

University of Akron Faculty Senate Meeting

October 3, 2013, 3:00 4:15 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The regular October meeting of the Faculty Senate will come to order. First item is the adoption of the agenda which was distributed to you. Are there any additions to the agenda to be proposed? All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted. The next item is the adoption of the minutes of the May meeting. The agenda lists September as well, but those are not available yet, so it's just the consideration of the May minutes. Is there a motion to approve the May minutes? Senator Clark. Seconded by Senator Hajjafar.

Are there any corrections to the minutes? Any corrections? All those in favor of adopting the May minutes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Minutes are adopted from our May meeting.

Next item is chairman's remarks. I have several items to report on. First you will recall that in our last meeting there was a resolution adopted by this body concerning the proposed changes to the University Council bylaws. I want to report that I met twice after that meeting with the provost, urged that the University Council return to the previous set of bylaws and work from those, and form a small committee made up of representative, a representative from each of the constituencies represented in the University Council to propose amendments that would be responsive to the concerns expressed by the Board of Trustees Rules Committee and to any lessons learned during the operation of the University Council during its first year, and I urged that the committee should act by negotiations rather than by majority rule which would allow one constituency to be outvoted by a coalition of the others.

The Faculty Senate's University Council representatives will provide details later in the meeting, but I am informed later that the University Council will proceed along those lines, and I thank the provost for carefully listening to the advice that I offered.

Second, General Education Reform Proposal, I'm informed that three colleges, the College of Health Professions, Summit College and Wayne College, the faculties of those three colleges have voted unanimously in favor of the General Education Reform Proposal. While expressing

some concerns and make something suggestions, the faculty of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences on the other hand voted 55 percent against and 45 percent in favor of the proposal.

I have recommended to Linda Subich, Chair of the senate's Ad Hoc General Education Revision Committee that the committee consider, in fact I previously recommended this, that the committee consider adding to the proposal an implementation plan, a relatively detailed implementation plan so that that would be part of the package that's presented to the Faculty Senate. That's up to the committee to decide whether to do that or not.

Third, the faculty workload issue. You may recall that last spring I strongly urged the administration and the faculty to resolve the teaching load controversy by adhering to and fully implementing the existing board of trustees regulation on that subject, which is consistent with and modeled after the Ohio Board of Regents Faculty Workload Policy.

I am informed and pleased to report to you that the administration and the Akron AAUP chapter have agreed to do just that.

Concerning direct admissions standards, I recently learned that the faculties of, at least, the faculty of at least one department was told by its chair that the provosts' office had raised or was about to raise the standards for direct admission to the undergraduate colleges.

This was a matter of concern because admissions policy is within the purview of the Faculty Senate at the university level and departmental and school faculties within each of the colleges. I therefore conferred with the provost and vice provost and was assured no such thing had occurred.

What had occurred is that over time direct admission standards have been changed by the departmental and school faculties without those changes having been submitted to the Academic Policies Committee for eventual approval by the Faculty Senate as required by a board of trustees regulation.

Accordingly, direct admission standards are being collected so that they can be submitted for the required Faculty Senate approval. If, however, a departmental or school faculty is considering changing direct admission standards, now would be a good time to make those changes so that the senate doesn't have to approve a change shortly after approving the existing standards.

But I want to emphasize that direct admissions standards for a faculty matter, in the first instance they're for the departmental and school faculties to set and after that they're subject to Faculty Senate approval.

And finally, the presidential search process. Since our last meeting I received a letter addressed both to me and to the president of the Akron AAUP chapter asking each of us to proceed with the election of three faculty representatives to participate in the search for a new president of the

university. I should say that the letter was from the chairman of the board of trustees at the university. Later in this meeting we'll conduct this election.

The three Faculty Senate representatives and the three representatives of the Akron AAUP chapter will have the opportunity to meet with the board of trustees Presidential Advisory and Screening Committee before the position is advertised, to discuss the proposed criteria process and scheduling of the search process, interview the finalists and meet with the board of trustees in secession to express their views of the finalists.

This concludes my remarks. Next item is special announcements. We have one death to announce, and I turn the floor over to Senator Sterns for that.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my sad duty today to talk about a long serving member of our faculty who went on to have international renown, this is John Popplestone, who was the founding director of the Archives of the History of American Psychology along with his wife Marion White McPherson. He was also professor of psychology.

John was born in 1928 in Louisville and died here in Akron on the 15th of September. He received his B.A. from the University of Michigan in 1949, his Masters from Wayne State University in '53 in clinical psychology, and a Ph.D. from Washington University in 1958 in clinical psychology.

He started his career in 1958 at Western Michigan University, coming to the University of Akron in 1961, where he was assistant professor until '63, associate from '63 to '67 and full professor from then on and continued in his role until he retired in 1999 being replaced as head of the Archives for American Psychology by David Baker. He was the department head in 1966 to '73.

He was the person who hired me in 1971, so you can decide whether his judgment was good or not. He was Chair of the Social Sciences division from '68 to '73 and his crowning achievement was founding the Archives for the History of American Psychology.

He was a fellow of the American Psychological Association, a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a member of the Society of American Archivists and the Cheiron Society, which is the International Society of History of Behavioral and Social Sciences. He served in many distinguished roles of the American Psychological Association, including being very much a part of both the 75th and hundredth anniversary of that organization. He also was President of the Division on History of Psychology. He was involved in a lot of manuscript and research proposal reviews for the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, National Historic Publications.

One of the interesting things and one of his honors, he was the president of Sigma Xi on this campus the University of Akron chapter, and he was co editor of five books and many book chapters.

Perhaps he was most well known, besides his 40 plus publications, for his innovation in television education. Dr. Popplestone probably, the estimate is that he taught over 10,000 students on television. This is when Akron, some of you have missed this. 1971 I came here. This was the television university of the United States. We had more instruction on television than any other school. And I must say to you it's very reminiscent of the online revolution.

In any case John was a popular figure, and on television, and he served in that role until he stepped away about three or four years, 1973 I think he stopped teaching on television.

So, he clearly was a major figure. We all realize the importance of the Archives of the History of American Psychology, and that's something that both he and Marion White McPherson felt was very important to the field, and they struggled with that with virtually no support from anyone for the first years, because he basically raised the early funds as we know now. We have the building. The Margaret Clark Morgan Foundation has chosen to support this, and the archives are now part of the Smithsonian network. So I think we can take great pride in his achievements in his time at the University of Akron.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Would you all please rise for a moment of silence? Thank you.

Next is the report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Bove.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, guests and senators. On September 12th the Faculty Senate Executive Committee sponsored a new senator orientation session that was well attended by both new and returning senators. Chair Rich presided over the session and provided an overview of the purpose, protocol and history of the Faculty Senate at the University of Akron. There were many thoughtful questions posed by the new senators resulting in rich discussion.

The Executive Committee met on September 19th for regular senate business. The committee attempted to certify senate election results from the Summit College and the College of Engineering. Both results were returned to the colleges due to errors. The committee also made appointments to the Accessibility, Athletics and Part time Faculty Committees.

Senators without committee appointments were identified, contacted and strongly encouraged to submit a self nomination or an appointment. The committee also discussed the General Education Reform process and that each college needs to approve the General Education Reform proposal that was distributed in May before the senate can act on it.

The Executive Committee next met on September 26th for regular senate business and to set the agenda for today's meeting. The committee certified runoff senate elections from Summit College and Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and made appointments to several senate committees.

Due to some of the confusion regarding executing senate elections this year, the committee will ask the Reference Committee to eliminate the plurality rule from the election process in the senate bylaws.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Majority rule.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Excuse me, majority rule. The committee hopes that this will eliminate confusion and expedite the election process. Apparently I was a little confused.

The question came to the committee whether or not to join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. The committee referred this question to the Athletics Committee for review and recommendation. The committee also discussed changes in direct admission standards and is concerned that the current changes have not been approved by the senate. Vice Provost Ramsier is gathering the data to bring before APC and then to the senate for approval.

There exists two vacancies on University Council committees to be filled by senate representatives. One non senator to serve on UC Communications Committee and one senator to serve on the UC Talent Development and Human Resources Committee. The committee encourages self nominations through the senate website. The Executive Committee will make the appointments.

And senators, thank you very much for your service to the senate and to the university. This concludes my report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions about the report? Thank you. The president is not with us today so the next item is the remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, everybody. As the chair indicated, we had I believe a successful University Council meeting this past Tuesday. After the last Faculty Senate meeting the chair alerted me to the resolution passed at that meeting. I was very much appreciative of that quick update, and as was indicated had the opportunity to interact not only with Chair Rich but several of your senator colleagues as well as members of CPAC and SEAC, and as was described the council this past Tuesday not only reconstituted its officers but also chose to proceed exactly as Chair Rich described. I very much appreciate the support, the guidance, advice and the feedback related to moving that agenda forward in a successful way.

As general education goes, we look forward to the continued process of faculty deliberation on gen ed reform. There were some votes in a positive way towards gen ed reform as it was presented, albeit with many expressions of concern or question with regard in large part to implementation. So it will be very important for the implementation strategy to be developed as a faculty collective as we move general education reform forward.

As you know, academic program review has been underway for many years at the University of Akron. And more recently in consultation with faculty we've requested that the department chairs and the school directors interact with the faculty to develop a response to the Academic Program Review Committee recommendations, that those reactions at the department school level then be communicated and discussed with the dean, which happened, and this past week I met with every dean of every college to consult with them about the outcome of those steps in the academic program review process.

The next step will be for me to intersect Academic Program Review Committee recommendations with the suggestions and recommendations transmitted by the deans, with points of view and perspectives from my own assessment or the assessment by the Office of Academic Affairs of the academic program review materials, interact with the president related to next steps, and certainly want to assure that whatever those next steps are we'll use the appropriate governance process to move the agenda of academic program review forward.

I did want to point out, however, that the assessment presented by the dean of the graduate school was appreciated, but I also need to point out that it was a separate and independent process from the academic program review process, and as such, was presented that way to myself and we made sure that it was presented to the deans, and the deans thereby to the faculty of the colleges.

As we continue to work on balancing the fiscal year '14 budget, I wanted to give you that update. You will recall that the first round of conversations dealt with covering a reduction in the base budget of about \$30 million. With a seven percent or so decline in enrollment this fall, we had to increase our planned re basing of the institution by about another \$15 million, thus we had a round of contingency plans, round two of balancing the fiscal '14 budget.

As reported at our last meeting we asked the deans and vice presidents to prepare scenarios that reflected about an eight percent reduction anticipating that the discussions with the deans and the vice presidents would resolve in a range of reductions that would not end up being across the board but would be as strategic as possible. Where we're at with that now is, and as we've tried to do in both the allocation of resources as well as the reduction of resources is minimize the effect of those reductions on the academic side. We're looking at about a 3.9 percent reduction on the academic side of the house and about a 7.3 percent reduction on the academic support side of the house, at least as reflected through the second contingency planning process.

For the academic units, I'm sorry, I'll start this way. For the academic support units the large percentage, nearly all of that 7.3 percent reduction on the academic support side reflects continuing reductions, that is reductions in our continuing obligations either through operating budget or positions.

On the other hand for the academic side of the house, about a third or so of the proposed reductions represent a one time reduction providing some continued flex with regard to planning the fiscal year '15 budget. Also that would allow flex and consideration of, perhaps we would anticipate our successful activities to increase enrollment over this period of time for the next year and perhaps give us a little bit of flex on that part of the reduction that wouldn't be permanent at this point in time.

Thanks to everybody for your continued involvement in MAP Works to help support students who through that process are identified as needing specialized support.

This semester was the first semester of implementing the early feedback or early warning on 100 and 200 level courses. That deadline for that early warning I think was at the end of the September. And thanks to everybody for their participation in that process. The next steps obviously are for advisors to reach out to those individuals and department chairs and school directors to be alerted to those individuals so proper support can be provided.

And certainly you probably noticed up on the website a location where you can help a Zip, and that's there to provide the opportunity for in a sense ad hoc input about the needs of students you may come across that you have identified as needing some sort of support. Once submitted through that process, the nature of the need will be assessed and the appropriate individuals will respond to providing the student the type of support that they need to be successful.

With that Chair Rich, that concludes my remarks.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions for the provost? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: This may not be a question so much as a comment. I know that you are planning to step down in another year and a half, and that's too bad. You have been one of the better provosts we've had. I have been here almost 25 years and probably have had 25 provosts. I won't even talk about some of them. But what worries me is I think you are pre retiring. And a lot of things we liked about you as provost are starting to diminish already a year and a half two years before you are going. This is a concern.

And one of the examples, this is something that Chair Rich was talking about that we finally settled on that we're gonna follow university guidelines on teaching loads. It took six months, a Faculty Senate resolution that was vetoed, a grievance by the union, a faculty petition that I participated in. Shouldn't take six months to go back to where we could have been back last spring.

I asked you about this in the college meeting the other week and you said, well, we have to make sure everybody worked hard. I think you ask any faculty member, are you guys working hard or are you sitting around the pool waiting for a tall, cool one to be brought, I think I know how that question would be answered. So this sort of faculty friendliness that we liked about you when you came, I mean, I helped hire you. Are you leaving it already?

And part of this also leads into what has been your major sort of signature thing, Vision 2020. And you know for a fact the second you are out the door so is Vision 2020. So don't abandon it yet. We kind of like Vision 2020 too. I mean, we knew that the 40,000, that never made sense, but there were parts of it that did.

And the part, and you aren't gonna be surprised by this, the part we liked the best was the part that was originally 200 new faculty, and we basically abandoned that. We have now in Arts and Sciences, I don't have the number for the university but for Arts and Sciences we have four fewer honest to God tenure track faculty now than we did two years ago. This is before we started having budget issues. So that's basically been abandoned. It was already pre abandoned last spring when the accreditors were there, because that aspect of 2020 was left out of the documents given to the accreditors.

I asked about it at the time and it was said that was just a "sliporee" and the fact that such a "sliporee" could be made I think is very telling. So I am very worried that you are allowing yourself to pre retire, and all of the things we liked about you as provost are going to be abandoned.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Do you wish to comment?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you for those comments, and I will do my best to make sure that we do not abandon in pre retirement those principles for which I continue to be committed to.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions for the provost? Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: I just have a question of clarification. Did I understand you to say there's something called Help a Zip? Is that what you said?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yes. There's a location on the website as I understand it.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Is it like the main home page?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I believe so. I can't tell you exactly other than I know there's a location on the website where you can identify students who you may come across who require some support or individuals interested in the University to whom you might want to refer information.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Is there somebody I could ask if I don't find it easily?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yeah. We'll have the communications group send out another announcement. It went out on E digest so I just wanted to point that out.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator McKnight.

SENATOR LYNN McKNIGHT: I know where that's at. If you click on the link that says faculty staff it comes up Help a Zip. And I went to a presentation today on student success at ITL. It's an interface to MAP Works is what I was told. So it will send an alert to MAP Works and then contact the appropriate person.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Merely to make sure I was clear on what you said about the budget, Mr. Provost, you said something about a 30 million dollar deficit, and then I thought you said something about adding 15 million, is that correct? So are we facing a 45 million dollar deficit at this point?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, no.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Okay. That's why I wanted to ask the question.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: The fiscal year '14 budget was balanced having managed the 30 million dollar re basing. Since there was a further decline in enrollment beyond the buffering that existed in the '14 budget, we have to reduce the base budget further, and that's by about \$15 million. So the second round of balancing so to speak for fiscal year '14 was another \$15 million linked to the enrollment decline from the fall.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: May I?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. So I just want to try to make sure I am as clear as possible on this because it seemed to be the case that there was a 30 million dollar deficit associated with this budget that we talked about in Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings with you and the president that I recall you saying a couple of times would be dealt with at the October board meeting.

So I, in my way of understanding it, was assuming that was the \$30 million that needed to be dealt with. Apparently that wasn't the case; that the budget that was presented for fiscal year '13 and '14 had already taken into account the 30 million? Is that what I'm hearing?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Uh huh.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: So now the October board meeting is to find a way to find 15 million more.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: That's right, yeah, which is what we reported at the last Faculty Senate meeting.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I see Vice Provost pointing over there. There may be some significance to that.

NATHAN MORTIMER: Permission to speak?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Please identify yourself.

NATHAN MORTIMER: I am Nathan Mortimer. I work with Mike in the Office of Academic Affairs. The original balance was \$30 million which was, consisted of various expense reductions, whether it's the academic units or central or academic support and revenue enhancements. It did have a contingency for a slight decline in enrollment. What Mike is saying is exactly correct. The second round, which is \$16 million, because it doesn't account for faculty raises, so we went the 46, take a couple million off for the first round and the further reduction for the faculty increase, we're roughly about \$41 million is how I would phrase it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions for the provost? Thank you very much.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item is the election of senate representatives to the Presidential Search Committee. There's a motion from the Executive Committee recommending a particular method of conducting this election since there are three people to be elected. Senator Bove, would you present the motion?

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Resolved that all three Faculty Senate representatives to the Presidential Search Committee shall be elected in a single election; that each member of the senate may vote for no more than three candidates; that the three candidates receiving the greatest number of votes shall be elected; and that a runoff election shall be held to break any tie that must be broken in order to elect three representatives.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This comes from the Executive Committee. It requires no second. Is there any discussion of this proposed method of conducting the election? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Okay. We'll now proceed with the election. The floor is open for nominations for representative of the Faculty Senate to the Presidential Search Committee. There are three to be elected. Senator Hajjafar.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: I nominate Senator Rich.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: I nominate Senator Bouchard.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other nominations? I was hoping for at least one more.

SENATOR T.S. SRIVATSAN: I second the nomination to Senator Rich.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any other nominations? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I nominate Senator Sterns.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Nomination of Senator Sterns. Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations be closed and that Senators Bouchard, Sterns and Rich be elected by acclamation? Moved by Senator Clark. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Matejkovic. All those in favor of closing nominations and electing those three by acclamation, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries without dissent. Next item is committee reports. We received written committee reports from the Faculty Research Committee, the Part time Faculty Committee and just recently the very short report from the Chair of the General Education Reform Committee. I don't believe that was technically a committee report. I think it was just an informational report from the chair. And also an informational copy of a report from a subcommittee of the CCTC to the CCTC.

I am not aware of anyone wishing to make an oral report from those committees, but let me ask. Does anyone wish to make such a report? Okay.

Next item is the report of the University Council of Representatives. Do any of the representatives wish to report? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I came in a little late due to class, so I did hear the provost allude to some comments that you may have made, so there may be a little bit of repetition here. I will try to keep it brief.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mine was bear bones and I said that the representative would supply more details.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: And from the meeting on Tuesday, we heard at the meeting a presentation from the provost and his role as co chair of the University Council, and presiding in the place of former vice chair and interim co chair Ken Marsden to the effect that a procedure which had been used prior, rather in August and September, had really resulted from an intent to respond positively to the concerns of the board's strategic issues committee.

When we first heard about this back in August or September, for some reason we didn't seem to be as aware of what the Strategic Issues Committee had said and had come through the provost, so we were presented with a link to the board meeting in June or the Strategic Issues Committee meeting in June where you can yourself read what they had to say.

The upshot of it was that the set of bylaws that had been produced and approved by the University Council in February of 2013 would be the new place from which any revision would take place. So, the bylaws proposals that had been made since that were implicitly withdrawn. I don't think any were ever explicitly withdrawn, and were back to using the 2013 proposed bylaws.

As I understand, the provost's interpretation of the Strategic Issues Committee comments, they felt that there were four points, three of which addressed appropriately through the bylaws as presented to them. There was one point which they, which was referred to variously as being able to respond nimbly or some other quick fashion to concerns the board may have. That appeared to be the major issue of concern.

So, the Steering Committee proposed that there be a small bylaws revision committee made up of a representative from the Faculty Senate representatives to the University Council, the graduate student representatives, the undergraduate student representatives to the University Council, a staff employee, committee representatives and the contract professional representative. So that would be five people who would meet to consider the remarks of the Strategic Issues Committee and to see what if anything needed to be done to amend those bylaws.

This brings us back to the process that we had spent a lot of time on. The bylaws of February, 2013 were not in my personal opinion what I would have liked to have seen, but they were the result of a serious and sustained process that included all of the constituencies.

So I'm glad to report that that is happening. There will be a meeting next week of this Bylaws Revision Committee, I believe, and we'll try to proceed to get that changed as quickly as possible.

The president did come to the University Council meeting and spoke briefly at the beginning, and he expressed the hope that this would be able to be finished and completed in time to be presented to the board at their December meeting. Now again, that was an expression of hope on his part, and I certainly hope we can do that, but that's pretty much what happened.

Senator Erickson you were there. Do you have anything to add?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Chair recognizes Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I think that Senator Lillie gave a very good summary of what was set up. I think in terms of the discussion you will be able to

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You might be speaking a little too softly to be heard in the back.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I think that Senator Lillie gave a very good summary of what in fact was set up at that committee, at the UC meeting, and I think in terms of the discussion that took place, Senator Lillie pointed out that for some of the, this issue to be met, the issue of being nimble and responsible, efficient, part of that was to do with the need for resources, independent resources by UC. And I think that was a statement that he made and I certainly agreed to, and mentioned and also that a whole lot of what we needed to do was more about the functional, wasn't the structure of the bylaws but how they could function effectively.

What we had set up in UC, EC the committee structure, we had in mind the development of long term plans by each of the committees and that those would go to University Council. And the provost talking about how we might make this work, talked in the same terms, said, oh well, the board will need the draft of the Finance Committee report in March and so the Finance Committee would be in the process of getting that into the right format by March and then getting feedback afterwards, and that every six months we might be able to do the same thing with some of this planning and so on.

And I think what I mentioned that was in the original version of the bylaws but got left out, and this is, we don't always get what we had hoped to have, but what was the detail of each of the committees and what they needed to do had been put in there in essence to develop that long term plan.

And I think that perhaps when they look at it again over the next month or so they'll be thinking how can we set up the role of each of the committees in such a way that they would be effectively developing a long term plan for that particular area and bringing it to the University Council legislative body, that being of course the issue we had brought up the last time.

Nobody at this stage is, we are starting indeed from where we had wanted to start, which is with a legislative body.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: There was further some very frank and I think helpful discussion from a couple of people about the, I guess I can't put it any more delicately, the thorough confusion that seemed to surround much of the implementation of the University Council. And I won't go over my perceptions of that here as to why that occurred, but I would say that I think it's, you know, very good that people realize that there was some confusion created. And what was supposed to be the intent of taking a very general proposal, the White Paper of 2011 and then using our experience to turn it into details. And in our system what happened is confusion rather than convergence. So we have recognized that. We are working on that.

One other element is that the current set of bylaws still includes a Research Committee. There has been the discussion about at the University Council meeting no longer at the University Council level no longer having a Research Committee so that the, you know, the clarity of the responsibility for the research function would then be returned to this body, which I think is a positive thing. Also, the inclusion of a committee that had athletics in its name. We think that's also been taken care of.

But once again, part of what's gonna be going on is we try to make sure there's a clear distinction between what the Faculty Senate does and should do and what the AAUP does and should do and what the University Council does and should do. We are continuing to work on that and hopefully we'll reduce the confusion.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Senator Witt, do you have anything to add?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I do not.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: No doubt that is appreciated at this stage. The next item is unfinished business. And we have one item which is the ratification of the Executive Committee's approval of core proposals over the summer. We delayed that until this meeting because we realized in the last meeting those had never been distributed. They have been distributed to you.

Under the Faculty Senate's bylaws the Executive Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate over the summer subject to our reporting those actions to the senate and their ratification by the senate.

The Executive Committee is of course recommending ratification, no idea what would happen if it were to be withheld, but there's a motion before the body from the committee to ratify those approvals. Is there discussion of that motion? Okay. All those in favor of the approval of those curriculum changes in favor of ratifying the Executive Committee's approval of those curriculum changes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Okay. Motion carries without dissent. Is there any new business to come before the body? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Chair Rich, let me just say that the one piece of information that we all may be interested in is that there were new officers elected at the University Council meeting on Tuesday. Stacey Moore will be serving as chair, and I will be serving as vice chair, and that gives us a faculty voice on the Steering Committee. So anyone who has specific issues, ideas related to the University Council, please speak to me about them or communicate with me about them because I think it's very important that our voice be heard.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you for that information. Is there any new business to come before the body? Senator Witt?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I just have really, it's a cry for help actually.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Cries for help come under good of the order unless you are going to propose something.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I'll wait then.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any new business? I think not. Good of the order.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: This, my cry for help, this concerns the curriculum proposal system once again. I don't know who there is to talk with about this. I remember a cartoon from the 1960s that showed a Coke machine with bullets riddled through it and it was bleeding Coca Cola, and the idea is when it takes your quarter you have no place to go. That's sort of how I feel about the curriculum proposal system. Stuff goes in it and then it goes up and down the curriculum proposal system and it hardly ever comes out right. And we can't seem to find out where it sticks or why.

Sometimes it's a comma that's out of place that anybody could see that this is just an error and fix it, but it has to go all the way back down this cumbersome system. I'd like for the Faculty Senate to somehow get to the bottom of why this is such a cumbersome system to use and then come up with a way to fix these things. You don't realize that if you happen to look at a particular proposal, you have to log into the system and then the phone rings, then it's time to go and you don't log out that no one on the face of the earth but you can see that proposal again, even the person who wants to fix it, right? I've had people call me at 12:00 at night because I forgot to log out only they were just, they were calling everyone because there's no way to know who's in there, just some damn body is. So I'd like for us to take a common sense approach to this.

Now, the system we have was the result of for years making 750,000 copies of each proposal and hand carrying it around to the departments. That's not a good idea either, but there should be some happy medium.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me say that I have the distinct pleasure and privilege of having nothing to do with that system personally. But there is no more widespread complaint that I have heard as chair of Faculty Senate than complaints about the way in which the curriculum review system works. I do want you to understand though that I have been in regular communication with Vice Provost Ramsier who is also the chair of the Curriculum Review Committee about exactly that set of problems and that he and the committee have been attending to those problems, and working to solve them, not fast enough I understand, but I welcome the comments. I think we need to have a way in which the information about the problems that people are having is being passed on to the people who can do something about them, and I've

been speaking with Vice Provost Ramsier about how we do that more systematically within the limits of resource constraints. I don't know whether Vice Provost wishes to add anything or subtract anything from what I've just said.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Permission to speak. I appreciate the comments by Senator Witt. This is on the agenda for tomorrow's first meeting of the Curriculum Review Committee. We have a report that will be summarized tomorrow about the changes that have been made to the system and it will be made to try to streamline and in essence make it function with common sense. And actually we've invited, we will invite Chair Rich to that meeting next time when there's actually the people from IT there to explain the situation and what they can and cannot do in the programming. So that's one thing. I think your point is, Senator Witt's point is well taken, and that we receive probably no fewer complaints than the senate themselves.

One thing I think that I as Vice Provost would ask would be speak to the faculty that serve on the committees that flag the comma and send it back, because I know that's a simple technical or editorial thing that doesn't require it to be sent back if it can get fixed at committee level, and faculty are on those committees appointed by the Faculty Senate. So you can start there at the local level to try to encourage your colleagues to not send back proposals that simply have a comma out of place. Substantive issues should be sent back. That's the intent of the proposal system, okay, so that would be one qualifier.

The second would be one of the main topics of tomorrow's discussion, I've made a proposal to the CRC to eliminate change of mode of delivery reviews. Some colleges have responded unanimously, at least through the dean's office that this is a wonderful opportunity to streamline the system. But there are competing concerns that having no review of change of mode of delivery of currently existing courses could lead to lack of quality control in my language.

I don't disagree with that, because having formerly served on Distance Learning Review Committee for many years there are some proposals that have been submitted in the past by former colleagues that were evident they did not have any clue how to deliver online material. So again, it starts at the local level.

Departmental curriculum committees presumably look at these proposals first before they go to the college level then to the university level. And by that time it's six months later and if issues are raised then by DLRC for example or University Review Committee, they're probably, they have some validity. So I think we all need to work together to make this thing work more streamlined but to maintain quality, in particular in the online market. If we put out material that gives us a bad reputation, we'll have a hard time recovering from that.

So again, tomorrow we're going to have a lively discussion at the CRC meeting about this proposal. The intent of the proposal was to get the discussion to start on what are we gonna do about simple change of mode of delivery. So I will be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions about that for the Vice Provost?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you very much for that explanation about the change of mode of delivery thing, because I have been hearing that that's already a fact, courses have been changed, they don't have to go through the curriculum review process, and, or I have been hearing oh yeah, we just have to say we want to change it and then it's changed. And so you've helped to clarify that what was a rumor is not actually yet a fact; is that correct?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: That is correct.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: So it's not yet possible to simply say at a college level or some other level we want to change the mode of delivery without going through the curriculum review process?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: That is correct because the rule stipulates that any change in mode of delivery has to come through the, come eventually through CRC, DLRC to the senate to be approved. So the answer is no, courses are not permitted to change mode of delivery unless they go through the system.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Within the limits of that definition right, the 30 percent.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: And your discussion tomorrow is gonna be whether or not that should change?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. My proposal is to red line out the whole part of that rule that has to do with change of mode of delivery, getting rid of the definitions of 0 to 33 percent and 33 to 99 hybrid online, just take it out and move on. I know that's not necessarily the process the committee will agree with, but it's a start to the discussion.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: What I am hearing you say is that part of the, and you were trying to give an idea of what both sides of the debate might be. Part of the potential concern is that even though it may seem to be a way to deal with a cumbersome issue, it also may provide us with a quality control review point where if the mode of delivery is changed, one of the questions that could be asked is, is your course appropriate for being changed from whatever it is in one to the other, because I suppose if you are not gonna do change of mode of delivery you could change it from being online to face to face, too.

So anyhow I guess I am encouraged that we're hearing that it hasn't actually happened yet, because I have been getting some messages that it has, and I, it's just confusing. So I look forward to hearing what the report of the committee is. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me, I will recognize you in a moment, Senator Sterns. Let me add that I suggested sort of middle ground alternative which would leave in the review at the, first of all would assure that these proposals can only originate from faculty which wouldn't be a

requirement if we just eliminated the whole provision as proposed. And second of all, that there be departmental review at least, and it doesn't need to go above the departmental level, maybe it should go to the college level, I'm not sure, but not to the university level. So that was sort of a middle ground position that would give you some review. But it could take place much more quickly as long as the departmental faculty is willing to act. Senator Sterns was next.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I wanted to comment as the person who you can blame for the implementation of the system, since I chaired it. The thing I wanted to point out is we're complaining from a much higher level because the programs we have now and the system we have now has a higher level of flexibility. We're able to move materials from one part, things that would have had to have been edited by hand in a previous period of time.

So there are many positives. One thing that might help is we haven't done training in a long time. There's a training package to facilitate the use of the system, and we might request that some additional training sessions be done, because just the point you are making was one of the first things I learned in training.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You mean logging off?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: The second thing was that we had a different kind of committee made up of people who were in secretarial roles, faculty roles, at all levels they could comment on the issues that they were receiving. And I think that that kind of committee may be useful to put back in place in our feedback.

And the other thing is we are not devoting the staff out of IT at the same level of intensity that we had at an earlier time period so Matt Beaven and his folks did a great job, but then they were assigned elsewhere. So there's issues of internal assignment of personnel that I think needs to be looked at as well. And this is one of the most important things that we have to do, so I think we should be thinking of remedies. But I'm still selling Harvey dolls with pins.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I was going to comment on the change of delivery to a web based course for example. I think that for one thing my own experience with the DLRC has been very positive and the recommendations that they made, and this is because I ferreted out the chair of the DLRC and asked directly, and they sent me these are the things, and I fixed those things and then the course sailed right through. And these were not that they made the course better, they were things I should have known and didn't pay attention to. So those kinds of training issues like, this is what you need to do to make this thing work will facilitate the change pretty easily.

But I do think that every web based course needs to be looked at by the committee. I think that's real important. And we might, I don't know, I mean the, I don't think that we need to go and decide that you need to have you know, an entire review because it's already been reviewed once when it was passed before.

So that's my only comment is that the DLRC does really good work, and I do understand that the, every single committee along the way has got a backlog of who knows, I don't know what University Committee is, but in Arts and Sciences we have about 50 at any given time, 50 proposals that are just waiting to have something done to them. And I think that gets in the way of, when we're talking about nimbleness and agility, and this is about the slowest thing I've ever seen. Some of our proposals in our department have had their first birthday being in the system.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Koskey.

SENATOR KRISTIN KOSKEY: I have served on Graduate Studies Committee in the College of Education for several years now and some of the things that were talked about being a faculty issue I would have to agree with in my experience.

For example, the department level, if things are having their first birthday it's not the system issue, it's the committee issue. And so you know, we've come up with, you know, we meet biweekly to review proposals. So I think there needs to be maybe some recommendations and definitions made to make it more efficient.

So one suggestion would be how often should proposals be reviewed, biweekly or weekly so that things can move through faster at the department, college and university level.

And second, definitions as to what are substantial changes that would require a proposal to start back at the department level. So, we get proposals sent back to us sometimes that we've passed for minor things that they shouldn't be sent back for, but there's a degree of subjectivity there. What's a substantial change? I don't know if we can really define that, but at least give some parameters for what might be examples of substantial changes to help guide committees and the chairs who are entering in the approval status as to whether they should be sending it back or just getting these things resolved at the committee level and then allowing it to move forward if those revisions have been made. So I think it would be helpful to have some of those parameters for committees to follow along across the different levels.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I think the intent of the original committee that Senator Sterns is falling on a sword for would be that there would be a way to review these kinds of issues and deal with them. And in fact on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, as you know we've brought this topic up a couple of times in the past year or so, and it's not new. It's frustrating. I understand that it's very frustrating.

The first committee I got on was the Curriculum Review Committee when we switched from paper to the old curriculum system that was on the computer that we felt was so terrible that we had to come up with a new one a couple of years ago. So I, I've seen some of this stuff as well and I think that there's a legitimate reason to say we've got some concerns, we need to be careful

about if there's a misplaced comma and not to get all bent out of shape about it, but commas can be important.

There are lots of things we need to talk about. Why is that? Not because of our proposal, not because of my proposal. I know whether the comma is right or whether I've misspelled the word in my proposal. But I don't know what you were thinking in your proposal. Those are the issues we should be talking about. We shouldn't be getting so frustrated that we give up our power as faculty to the administrator and say, you take care of the comma. You take care of the misspelling, because I've got research to do. We're gonna end up in a position that we won't like because we will have been a little pissed over trying to get this stuff done in a more effective and efficient way. This, the curriculum is ours right, so put your commas in the right place. I have an undergraduate degree in English. I can help.

But you know, recognize, I think Senator Koskey said it well, that it may be that the faculty need to pay more attention to this. This is our stuff. And so I would encourage you to do that. I would encourage us also to keep pressure on for saying, look, we're talking to the administration about reasonable things. This is not the first time you've heard it. We've not brought it to this body over and over again because we've been trying to deal with it at other levels. You should be aware of the fact that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the chairs, others have been working on this. We don't need to tell you that because we need a pat on the back but because you need to be aware of the fact that this is part of what the senate does to help govern the faculty of the university and to make it possible for us to do the best possible job we can.

So I would urge everybody not to get lost over a comma or some misspelling things. It's frustrating, it's no fun, it's not what we should have happening, but it's fixable.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I want to clarify one thing. I think what was being suggested is that each of the relevant faculty committees exercise some appropriate judgment about what requires the proposal to be returned for a new set of approvals and what doesn't. So although there's a possibility that a comma could really change the meaning and therefore be a substantive change in those instances where it's a comma or otherwise where it's a merely technical correction and nobody would think that that correction, that that difference that results between the original proposal and the modified one would have been significant to any of the approving bodies in between, it obviously would have been approved whether the comma was there or there because it's not a substantive change that it doesn't get sent back for all new approvals. That's one of the problems that's been faced. That requires some decision to be made about which require re approvals and which don't.

But I think what was being discussed was not having administrators do that but having the committee that spots the problem decide, is this something that really needs to go back for new approval or is there something that the proponent originated.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: That's within the spirit of my comment. Thank you.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: One other comment, we must remember that once those things are approved they automatically then go on to the plotter for the bulletin. So at some point you want to make sure that it does represent the highest level of scholarship and use of good language when it goes out to the world at large.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Certainly. I wasn't suggesting anything to the contrary. It was just the question whether the change gets made by the originator and then it proceeds from wherever it was that it got caught or whether it goes back for departmental approval and college level approval. Some of them need to, some of them obviously don't. And someone, a faculty committee needs to make that judgment about whether it needs to go back for a whole new set of approval. Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I was going to say a bottleneck which I've heard about on this is that sometimes someone's proposal has been approved once earlier and they have no idea.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I've heard about and reported that one, too. And actually I'm not sure. I don't recall where that one stands right now.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I believe that issue has been rectified. But now after proposals are approved E mails are being sent to the originators. If it hasn't, if that programming isn't finished yet, I will qualify my answer with if it's not done it's almost done. But I think it's done.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Anything else for the good of the order? Well, we've done a lot of good for the order today. Is there any other business to come before the body? Hearing none, I declare us adjourned.