

12-1-2011

Transcript from Faculty Senate Meeting December 1, 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. "Transcript from Faculty Senate Meeting December 1, 2011." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 1 Dec 2011. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/45>

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*
December 1, 2011 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, December 1, 2011 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Building (BCCE 201). Chair Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

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

I. Approval of the Agenda –

Chair Sterns – I'm going to call the Senate into session. First business is the approval of the agenda, might I have a motion to that effect. (motion by Lillie, 2nd by Huff) Discussion, Senator Huff.

Senator Huff: I second it.

Chair Sterns: All in favor please say aye. (aye) Any opposed? (none)

II. Approval of the Minutes -

Chair Sterns – The October minutes were e-mailed this morning to all senators, we can either act on them now or we can wait til the next meeting. How many people had a chance to really review them today? So if no one objects I'll hold over the approval til the next session.

II. Chairman's Remarks and Opening Comments –

Chair Sterns: In terms of today's Chairman's remarks we have a great deal of business to do today so I'm going to keep my remarks as brief as possible. I do want to say though that as we have this last session of the fall semester that we have been able to accomplish a great deal in this last time period and I think we're all extremely pleased with the fact that the University Council has had its first session and another session to happen on Monday so indeed that is in

movement which has been a major goal. And the Faculty Senate is looking forward to collaborating extremely in a very positive way with the new University Council. I also want to thank all the senators and committee members for their work this year we've very much appreciated the cooperation we've had in working together, I especially want to say a sincere thank you to the Executive Committee who as exciting as these Senate sessions are, we have many more in our conference room in Schrank North and in that regard I want to thank each and every one of them for their counsel and support and for their needling and pushing me at various times, kept me on the right track. So without any further ado thanks to everyone and we'll turn now to the report of the Executive Committee.

Reports

Executive Committee – Frank Bove – Thank you Chair Sterns. Good afternoon senators, there are several items on today's agenda that may generate significant debate, in light of that my remarks will be very brief. The committee held a regular meeting on November 10th, topics discussed included the positive feedback from the faculty regarding the Senate's new website, the election of Harvey Sterns as Chair of the UC Physical Environment Committee, the progress of the college convergences, the 26 million dollar liability and the e-learning initiative underway at the university. The committee also generated a preliminary agenda for the November 17th meeting with the President and the Provost. On the 17th we discussed the e-learning initiative and the 26 million dollar liability issues, these fruitful discussion added a clarity to the understanding of the common goals, the barriers and the processes involved. We discussed the next organizational steps for University Council and its committees in order for election of officers to begin its work. We also talked about the Wayne college faculty integration and the general education transformation committee. The committee has also spent a tremendous time thoughtfully appointing faculty not only to the University Council standing committees but also to the General Education Transformation Committee and the E-Learning Strategy and Implementation Committee. You should have before you a handout that lists all the appointees to date. That concludes my report. Thank you very much for your service to the Senate and the university and I'd be happy to take any questions. Thank you very much.

Chair Sterns: It is now my pleasure to call upon President Proenza for remarks...

Senator Mancke: A question.

Senator Lazar: My apologies Frank, I don't know if this is the right place to bring this up, I appreciate the great amount of work that everyone is doing and the wonderful reports that we receive. If it would be at all possible to receive them any earlier I think that would be a great help to the senators really being able to process this information, have an intelligent discussion and be able to give the real feedback that the senate needs to give to these very important concerns. Thank you.

Remarks of the President

President Proenza: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Chair Sterns has given me my instructions about being brief so I'll endeavor to do so, I really just have three things to accomplish this afternoon. The first is to echo Harvey's and Frank's thanks to all of you, indeed to the entire campus community for a very fine fall semester, for a very fine calendar year. This university continues to achieve many great things and be recognized for those achievements in new and important ways and it is a tribute to you, your students, your fellow faculty and staff and so my heartfelt thanks to all of you for the hard work and diligence that continues to bring a great credit to the university. In a similar vein I want to of course wish you all a very happy holidays and the middle part of my remarks is to encourage you to, in light of what I'm about to say, to use some of the relaxing time that I hope all of us will enjoy this seemingly has been one of the busiest falls I've ever experienced. But to use some of that relaxing time both certainly to enjoy relaxing, to enjoy your families and to perhaps reflect on some of the challenges that are facing higher education, our own university and the nation in other ways. So I just want to reflect on that a little bit and via report on a recent visit by the governor.

You no doubt have heard that there are new realities, a new kind of reality facing higher education and we're going to see some of this reflected in new challenges in Ohio the budget continues to be constrained and there is this concept of Enterprise University entity that will have to massage and work through during the year. At the national level undoubtedly you are following the widespread concern about the rising cost of higher education as well as the

question of actual attainment of or graduation rates. I'm pleased to tell you that we're actively participating in that national and statewide dialogue and in many cases setting some of the conversations going and bringing in some of the ideas to the table certainly the work Rex Ramsier has done on the student achievement and how we might devise pathways for student success is a testament to what we're doing. We're also shaping some of the conversation with graduation rates and we'll have more to say about that, but these are serious conversations and some of them are occluded by either traditional measures as I remarked to you today, Dean Midha has just come in and just yesterday he did a fantastic analysis of the fallacy of using percentage growth rates when you're comparing two different values for example one which is very high one which is very low. It simply leads to misleading conclusions, thank you Chand for that analysis. So examine those kinds of concepts and then please note a couple of other things. Early this week the state superintendent of schools was on our campus and he said very clearly that he believes and I agree, that we're not expecting enough of our students particularly in K-12 and to a certain extent perhaps also in college at times. He's also very concerned and again I concur because the rating of schools achievements in Ohio and in many parts of the nation when the state says that a school is "Excellent" they're really saying that the students have achieved 40% of the correct answers in the regular tests that are used to characterize achievement in school. And we know of course that 40% of the students that come to us or to any other university across the nation are unprepared for college. I know that I've shared with you the observation that I came to the United States as a young boy from another country, it was fully two years after I had arrived here before I started learning anything new substantively other than English. That's a telling observation that some of you that have traveled abroad can immediately understand. And that's lead me to say and to write about the fact that for two reasons, one historical and one which I've just related today's college is in a sense yesterday's high school. What I mean by that is that at the turn of the 1800's to the 1900's our nation very affirmatively said that the industrial revolution had brought forward a new requirement for national education attainment and they said that all of our young men and women should go to school through age 18 effectively through high school and somehow or other as we've approached the twenty-first century and are now into it, we're all saying that college is the new requirement and it's certainly reflected in essentially 85% of all jobs today requiring a college degree or maybe even more or some college in some cases, and needless to say our nation has yet to say that is the new

standard, that is the new equivalent of what was required for 18 years of education before. We can talk about that later but it also brings to point the question that I've raised with you if today's college is yesterday's high school, what will be the next generation of higher education? We've yet to define that except of course by graduate education. And this is important ladies and gentlemen because as I observed to my leadership team this morning unfortunately as an astute observer it's somewhat problematic when Americans show up increasingly on the world stage with a great big sign hung around their necks "I'm very expensive and I really don't know very much". Think about that and please do reflect on what it is that we have to do. So what I'd like for you to reflect on over the holidays when you feel like relaxing in a intellectual sense, how do we expect more from our students, how do we expect more from ourselves? Let me conclude my remarks this morning by saying or simply telling you about a visit by the state's governor, John Kasich, to our university last Tuesday. He had asked after many conversations to come and witness some of the work we were doing in collaboration with several companies across Northeast Ohio and also some of the start-up companies that we've been responsible for generating. He stated quite openly "this is exciting stuff that we have here" and I can tell you that of the twelve companies that were represented there folks like Timken, FirstEnergy, Parker Hannifin, Lubrizol and start-up company Segment and Megajewel among others Akron Polymer Systems being one, it really communicated to the governor that this is a university that understands collaboration with business understands the value of working collaboratively as certainly you have demonstrated here internal to the university and so for whatever it is worth we are at least for a little while in good stead with those in Columbus. Mr. Chairman, I hope that wasn't too long. Enjoy the balance of your meeting, I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Sterns: Senator Elliott.

Senator Elliott: Hi, as the treasurer of the AAUP I get a report on the number of full-time faculty at The University of Akron. That number was 695 last year and it's 653 this year. So while we had a 6% increase in roughly round numbers for our salaries, that's a 7% decrease in our numbers. So that's actually a step backwards. So if the university total budget is going up then the percentage that's faculty salaries is going down. Last year that number was 15% that's the

fraction of the total university budget that's spent on faculty salaries. So this year it must be closer to 14%. So when I reflect on why higher education prices are going up I come to a pretty quick conclusion. But I don't know how to communicate that to you or to the governor. So if you can give us any advice on that.

President Proenza: Well a lot and clearly perhaps when we have more time we can take it up fully, but let us please understand and the Provost can address this more fully, that we fully recognize that we need to increase the number of faculty and there's a plan to do so by the number of roughly 200 over the next several years in a very aggressive and strategic investment plan that I believe you've heard from him at least in part if not in full. You're question about cost is really a much more complex one than we have time to address. But Chand Midha as I said did a very careful analysis, we have a dichotomy emerging in higher education between the private universities and by that I mean you know the recognized institutions large and small and public universities both large and small, I'm not talking about the proprietary institutions now. And please don't feel threatened by the proprietary institutions but do understand that they are doing something that the public appears to be responding to and that is a challenge to us to explore new ways of doing things. Specifically what is happening is that private higher education began just a few years ago the data that Chand analyzed I think he got in 2005 approximately was that correct Chand?

