industry regardless of what it is, if you change the nature of economic forces impinging on it or the nature of the technological forces which it demands at some point that industry, that set of organizations must themselves change. And I believe that is what we are going to see. I therefore urged our Trustees and I urged this academic community to examine carefully what it is that we do, how it is that we do it, and quite simply begin to ask how we can we do it more effectively, more efficiently, and more productively. Because if we don't and we are increasingly less and less dependent on the state for support, it means that we will be shrinking away the surpluses that we might have for reinvestment for each other in our enterprise which is so vitally and increasingly successful.

So what does this mean? Well I was at a meeting of the National Academies just yesterday and the day before where we were looking at the impact of social media, not only on research but indeed on our society. It was absolutely fascinating. Most of you, except some of my good young colleagues, don't have a clue. I certainly don't know what was happening in some of those social media spaces, but it's at the same time so uplifting to see how young people are using the media to advance the very elements of education and/or healthcare. Wow, it just blows your mind. And so what does that mean? Let's be attuned to what's happening. Let's figure it out. And I don't mean just social media. That's something that is a force in our society and we'll see it grow and change and it's changing by the day, companies being formed by the minute out there. And that means that we need to be attuned, that we might need to be participating in some of those things out there and ultimately to find the appropriate way to see in which that could add value to us at the same time that it enables us to remain successful. So there's a little bit of what's

happening in the world. Let me pause there and invite any questions that you may have. And if not, thank you for all that you're doing and do enjoy the sunshine while it lasts.

Senator Speers: Do you anticipate, while we're flat-lining in enrollment, that we're still going to have to increase tuition every year? And I'd like to addendum my first suggestion and say that we could freeze all salaries, including mine, which would put us in tune with the fact that we are very lucky to have jobs, that we can hang on for a year or two and that it would be all administrators and all faculty.

President Proenza: And I think that the answer lies in the complexity of the situation and not just in one approach. I think that we need not necessarily experience the flat lining of enrollment. I think that since we presently only serve twenty-seven percent of those who might seek our services. We have a significant opportunity to grow our market share since we presently insist that good classes can only be small classes. Perhaps we can learn how to be more productive where appropriate. Since we insist on teaching everybody in a classroom, perhaps we can learn that there are ways of reaching people that may be preferable by them and some analysts are demonstrating that. Certainly if you read Anya Cumminance's book *DIYU* there are many students that are simply choosing to teach themselves. But our society will continue to expect us to provide them some assurance that someone has the skills. So I suggest we invent within our institution or parallel to our institution a new business model in credentialing people whether or not they've taken a course with the university. And I'm sure that there are a hundred and a thousand more avenues towards that end of being successful and not sitting still in other ways.

Senator Mancke: You just used a phrase that caught my ear, a university credentialing people even if they've not taken any courses with us. Can you give us an example of what that means and under what circumstances? I can't imagine the circumstances under which we would credential you and, yet, we have not educated you.

President Proenza: I quite appreciate that this is anathema to tradition, but we already do it. Our advanced course placement we're credentialing, we're certifying that somebody knows something so they can go on at a higher level than they demonstrated in their transcript coming

into the university. So I ask you why would it not be possible to use our skills to have someone come in in whatever way you decide because you are the academy that decides whether somebody knows something or not? But if somebody shows up and demonstrates that they know the course material that you teach, why wouldn't you be willing to certify. I suggest that that is an option we ought to explore. I know it is sacrilegious, anathema whatever word you use, but hey this is the 21st century.

Senator Mancke: I guess I'm just not following you because there are some accepted practices in the university already. We accept transfer credits. I guess I'm not understanding the kinds of possibilities you might be suggesting and if you have something specific to illustrate your point.

President Proenza: I'm not sure that I can give you a concrete example. I have been raising this question for about two decades in various settings. I think it's time for us to explore the fact that all of things that happen within an educational institution don't need to happen in the same way that they've always happened. So I'm suggesting that a student could choose to come to us, not for a course but assessment or whether they've learned something regardless of how they've learned. And I think it behooves us to do it for our better job. I would submit to you that there are some universities that give out a grade that may not reflect that a student learned anything there. Many of you know that I have a very strong public position on the fact that, forgive me, our industry, higher education, has what I believe are invalid measures of excellence. Many institutions and certainly *US News and World Reports* makes a huge weighting for how many students other institutions exclude. And yes, if you know a thousand very good students choose to aggregate with us and we do absolutely nothing for them but they do very well for themselves, does that mean we were a good institution? I would submit not. So I'm suggesting that there ought to be a lot of new things in our thinking and it's time that we move from an input basis for judging academic excellence to output measures. But I invite you to devise those approaches in ways that can keep us from freezing our salaries, among other things. These are fun things to explore and debate. Have a great afternoon.

Remarks of the Provost - Provost Sherman: Thank you Chair Sterns. Certainly, if I could take a minute or two, I'm late because I was on a conference call with Bruce Johnson and IUC

addressing how a committee will be formed to advise the Presidents of the Ohio universities on the definition and the rationale for Enterprise University; on perspectives the universities might take, on the particular mandate relief recommendations, for what other items we might propose, be items for academic relief, as well as providing input recommendations on probably what the real intent is of declaring an enterprise university system, and its proposed scholarship funding. The Chancellor has advocated for merit-based aid for students attending Ohio universities. So I'll be happy to report back to you on the progress of that committee, but today was an orientation conversation.

We had two very good forums over the last couple of days related to student academic success and certainly appreciate the high attendance, I think about 350 or so faculty, staff, and students attended. Vice Provost Ramsier and others have been working a lot on applying data to make us better understand student academic success so we are in a position to be distinctive in that regard. So we'll look forward to additional conversations that link to consideration of scholarship redesign, of a new enrollment strategy, of appropriate course offering sequencing so students can undertake the first two years of their curriculum without having to figure out what course to take in what sequence. But be provided the opportunity to have the courses in the right sequences so they and we can spend more time interacting to their advantage and our advantage. That's all I wanted to say about that. It is part of the HLC reaccreditation discussion, so we anticipate additional conversations in that regard. Finally, I heard the President refer to "termination dust" that's snow. Based upon the decisions we had to make last year about closing campus on bad, hazardous weather conditions and realizing today there was an article in the paper about the weather we can anticipate this winter, I think I prefer to call it "cancellation dust" or "sleeplessness dust," given the fact that we might be up very early some mornings considering issues of safety both for our faculty, staff and students. With that I'll end my comments.

VI. Senate Elections: Election of faculty representatives to University Council - Chair

Sterns: We now turn to the Senate elections for three faculty representatives to University Council.

Chair Sterns called for nominations for the first representative (Faculty Senator, three year term). Senator Erickson nominated Senator Lillie for the three year term. With no other nominations, Senator Rich motioned that nominations be closed and Senator Lillie be elected for the three year term by acclamation. **The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.**

Chair Sterns called for nominations for the second representative (Faculty At-large, non-senator, two year term). Secretary Bove nominated David Witt from the School of Family & Consumer Sciences. Senator Shanks nominated Elaine Fisher and Cheryl Buchanan from the College of Nursing. With no other nominations, Senator Erickson motioned that nominations be closed and the election carried out by secret ballot. **The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.** David Witt received the majority of ballots cast and was elected for the two year, at-large term.

Chair Sterns called for nominations for the third representative (Faculty Senator, one year term). Senator S. Clark nominated Senator Erickson for the one year term. With no other nominations, Senator Rich motioned that nominations be closed and Senator Erickson be elected for the one year term by acclamation. **The motion was seconded and passed without opposition.**

VII. Committee Reports

Academic Policies Committee - Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns.

Academic Policies Committee presents two items for your information, they are the updates mentioned previously by the Chair on the convergences of the College of Arts and Sciences with the College of Creative and Professional Arts and the College of Health Sciences with the College of Nursing. Academic Policies Committee reviewed and discussed the reports at their meeting this past October 3rd and brings this for your information. Are there any questions? I'd be happy to try to answer them.

The second item of business, I would like to ask this body's permission to bring forward a resolution for your consideration that did not meet the seven-day window in advance of the convening.

Chair Sterns called for a motion to waive the seven-day requirement. **The motion was made, seconded, and passed without opposition.**

Associate Provost Ramsier: The resolution as printed on this one-page sheet concerns a proposal from the faculty of the College of Engineering to establish a center for Surface Engineering and Lubrication Research within the College of Engineering. The Academic Policies Committee discussed this request and unanimously requests that it be brought forward to you today. If I may, I would prefer not to read every word on the resolution except the end:

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Policies Committee on October 3rd, 2011 unanimously recommended the establishment of the Center for Surface Engineering and Lubrication Research within the College of Engineering at The University of Akron.

With no further discussion, Chair Sterns called for the vote on the resolution. **The resolution passed without opposition.**

Computing and Communication Technology Committee - Secretary Bove: The CCTC met yesterday and elected a new chair, Dr. Scott Randby of Associate Studies.

ad hoc Student Judicial Policy Committee - Senator Rich: The ad hoc Student Judicial Policy Committee had planned to offer for your consideration amendments to the Code of Student Conduct. However, within the last day or two some issues have surfaced that the committee has concluded require it to go back and change a few proposed provisions of the code. And so at the risk of appearing to be to you like Lucy withdrawing the football just before Linus attempts to kick it, we will not be asking Faculty Senate to act on the Code of Student Conduct today but rather plan to bring it back a month from now.

ad hoc Committee on Part-time Faculty Issues - Senator Osorio: You have our committee report. We met with Vice Provost Ramsier in September and we have come up with a couple of items, actually three items we would like to request, two of them require some kind of research, I

would like to propose an amendment at this point to the resolution to have that research reported back to the Senate.

Senator Osorio moved to amend the resolution to insert, “and report findings to the Faculty Senate.” **The resolution amendment was seconded and passed without opposition.**

Senator Osorio: Okay, so there are two concerns that we would like to get a report on. One would be technology and what the current status is. Quite a few part-time faculty members have complained that they don’t have adequate technology to use either in the classrooms for their teaching with computers or to keep up with student communication needs on Springboard, etc. Hopefully, they’ll be able to look at how technology is distributed, especially with this new rollout. The second concern is adequate office space. There are many people who are in wide-open pens; there are four, five, or six people in there at a time. It is very difficult to create any time for students and the students and faculty are uncomfortable with this. Those two were the ones we were asking for a report. The third concern regards part-time faculty orientation. It was held last year, but not this year. We would like that this be held annually. And I can take any questions.

Provost Sherman: We’re more than happy to deal with issues of technology for part-time faculty as well as raise office space considerations, no problem there. And with regard to the orientation, this must have been a hiccup because I would have fully expected there would have been so we’re looking into why that did not take place.

With no further discussion, Chair Sterns called for the vote on the resolution. **The resolution passed without opposition.**

VIII. Unfinished Business - Chair Sterns called for items of unfinished business; there were none.

IX. New Business

Reorganization of the Department of Geography and Planning - Chair Sterns: The item on the agenda is the reorganization of the Department of Geography. And I've asked Dean Midha if he would join us today and tell us what is happening with the Department of Geography and Planning.

Dean Midha: Good afternoon everybody; I'll keep it short so we can go outside. Over the last 15 months or so, the Department of Geography and Planning has gone from a faculty size of about twelve to about five. We formed a committee to explore the convergence of Geography and Planning with Public Administration and Urban Studies. The committee was formed and based on the deliberations in that committee it was quite clear that the match for the convergence of these two departments was not a good one. Most of the faculty expressed their desire to be aligned with the Geology Department and one expressed the desire to be aligned with Public Administration and Urban Studies. Therefore, in some way the Geography curriculum and the degree offering is aligned with the Geology Department and planning degrees are aligned with Public Administration and Urban Studies.

As far as the degree offerings and the course offerings are concerned, they remain intact. No numbers have been changed; even the department name change has not taken place. The faculty of Geology and Environmental Science along with the faculty of Geography will be coming up with a proposal for a possible name change. That proposal will go through the normal channels, going through BCC in our college, then going to APC, and then coming to the Faculty Senate. Likewise if any changes would ever take place in Public Administration and Urban Studies the same process will be followed. It will be earlier in the Geography and Geology divisions than in Public Administration and Urban Studies because there are some issues in the department of Public Administration and Urban Studies. A new committee is being formed there chaired by John Green and they are studying the possibility of having a school of public policy and urban affairs and we'll see what alignment can take place between some faculty of political science and some faculty of economics and some faculty of urban studies and public administration. So that recommendation is supposed to come to us by the end of this fall semester. Any progress towards changing curriculum or changing the name of the departments, because of the planning factor of the alignment, will probably take place in the spring semester; whereas, Geography and

Geology could start this semester. Incidentally, I learned yesterday that until 1970 on this campus there was a department of Geology and Geography. So we'll do all the things through the normal course of action when the committees form later. That's my statement on the Department of Geography and Planning. And I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Lillie: I'd like to commend Dean Midha on having such a complete explanation of the process that is being brought forward. I think part of the confusion was due to the item posted on September 20th in the e-mail digest. So I'm really glad to hear that that was sort of planned and it hasn't actually occurred and the process is going to continue as outlined. Thank you.

General Education Requirements - Chair Sterns: The Executive Committee is bringing forward a resolution. I did have the opportunity this morning to meet with Provost Sherman and he wanted me to communicate to this body that the resolution has his full support. The resolution reads:

Whereas, The last substantial revision of the General Education requirements for the University of Akron took place in 1993; and

Whereas, An ad hoc task force organized by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, in which college many existing general education requirements are located has initiated a review of the general education program from the perspective of the College of Arts and Sciences; and

Whereas, This task force communicated with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee about its initiatives, seeking the support and endorsement of that body; and

Whereas, The task force has made recommendations which it believes should be considered as informing a University-wide review of general education requirements and their function; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate is the legislative body of the faculty with regard to its academic mission; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate create a University committee reporting jointly to the Faculty Senate and the Provost, charged with reviewing the general education program of the University of Akron and reporting its findings to the Senate and Provost no later than April 1, 2012. The committee shall consider principles proposed by the Arts and Sciences task force for the effectiveness of their application University wide. Members of this committee shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which shall

consider recommendations for appointment from the members of the current task force and from other sources; and

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate commends the initiative and collaboration of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of that college, and the members of the task force for their essential work on this topic and for laying critically important groundwork for future considerations of the topic.

Senator Woods: What is the interaction with that committee and GEAC that is already established?

Chair Sterns: All of these recommendations would come to GEAC eventually. We need to have a full discussion at all levels of the university so that there is a well developed proposal that will come to GEAC through the approval process. But in this case because I think this is so important to the university as a whole, that it makes the most sense to do this collaborative approach in this resolution. This would not undo anything that has been done so far; it only supports it. It gives it a full level of faculty involvement.

Senator Lillie: Mr. Chairman, this relates to GEAC in the sense that one of the things that we discussed with the Executive Committee was that a lot of the foundational work has been done by the Arts and Science group under the direction of Dean Midha and Linda Subich. We had hoped that perhaps in, over, and above those members of the task force who may also wish to serve, we would ask for some members from GEAC for the liaison purposes so that there would be some kind of connection with that particular body. That seemed to be the sense of it.

Dean Midha: I will admit I'm confused by the resolution that has been read, so I might ask for it to be read one more time after I explain what has taken place. Earlier this summer I was approached by Provost Sherman to look into gen ed requirements on this campus and across the country. We informed Provost Sherman that on this campus the revision of general education has not taken place since 1993. We also informed the Provost that last time the process took seven years. We formed a small subcommittee of five very respected faculty in Arts and Sciences to look into trends in general education requirements. We presented that to the Provost for his consideration. He then requested us to take that to Senate Executive Committee. They

gave us feedback, they liked us. So now I'm a little bit confused, of course. I don't have the resolution in front of me, but I heard somewhere that this is a committee of Arts and Sciences; well that's not the case. I think that's what we tried to explain two days ago when Senator Sterns approached us. But I'm seeing a big change between then and now.

Senator Rich: Mr. Chairman, I believe Dean Midha has simply misunderstood the resolution. The references to Arts and Sciences were acknowledgements of the work that had already been done. They were not references to the university committee that this resolution would create. The university committee this resolution would create is a university committee, not an Arts and Sciences committee.

Senator Mancke: I was one of the members of the initial committee so I just want to make a couple of comments about it. In reference to the 1993 change, before that change was made, all general education courses were actually in University College and had University College numbers. And when that transition took place in 1993 many of those courses were moved into departments and so that took a long time. But one of the things that didn't happen in moving those courses into departments is that there was not a good integration of the general education program with the baccalaureate program. They are seen by students as being very distinct aspects of their education. What the committee took as its task was how to rethink the relationship between a general education curriculum which provides broad skills and broad knowledge with a major which provides deep skills and knowledge. So what the committee has done is to create a conceptualization of how we might discuss and implement a change that would more fully integrate general education into the baccalaureate program so that it is an integrated program. Part of our objective was to address this whole issue of the relationship with University College and the general education program was one of those steps of greater integration. We did not address any of the courses in the current general education program. We did not address the curriculum itself. That is appropriate to the departments. That is appropriate to the Senate. That is appropriate to the entire faculty. So for anyone who is concerned that we may be targeting your course for the chopping block, we're not. Those are all up for discussion. Provost Sherman recommended that we move it to the Faculty Senate and that we create a broader committee that was across the whole university and that would bring the skill and the

knowledge expertise for the range of general education. One of the issues has been to keep this process moving because we would like to do it in a two-year timeframe and we initially envisioned a three-year timeframe and Provost Sherman said can we do it in two-years so we said fine. So I think part of the confusion here is that because the Senate only meets once a month. It was between last month and this month that members of the committee were identified and the committee constituted. There is a constituted committee and I think it's only appropriate that those been read off.

Provost Sherman: Yes if I might, that's exactly my understanding with regards to endorsing this resolution. And that is to align the Faculty Senate interests with the members of the General Education Revision Steering Committee that has been appointed. In a sense that committee is now dually appointed by myself and the Faculty Senate. That provides the opportunity for the Faculty Senate to consider and assure that membership of that committee is appropriately reflected in particular so that the appropriate level of interaction with Faculty Senate and its various committee can happen as the deliberations proceed. So I think my interpretation of the intent of this resolution is exactly aligned with how Senator Mancke stated it.

Senator Cerrone: I guess my question will be answered when the list is read, I was just curious if there's anyone from Summit College represented on that committee.

Senator Scotto: I too wanted to clarify that there was a committee that was created and that committee is called the Revision Steering Committee. What is the difference or how is it connected to the general education advisory committee, are those two committees going to exist as Faculty Senate committee, and how are their missions different?

Senator Mancke: The general education advisory committee was moved from a Provost's committee to a subcommittee of the Curriculum Review Committee at the end of last year. So the general education advisory committee is designed to review proposals for general education courses. It is not currently defined in the current rule as being a committee that looks at the broad issue of general education so the committee that was constituted and this committee is to look at the broad issue of general education in this university. Any curriculum proposal

associated with these changes would go through the normal curriculum process and would end up in GEAC for consideration.

Senator Hanson: I'd just like to make a recommendation that a professional advisor is included in the committee to discuss how the general education courses would fit into a broader academic plan.

Senator Woods: I would like to request a slot be on there for a representative of Wayne College.

Senator Lillie: Mr. Chairman, Provost Sherman and I have been discussing ways in which we might clarify this. He has a statement that he's written that we both think represents the sense of what we're trying to do here.

Provost Sherman: Thank you very much. Basically, what I understand we're attempting to accomplish is that the Provost, with the support of the Faculty Senate, will collaborate with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to form a general education revision steering committee using the general education taskforce findings previously referred to as a basis for consideration of general education reform. And that there be regular reports to the Faculty Senate on progress of the steering committee, notwithstanding a major report to the Faculty Senate on April 15th. So basically with your endorsement I would work with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to adjust the committee structure, the committee would use the taskforce report as the basis for which it would move forward, and that committee would give regular reports to the Faculty Senate, notwithstanding a major report to the Faculty Senate on April 15th, 2012.

Senator Mancke moved to amend the resolution for the committee to report back to the Senate, "no later than April 1, 2012." **The resolution amendment was seconded and passed without opposition.**

Senator Lazar: Does the amendment as presented have a finite composition of people?

Senator Rich: Under the resolution as is always the case, the Executive Committee appoints the members of the committee. Now the discussion in the Executive Committee, I think it's fair to say there was a unanimity on this, was that the Executive Committee would appoint the members who've already been listed and consider the possibility of some additional appointments to achieve a balance. There have been suggestions made already today that seem to me to be good suggestions that I feel confident the Executive Committee will take into account and I believe act on it. But as a purely technical matter it is on this resolution for the Executive Committee to make the appointments.

With no further discussion, Chair Sterns called for the vote on the resolution. **The resolution passed without opposition.**

X. Good of the Order - Chair Sterns called for items for the good of the order; there were none.

XI. Adjournment - Chair Sterns called for a motion to adjourn. **The motion was made, seconded, and approved without opposition.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney