

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

FACULTY SENATE

November 5, 2015

3:00 pm. - 4:17 p.m.

CHAIR: The November meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed?

SENATOR RABER: So moved.

CHAIR: Moved by Senator Raber. Seconded by Senator Riedl.

Are there any proposed changes to the agenda?

All those in favor of adopting the agenda as distributed, please signify by saying aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the May meeting, which were distributed on Tuesday electronically?

Moved by Senator McCullough. Is there a second? Senator Saliga seconds.

Are there any corrections to the minutes of the May meeting? All those in favor of adopting the minutes of the May meeting as distributed, please signify by saying aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted.

Next is the remarks of the Chairman.

I would like to welcome a new member of the Faculty Senate, Cassandra Spaeder representing the Undergraduate Student Government. I was also planning to welcome a newly elected representative of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences, but a few hours ago I received an e-mail from her resigning from the Faculty Senate for reasons of workload and explaining that she had not been aware that she had stood for election. Although she had been a candidate in the initial election and two subsequent runoff elections. As a result, the College of Arts and Sciences now has two vacant seats that need to be filled by special election.

It is apparent to me that the process by which nominations are made and elections are conducted in that college needs to be re-examined and substantially improved, and I urge the representatives of that

college in this body to do what they can to bring this about.

I would also like to congratulate Kathleen Clark on her recent reelection to the Faculty Senate as a representative of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Let me remind all the members of this body to sign one of the attendance sheets so that your presence at the meeting may be duly recorded.

On the agenda for today's meeting we have an election, or perhaps two, to conduct. We need to elect a vice chair of the Faculty Senate. The runoff election in the College of Arts and Sciences has concluded and our erstwhile vice chair John Miller was not reelected to the Senate, although the seat was not filled because the winner of that election resigned before attending her first Senate meeting, and depending on the outcome of vice chair election, we may also need to elect another member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

From the Academic Policies Committee we have a proposal to rename a department in the College of Applied Science and Technology. From the Curriculum Review Committee we have a number of curriculum change proposals to consider. From the Computing & Communications Technologies Committee we have a resolution concerning online student evaluations of teaching. Consideration of this matter was postponed from the May Senate meeting and again from last Senate, last month's meeting.

Although I generally don't comment in this forum about political events that don't bear directly on issues of public higher education, I do wish to note the passage of State Issue 1 in the general election two days ago. This reform of the state legislative redistricting process can be expected to lessen the amount of partisan gerrymandering that occurs in Ohio. In light of the last 25 years of Ohio political history, it seemed likely that this reform would result in a legislature that is more supportive, or perhaps I should say less unsupportive, of public higher education than it has been. That's the good news.

The bad news is that it will have no effect until after the completion of the 2020 decennial census. At least until then I am afraid that there is little relief in sight for public higher education in Ohio.

As I notified you by e-mail yesterday, Senior Vice President Provost Mike Sherman is unable to attend this meeting and has submitted his remarks in writing. These will be appended to the minutes of this meeting.

I learned this morning that President Scarborough also is unable to attend this meeting. Both he and Provost Sherman are in Columbus attending a meeting organized by the Ohio Board of Regents.

President Scarborough did state in response to a question from me that he expects the search for a new senior vice president and provost to begin in January and that the search for a permanent dean of the College of Arts and Sciences would begin after the new senior vice president and provost is on board. On board is a quote.

Also in response to a question from me, President Scarborough indicated that he is in the process of meeting with the deans of each of the colleges concerning the second phase of full-time faculty position allocations. He has already met once with the deans of the colleges of Polymer Science and Engineering, Business Administration, Health Professions, and Engineering. A followup meeting has

been scheduled with the Business Administration dean. Decisions have been finalized by the Polymer College, but not yet about the other colleges just mentioned.

This concludes my remarks.

There are no special announcements today, so we proceed to the report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Schulze.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Since the Faculty Senate last met on October 1st, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met twice by itself and once with the President. The Executive Committee first met on October 15th to conduct regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the President. The EC certified the runoff election results in the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences. We appointed two faculty members to the student success retention team. We discussed the University Council Committee's roles and functions. We discussed a question from a Senator regarding faculty appointments in Wayne College. We also discussed the apportionment of Senators in the past in the College of Applied Science and Technology.

Later that day the EC met with the President. We were updated on the Gen Ed Core 13, the appointment of Janet Dean to be general education coordinator, the allocation of graduate assistantships for 2015 for fiscal year 2017, the advertising for an assessment coordinator, and the EC was updated on the following issues: Implementation of the approved college strategic plans and allocation of full-time faculty positions, the status of the strategic planning process for the university libraries, Graduate School, Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, and the Honors College, and the search for deans of Wayne College and the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences. We briefly touched on changes to the academic calendar that are being negotiated with Akron AAUP.

The Executive Committee next met on October 29th to discuss regular Senate business and to prepare the agenda for today's Faculty Senate meeting. The EC discussed evaluating the effectiveness of Trust Navigator success coaches. We also discussed the pending runoff Senate elections in the College of Applied Science and Technology and Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences. We discussed a question from the General Education Advisory Committee. We also discussed finding a replacement for a member of the General Education Critical Thinking Tagged Learning Outcome Committee who has left the university. We also discussed the vice chair position Faculty Senate EC.

This concludes the Executive Committee's report.

CHAIR: Are there any questions for Secretary Schulze about the Executive Committee report? Thank you.

As I mentioned before, the President is not present. Neither is the Senior Vice President and the Provost, so we proceed to the election of a vice chair of the Faculty Senate. Are there nominations for vice chair of the Faculty Senate? Senator Schulze?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: I would like to nominate Linda Saliga.

CHAIR: Linda Saliga has been nominated. Linda, do you accept the nomination?

SENATOR SALIGA: I accept.

CHAIR: It doesn't require a second.

SENATOR FRANKS: Oh.

CHAIR: Although they are always welcome. Are there any other nominations for vice chair of the Faculty Senate. Any other nominations? Any other nominations?

Is there a motion that nominations be closed and Linda Saliga be elected vice chair by acclamation?

Moved by Senator Clark. Seconded by Senator Sastry.

All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries. Congratulations, Senator Saliga ☐☐ Vice Chair Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: Thank you.

CHAIR: Because, because Senator Saliga was already a member of the Executive Committee, this creates a vacancy on the Executive Committee, so we need to elect a member of the Executive Committee to serve the unexpired term of Senator Saliga which ends in September, the September meeting of 2016.

Are there nominations for the Executive Committee, for an Executive Committee member? The chair recognizes Senator Schulze.

SENATOR SCHULZE: I'd like to nominate Joe Minocchi.

CHAIR: Joe Minocchi is nominated. Joe, do you accept?

SENATOR MINOCCHI: I do.

CHAIR: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I would like to nominate Doug Hausknecht.

CHAIR: Senator Hausknecht, are you agreeable?

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Yes.

CHAIR: Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: I have not asked the Senator, but I would like to nominate Senator Huss.

CHAIR: Senator Huss, are you agreeable to serving on the Executive Committee?

SENATOR HUSS: Not at this time.

CHAIR: Thank you. Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Okay.

We will vote by secret ballot.

Would you write the last names on the board?
(Ballots counted.)

CHAIR: By a vote of 22 to 15, Senator Hausknecht is elected to the Executive Committee.
Congratulations.
(Applause.)

CHAIR: Next we have committee reports. First, the Academic Policies Committee.

Vice Provost Ramsier, Chair of the committee.

SENATOR RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Academic Policies Committee brings forward one motion for your consideration: To change the name of the Department of Public Service Technology to the Department of Disaster Science and Emergency Services. This was a motion that came from the faculty unanimously through the college faculty and also the Academic Policies Committee. I'd be happy to answer any questions I can.

CHAIR: Okay. The motion that is on the floor comes from committee, it does not require a second, to rename the Department of Public Service Technology to the Department of Disaster Science and

SENATOR RAMSIER: Emergency Services.

CHAIR: and Emergency Services. Thank you.

Is there debate on the motion?

Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed to opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

SENATOR RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR: Next we have the report of the Curriculum Review Committee. Again, Chair Ramsier.

SENATOR RAMSIER: Thank you. The Curriculum Review Committee brings forward a set of proposals that have made their way through the curriculum system without any further pending comments or objections. Hopefully you all received these and had a chance to look over them. This is a motion, again, from committee. It doesn't need a second. I'd be happy to answer any questions I can.

CHAIR: Is there any debate on the proposed curriculum changes? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries without dissent.

SENATOR RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR STERNS: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I notice here that they are still using SUMM for courses. I think that used stand for Summit College. Do you want to consider changing that?

SENATOR RAMSIER: Good point. Duly noted. It should be changed. You're right, Senator. Again, this would involve changing something in the system.

SENATOR STERNS: I know.

CHAIR: Which ought not to be as difficult as you made it sound.

SENATOR RAMSIER: No further comment.

CHAIR: Or not sound, I should say. Next we do have a report from the Part-Time Faculty Committee that was distributed recently. As I recall, it was informational only. Is that correct?

HEATHER LOUGHNEY: Yes.

CHAIR: Is there an oral report as well? I take it not.
Next on the agenda is the report of the UC representatives. Is there such a report? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: The report would be very similar to the one I made last time. There are still a number of unresolved questions regarding the future of the University Council. Some of you may have seen the e-mail that the President distributed today regarding the, as he put it, board hiring or consulting with someone from the Association of Governing Boards as to what the future governance to, again, I don't have it in front of me, but as I recall, to assess the current and perhaps propose the future governance process for the university. That seems to some of us to be the kind of language that could mean that not only would this be an impact to the University Council, but it could also be to other governing bodies, presumably including the Senate, University ☐☐ I'm sorry, Undergraduate Student Government, so on and so on. So to some extent, until that report is received, I think probably we are going to have to struggle on with the University Council.

Despite that, there have been some occasional positives in terms of some of the proposals that have been worked on through one or two of the committees that seemed to be functioning more or less as they were anticipated to function, and I think Senator Erickson could speak about that in a minute because I know she's the chair of one of them.

I am still fairly discouraged about the lack of process and the lack of respect with which University Council has, generally speaking, been treated. I'm encouraged, on the other hand, by the fact that vice chair of the board, Jennifer Blickle, has attended a number of the meetings and has been open to post-meeting discussions, not particularly happy about them, but open to them. So there is, apparently, there is some kind of, for the first time in 15 or 20 years, there is some kind of a direct connection between the governing bodies and the Board of Trustees. So overall I think there are some

serious problems remaining, but it's □□ if I was trying to think of a good medical metaphor, I would say we are on life support, but it's not over yet.

So once again there have been some positives. I'm sure that Senator Erickson, if she wishes to add to this report, can say what some of them are. Thank you.

CHAIR: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Just to follow on from Senator Lillie, the last meeting of the University Council is the one that they □□ it came out of the bylaws, didn't it, that we should have one meeting?

CHAIR: Senator Erickson, would you speak louder and speak to the chair, in part so that your remarks may be recorded.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes. That the meeting of the University Council is the one where they have all of the members of the committees in the University Council structure attending. This is where the real work of University Council is meant to go on. And we □□ at that meeting there was presented half, but not only half, of the meeting for academic student success, and noticed that that is a committee that also has □□ its academic part is part of Faculty Senate, but this was only half of it. We presented our □□ I'm chair of the HR and Talent Development Committee and we presented our goals for next year, this is what we are meant to do, and I think we felt that we had done a good job and I guess Senator Sterns, in his role as vice chair of University Council, pointed out that he thought that we had done a good job of providing the goals, where the goals that we were looking at were evaluating the performance methods used in the nonacademic side in coming up with plans relating to, you may remember I talked to you, we have talked to you before about putting in a report on succession and retirement planning, and this is to expand that into layoff planning, and as the Institute For Teaching and Learning has been removed, how, given our title as talent development, as well as HR, how we would deal with those issues of talent development, what would be the right kind of planning to be done in those □□ for those activities.

Again, these are all planning, this is all □□ we have got a group of enthusiastic members, I guess, who are working on it. The faculty □□ the University Council has asked faculty □□ each of its constituents to come up with how they think certain committees □□ what kinds of areas certain committees should look at, and that request has come to Faculty Senate, and I know Senator Rich has said that he would be calling a meeting of the faculty Senators that are on these committees so that they can come up with some suggestions for the important topics that the committees should look at.

I think it's a really important thing, and Senator Lillie has said it a number of times and I would echo it, especially important when in this particular situation, especially with the vote coming in from, from the council for □□ what's it called?

SENATOR LILLIE: HLC?

SENATOR ERICKSON: No, not the HLC. Well, HLC certainly. But that it is not easy for committees that have a majority of their members are nontenured, they, in the most absolute sense, that the person who is their boss is a committee member, in fact, is a codirector, if you like, of the committee, and it's very difficult for them to come up to feel comfortable with making their own independent judgments of what should be looked at and discussed. Even if they are prepared to do that and there is a vote on it,

somebody has to ask for a secret ballot, which was our only way in the Bylaws of coming up with something that could allow people to vote anonymously. And it's the faculty, either the department chair or the faculty representatives on the committee, that must ask for that, because we couldn't get through University Council that it be the default position.

So I think the role of the faculty in University Council committees is really, really important, and when Senator Rich calls for a meeting of the members, I urge you to come and think hard about what you think would be important areas for your committees to look at. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you, Senator Erickson.

Next we have an item of unfinished business which is the report from the Computing and Communications Technologies, the Technology Committee on online student evaluations teaching. The chair of the committee, Chair Randby, is here with us today, and he is, by virtue of being chair of the committee, a nonvoting ex officio member of the Senate, so, Chair Randby, would you please present the proposal for the body's consideration?

SENATOR RANDBY: Yes. Thank you. We □□ this was work that was done by a subcommittee of the CCTC last spring and we have a recommendation that has been submitted to the Faculty Senate which is, it's a resolution, "The University of Akron should rapidly phase out use of current paper□based evaluation of the instruction system and broadly adopt the use of the online evaluation of the instruction system. Adoption of online evaluation should be accompanied by support from the Faculty Senate and the Office of Academic Affairs. A transition plan should be developed which identifies the best practices for instructors to follow or to maintain a response rate near that of paper evaluations. Further, all necessary steps should be taken to eliminate the perceived discrimination against those students who do not have immediate access to an Web□enabled device, laptop, smartphone or tablet, when an instructor gives students an opportunity to take an online evaluation during a class."

This resolution is not intended to be a dictate, it's intended to □□ because there are, there are issues that need to be solved before the university goes to totally online evaluations. Some of the issues which we address in the report are the response rate issue and also, as mentioned in the resolution, the difficulty that some students have because they don't have access to, immediate access to the Internet. So those are issues that we recommend should be dealt with and resolved, and that's our resolution.

CHAIR: Okay. The resolution is on the floor. Is there debate on the resolution? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: I have a question about, we have a lot of students, I assume this would be prompted by an e□mail or something like that to students in a class. What if they don't use that e□mail address as their e□mail address, and what percentage of students would never receive the prompt because they functionally use a different e□mail? And I'm just worried on how many misses we'll have.

CHAIR: Chair Randby, do you wish to respond?

SENATOR RANDBY: We didn't think about that question.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay. Well, I ran into that problem myself, so □□

SENATOR RANDBY: See, I deal with that kind of thing in my classes by requiring students to use their UAkron.edu address, whenever they send an e□mail to me, I'm required to check it, but not all

instructors do that. But yes, that's an issue that would need to be resolved, certainly.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I would like to ask, Mr. Chair, if you are considering a standard form for the university as a whole, many departments have additional questions that are specific to their evaluation strategy. A number of those questions are considered for merit and/or tenure and promotion evaluation, so there has to be some individuality by department. Have you addressed that issue?

SENATOR RANDBY: That's already addressed. Whenever a department wants to do online evaluations, they can use their form and their and one thing that's an advantage if you do that sort of thing electronically, it's like you don't have to worry about trying to read what students wrote, because they are typing it, and that sort of thing. It's easier to compile.

SENATOR STERNS: Thank you.

CHAIR: At least you will be able to recognize the characters.

SENATOR RANDBY: Well.

CHAIR: Senator Feldt did you wish to

SENATOR FELDT: Yeah, Scott, I was just wondering if the committee looked at the questions that are used for the online evaluation, because I teach online courses, too, but I noticed that when years ago when they moved the paper to the online, they kept the same questions, but they wouldn't be applied to an online class. So they are like, for example, did the instructor show enthusiasm? You know, it's harder to or did they look prepared today? I don't know. Are we still using the same questions that are on paper, I guess, and if that was something that was looked at.

SENATOR RANDBY: That can be that depends on the department or college. So in our college we did make some adjustments to the instrument because of that issue.

SENATOR FELDT: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR: So as I understand it, Chair Randby, and I am stating this so you can confirm or deny, the resolution would have no implications at all about what questions are in the survey?

SENATOR RANDBY: That's correct.

CHAIR: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I think if I were coming to this not having been on the committee, because I was on the committee, I would say that this is the committee is not, as you noticed saying that we have to move to online. It's sort of saying, well, what would you think? I think it's going to be an interpretation made by each member of the Senate as to what it exactly means, but it sounds as though it means that we move if we can and we look at the problems as we go. And I think that's about as

positive as I could get, certainly, about moving to online.

I know that there are costs of doing it in class. Basically not our costs necessarily, but because the computer □□ most of us, I think, have sent it to the computer center and I do believe a whole lot of folks that were doing that kind of thing are no longer with us. So that makes an issue. So you may be doing it yourself if you do it by hand. But I looked at the literature as best I could, as an economist, a pure statistician, and there is a lot of issues on this. They have done studies over the years and they say, well, yes, the numbers are down, but is it more biased? Well, one way it is biased towards the people who come to class, the other way it's biased towards people who don't come to class. And yet we □□ many departments use it in performance evaluation.

I think this is a serious issue that each department, I guess, is going to have to evaluate carefully itself. And I would hope that that resolution could be interpreted that way because that is what I think needs to be done.

And in the meantime, one can, of course, and this would be a way of doing things, is to do experiments where part of it is done by online and part of it not. But it would be up to the department.

CHAIR: Chair Randby, I wonder, might you reread to us just the relevant part of the resolution that addresses the question Senator Erickson just raised?

SENATOR RANDBY: Okay. A transition plan should be developed which identifies the best practices for instructors to follow in order to maintain a response rate near that of paper evaluations. The necessary steps to eliminate perceived discrimination should be taken for those students who don't have immediate access to a Web□enabled device.

I think that points are addressed in the executive summary where we talk about, which I didn't read, we talk about the cost issue, which is, for my department and other departments, the cost issue is a big one. It will save □□ going to online evaluation will save a lot of time and it will save us a decent amount of money. So she mentioned that issue.

Response rate, which was addressed in the resolution, that's a very interesting issue, and I agree with Senator Erickson that it's one that needs to be looked at seriously. Okay. I hope I answered the question.

Can I make one comment? CHAIR: Yes.

SENATOR RANDBY: I don't agree with the resolution in one word. This word was inserted, but when it says "University of Akron should rapidly phase out the use of current paper□based evaluation from the instruction system," I don't agree with the word "rapidly." I think, as Senator Erickson said, that we should do it carefully, if we're going to do it at all. What this resolution is saying is basically let's look at it. It'll save money, and it has other benefits.

CHAIR: Senator Sastry?

SENATOR SASTRY: I want to express that several of my colleagues have expressed concern with the current paper□based system, and I think it's fine for us to go to an online system. I think there are issues, in fact, there are issues with the paper□based system, and I think it's better to resolve these

issues and put it in a secure place especially because the results are being used for retention, tenure and promotion. So I am also wondering if the committee has considered using the computer-based testing center for a fixed duration of time to carry out these evaluations because that will resolve the problem for people who don't have access to online devices in classes.

SENATOR RANDBY: We didn't consider that, but that's certainly something to consider.

CHAIR: Senator, Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: Yes, I just had a question. I just assumed most departments switched to the online when they started charging individual departments for the paper ones, so is there any information from the committee on how many are still using the paper ones versus the online ones? Because I know that was our biggest consideration when I mean here's the budget, deal with it.

SENATOR RANDBY: It's been a while. We might have that information. We have an attachment here which says, yes, there is a number. We have a whole list in the document of programs that are not using online evaluations.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: Okay.

SENATOR RANDBY: So, yeah, that work was done.

CHAIR: Senator Lillie, do you wish the floor?

SENATOR LILLIE: Yes, please, just for a moment. Given the history of the last year or so, and even before that with some of the concerns that were raised through the [redacted] what is now The LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education [redacted] and I'll be taking up a collection for it after this meeting [redacted] what is now The LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education, when it was asked whether or not it would like to suspend admissions to certain programs in order to fix them and we said yes, that seems like a good idea, and we woke up and discovered that the programs had been taken away, effectively. We have been informed by some folks from time to time if, for instance, because we suspended admissions to something in order to fix it, that means the whole thing, the whole program has to go back through the entire process, including going to regs.

Now, that was certainly not the intent that we had when we agreed to that particular, that particular effort, because we thought it would be a good idea to revise and update our Ph.D. program. So I'm using that as an example because what I'm hearing from this resolution is sort of our typically vague academicese. We should, and it would be good, and the University of Akron ought to, that certainly within the past couple [redacted] certainly within the last year, and with some of the issues that have arisen since the rebranding, we should be very careful about exactly where these resolutions are going and what kind of, what kind of implicit permissions they may give to the administration to say, well, you guys said you wanted to do this.

Now, I think it's all well and good to say if really what the resolution is going to do is to start a process that will then go carefully with the full input of the faculty and under the control of the faculty, fine. I would urge us to be very concerned about it, however, because of the nature of recent historical issues that have exercised those to some extent and that ended up being, being more, more of a problem to us than they should have been because we felt that we understood what was happening and that we would retain the control, and we didn't.

So what I'm rising to discuss is not the merits of online versus not online. What I am rising to suggest is that when you vote, you vote on whether or not you think this is a clearly defined, described, you know, process that's going to continue to be under the control of the faculty, as it seems to me the committee intended. So that's my, that's my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR: As Chair Randby is a nonvoting ex officio member of this body, he is not in a position to offer an amendment. Does anyone wish to offer an amendment to delete the word "rapidly," as suggested by Chair Randby, and perhaps substitute another word? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: I move we delete the word "rapidly."

SENATOR ERICKSON: Second.

CHAIR: Is there a second?

SENATOR SALIGA: And change to "cautiously"? Do we like "cautiously" better? Anyone? I'll just go with deleting "rapidly."

CHAIR: I believe Chair Randby was suggesting the word "carefully."

SENATOR SALIGA: "Carefully"?

SENATOR RANDBY: I'm okay with just deleting the word.

SENATOR SALIGA: Okay. Then delete.

CHAIR: So the motion is to delete the word "rapidly." Senator Erickson seconded the motion. Is there debate on the motion to amend the resolution by deleting the word "rapidly"? Senator Sastry?

SENATOR SASTRY: I'm not in favor of deleting the word "rapidly." I think we should say I'm in favor of what Senator Lillie just said, which is that there has to be some kind of a schedule for requiring adoption of online evaluation, and my concern with the resolution right now is that it leaves everything so vague, so open, and some department may just choose to say, oh, it doesn't require us to do anything and I think that that interpretation should be avoided at all cost. I think it's a very important thing to do, to go to online evaluations for all courses, and it's a useful thing to put a schedule to make sure it's happening.

CHAIR: I must say that, as a professor of constitutional law, I am resisting the impulse to suggest the words "all deliberate speed." Senator Howley.

SENATOR HOWLEY: I am in favor of deleting the word "rapidly," but I also wonder if we might change the amendment to offer the last three sentences as conditions upon which we would adopt online resolutions so we would say that the university should phase out the use of current paper-based evaluation of instruction system and broadly adopt the use of the online evaluation instruction system if the following conditions are met. And then there's those sentences.

CHAIR: The chair for the moment will interpret that as opposition I'm sorry. Did you say what

did you say your position was on at least for the word "rapidly"?

SENATOR HOWLEY: I am in support of deleting the word "rapidly."

CHAIR: Okay. And I take it that you intend to offer a motion once the motion currently on the floor to amend has been disposed of; is that correct?

SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes, that is my intention.

CHAIR: Thank you.

SENATOR HOWLEY: Thank you.

CHAIR: Okay. So the motion before us is the motion to amend the resolution by deleting the word "rapidly." Is there further debate on that motion? I take it you are ready to vote.

All those in favor of the motion to amend the resolution by deleting the word "rapidly," please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign.

SENATOR SASTRY: (Indicating.)

CHAIR: The motion carries without dissent. The word "rapidly" is □□ oh, I'm sorry.

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.

CHAIR: It does not carry without dissent, but with dissent. It nonetheless carries. The main motion is now before us again. Senator Howley, do you wish to offer your motion to amend?

SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes, I do.

CHAIR: You heard the motion a moment ago. Does anyone need it to be repeated?

(Unidentified): Yes, please.

CHAIR: Would you please repeat it?

SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes. So I would like to make a motion to amend the resolution. The first sentence will remain the same, without the word "rapidly," and then it will add, you know, that we will adopt the use of the online evaluation of instruction system when the current conditions have been met, and then the next three sentences as conditions.

CHAIR: So you mean the following conditions have been met?

SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes, when the following conditions have been met, and the next three sentences as conditions to be met.

CHAIR: Okay. Is there a second to the motion? Senator Saliga seconds the motion. Debate on the motion to amend the resolution as just described? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Not exactly. I just wanted to make sure that I understood what was happening. This would then put us in a □□ should this, should this proposal pass, it would then be the recommendation of the Faculty Senate that, provided certain, certain conditions which were important to the committee and to the Senate were met, if, as and when those were met, then we would proceed forward with the rest of the resolution; is that □□

CHAIR: That is correct, Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR: Senator Schaeffer.

SENATOR SCHAEFFER: Senator Rich, I question how we can determine that it is effective in getting the proper amount of responses if we don't actually put it in place.

CHAIR: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: These conditions to be met, what, at the department level? Now, that, it seems to me, a very reasonable thing, it need to be met at the department level, not at some kind of vague thing which says, you know, 51 percent of the departments meet it, then we all have to do it. I think it would have to be done on a department by department basis if you are going to make conditions. Then somebody has to □□ you have to work out who is going to determine whether you meet those conditions or not. It becomes quite a complicated business, but I am just pointing out that that □□ I don't understand how you □□ when you put it that way, the conditions met, but it's too vague, I think, to, as it stands, to be effective, and I think it would then meet the issue, we would still be faced with the issue that Senator Lillie gave up, which it depends on the interpretation, and the department might have an interpretation that says it depends on us, and the administration might say, well, yes, a whole lot of people have done it, so □□

CHAIR: I would point out with some hesitancy that it would be in order to move to amend the motion to amend. That only a secondary motion to amend would be in order, not a tertiary one.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Well, if you want an amendment to say that at the department level, I don't mind adding that.

CHAIR: At the department or school level?

SENATOR ERICKSON: At the department or school level.

CHAIR: Okay. There's a motion to amend the motion to amend by inserting the words "at department or school level," as indicated. Is there a second? Senator Kidd seconds.

Debate on the motion to amend, a motion to amend by inserting in the motion to amend the words "at the department or school level"? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: Could we hear what this is going to say, then?

(Unidentified): Yes, please.

SENATOR SALIGA: Because I'm getting a little lost.

CHAIR: Senator Howley, would you read the clause in which this language is to be inserted? It's one of the conditions that would need to be met.

SENATOR HOWLEY: Which, the □□ which clause? I'm sorry. Just the amended amended clause?

SENATOR SALIGA: I would like to hear what the actual thing would sound like now. So start at the beginning and □□

SENATOR ERICKSON: And read to the end.

SENATOR HOWLEY: Okay. So, "The University of Akron should phase out the use of the current paper-based evaluation of instruction system and broadly adopt the use of the online evaluation of instruction system if the following conditions have been met: At the department or school level, the adoption of the online evaluation should be accompanied by support from the Faculty Senate and the office of Academic Affairs. Transition plans should be developed which identifies the best practices for instructors to follow in order to maintain a response rate near that of paper evaluations. Further, all necessary steps should be taken to eliminate the perceived discrimination against those students who do not have immediate access to a Web-enabled device, laptop, smartphone or tablet, when an instructor gives students an opportunity to take an online evaluation during a class."

CHAIR: I don't think that the language was meant to be inserted in front of the first of those conditions because it doesn't really make sense in that context.

SENATOR HOWLEY: Okay.

CHAIR: Senator Erickson, would you just clarify what it was that you wanted "at the department or school level" to modify in this resolution? I can see you are at the disadvantage of not having it in front of you.

SENATOR ERICKSON: No, I don't have it in front of me.

CHAIR: Chair Randby is about to assist you.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yeah. I personally think we have now gotten to the point where we should go out □□

CHAIR: That's entirely possible.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I don't know want to do this, but we should go back and rewrite this. It's so complicated.

VOICE: We ought to table it.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yeah, table it until we have got it sorted out. That's what I think.

CHAIR: Table is not the □□

SENATOR LILLIE: Table wouldn't be what you want.

SENATOR ERICKSON: No, I know that, but □□

CHAIR: I'll help when the time comes, but let's just clarify this.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Okay. Taking out "rapidly." "Adoption of online evaluation," you could leave that where it is. Now, you wanted to bring in, Senator □□ can't read your □□

CHAIR: Senator Howley.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Senator Howley, where you were going to bring it in, you wrote it in that it should be □□

SENATOR HOWLEY: It seems to me that the last three sentences, if what □□ you know, if I'm getting the sense of the Senate correctly, that we are not sure that we can trust these conditions to be met, we're not □□ we're concerned about that, so we might say that it is, in fact, conditional. Now, whether or not these □□ I think you make a great point about the measurement, our ability to know when we have met these conditions. That's an entirely different question.

CHAIR: So I must say I'm wondering at this point whether it would make sense to refer this back to the committee.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I think so.

CHAIR: We do need to give them an instruction when we refer it back.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yeah. So we're going to make another motion that does that?

CHAIR: Is there a motion to refer the matter back to committee with instruction, and if so, what is the instruction? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you. Yes. I move to refer this proposal back to the committee for further review, in particular with regard to the questions raised by the two of the amendments that have been made in this body. And, of course, any other issues that may arise as a result of considering the implications of those amendments.

CHAIR: Okay. The motion to refer it back to committee with instructions. Is there a second? Senator Raber seconds. Debate on the motion to refer?

SENATOR RANDBY: Can I ask questions?

CHAIR: Yes.

SENATOR RANDBY: All right. Is the desire for us to come up with a more concrete plan?

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.

SENATOR LILLIE: May I clarify the motion?

CHAIR: Yes, Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: The motion, or the intent of the motion for me was to say it appears that there is support for some of the concerns that were raised about exactly how the implementation of this may move forward; therefore, the intent of this would be to ask the committee to make sure that they have considered how the implementation would occur and that they ensured that the faculty would be involved and in control of the process all the way.

Now, whether that's at the department level or at some other level is not for me to say. It may be for us to debate later, but that's not something that I am suggesting that I would have heard in this body in terms of the amendments proposed or some of the concerns raised. So that would be how I would clarify the motion that I made.

CHAIR: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: As one of the people trying to amend this, the amendment for me was that it should be on the department level. So at least they should be considering whether it be done at the department level.

SENATOR LILLIE: They can do that.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Because RTP is done at the department level and how you evaluate how much of that is included in your performance is at the department level. That department issue should be included.

CHAIR: Senator Lillie, would you be amenable to an amendment of the motion to of the instruction to the motion to recommit that would instruct the committee to consider the level at which these determinations should be made?

SENATOR LILLIE: I certainly would. I thought I had implied that, but if I hadn't stated it clearly, then yes, I think it should be done. And I would, if the seconder would agree, I would agree.

CHAIR: Senator Raber was the seconder. Is that are you agreeable to that?

SENATOR RABER: (Nodding affirmatively.)

CHAIR: Okay.

SENATOR RANDBY: Can I ask another question?

CHAIR: Yes.

SENATOR RANDBY: Is this being referred back to the CCTC?

CHAIR: Yes. If the CCTC wishes to refer it back to its subcommittee, it's free to do that.

SENATOR RANDBY: Okay.

CHAIR: But this came to the Senate from the CCTC. When it gets referred back, it's referred back to CCTC. Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I would like to just ask, it's more of a comment related to the business at hand, in that these evaluations are not just standing by themselves, they have specific content within them, and so the nature of the content is important as well.

Also, we are in the middle of a major challenge to our assessments for our outcomes across the campus. How are these evaluations going to be □□ have some kind of uniformity or inclusion so that we can benchmark it against other things? I know that for a while we used the IDEA national benchmarking, but I think there's more here than just the online, there's also the issue of the quality of the evaluation, the content of the evaluation and so forth.

CHAIR: The motion, however, I believe, is to recommit with instructions that pertained entirely to the matter that was □□

SENATOR STERNS: I understand.

CHAIR: □□ as it was presented by CCTC which has to do with the changing to online student evaluations as opposed to on paper.

SENATOR STERNS: I realize that my comments were broader perhaps, but intentional.

CHAIR: Is there further debate on the motion to recommit? If not, all those in favor of recommitting, please signify by saying aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries without dissent. Thank you, Chair Randby.

Next we have new business. Are there any items of new business to come before the body? Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: So I have been thinking that the future of the university with respect to strategic investments is largely focused on centers and last year we had some action because of responsibility shared with us by this body, we did an evaluation of centers and institutes, and through that process we discovered that there is no board rule at the University of Akron that governs how centers and institutions should be formed, managed, operated or dissolved. So I'm making a motion that this body consider initiating action to task a committee to formulate such a board rule and eventually discuss, debate, and adopt.

CHAIR: A motion for this body to consider doing something is not really a motion.

SENATOR SASTRY: Oh.

CHAIR: Let me offer this alternative: I think it would make sense for the Executive Committee to consider referring to the Academic Policies Committee, which historically has dealt with matters of centers and institution □□

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.

CHAIR: □□ the question of whether to propose a board rule □□

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.

CHAIR: □□ such as you point out that we don't have.

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.

CHAIR: Okay? Would that, would that be an acceptable □□

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes. Yes.

CHAIR: □□ resolution to this issue?

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.

CHAIR: I promise you that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will consider doing that.

SENATOR SASTRY: Thank you.

CHAIR: And I am optimistic about it.

SENATOR SASTRY: Thank you.

CHAIR: Are there any other new business to come before the body? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I can't resist responding, having been □□

CHAIR: Is this actually new business?

SENATOR STERNS: It's in response to the comment made by □□

CHAIR: You are not going to be proposing new business, are you?

SENATOR STERNS: No.

CHAIR: I might point out that the next item on the agenda is good of the order, and it would be good of the order to make comments such as that.

SENATOR STERNS: I will be happy to accept the Chair's suggestion.

CHAIR: Under new business we would entertain a motion that has not already been entertained. Senator Coffey, do you wish to have the floor?

SENATOR COFFEY: Yeah, I do. I have been approached, I'm sure many of you have as well, by many people about the Senate's response to some of the actions by the administration. To be honest, I have looked at the Senate Bylaws and I don't really know how we would go about handling a vote of no confidence. I don't know if there's support for a vote of no confidence, but it seems to me we should form an ad hoc committee to explore both the procedures and if there is merit for a vote of no confidence. I am proposing formation of an ad hoc committee to explore these questions.

CHAIR: Let me just point out that the Senate Bylaws incorporate Robert's Rules of Order. There's no real ambiguity about procedurally how this would occur, but it's entirely in order to move to create an ad hoc committee to consider proposing a resolution of no confidence, and I take it that that's what you are moving.

SENATOR COFFEY: To consider opposing? I think the committee needs ☐☐

CHAIR: Proposing. Proposing.

SENATOR COFFEY: Proposing. Oh. I thought you said opposing. Proposing. Yes. Proposing. Thank you.

CHAIR: Is there a second to the motion?

SENATOR LILLIE: Second.

CHAIR: Seconded by Senator Lillie. Is there debate on the motion which is to create an ad hoc committee, the members of which would be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, to consider proposing a resolution of no confidence, I believe the words you used were in the administration?

SENATOR COFFEY: On President Scott Scarborough.

CHAIR: Is that change to the resolution ☐☐

SENATOR LILLIE: I don't think it makes any material difference, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR: So I take it you are not objecting to the change?

SENATOR LILLIE: I'm not objecting, no.

CHAIR: So that's the motion. It's to create an ad hoc committee to consider proposing ☐☐ not opposing ☐☐ proposing a resolution expressing the Senate's lack of confidence in President Scarborough. Is there debate on that motion? I take it you are ready to vote on the motion?

All those in favors of the motion please signify by saying aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign.

SENATOR SCHAEFFER: Nay.

CHAIR: The motion is adopted.

Is there any other new business to come before the body? If not, is there anything for the good of the order? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Just very briefly. It's one of those things that's been going on for a very long time. You may be aware of the fact that in the athletic field there have been longstanding concerns over what to do about concussions for student athletes. As a member of the Athletic Committee, and for the past few months we have been trying to figure out are there ways in which we can take the good things that they do and perhaps come up with a method that we can then propose through the appropriate channels on how, on how students who are not student athletes might also be identified in a manner that maintains confidentiality and that also provides the kind of services that they might need. And I want you to be aware of the fact that we are moving forward with that, it's very slow, but it is moving, and I just had a case study of this in one of my classes, a student who came to me who self-identified, and if there is anyone else who has any thoughts on the matter, please get in touch with me or Marc Haas. Thank you.

CHAIR: Is there anything else for the good of the order? Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: I have a question, so I don't know if that's appropriate here, but □□

CHAIR: That's appropriate.

SENATOR WILLITS: □□ at the beginning in your comments you said something about the Provost is being □□ or going to do a search, so is there a resignation? Did he retire again? I guess I missed it, so can you just □□

CHAIR: No, I think this was mentioned by the President in the last meeting. The Provost's contract ends June 30th, 2016.

SENATOR WILLITS: Okay.

CHAIR: And although I don't think what I am about to say was specifically mentioned, but I would add the rule recently adopted by the board would preclude his continued employment, not specifically his, but any retire he hires continued employment beyond one year after retirement and rehiring. So the search would be for a moo Provost who would □□ whose tenure would begin presumably July 1, 2016.

SENATOR WILLITS: Thank you.

CHAIR: Anything else for the good of the order? Senator McCullough.

SENATOR McCOLLUOUGH: Since a friend of mine was curious, I recently did a literature search about student evaluation of teachers, and there's not a lot of consensus on their empirical validity for evaluating teacher quality. If anybody is interested in those papers, I would be happy to share them with you.

CHAIR: Thank you. Senator Sterns?

SENATOR STERNS: I would just like to comment on the point raised by Senator Sastry regarding institutes and centers. Dr. Gandhi and I were part of the national that created the institute for life Lifespan Development and Gerontology 39 years ago and we actually have the paperwork to show its approval at that time. But I'd like to point out that there have been different ways about going about creating centers and institutes, and one of the problems has been over the years that some of them reported to the Provost's office, some of them reported to the individual deans, there was not uniformity in terms of the organizational structure. When attempts were made a number of years ago to bring institute directors and Senate directors together, one of the things that characterized that meeting was everyone had their own deal. So there was not the same kind of dimensions, approaches. And if you look at the way in which directors are compensated, you would be dramatically surprised at the magnitude of difference between, for instance, a recently appointed Senate director versus the extras \$67 a month I get.

SENATOR LILLIE: Is that over nine or 12 months, I wonder?

CHAIR: Is there anything else for the good of the order? Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes. There's one more burning concern that came up today and I wanted to share it and make sure because I think I need to bring it up in the Graduate Council on Monday as well. We just found out that we're not allowed to write contracts for incoming graduate students starting spring with any university dollars. And the issue being that that would be tuition reimbursement for committed projects, right? So if it's appropriate, I need to ask these questions carefully about whether contractual obligations for current grants that have been submitted and received by the university are going to be honored. That's a serious concern.

The other serious concern is my colleagues would like to understand whether people that are making these decisions have thought through implications on retention, downstream implications on subvention, upstream implications on enrollment, and so I would like the issue to be raised at whatever level it needs to be raised to get it addressed.

CHAIR: I would ask you, Senator Sastry, to put those questions in writing in an e-mail to me □□

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes.

CHAIR: □□ so that I may raise those questions with the appropriate administrators.

SENATOR SASTRY: I'm happy to do that.

CHAIR: Thank you. Is there anything else for the good of the order? Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: So with that, did we miss an update from the Graduate Council representatives?

Maybe then we can get clarification on what Senator Sastry was talking about, because, you know, I only have what he just said in terms of details.

CHAIR: There was no report of the representatives of the Graduate Council. Do any of those representatives ☐☐ do either of those representatives wish to respond? Senator Allen?

SENATOR ALLEN: No.

SENATOR STERNS: I wish to hear about this.

SENATOR ALLEN: No, no, no. We have heard nothing about this.

CHAIR: Senator Sterns, did you wish to add anything to that response?

SENATOR STERNS: I completely support the viewpoint of my colleague.

SENATOR ALLEN: We have a meeting on Monday.

SENATOR LILLIE: Which colleague?

CHAIR: The record will show he meant Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Me.

CHAIR: Anything else for the good of the order? If not ☐☐

SECRETARY SCHULZE: I do have one thing. I'm sorry. Tomorrow night, Friday, at 5 o'clock, Akron AAUP will have its third First Friday event at Lockview on Main Street. We sent out an e☐mail about it. I just wanted to remind you again, we'll pay for a beer for you, bring a colleague, come and just ☐☐ this is just to socialize. Just wanted to remind you of that.

CHAIR: As this body includes persons who are not members of the bargaining unit, perhaps you would clarify whether this is meant only for members of the bargaining unit.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: It's meant for members of the bargaining unit whether or not you are a member. So it is.

CHAIR: Whether or not you are a member of the union.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Yes, whether or not you are a member of the Akron AAUP. If you are in the bargaining unit. And if you are confused about this distinction, come and ask us about it.

CHAIR: After a beer, you'll understand.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Yes.

CHAIR: So what this means is full☐time faculty members in any of ☐☐ pardon?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Yes.

CHAIR: Full-time faculty members in any of the colleges other than the School of Law.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Although if you wanted to come, you would be please come.

CHAIR: Just me or is my colleague Senator Morath also welcome?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Any of your colleagues can come.

CHAIR: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: One more thing about my interest here in The LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education. That's what it's called, guys. It was in the newspaper this morning, and for our younger colleagues, this is actual physical news, it's not just electronic. There was a magazine called The Spirit of Philanthropy and in it is a article about LeBron James: The King of Philanthropy is Just a Kid From Akron is the title of it, and I urge you to read it, in particular the paragraph that says, "Regarding the students who are being mentored through The LeBron James Family Foundation, once they graduate from high school, LeBron students are guaranteed a full scholarship to the University of Akron."

SENATOR NOFZIGER: That's not true. Sorry.

CHAIR: The Senate will remain in order, please.

SENATOR LILLIE: "James won't be paying the tuition bills, which would add up to tens of thousands of dollars if all 1,000 students now in the foundation's two educational programs were to attend. UA is picking up the tab. In exchange, James is starring in one commercial a year for five years for the university."

I think that's about as succinct a summary of what is actually the case as I could imagine anywhere. Please be sure that everybody understands that, you know, Senator Lillie thinks LeBron James is a wonderful person, he has done wonderful things, but unlike what First Lady Michelle Obama said the other day, he has not paid for the scholarships. She said that openly to all the people who were there in the gymnasium. Some of us were there and we heard her say that. I think it's important to understand what the nature of this particular situation is. It has been extremely difficult for me and for others to get any details or any idea of how we're moving forward. You have heard me ask the President several times about this and the answers are still ones that seem to be in process. So I just wanted to make sure that people were aware of what, as far as we could tell, the facts are, and let's hope that we can take advantage of all of the support from The LeBron James Family Foundation and be there for folks from Akron and surrounding areas, but let's do it on the basis of truth and what actually is happening, not on the basis of marketing and innuendo.

CHAIR: Is there anything else for the good of the order?

I take it you are ready to adjourn?

I hereby declare us adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned at 4:17 p.m.)