Chand Midha: No it was 2000-2009.

President Proenza: Approximately the last ten years and of course the private university tuition began about 20,000 dollars it's now at about 40,000 dollars but the national reports have it showing it increased only about three or four percent per year net cumulative total of about thirty-five percent whereas public higher education it increased by a larger annual percentage rate and by a cumulative total of seventy-five percent. But hopefully you understand enough mathematics that's on a base of about 40,000 dollars initially. So both have doubled but the net increase in one is about 20,000 dollars and the net increase in the other is about 4,000 dollars. There's another dimension however which should trouble us and that is the salaries for our colleagues in private institutions are growing faster than ours as are other forms of revenues to

those institutions. At the same time we have significant what we refer to as unfunded mandates one of which comes from the generosity of our state when they take away money from us the other from the generosity of our federal government when they expect certain reports that are very time intensive and usually for each legislative requirement it requires a person so those and many others some of which our own fault, we need to spend more time addressing that very important issue and thank you for highlighting it. Anything else?

Chair Sterns: Senator Bouchard.

Senator Bouchard: This is something which you might not be aware of so I just wanted to tell you, it involves the Faculty Research Committee which is a subcommittee of the Senate and I'm on it. We still don't have a budget for the year and I don't know if you even realize this but this is a real problem because we should have been advertised in November for people to get proposals together over Christmas to put them in in January so we can make a decision before Spring Break so they could know what they're doing in the summer.

President Proenza: Rex, Mike could you see to that question please?

Senator Bouchard: And part of it also we've been told by the Vice President for Research that if we're really lucky this year we'll get approximately half of what we got a few years ago because as his budget has been decreased he's taken most of that out of the summer research money. We got sixty-five applications last year so this is clearly something...

President Proenza: Oh, this is the summer research money, ok.

Senator Bouchard: But we have to get rid of the during the year research money when our budget was cut so this is very important seed money.

President Proenza: We'll get back to you at the next meeting.

Senator Bouchard: It's just an important thing I wanted to make sure you knew about.

President Proenza: Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Any other questions for the President? If not thank you very much and have a happy holidays. Remarks of the Provost.

Remarks of the Provost - Provost Sherman: Good afternoon, I apologize for being late, I was at a talent dividend meeting where individuals that are helping with the education continuum are discussing how we might propose a an area strategy related to baccalaureate degree completion, associate degree completion and I'll update the group probably at the next meeting on those exciting activities. I think last meeting I indicated that I would review with you comments made to the Board of Trustees as well as add some comments unrelated to the Board of Trustees meeting. First I wanted to wish everybody a great holiday season and a new year and indicate that now is the time to reflect and be thankful for opportunities that exist and outcomes that have been achieved. And with regard to those, I reported to the Board that amongst our many successful and licensure and certification passage results. The passage rates for Audiology is 98%, the passage rate for Speech, Language Pathology is 96%, the Nursing passage rate compared to a state average of 87% is 94%. And for Law the state average is 87% and ours is 89%. Certainly we have other academic programs that are doing equally well and during future meetings I will bring those to the Board's attention. I indicated to the Board that great success of the faculty discussions and collaborations related to the convergence of the Buchtel College of Arts and Science and the College of Creative and Professional Arts, making sure that I recognized the guidance and support of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate with regard to the processes governing those steps and thanked Dean Midha and his leadership team for successful resolution of a vote recently, actually seven months earlier than we had anticipated wherein 90% voted in favor and 10% were opposed. I indicated that this is a remarkable result and certainly a strong indication of the appropriateness and the readiness of the 4 faculties for this transition. I reported to them that as we discussed here at our last meeting here and at their previous Board meeting, that we predicated a budget on 3.5% growth, our growth was about 1.5% but obviously leaves a budgeted to actuals gap and that led to interactions with deans and their leadership about connecting with approximately 6,000

freshmen/sophomores in the college ready category where each dean and the advisors and the faculty and the staff in the colleges would reach out to students identified in math works as requiring some special guidance and some advice. And I was pleased to report to the Board that to date six of the eight degree granting colleges have at least 80% of these students enrolled in the Spring 2012 certainly that number will increase in the next few days and we'll be working with those two other colleges to achieve equally successful results. I had the opportunity to indicate to the Board that this past year it was wonderful to be able to recognize faculty colleagues for outstanding teaching, research and service wherein the results of a rigorous review process led to our identification of outstanding teachers, researchers and community service and presented to the Board about a 3-minute video recognizing those individuals for those accomplishments as indicated by their faculty colleagues and how they observe their colleagues contributing to the success of students, departments and faculty colleagues. I believe that video will go out in e-mail digest today there will be a link to that and we'll also have a link to a full feature video recognizing each of those faculty members individually. The one we showed to the Board was 3-minutes that featured all of the recognized faculty. I had the great opportunity to begin to interact with colleges and student groups and student vice presidential areas to again kind of provide a contextual framework for about where we were at with Vision 2020. I've engaged them, put the faculties in those colleges into conversations, discussions and dialogue related to opportunities at The University of Akron. We will be compiling that feedback and creating an avenue through which you can see how we are responding to the feedback that we're receiving. I thought however for this feedback I would provide a few components of feedback that we seem to be receiving fairly consistently from students. And I think this just illustrates that we can serve students a little bit better and facilitate their success and would urge the group to consider policies where appropriate to address those issues and concerns. A consistent message has to do with the offering of courses in the appropriate sequence for completion of the degree, were going to be working with the deans to ask for the identification of four year degree programs and then work with the faculty obviously to be able to offer those courses in the right sequence to deliver those degree programs in four years. Obviously that's a dual responsibility, faculty availability and resources for faculty to deliver those courses. The students would encourage us to create the opportunities for grades to happen in courses earlier in semesters than in some cases they are typically experiencing, often times it's very late in the semester before they have an indication of

the success they're achieving in that course and the students asked if any opportunities for classes to more consistently offer feedback earlier in the semester. There was and has been a little bit of concern expressed about faculty office hours, I would just encourage us to encourage our faculty colleagues to meet their office hours and obviously if something comes up where that doesn't work to leave a message on the door or to otherwise alert the class to an adjustment to those office hours schedules. One of the concerns that I'm not quite sure how to express but I'll merely address it from the perspective that I think that as we raise our expectations of our students we do have an obligation to raise the expectations we have of ourselves and I think as we work to enhance the student profile but also as we work towards facilitating a remarkable student experience in ways that are different than we've previously undertaken, we'll certainly be getting more and we'll certainly be giving more. And that's really an opportunity for all of us to make this a distinctive University of Akron. So I thank you very much for the opportunity to make these comments and would entertain any questions that the Faculty Senate might have.

Chair Sterns: Are there questions for the Provost?

Senator Ducharme: yes I had a comment about the students request that they have grades in place before drop date.

Provost Sherman: Earlier in the semester is what they're saying.

Senator Ducharme: Yes, so I know they request that for the purpose of dropping a class if they're not going to get a grade they like. So the flip side of most of that request I believe is this syndrome that just lowers the quality of the degree that they can end up with so if they're going to get a low grade let me know that early so I can drop that so I can retake it drop it, retake it, there's the grade I want. So the quality of the education does not go up by meeting that request.

Provost Sherman: I'm just saying that I'm hearing that, they're telling me I have no information from which to judge the request and I think to the point that that's also why I made the comment that we need to elevate our expectations of them and they'll create higher performance of ourselves. Just please evaluate. I'm hearing more about the timeframe within which grades are

even provided as opposed to what the grades are. And I have no idea is, what the practice is if there's a policy, I'm just asking for that to be given due consideration. But I understand the point you're making exactly.

Senator Ducharme: Cause they want it doesn't mean it's good for them.

Chair Sterns: Other questions? Okay, thank you very much. Have a very nice holiday season.

Provost Sherman: And to you all, thanks.

Committee Reports

Chair Sterns: Is there a report from the Graduate Council? Okay, if not we will turn to Academic Policies Committee. Associate Provost Ramsier.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns. I would ask permission to bring forward some motions from the committee for your consideration for action today that did not make the seven-day window because of the timing of our meetings.

Chair Sterns: Is there a motion to waive the five-day rule? (motion by Hajjafar, 2nd by Speers)
Senator Hajjafar, Senator Speers second. Any discussion? All in favor please say aye. (aye)
Any opposed? (none)

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you. We have three action items today and some simply for information which have been distributed. The action item I would first like to focus your attention on is a request from the College of Engineering faculty to establish the National Center for Education and Research on Corrosion and Materials Performance. After due consideration the Academic Policies Committee has resolved that on November 14, 2011 we unanimously recommended the establishment of this center at The University of Akron. We bring this as a committee as a motion for your consideration.

Chair Sterns: Okay the committee has brought forward a motion, is there any discussion? Okay are we ready for a vote on this? Okay, all in favor please say aye. (aye) Any opposed? (none)

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you. Second item I'd like to bring to your attention and for your consideration is a request from the faculty in the School of Family and Consumer Sciences and the faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences if you seen the background material you understand that when the convergences of the Nursing College with the Health Sciences, Human Services was proposed as well as the Arts and Sciences College with the Creative and Professional Arts there were opportunities for units and departments and programs to move into those new structures in the colleges where they best fit. The Family and Consumer Sciences was a school in the Health Sciences, Human Services College, their faculty have proposed to split the Nutrition and Dietetics and other associated programs into the new Health College, the other remaining faculty and the three programs in the Family Consumer Science section would move the Arts and Sciences College. So that's the basic premise. The faculty requested it, it's been approved by the receiving colleges and by the deans, so Academic Policies Committee resolved on November 28, 2011 unanimously to recommend that the divisions of Child and Family Development including the Center for Family Studies and the Clothing, Textiles and Interiors division be moved to the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences as a school or a department depending on how that structure comes out, of Family Sciences at The University of Akron. This comes as a motion from the committee for your consideration.

Chair Sterns: Okay we have the motion from the committee, is there any discussion? If not, are we ready for the vote? All in favor please say aye. (aye) Any opposed? (none)

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you. Third item from the Academic Policies Committee for your consideration is entitled Recommendation of non-approval of a college name change. You will see from the supporting documentation the APC the Academic Policies Committee began considering the request from the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering to change their name to the College of Polymers and Advanced Materials and at the time in the spring of 2010 to also add a third department in that new college; the department of biomaterials. So since February of 2010 the Academic Policies Committee has been considering this proposal and

variations on said proposal based on our interaction with the college. More recently we requested input from the other colleges that would potentially be affected by the name and/or mission change of the College of Polymer Science, Polymer Engineering that being the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering. We received written feedback from all colleges concerned, invited members from each college to come to our committee to discuss their position, their view. After that, at a very recent meeting on the 24th of November which was this week, Academic Policies Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate not approve renaming and changing the mission of the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering. This comes as a motion from the committee for your consideration.

Chair Sterns: The motion has been presented, is there a discussion of the motion? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I'm just rising to ask for a clarification. The intent that I'm getting from what you're saying is that Academic Policies Committee has decided to oppose this particular effort by the College of Polymer Science. What we have here for a resolution is that we not do something. If there was no resolution that came to us to make the change we would also not do something. So I'm just trying to clarify what the purpose of this resolution in your mind and in the mind of the Academic Policies Committee. So that it's on the record and in the future people will have an idea of what it is it's supposed to mean.

Associate Provost Ramsier: It's a very good question. Academic Policies Committee and many members of the committee are here in person and can speak to mind, I will speak as the Chair of the committee. In my opinion the Academic Policies Committee spent a lot of time working on this issue. I do not, since this came as a motion from a college a vote by the faculty to change their name and mission, that vote and request came from to the Senate via the Academic Policies Committee. I do not believe the Academic Policies Committee should have the right to stop the process and disapprove a proposal and have it not come to this body as we are a standing committee of the Senate, it's the Senate that should make the decision. The committee is recommending that the Senate not approve the request, that's the way I view why this is drafted the way it's been drafted.

Chair Sterns: Further discussion. Senator Gwin.

Senator Gwin: Part of the problem in this is the wording of the motion. Motions are normally expressed in the positive and then voted down. I think the way they got a recommendation from the college to do something I think if you present that to this body and it is voted down that's very clear. But by phrasing it in a negative way then if that is not successful does that mean you endorse it? The problem with phrasing the motion in a negative way it clouds the issue.

Chair Sterns: Senator Rich.

Senator Rich; I think the point is well taken, I think what the committee intended and I was not in the majority on this point, was for the Senate to vote to deny the request by the college. But that still leaves us with this question of a negative vote. I don't think it would be true that the Senate would thereby have approved the proposal in fact we would have to vote to approve the proposal which is why I think the point is well taken. I have a different view about the role of the Academic Policies Committee. I think it is within the purview of the Academic Policies Committee, and I said this in the meeting which I believe I was in a minority of two, I believe it is within the purview of the Academic Policies Committee to decide not to act favorably upon and report that to the Senate a proposal such as this. It's a judgment call I think whether the committee should do that or not but I disagree with Dr. Ramsier on the question of whether it's appropriate or inappropriate for a committee to take such an action. I myself although I certainly understand why the committee would wish to not further consider this proposal having spent a lot of time on it, I'm not sure that it is necessary at this point or advisable for the Senate to take a final position on this proposal, I will say that I think the proposal has not been adequately supported by the college. I certainly would not favor approving it at this point, if forced to vote on whether to approve it or not I would without hesitation vote not to approve it. On the other hand I think that the problem is that the college has not made a good case for a proposal that perhaps has merit. And that's why I have my own view on this and again I was in a small minority on the committee is that there's no need for Senate action on this question at this time. The committee has the ability to control it's agenda, the college cannot dictate to us how much

time and when we spend the time on this proposal. It's a matter of the committee deciding for itself we've heard enough about this for the time being, the case hasn't been made, if you want to go back and make a better case we'll entertain it sometime in the future, but that doesn't mean we'll entertain it immediately upon your submission of it we have other business to transact. So I don't think it's necessary for the sake of allocating the committee's time well that the Senate disapprove this which is what I understand the main argument for us taking action on it is. Now if there another argument it probably ought to be made. But if that's the main argument I think the committee has it within its power to control its agenda in fact I don't see how there could be any question of that.

Chair Sterns: Further discussion. Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: To expand on what Senator Rich has just said a little bit, it would seem to me that if the Academic Policies Committee either made no motion to the Senate or made a motion that was in the act of form and the Senate took action on it in this case refused to endorse the proposed name change, it would be in order for the I'm sure elected senators from the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering to bring their case to the floor of the Senate as well then to return the Academic Policies Committee as well. So I would want to make a point that there is plenty of opportunity for this to occur in the right order and would encourage that that be reflected on by the Academic Policies Committee and by the senators from the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering.

Chair Sterns: Other comments? Are there any senators here from the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering? I believe their attendance record has not been outstanding. This would be a moment when it would be good to have representation on the floor. Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: I would add that the College of Science and Polymer Engineering has actually not been represented on the Academic Policies Committee that's I think a reflection of a lack of exhibition of interest on the part of any members of the faculty of that college I'm observing that certainly as a member of the Executive Committee that had such interest been exhibited we

would have made an appointment but that's in some respects the college has no one to blame but itself for its lack of representation, on the other hand that doesn't mean that the proposal doesn't have merit I have to say that again that I don't think it's been well supported and in many ways the college has been its own worst advocate. But I'm a little concerned that the dynamics of the process have not resulted in a substantive fair, I mean it's been a procedurally fair consideration but I'm not sure it's been substantively completely fair in the sense that there's no one who's really been in a position to make the case except when the representatives of the college were specifically invited and I have to say they didn't make a good case. So again I if forced to vote on this now I would certainly vote against the name change and the corresponding change, but I don't think that it's necessary at this point or wise for the Senate to vote on it.

Chair Sterns: Is there a recommendation for action? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I will rise to move that consideration of this resolution be postponed indefinitely.

Chair Sterns: Is there a second? Senator Schuller.

Senator Rich: I wonder whether Senator Lillie would be willing instead to entertain making a motion to recommit?

Senator Lillie: I sort of like the postpone indefinitely language. I will try to explain it in that regard and that in essence puts off us having to vote on this and helps to avoid the idea that maybe if some if you vote yes you really mean no and it just lets us not have to face that but it doesn't do anything to perhaps later the Academic Policies bringing a new motion. It just says that this one is not going to be considered now or at any time in the future. So for that reason I would think that it was postponed indefinitely it would sort of free the field for perhaps a clearer, more positive means of making this point. In the meantime because the Senate would not have taken actual action then there would not be any kind of change that would occur, it seems to me that then Senator Rich's point that perhaps there is merit to it that the case hasn't been made has the option without the Senate going on record as opposing it in any way. And so for those reasons I sort of would stick with that particular language at this time.

Chair Sterns: Further comments? Senator Mancke.

Senator Mancke: I'm a little conflicted on this issue. I think that part of what I am hearing from the APC report is that the Senate committees and the Faculty Senate should not be a rubber stamp of what colleges want to do without due consideration for the place of the college within the larger university. And I do think that the sense of the APC resolution is to that end. That one college should not just expect the rest of the university to rubber stamp whatever it wants to do. This may not be an appropriate, the best way to do that. But I do think that it is an important statement to make, not just to the college in question but to all of us in the university that we can not go off with ideas that do not necessarily take into account the needs of the rest of the university.

Chair Sterns: Other comments? Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: I think that as long as the Senate doesn't actually approve the name change we've essentially sent that message whether it's by means of postponing indefinitely the consideration of the resolution or whether it's voting to disapprove or deny the request. Either way I think it's clear that there's no rubber stamping going on. And I also think that what happened in the APC itself indicates that there's no rubber stamping going on.

Chair Sterns: Am I missing anyone?

Associate Provost Ramsier: If I could ask a question for clarification. So Senator Rich would be proposing that Senator Lillie's motion to postpone indefinitely does the same thing in effect as voting on the committee's motion after a year and a half's worth of work, to not approve the request? Then I guess I have to question the body as to why they feel better about voting to postpone indefinitely therefore killing something, a proposal from a group of faculty, versus voting against the proposal. To me, the latter makes a stronger statement.

Senator Rich: According to personal privilege, I believe that my statement has been mischaracterized. I was thinking specifically about the question of expressing the idea that there's rubber stamping or no rubber stamping going on. I did not claim that the two actions had identical effects in all respects. But I think if the college asks to have its name changed and its mission changed and one way or the other that didn't get approved, that demonstrates that there's no rubber stamping going on. That was my only point about that.

Chair Sterns: Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: The reason why I arose to make a motion to postpone indefinitely is really due to what I was hearing from people from the other debate indicating that there may be some problems with the wording of this particular motion. Rather than take the time here to try to do that work and given the what I'm sensing is the feeling of this body that perhaps it's not ready to approve the motion to rename the College of Polymer Science it appeared to me that that would be a way to kick the can down the road if you will, it does not kill the idea, it may kill the particular motion but it does not kill the idea. If the motion came forward later from the College of Polymer Science or it came forward at least in a way that would allow the Senate to really go on record as to what it thought I think that then would be a stronger message. This motion this particular resolution does not do that for me. So that is the reasoning why I thought it would be a good way, parliamentary in a way to move things along. It's not at all to reject the amount of work that been done by the Academic Policies Committee but like Provost Ramsier I've been involved in a lot of service, a lot of work, seven or eight years with the University Council exploratory committee, you were involved in that as well, so I'm aware that sometimes it takes awhile for things to get done but I also believe very strongly that it's a good idea to have good process and to make good decisions and to make clear decisions. And so I think particular resolution is not as clear as it could be and that was my way to try to say well let's give people the opportunity to perhaps revise it, come up with a new one in some way to make what might be a great idea stronger.

Chair Sterns: Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: Just as a procedural point, I think that the problem of the phrasing of the motion is easily solved, if the motion to postpone indefinitely is defeated, I will propose an amendment that would change it so that the motion is approve the renaming of the college, if there's a second to that amendment and the body chooses to amend it in that way, then we can vote yes or no on approval and a negative vote would mean that we've just approved it. I think that's an easy problem to solve procedurally.

Chair Sterns: Okay, are ready to vote on the motion to postpone indefinitely. All in favor say aye. (aye) All opposed say nay. (nay) I think we'll have to do a hand count, the Chair was not able to determine the vote. So let's do this by raising your hand please. All in favor please say aye, I'm sorry all in favor please raise your hand. A little negative transfer there. Take a count. (aye = 29) We have 29 for. All opposed? (opposed = 12) Let's start again, sorry. Put your head down on the desk first. 12? That's what I have. So the motion passes.

Senator Speers: Can you give us a nay vote number?

Chair Sterns: 12. If you wish to abstain under Roberts Rules you have to declare I Abstain. And then we will make note of that. Does anyone want to abstain? (none) It's not current procedure to call for abstentions. Okay.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you.

Senator Speers: May I ask a question please? As I understand it you've been approached by the School of Dance/Theatre/Arts Administration to look into the issue of whether we are offering a Masters in Arts Administration, is that the case? Alright well. That's what we're told. Let me just ask this then, if we have a Masters in Theatre Arts, twenty-five years ago we created a component of the Masters of Theatre Arts in Arts Administration and currently now are advertising it on our webpage that we offer a Masters in Arts Administration and a Masters in Theatre Arts my thought is that we cannot advertise that unless we go through the process of getting a Masters through the Ohio Board of Regents.

Chair Sterns: With all respect Senator Speers, we are in the middle of doing committee reports.

Senator Speers: Oh I'm so sorry, alright.

Chair Sterns: With all respect I would like to say we would be very happy to discuss that issue when we, I do not think that this is the time to do it.

Senator Speers: May I talk to you after?

Associate Provost Ramsier: Certainly.

Chair Sterns: I don't mean to be disrespectful.

Senator Speers: No because he was answering the types of questions I thought I would ask it because I can't get a straight answer.

Chair Sterns: And it could come up under New Business as well. We're now moving to the Curriculum Review Committee.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns. Curriculum Review Committee has a report with a recommendation for consideration from the committee. As you can see from the supporting documentation, there were three new program proposals put into the curriculum system, objections were filed by the originators of those programs from the College of Arts and Sciences and Summit College. All of these three new programs in the Associated Degree for new courses that would come with those three programs are in what we have placed under the broad category of Criminal Justice, simply for reference. Arts and Sciences has proposed a new degree program that is based on the current tracks in Sociology and Political Science whereas Summit College has proposed two new Bachelors degree programs building on their current Associates degree programs. As you can see from the documentation and from the synopsis in our report, the Curriculum Review Committee reviewed the written materials, the proposals and the objections, we then requested more written feedback from both the proposers and the

objectors, we then invited representatives from all concerned parties to a meeting to express their views. After that meeting the committee deliberated on what had been heard and what it had read and the committees rationale for its votes which are tallied here in the report is that the committee was convinced that the Arts and Sciences program would more effectively use the courses and faculty in the departments of Sociology and Political Science by creating one program from the existing two. The proposed would require no new resources to implement. Conversely, the committee was not convinced that the proposed Summit College programs built upon the existing degree were efficiently organized or that they could be delivered with the current faculty. The recommendation from the committee to the Senate is that given the apparent redundant nature of these three degree program proposals, and the success of the two currently existing 2 + 2 programs between Summit College and the College of Arts and Sciences the committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the College of Arts and Sciences degree proposal along with the associated new course proposal and recommends that Faculty Senate not approve the two Summit College degree proposals and the associated new course proposals that go with them. This comes for your consideration as a committee report.

Chair Sterns: Your recommendation from the Senator Gerhardt.

Senator Gerhardt: I've got some concerns with the proposal set forth by Arts and Sciences, namely the fact that current Associate degree students who are majoring in Criminal Justice at the Associate degree level would not have a step-up program to a Bachelors degree as the current proposal stands. They would essentially be stranded as it were and in light of wanting to really bring our whole student population up as high as we can a proposal that literally limits student potential is very concerning to me. That's just one of my concerns, I have several faculty members here who have also requested they have a chance to speak in front of the Senate, I'm not sure the protocol for initiating that.

Chair Sterns: The protocol is to ask for permission to speak. So..

Senator Gerhardt: Whoever would like to speak.

(end of tape)

David Licate: Permission to address the Senate. My name is Dave Licate, I'm the lead faculty of the Criminal Justice program, department of Public Service Technologies, Summit College. I have a not so brief statement to make on behalf of the Criminal Justice faculty. On April 4th of this year the Criminal Justice Technology Program e-mailed copies of proposals to Criminal Justice Bachelors degrees to the chairs of Political Science and Sociology before the proposals were even submitted to our own college for review. The Criminal Justice program had every hope of collaborating on the design of a new Criminal Justice Bachelors degree that would satisfy the interests of our diverse population and the demand of the rapidly changing professional community. Unfortunately, Arts and Sciences I'll refer to as BCAS thusly, objected immediately to our proposals and we feel without full consideration of the merits. A BCAS chair stated that his administration was encouraging objection to the Summit College proposals, not on academic grounds but solely based on a fear of losing students to Summit College. These BCAS would then propose their own Criminal Justice degree without Criminal Justice faculty input. The BCAS proposal, a Bachelors degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice with only nine hours of criminal justice courses. The Criminal Justice program, the largest program and the second largest college at this university thought it was reasonable to include more than three criminal justice courses in a program titled "Criminology and Criminal Justice", it's an intro course into electives and not even any of our core courses. We proposed a compromise, BCAS modify their proposals, offer more criminal justice courses and structure their proposal more in line with national standards, they could house this new program in BCAS and lose no students. Summit College would offer the more technical criminal intelligence degree. This arrangement would reflect the current divide between more conceptual justice studies programs and more applied, professional studies programs that more prominently feature technology. After meeting BCAS representatives it became apparent that no compromise would be possible, it was communicated by BCAS that Summit College was never to have a CJ Bachelors degree or upper division courses. So at this point we'd just like the record reflect that the full-time, tenured criminal justice faculty of The University of Akron do not approve of the proposed BCAS degree titled Criminology and Criminal Justice. First, the BCAS proposal is not in the best interest of our students. If the BCAS proposal passes and becomes the Criminal Justice Bachelors at UA, it will strand dozens of Summit College Associate degree students as was referenced earlier. We

have no step up to the new BCAS program. That alone is good enough reason to delay this process or to disapprove this proposal. Again, in the haste to approve a program before Summit College, BCAS did not account for dozens of Criminal Justice Associate degree students that will have no step up program in place if BCAS proposal is approved. Summit College students will be harmed by this proposal. Second, the BCAS proposal is academically deficient in several areas. It is a repackaging of courses that have existed for over a decade, it's not innovative, it does not account for the significant changes that have occurred in public safety in the past decade. The BCAS departments do not have the capacity to extend criminal justice technology to our students in a meaningful way. As currently structured the BCAS proposal will permit UA student to earn a degree titled "Criminology and Criminal Justice" while avoiding the literature in several disciplinary areas such as police studies and legal studies. Third, the Summit College proposals are a response to demands in the professional community. Several agencies were looking forward to students educated in Criminal Intelligence and Analysis program. Programs were vetted by our professional advisory board which meets every semester. We were careful to listen to the demands of the professional community and the demands of our students in constructing our proposals. The programs are modeled after gold standard programs in criminal justice and very successful intelligence analysis programs at other universities. Hours of thought and labor went into each proposal with CJ faculty giving up most of their summer to work on the proposals. Finally, the BCAS proposed degree directly impacts the Criminal Justice Technology program. The lack of collaboration on the part of BCAS should not be condoned or rewarded. We respectfully disagree with the university Curriculum Review Committee's conclusions that BCAS could more efficiently administer a program in Criminal Justice. The evidence would seem to contradict this finding. In the past five years the Criminal Justice program has seen significant growth in enrollment. Our college has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in three new criminal justice labs. The program has updated all three of its Associate degree tracks and added several minors and certificates. We've received virtually every major justice related grant, the latest just two weeks ago to coordinate an initiative that will transition the largest eight police departments to a proactive strategy that is guided by crime analysis and evidence based practices. Certainly the Department of Justice and Ohio's Office of Justice Programs are convinced of our competence and efficiency as they continue to fund our initiatives in a highly competitive environment. In February our new high tech forensics lab funded by a half million

dollar Justice Department grant will open, providing our students with unparalleled opportunities in high technology crime investigation and prevention. We've invested tens of thousands of dollars in state of the art software in crime analysis and forensics, we have partnered with private companies to build one of a kind, automated homeland security technology education stations and that was a \$34,000 investment for our students. The Criminal Justice program is heavily engaged with the community and is often asked to evaluate public agencies and solve community problems. We have been busy and we have accomplished much. Although our action and evaluation research is more likely to produce a report than a peer reviewed article we believe that our contributions to our students, university and community are significant. We feel that our contributions are often misunderstood and the CRC respectfully defaulted to that with which they were familiar with and not necessarily that which is best for our students. It's difficult to argue that BCAS can more efficiently administer a program when full-time Criminal Justice faculty in Summit College teach more sections of crime related courses than Political Science and Sociology combined. The Criminal Justice program offers 45-50 sections of Criminal Justice courses a semester, if one examines the courses offered just this semester you will see that adjunct faculty teach the majority of courses in Political Science and Sociology most of the adjunct faculty teaching related courses in Political Science actually have taught for the Criminal Justice program at Summit College. Where would invest? Would you invest in the companies that produce a product that has not changed in over a decade? That does not engage technology or innovation, that does not listen to demands of its clients and community? Or would you invest in a company that is constantly innovative, has the latest in technology, has added new facilities and new programs and has been careful to listen to the demands of its clients. And now consider this, if others were willing to invest in that company to fund their initiatives would you? Rejection of the Summit College proposals is a rejection of the addition of hundreds of new students at this university. They certainly will not come for the BCAS proposal. Our computer minor in forensics alone generated over a hundred inquiries and media attention when introduced. Student choose UA because of us. We've had students who have completed traditional criminal justice degrees at other universities come to UA for our certificate in forensic studies. The disapproval of our proposals means the disapproval of badly needed courses in intelligence analysis, critical infrastructure protection, financial crime and investigation, advanced crime analysis and advanced legal studies. Such courses would have greatly

contributed to our university and community. Our competitors already have these courses or are developing them. Senators you have a choice; you can look to the past and maintain the status quo by adopting the BCAS proposal or you can make our priority on innovation and creative thinking at this university more than rhetoric by adopting the next generation of criminal justice education. Above and beyond all else, let us act in the best interests of students. At the very least delay this vote and allow us to have a real conversation on the future of criminal justice at this university or vote to disapprove the BCAS proposal. I thank you for indulging me, I know it was lengthy. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Senator Elliott.

Senator Elliott: I have a question for the Provost, if it's allowed for him to respond to it.

Chair Sterns: You can address it to the Chair who will be happy to relate to him.

Senator Elliott: I've heard various rumors about the level of interest the Provost in BS programs in Summit College and at first I heard that they wanted to do more of that and then more recently I've heard that maybe they don't. If the Provost could decide whether there were every going to be available or not then I think that might shed some light on what we have to decide.

Chair Sterns: Well I'm not sure that your question was completely clear.

Senator Elliott: Is the Provost in favor of expanding BS programs in Summit College or does he disapprove?

Chair Sterns: As the Chair I will certainly relay the message to the provost if he'd like to respond.

Provost Sherman: I mean the governance process has to be respected. But in that context the faculty need to be respectful with regard to Bachelors degrees in whichever colleges I think that that is a faculty issue linked to circumstances of student demand, job opportunities and critical

mass of faculty to deliver those programs. I would imagine there's way to collaborate to deliver most academic programs at the Bachelorette level perhaps more effectively and perhaps more efficiently through collaboration amongst colleges and departments.

Senator Ducharme: Yes I wondered if there is someone here who could speak for the BCAS perhaps Matt Lee since his department was so belittled by the lengthy or not so short rhetoric to respond a bit.

Chair Sterns: Well Senator Ducharme is asking.

Matt Lee: thank you for the opportunity, I won't take as much time as, let me say that I disagree with basically everything my colleague in Summit College said about our program and about the process by which we tried to collaborate for about a year in bringing the resources from both colleges to bear on this issue of criminology and criminal justice education at The University of Akron.

Chair Sterns: Excuse me, do you think you could come down? You're standing up there so this side of the room can't see or hear you. And when you come down please reintroduce yourself.

Matt Lee: I'm Matthew Lee, I'm the Interim Chair of the department of Sociology. As I was saying I disagree with the characterization that my colleague from Summit College used in describing both the process by which we attempted to collaborate and also the course offerings that we have in both Sociology and Political Science. The sticking point from the very beginning is we tried to collaborate and develop a program that incorporated resources from colleges boils down to a simple issue. Summit College would not share their curriculum vitas with us, we had no idea what their faculty expertise might be in these areas and we were never able to ascertain what they could bring to the table in terms of offering courses. I received the response dated November 14th to the Curriculum Review Committee from Summit College just last night at 5:30 and this was the first opportunity I've had to look at the credentials of the faculty in Summit College. The ACGS which is the accrediting body for the Criminal Justice programs states that four year degree granting programs must have 2/3 of their faculty with

Ph.D.s. From the list that Summit College provided I count two Ph.D.s for eight faculty. Some of the full time faculty they've listed here there's no degree listed at all. This has been the problem for over a year. We simply can't wait any longer to move forward with an attempt to make better use of university resources in the College of Arts and Sciences to offer one streamlined degree instead of two somewhat competing degrees in Political Science and Sociology. While we're trying to wait for a clear sense of what kinds of resources Summit College might have. Again, we tried to work for a year on this. I don't see in the list of the summary of the criminal justice faculty the kind of expertise in my colleagues in Sociology and Political Science agree with me, that would allow them to offer a four-year degree. Four year degree as I understand them are to be offered by faculty members who are scholar-teachers. Who are engaged in the creation of new knowledge, who are in conversation with other scholars. We haven't been able to ascertain for a year now which scholars the faculty in Summit College are engaged in conversation with. This is one of the many many issues and I don't want to take up the Faculty Senate's time because frankly this has already been debated by the relevant subcommittee which has made a recommendation. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Senator Lazar.

Senator Lazar: Thank you, I have several questions. One, is there an actual resolution in front of the Senate floor? And do we have a copy of that?

Associate Provost Ramsier: You have a committee report with the recommendation.

Senator Lazar: And that's actually the same as the resolution? There's actually something there that we're to vote on?

Associate Provost Ramsier: Yes. In my opinion.

Senator Lazar: Okay, it's just slightly different than what I'm familiar with. My thought is that whereas the Faculty Senate is not to be seen as a rubber stamp nor is the entire Faculty Senate to be seen as a rubber stamp for its subcommittees and not being a member of BCAS or Summit

College I received this documentation on Tuesday, I take my role as a senator very seriously and I have spent as much time as I could devote to reading it. I also see myself as a representative and I feel as though this has not been sufficient time for me to study such a strong problem as this. It's deeply fractured and there's very strong opinions and facts on both sides of the matter. And I feel as though I wasn't able to communicate that to the other folks that I'm representing as well as I was unable to sift through and say well this is these folks say, this is the governing body, this is what they say, I feel as if is not a sufficient time for the Senate to adequately address for a vote right now. And my third point is that this is a much larger problem just in reading it as an outsider this is a much larger problem than who gets to have this program? It's a question of roles of entire colleges in a time period when we are in a great state of change as a university where we're reevaluating our roles and I understand that this is something that's been going on but I feel as though both sides have very strong points and I don't know that it's our role to say okay, the arm wrestling has come to a gridlock, let's us just pick one. So I would prefer to either postpone the vote on the Senate floor or to recommend a third option, neither approving one or the other but saying can we look at a third we have so much strong people on both sides of the fence that really need to be able to collaborate and I'm not comfortable with saying I have to pick one winner in the two. (applause)

Chair Sterns: Senator Mancke.

Senator Mancke: I would respectfully disagree with Dr. Ramsier and I was on the committee so I will take partial responsibility for how this report came to you. I actually think we have three resolutions we have three resolutions on this. And they should all be one resolution is to approve, they should all be resolutions to approve each proposal and the committee would recommend approving the BCAS proposal, disapproving the two program proposals from Summit College so we effectively would have three resolutions because we had three curriculum proposals that we were considering. We should deal with each of those curriculum proposals separately, in the committee we dealt with them separately and so we should bring them to the floor of the Senate so that if as separate resolutions. So if we could change the committee report slightly to recommend the proposal to have a resolution to approve each one of them but the committee chooses to recommend that we not approve two of them. But it seems to me we have

three resolutions on the floor. That addresses the one question. I think we are also dealing with a significant difference in terminology and structure in that the report from Summit College says that criminal justice within their college is a separate discipline. It is not a separate discipline it is a separate degree. Summit College has six departments and it is a degree within one of those proposed degree within one of those departments, that department is Public Service Technology as I understand it. But Summit College structures its programs and its curriculum very differently from the rest of the university and so I think that we are dealing with a large and substantive question about the way in which Summit College fits with the rest of the university and the way in which it defines disciplines in a significantly different way from the standard academic definitions of these which contributes to the problem and contributes to the difficulty of discussing these issues in a meaningful way.

Chair Sterns: Senator Cerrone.

Senator Cerrone: I have a comment from another CRC committee member that she asked to be stated; “the Faculty Senate really has an opportunity today to do what the Curriculum Review could not regarding the three Criminal Justice degree proposals because the committee members were informed they were only provided the vote to either approve or reject the programs, not to table the issue and request further consultation as I think Senator Lazar is mentioning and so I think at that time we do have a diverse range of students at the university and some benefit from either one of these programs an applied program that could be offered through Summit College or a theoretical program offered through BCAS. There’s clearly room for both students and she states that let’s not throw the proverbial baby out with the bath water and she urges the Faculty Senate to seize the opportunity to encourage collegiality, collaboration and consideration of how our students might best be served.

Chair Sterns: Senator Gerhardt.

Senator Gerhardt: I think clearly this is not an issue that should be solved today I mean as was already mentioned this is too much and too serious to take too lightly so I would like to make it a motion to amend the proposal and move to disapprove the proposals by Arts and Sciences.

Chair Sterns: Once again you've got a motion to..

Senator Gerhardt: A motion to amend.

Chair Sterns: To split the resolutions apart.

Senator Gerhardt: At least I guess.

Chair Sterns: We want to make sure that, is there a second to that.

Senator Gerhardt: I guess I'm moving to table.

Chair Sterns: Settle the commentary in here.

Senator Rich: It certainly would be in order to move amend the resolution to change it to disapprove both, that seems inconsistent with what the movement was saying should be done which was to not decide at this point. This would put us in the position of deciding. As to the Chair's question, it would be in order though not necessary to move to divide the question if someone wanted to vote separately on the BCAS and Summit College proposals but if I understand the intent of the movement correctly I think the proper motion would be to move to recommit or as perhaps Senator Lillie would prefer to postpone.

Chair Sterns: Senator Cerrone.

Senator Lillie: To postpone to a time certain.

Senator Cerrone: I motion to table recommit.

Senator Rich: That actually would not be in order. Unless you mean that we should take it up in twenty minutes.

Senator Cerrone: I guess my only concern with recommitting is that the committee was told they were only provided the option of approve or disapprove if it goes back to the committee are they then presented with the same options or are they presented with the option of having the two departments continue consultation and cooperation?

Chair Sterns: It is possible for the Senate to send a message to the fact, Senator Hajjafar.

Senator Hajjafar: As far as collaboration is concerned, this is a history of twenty-five years. Twenty-five years ago this Criminal Justice program was housed in Political Science department and back then they called it two-plus-two program with the C & T College then and the Arts and Science and after two years the students in Summit College and C & T then they used to get a Associate degree and they had the opportunity to move Arts and Science and complete their Bachelor degree. To Arts and Science and complete the Bachelors degree. So there has been collaboration with Summit College, actually in the meeting when we were discussing all of this I wanted to make sure that this new program in Arts and Sciences two-plus-two is still valid. And the chair of the Sociology department guaranteed that it will be the same the Summit College students they can step up. So when we say there is no step up, that's not true, there is a step up is that?

Chair Sterns: Wait a minute.

Matt Lee: Can I respond?

Chair Sterns: You can but you have to wait for him to finish.

Senator Hajjafar: So can I ask him to explain?

Chair Sterns: You can ask the Chair to do that?

Senator Hajjafar: Can you ask the Chair of the Sociology department what happens about two-plus-two?

Chair Sterns: Could you be kind enough to answer the two-plus-two?

Matt Lee: I would like the Chair of Political Science to join me in answering this question. What I said is that historically the advantage of the current program is that students are not required to take foreign language and that gives them a few credits that help them finish their degree quickly. The new program would require students to take a foreign language which is consistent with the Arts and Sciences degree. But it doesn't penalize the students in the sense that they can't complete a Bachelors degree. So that's what I was trying to explain. But there is no such thing in the state of Ohio as two-plus-two. This language is not to be used, is my understanding. There is no, currently there is no two-plus-two. There are ways that the Political Science program attempts to accommodate Summit College students which is to allow them to not take the foreign language and to substitute other courses. But there is no as a formal matter, there has been no two-plus-two for many years on this campus or on any other campus in Ohio.

Chair Sterns: Would you be kind enough to introduce yourself.

Jim McHugh: I am Jim McHugh, chair of the Political Science department.

Matthew Lee: And so Jim can talk a little more specifically about that kind of issue because in Sociology we haven't had it and even there it's not really a two-plus-two.

Senator Hajjafar: So now my question is if your program and your Bachelor degree accepts students from Summit College after their Associate degree..

Matthew Lee: Yes, absolutely.

Senator Hajjafar: That was my question.

Matthew Lee: I said yes, we have no reason not to accept students with an Associate's degree. They will have to take a foreign language which will require them to some additional credits.

Chair Sterns: Well you have to address the Chair sir.

Senator Hajjafar: So that becomes part of the program but after Associate degree students from Summit College can they go to the Arts and Sciences?

Matthew Lee: Yes.

Senator Hajjafar: Okay.

Chair Sterns: Thank you, now I believe we had Senator Mancke and then the permission to speak by Associate Dean..

Senator Lillie: I'm going to rise to a point of order if I may. We had Senator Cerrone who it seemed to me at one point to be in the middle of inciting a motion and then suddenly we moved to other debate and what I want to do in rising to this point of order is to make sure that that's been taken care of and that she hasn't been, she doesn't feel railroaded.

Senator Cerrone: I'll make a motion to recommit.

Chair Sterns: Well if we have a motion to recommit. (2nd by Gerhardt) Discussable? Okay, I'll turn to Senator Mancke and then Associate Dean Zipp.

Senator Rich: Point of order, was there a second? Can I just suggest a modification to it, a recommit, it's advisable to include some instruction so that the committee knows what it's supposed to do and well recommit means it goes back to the committee from which it came but I think the point was to ask the curriculum review committee to work with the representatives of the two colleges to resolve differences and arrive at a mutually satisfactory arrangement. Is that what was indented?

Chair Sterns: Senator Mancke?

Senator Mancke: I don't believe that many members of the Senate understand the role of the Curriculum Review Committee. It is to decide on specific proposals and to make a recommendation and to listen to objections raised. It does not have a mandate to engage in major discussions about the nature of different colleges in this university. Part of what we discussed and one of the things that we did discuss in the meeting is that there was great emphasis put on it is that Summit College is not the rest of the university does not have a clear understanding about what the mandate of Summit College is, how the rest of the university is to interface with Summit College, whether or not some Summit College can do something such as demand that a program in the College of Arts and Sciences drop a foreign language requirement when it has been a traditional part of that college's requirement. It is not the role of the Curriculum Review Committee to discuss the structure of Summit College. If the Senate would like that done I would recommend that it strike an ad hoc committee to look at the structure of Summit College and its interface with the rest of the university but it is not appropriate to send it back to the Curriculum Review Committee for that to happen in that committee, we have no mandate to do it, we cannot do it.

Chair Sterns: Okay, permission to speak to Associate Dean Zipp.

Associate Dean Zipp: Thank you Chair Sterns, I just want to make one minor clarification and correction based on the comments of my colleague, Dr. Licata from Summit College. At no time did the administration, the Dean's office in Arts and Sciences tell either Sociology or Political Science to file an objection. When they brought these issues to us what we told them was if they have an objection it is not the Dean's office responsibility to do this it's the faculty. If they want to object it's the faculty's decision. They don't want to object it's the faculty's decision. This is not the Dean's, the purpose of the Dean's, it is a faculty decision and the faculty have to take responsibility for it so we did not encourage or discourage objections to these proposals. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Permission to speak.

David Licate: Thank you. I just like to address just quickly the issues of not sharing our vitas as Dr. Lee stated. They were attached to our proposals from day one. The vitas were attached to the proposals so this idea that you were unable to view our vitas and you didn't know our qualifications, you have to attach the vitas to the proposals, they are submitted from day one. So that's just a straw mat. The step up program, we have a step up program with Political Science I think as of three years ago. Three years ago Sociology removed our step up program and that's actually what led to our conversation that was facilitated by Chair Sterns in the chambers of I believe the Senate to try to avoid something like this and that's when we agreed we'd share our proposals with each other, hence my e-mail sharing my proposal with the two chairs. But Sociology removed the step up program three years ago, we're still not sure why that was but there is a step up program with Criminal Justice, we also have a step up program with Emergency Management in our own college and let us be clear that if this becomes the Bachelors program for The University of Akron our associate students will not be able to step up. They eliminated the step up program in Sociology three years ago. Also, let me conclude by saying I don't know of any Arts and Sciences Criminal Justice faculty who participated in the creation of this, it was Chair driven, certainly Dr. Zipp was there for many of our meetings so we never saw them. When we were representing our side it was driven by the faculty and lastly it's not our issue or our fault that you don't understand Summit College. Come down to talk to us, we're clear on our mission. If you're not, introduce yourself and we'll build a bridge.

Chair Sterns: Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I will address this to the Chair. I respectfully request that the Chair take notice of the fact that there is a motion to recommit on the floor that has been duly seconded and with some instructions from this body. These are important topics that I'm hearing about but again, with all due respect, Mr. Chair, I did not hear in this motion to recommit what apparently Senator Mancke heard. So in my mind, while that's a very important topic and one that deserves full consideration it's not what I thought this motion was about so I would hope that we would speak to the motion rather than to continue a debate that is not a bad, I don't have an axe to grind here

is what I'm trying to say. Is there a way we can move forward and speak to the motion and then if the motion is to not recommit then it's quite possible to move on to vote on the motion that the Curriculum Review Committee made. There is a way to do this. The Curriculum Review Committee and the people who are here who are representing their various points of view have done a great job in putting this stuff together but there seems to be a sense on the part of people that it might be a good idea to think about it a little further and it might be a good idea to see if there's a way to get people to get together in a collegial way to talk about it before once more before the final decision is made. Now if that motion were to pass and it proved impossible Mr. Chairman for these bodies to get together, we would find out about that by next month. So I would again respectfully encourage you and the people here to speak to the motion that's on the floor and for us to make sure we know what that motion is so we can focus our comments in the appropriate way on what it is we're supposed to be talking about at that time. I believe every single point I've heard so far is fascinating, I'd like to hear more about it. The level of discourse could be perhaps no let me back off and not even talk about that. Let me just say that I believe that that's what we ought to be doing is speaking to the motion.

Chair Sterns: Okay, Senator Erickson are you speaking to the motion?

Senator Erickson: I'm speaking to the recommittal motion. And as a point of order I think Senator Mancke presented I think her understanding of what I think is in the rule on what is the role of the Curriculum Review Committee. I don't know I haven't got it with me, if that is or is not correct. What should we doing on that because if you send it back to the committee and all they can do is vote up or down then I don't think that is what is position that Senator Lillie made on that particular in his present discussion. So I think we need to know what to do on this one. Because if not where do we send it?

Chair Sterns: Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: The first point I'd like to make is that it's not very easy to divorce the question of the merits of the underlying motion from the question of whether to recommit because of course it is germane to the question of whether to recommit to argue that in fact the motion presented by

the committee should be adopted here and now. So I respectfully disagree on the point of whether it remains in order to discuss the merits of the underlying proposal when the motion to recommit is on the floor. Now I do think the point that was raised by Senator Mancke is an important one in relation to the motion to recommit is if it is the Curriculum Review Committees view that it cannot do what is being requested of it in this motion to recommit, then it would be fruitless to recommit. I believe the view is wrong. I see no reason why the Curriculum Review Committee must regard itself as a strictly adjudicatory body I believe we've heard this view abdicated before, it has always seemed to be wrong to me. The Faculty Senate is a policy making body, the Curriculum Review Committee is a policy recommending body. There is no reason why even though the rules don't specifically provide for what we are asking, that that committee or any other committee of the Senate can't say to the parties involved let's sit down and let's try to work this out. Now if in end agreement can't be reached then yes, it will have to vote up or down on the distinct proposals that have been made, but I see no reason why under the bylaws of the Faculty Senate the committee could not do what we're asking, whether it is willing to do it or not I think is a separate question.

Chair Sterns: Senator Lazar.

Senator Lazar: So I believe in listening to this that a good course of action would be to recommit it to the APC, if the APC. (CRC) It's Rex, I'm like it's one of those. My apologies, even just by standing there. Back to the CRC and if they come back with either no success at that effort or after internal debate have decided that it is not appropriate and then my feeling is that if we would vote then on the merits of the proposals, voting all three down would essentially say the same thing, saying please go back and work something out this time without the benefit of the CRC.

Chair Sterns: Remember to speak to the motion.

Senator Lazar: So I think the motion is a great idea.

Chair Sterns: Permission to speak.

Matthew Lee: Just a couple of points. First of all I just want to go on record in agreeing with Associate Dean Zipp that we were not ordered or told to object to anything it was explained to me what the process was that's it. So that's important to get that on the record. I think it's a huge mistake to send this back for further discussion. The faculty in the Department of Sociology and I'll speak for myself but I'm speaking for the faculty, Jim can talk about his faculty and his views as well, have fundamentally different opinions about Criminal Justice and Criminology education than the faculty at Summit College. There is nothing to be worked out at this stage. The Curriculum Review Committee had more insight into the process by which we've tried to do this for a year now. More discussion of what we attempted to do and why that didn't work. The bottom line is that the faculty in Summit College have a different perspective on criminal justice education and from what I can tell don't have the credentials to offer Bachelors degree 300-400 level courses in Bachelors degrees. This is the perspective of the ACGS which thinks Bachelors degree granting programs should have 2/3 or their faculty with Ph.D. The bottom line is we have a different approach to criminal justice education, we have different credentials, we have different interests. There's no way to combine oil and water on this. It's going to come back to this body in the next meeting as essentially irreconcilable differences.

Chair Sterns: With all respect, remember we are discussing the motion.

Matthew Lee: I'm speaking against the motion.

Jim McHugh: Thank you for allowing me to speak. My opposition to the motion is basically the same. That to recommit would nothing other delay for the sake of delay. Now I do agree that it's too bad that some of this information was not made available sooner. For our part we made all of the information we could available as soon as possible it was frustrating to us too to not have certain facts in front of us, to have more time to review the competing discussions, arguments etc. And I also believe that it's true that this does fit into a larger context that recommitting necessarily will not resolve which is what is the mission of the university and its constituent colleges? I am not a business man, I was trained to business man. I am an educator.

I specialize in higher education. The opinion of myself and my colleagues was based on those criteria. Now we also consider of course, and recommitment would not address this, what would be the ultimate result for our graduates? Would it be a sufficient Bachelor degree for a local police force as well as for the FBI or the Department of Homeland Security or the Department of Justice? Our program proposal is not only based on two current proposals which will still be there if this does not go forward they're still going to be there, but what we want to do is bring those two together into a much better program that is consistent with the values of higher education that we are trying to promote and that is the reason that recommitting would not solve this because again Matt Lee is correct, it is based on two fundamentally different approaches to higher education and ours is based on the four-year experience that we associate with the university as conventionally as well as traditionally understood so I would urge to take account of those considerations and not recommit this at this time. Thank you very much.

Chair Sterns: Would you give us your name again?

Mary Myers: Yes I am Dr. Mary Myers. I am a psychologist and retired police captain from the Akron Police Department and a Ph.D. in Counseling and Human Development Services from Kent State University with a minor in Psychology. I'm also a licensed practical clinical counselor supervisor and licensed social worker. I have a number of letters after my name. I work for Summit College at The University of Akron. I think there is a core problem that has not been mentioned yet which is why I speak. I think there is a misunderstanding of the role of Summit College here at the university. We've discussed that. But there is also a misunderstanding of the qualifications of my colleagues here at the Summit College and that is why I have asked them to face you face to face so that you might see that while our educational tenure requirements might be different than the other colleges, they are no less rigid and of high quality. For example, I was asked how many blind peer reviewed articles I have read. My specialty is in higher education. I've been teaching for 36 years in addition to being a full-time police officer. I teach, I don't take time to write articles. I've made over 50 media presentations in the last two year, I am written in the Gold Standard of the university. I was told by Institutional Marketing that I have brought more media attention to this university in the last two

years than any single other professor on this campus. Now you might laugh because it's about profiling serial killers. That's okay, the media wants it. And it is bringing media attention here.

Chair Sterns: With all respect, I don't mean to be disrespectful but we need to speak to the motion.

Mary Myers: To the motion. I approve the motion, no I, we're willing to negotiate with Sociology and with Political Science. I have an e-mail, it was from James McHugh, and it reads "the proposed interdisciplinary Bachelors degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice has been approved by Buchtel College Council pursuant to minor revisions the council is requiring. With a little luck we will be able to enter the proposal into the university system by the middle of this week, ahead of the Criminal Justice Technology Bachelors degree proposal of Summit College. At that point it would be brought to the attention of the university's Curriculum Review Committee for further consideration." They have not negotiated in good faith. We are willing still to negotiate this fight the disrespect that has been shown to the quality of your fellow colleagues at Summit College. Thank you very much.

Chair Sterns: Your Chair is attempting to be as fair and open to the discussion as possible. But we do have to speak to the motion. And we are not in any way challenging your credentials or capability, please understand that.

Jim McHugh: Mr. Chair, point of personal privilege. That e-mail was written to my faculty I don't how it got to Summit College but it was written to the faculty well after negotiations had broken down irreparably. We had been working for months and in fact even longer so the idea that I just want to clear the record on that.

Chair Sterns: Now because we have to finish business today, we need to focus on the motion so the Chair will only entertain specific comments on the motion. Senator Gwinn.

Senator Gwinn: The function of the Faculty Senate is varied. Not only do we approve things that come to us but we put an overall view of the quality of the instruction that's going on within

the university. I think we've heard some excellent presentations this afternoon on criminal justice programs, how they got there, where they are. But I think after putting them all together it looks like the criminal justice process at The University of Akron could be stronger, better integrated and toward that end I support the motion to recommit.

Chair Sterns: Senator Schuller.

Senator Schuller: Yes, after listening to the program chairs discuss their proposals it sounded to me much like there is a very different approach to the education in criminal justice and for that reason it's wise to recommit because in the original proposal it was pointed out that these were redundant programs, they don't seem redundant to me they seem very different.

Chair Sterns: Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: I have to say that having heard the debate I'm increasingly pessimistic about the prospect for a committee resolving this and I think that there's also a much larger issue lurking here and that is that I think there are differences of opinion about the appropriateness of Summit College offering Bachelor's degree perhaps in general for these reasons I think although I disagree with Senator Mancke about what the rules permit the Curriculum Review Committee to do I am increasingly inclined to think that it might be better to refer this to an ad hoc committee which could take a fresh look at it, perhaps be not quite as large a committee and perhaps one that would be charged with reviewing not just these proposals but also the larger questions that I think these proposals are raising and that are making it difficult for agreement to be reached on these proposals. I don't speak now firmly against the resolution but the motion to recommit, but I am having doubts now about whether it will be fruitful to do so.

Chair Sterns: Now the person who made the motion, Senator Cerrone are you willing to accept that or...

Senator Cerrone: Can you clarify so..

Chair Sterns: What I'm trying to do is ask whether it comes as a formal amendment or whether you're willing to change your motion. Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: I'm not sure I would want to try to amend a motion to recommit, but let me say that if the motion to recommit is defeated I would offer a well no, maybe I will go ahead and let's just test this. I move to amend the motion to recommit so that the, let me say, the motion to commit this question to an ad hoc committee to be appointed by the Executive Committee that will be asked to not only try to resolve the differences that we've heard about today but also to address the larger questions concerning the role of Summit College and report back to the Senate with some recommendations on those accounts.

Chair Sterns: Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson: 2nd. And I can speak to the motion?

Chair Sterns: Speak to the amendment.

Senator Erickson: Speak to the amendment, I apologize. I agree with the amendment to the motion that Senator Rich brought up. I've had to agonize on this myself. I come from an applied field. I have my Ph.D. in Agricultural Economics, which is applied economics. And so I do understand to an extent where the issue of making sure one has applied aspects to what one is doing and the difference between that and the purely theoretical position. And I do understand too though that as member of the College of Arts and Sciences and proudly a member of it, that you need to have a strong analytical thinking is one of the things that the result of a standard of a high quality four-year degree and so a applied field which does not put that as number one is a real problem. And I do understand too that these two come from two different positions however I feel that as in my own field that we ended up having a very strong analytical background and scholar teachers no question in my field, some of them the most important scholar teachers in economics in essence at one point, that it is possible to do some reconciling now maybe it's not possible in this case but I do also say and this is why I think a recommital is to do with what is the role of Summit College. It was when I came here and has been for years and years and years

can I quote on this? A two-year associate degree program, that's what they did and did it really well. Then you know well should we be a community college that just gets people, you've got to decide what you're doing and then it makes sense for what in essence the degree is meant to do.

Chair Sterns: Speak to the amendment please.

Senator Erickson: I am speaking to the amendment and saying that therefore it makes sense to pass it to a committee at this time.

Chair Sterns: Okay let's...Dean Silverman.

Dean Silverman: I just wanted to speak if I could. I apologize I missed most of the discussion I was giving a speech over at the student union. My name is Stan Silverman, I'm dean of Summit College. I apologize I don't know what's been said up to this point but Summit College has been in existence for well over 40 years, they've been offering Bachelors degree for almost all of those 40 years. I'm not sure how long Dr. Erickson has been here but we started in 1964, we started offering Bachelors degrees in 1968. So we've been offering applied Bachelors degrees since 1968. That is our mission, associate and applied Bachelors degrees. We offer, an example the most recent was Respiratory Therapy has always had an Associate degree, the hospitals asked us to create a Bachelors degree, we created a Bachelors degree. Most recently was a Bachelor of Organizational Supervision and now we're looking at some Criminal Justice because we've gotten these large grants from the Department of Justice, we worked with the Sheriff's department, they're applied degrees, helping the community, very student focused. I think there is plenty of room to have both degrees. There's no reason why we can't have both degrees. There are different tracks. Maybe they should be one program with different tracks, one in Summit College one Arts and Sciences, I'm fine with that but I think we shouldn't be quashing either of them. I think both of them are important to the community, they're important to the students, they work. And I think that's the direction we ought to go in. But that's just my poor, humble, personal opinion. Just to clarify just a couple of other things; Jim the letter that you talked about was sent way before we ever started discussions and that was incorrect. But bottom line is I think we can work together, I would love to see two tracks or just have both of them. I

think we are really hurting the students, we are really hurting the community to really limit what we're doing in this area. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: We really need to bring closure to this question in view of our usual time constraint. So unless anyone has something really essential to the discussion I think we're ready to vote on the amendment.

Matt Lee: Can I make one more very brief final..?

(Senate responded "no")

Chair Sterns: Yes, the Chair will indulge that.

Matthew Lee: Okay as you think about this I've already said that it's highly unlikely that we're going to bring oil and water together on this thing. If this body feels that we should be offering Bachelors degrees at this university with classes that used to be 200 level and we're just going to change the number to 300 or 400...hey please. And with faculty that only two of the full-time faculty have Ph.D.s and they've got twenty other part-time faculty there's not the faculty capacity to do a Bachelors degree in this area and there's no way to bring these two programs together, we tried for over a year and I did not have access to the cvs through the curriculum proposals.

Chair Sterns: Okay the Chair is convinced we must accomplish two things today before we're done. We have to approve the graduation list which means we have to finish this business. So at this time I would like to ask for a vote on the amendment. Senator Rich's amendment.

Senator Lillie: Can it be repeated?

Chair Sterns: Can we repeat the amendment?

Senator Rich: The amendment is to refer both the questions presented by the Curriculum Review Committee have been discussing and the larger question about the role of Summit College to an ad hoc Senate committee to be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Chair Sterns: Okay, that is the motion. And to bring the report back..

Senator Rich: Of course.

Chair Sterns: Okay, we were just repeating the motion.

Senator Cerrone: I would ask for the role of Summit College to be stricken from the amendment because that was not part of the discussion.

Chair Sterns: Did I hear the role of Summit College?

Senator Rich: Yeah, the reason I included it is both when I stated the motion and when I just restated it it is that it seems to me that a significant amount of the questions about approving the Summit College proposals are tied up in those larger questions and that they need to be addressed in order to resolve that.

Chair Sterns: We're at the point now that we're going to vote on the amendment. Senator Hajjafar.

Senator Hajjafar: Based on what Dean Silverman said, we already have approved, the CRC have approved the Arts and Science program to go through so based on Dean Silverman's compromise I think we should approve the Arts and Science for them to get go ahead and don't be delayed and then the committee to be assigned to go over that.

Chair Sterns: That's not what the amendment says.

Senator Hajjafar: Can I make that amendment?

Chair Sterns: Let's just vote on the amendment. Permission for Elizabeth Erickson to speak, Kennedy I'm sorry. Elizabeth Kennedy.

Elizabeth Kennedy: For many years I think it was between 6 and 7 years I sat where Frank is sitting as a senator and I look around the room and I see many faces that are familiar to me around my service on the Faculty Research Committee. So it's a pleasure to be back here again just didn't know we'd have cookies. I would say speaking to Senator Rich I do appreciate your concern for our college, I do however think that a more important role is for us to separate the two issues. While I'm sure the Summit College faculty would welcome the opportunity for our colleagues across the university to get to know us, to understand our mission, to help us to find a future, we would more than welcome that. But in terms of this particular issue we have three different departments in two colleges who really need to collaborate and work it and I'm going to agree with my esteemed colleague Senator Lazar there hasn't been time for adequate discussion of this. So I would encourage to vote for the motion to send this back to committee and perhaps as a second or secondary issue develop an ad hoc committee working with other constituency groups across campus to figure out exactly what Summit College is doing and what we can do to the benefit of our students and our university as a whole. Thank you for your indulgence.

Chair Sterns: Okay one more indulge, Senator Huff.

Senator Huff: I move to close the debate.

Chair Sterns: If you move to close the debate then we have to vote on closing the debate.
(end of tape)

Tape 2 did not have audio. These are my notes from the meeting:

Motion to close debate passed.

Motion to amend passed.

Motion to commit – send back to ad hoc committee to look at proposals and degrees and also the role of Summit College passed after a hand vote:

Aye – 28

Nay – did not hear this, Frank do you have this?

Approval of Graduation list – Motion by Hajjafar, 2nd by Ducharme.

Passed without dissent.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Hajjafar, 2nd by Steer.

The meeting adjourned at 5:16 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney