

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 7, 2000

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, Dec. 7, 2000, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-four of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Ebie, Edgerton, Kennedy, Lyons, McCollum, Schwarz, and Weaver were absent with notice. Senators Binienda, Braun, Dhinojwala, Hanlon, Hebert, Holz, Isayev, Louscher, Ofobike, Pope, Purdy, and Steiner were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

APPROVED APCC'S PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2001.

APPROVED MOTION ALLOWING APCC TO INSERT STUDENT FINANCIAL AID DATES INTO APPROVED CALENDAR FOR ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2001.

APPROVED CURRICULUM PROPOSALS CT-00-36, CT-00-39, & PS-00-03.

APPROVED AMENDMENT TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS REGARDING CHANGING THE TITLE OF VICE PRESIDENT FOR INFORMATION SERVICES TO VICE PRESIDENT FOR INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGIES, LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING.

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chair asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Midha so moved, to be seconded by Senator Hajjafar. The Senator then voted its approval of the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2 - The Chair called for a motion to approve the minutes of the Nov. 2 meeting. Senator Midha made the motion which was seconded by Senator Saliga. No corrections were offered from the floor, and none had been sent to the Secretary that the Chair knew of. The Senate then voted its approval of the minutes.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - In his remarks Chair Sheffer stated that as the semesters neared completion, he hoped all continued to be successful. He wished everyone a very relaxing holiday season and then time after the holidays to get into writing, research, and other creative endeavors. He stated that he wanted to welcome a new Senator, Dr. Janice Yoder, a professor of psychology, who was now the new Senator from Arts & Sciences. Senator Yoder was to arrive at 3:30, at which time the Senate would give her a round of applause.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The first announcement concerned the changes to the Faculty Manual which were passed by the Faculty Senate on October 5 regarding the guidelines for initial appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion of regular faculty. The Chair reported that at yesterday's Board of Trustees meeting, the Board had approved the recommended changes.

The Chair also wanted to notify the body of three of our colleagues' deaths. First, it was with deep regret that The University of Akron and the School of Law announced the recent passing of Stanley Samad, the fourth dean of the Law School and the first dean following the Law School's merger with the University. Mr. Samad was 80, and had been dean for 20 years, the second longest deanship in the Law School's history. During his tenure the Law School obtained ABA accreditation, membership in the AALS, and the 1974 building was constructed and opened.

The second death was that of Dr. James T. Hardy, the Associate Dean of the College of Education. He passed away on December 3. Dr. Hardy served as the Associate Dean for the past two years and previously had been department chair of Educational Foundations and Leadership. He had come to the College of Education in 1991 after having served as Assistant Superintendent of the Akron Public Schools.

He received his doctorate from The Ohio State University in 1975.

Yesterday we were informed of the death of Dr. James Hutton, the Director of Learning Technologies and Scholar Learner Services at The University of Akron. He died in a traffic accident on I-71. Dr. Hutton joined The University of Akron in September `00 and had been establishing the groundwork for the collaborative alliances with several K-12 school systems and colleges. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of San Diego, master's degree from Georgia State University, and his doctorate of education from the University of Southern California.

The Chair asked the body to honor these three individuals with a moment of silence.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - The Secretary of the Executive Committee, Senator Elizabeth Kennedy, was not in town for the meeting. Chair Sheffer told the Senate that Elizabeth's mother had passed away this morning. Therefore, the Chair gave the report for the Executive Committee, and stated that he was sure it would be made more relevant when Elizabeth returned.

The Executive Committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting. At the first meeting, the first order of business was to set the agenda for today's meeting. The committee discussed the results of the meeting on November 9 with Vice Chair Erickson and the Senate committee chairs and certified the Arts & Sciences election results. We also discussed a request for a Senate seat for a representative from the Association of The University of Akron Retirees.

At the second meeting on Tues., Dec. 5, the Executive Committee met with President Proenza and Executive Assistant to the President, Becky Herrmstein. We discussed the results of the parking retreat that had been held in November. Information would be given to Senators today during the report of the CFPC. We discussed state funding issues, particularly with respect to the success challenge definition of time of graduation. We discussed with the President the report card grading the states on higher education performance developed by the National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education. Incidentally, the Chair mentioned that the URL for this report could be found at www/highereducation.org, if Senators wanted to see the entire report. It was very interesting. Finally, we discussed an article in the "Chronicle of Higher Education" regarding the passing rates and graduation rates for athletes. That concluded the Executive Committee report. The Chair asked for questions from the body. None were posed.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - The Chair introduced President Proenza.

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, colleagues. Indeed during our meeting with your Executive Committee we talked about several reports and I wanted just to add a couple of comments for the good of the campus community, because this seems to be the season for report cards. You are writing some for your students shortly, and it seems like others are writing report cards for us. About a year ago, you may recall that I wrote an editorial piece in which I talked about the state and suggested that it might be appropriate for us to call for a report card on the state. Guess what - as your Chairman has just indicated, it came in last Thursday, November 30, and it was not good. It was a nearly failing grade with particularly a D- in affordability. In all other areas but one, the state was graded a C or C-. The one it did better in was persistence; that is, once we get students into college, they tend to do well and proceed, and indeed this University does exceptionally well in providing for students. Yesterday the International Math and Science scores were released and again, regrettably, the United States does not do as well as other countries. This is also true as I remarked with you in regard to the percent of our population that participates in both higher education and secondary education. We are no longer the dominant force in education that we once were.

Next week on December 13, as again your Chairman remarked, the Ohio Board of Regents will be releasing its first performance report on our institutions of higher education. This is a report that was called

for by the Governor of the state of Ohio. It is a difficult report to write for a variety of reasons. Data definitions are not uniformly utilized across the state. Data are not necessarily uniformly analyzed or reported. Data are not necessarily well understood, etc., etc., but we shall see how it comes out. The Provost and I have been reviewing the basic elements of the performance report as they're available to date, and in many respects we figure reasonably well. The area that is perhaps most controversial is the one of degree completion, because the Board of Regents' report is not distinguishing between part-time and full-time students at institutions like ours in which the majority of our students are part-time, as you know. So we will continue to elaborate on that and inform you. I did provide for our Board of Trustees a short summary of the report that Dan mentioned, and I'll be happy to make that available to you, but he's given you the URL so that's perhaps how you can best satisfy your interests.

I'd like to again thank the Executive Committee for candid and productive discussions-they're exceptionally good. Now let me move on to some items of interest. As you may know, my office has had an opening for an Executive Assistant in Strategic Initiatives, the position that was shortly occupied by Greg Chambers. He left to return to his previous employment, and for a variety of reasons, none that make my staff very happy since they are working at break-neck speed. However, in the interests of the budget and a number of other things, I determined that we would abort that search and not continue it at this time. So, Becky (Herrstein), you'll just have to work a little harder.

Yesterday we had some unprecedented achievements and let me tell you about them. First, we were delighted to receive a formal letter from the Akron Mayor, Don Plusquellic, advising us that he would recommend to the City Council the closing of the two streets called for in our Master Plan, Carroll and Union Streets, no later than May 15 of this coming year. That would put it a little after our class schedule, and in fact what we basically agreed to is that all of the legal work would be completed by then and we would take between May 15 and the beginning of the fall to determine exactly when to close them. There are some traffic issues we want to agree to together in regard to redirecting traffic on Exchange St., for example. But that is indeed good news because it moves us again one step closer to the fulfillment of our Master Plan, and we are excited to be able to report that. And in case you did not get up and read the 'Akron Beacon Journal,' that was front page news today and it was indeed good news.

Yesterday we also concluded an agreement with the city for a building of a sky walk between the Akron parking deck and the Polsky building, the Summit County Parking Deck. Thirdly, we've also reached an agreement which still has to be ratified that concludes the various issues that relate to the John S. Knight Center. I'm particularly pleased to just remark to you that it is fully in keeping with our original agreement in which the University would have had nothing more than an oversight. Never did we want an operational role despite what some have suggested. The agreement that we've reached indeed keeps us out of any operations but continues to provide for the University to have access to the Knight Center on a preferential basis in terms of cost. So again, this concludes an issue that had been lingering.

Yesterday the Board of Trustees also approved a number of things that I'd like to share with you. Importantly, as you know, we've been undertaking some major innovations in technology and before you ask, let me tell you that the 35 percent that's supposed to go to the departments and colleges is there. We simply forgot to send a note that the money was there, so please ask your budget officer and they will tell you the money is there.

Continuing, the Trustees approved our plan to institute a pilot, and I underscore pilot, program for wireless laptop communications. That pilot will initially involve Senate faculty that are involved in technology; it will involve the Law School and the Library, and it will involve one of our Greek organizations. We plan, of course, to use the pilot for precisely what a pilot is intended to be and that is to assess the benefits issues relating to the deployment of a wireless and portable computing environment.

During this process we're going to have to be addressing a number of issues, and let's address a couple of them. Fundamentally, we had a very nice plan for computing technology that was authored in 1995 and I've read it and fundamentally agree with all of the basic aspects of it. We are now at a time when technology

has evolved further when cost structures have changed, and we recognize, for example, that we must achieve some economies of scale, some purchasing power, but we have to explore how to do that. Let me assure you that we're going to have to walk through these issues gradually.

For example, some have imagined that because we're talking about a laptop program for our students, that we would immediately insist that all of you use laptop computers. If some of you are more comfortable with the machine you've got - fine. Some of you may like a laptop and we'd like for you to have that option. We may find, and these are just options we'll have to investigate so nothing is on the table as finalized and I don't know whether this is even rational, but it could happen depending on the pricing structure, that a laptop might be more economical to buy as the CPU to which you would then attach a large screen, a keyboard and a mouse, if you would prefer to work that way. Then you would have the option of having a nice full-size machine and a laptop if you want to use it as a laptop or a full-size machine. Would you have to use it as a laptop? Of course not. You could use it as a standard CPU just as you always ignore that thing under the desk that takes your CD or your disk. But who knows - maybe you'd find it advantageous to do if we come to that stage. These are just options. The pilot program is going to teach us a great many things about it. We can examine it and begin to see how we walk into the next generation of computer technology for our campus. That we're making enormous progress is undeniable.

As you know, this year we have markedly enhanced the off-campus access. Hopefully, within a week we'll be able to announce that you will have high-speed access from your home to the campus for less money than you're currently paying; in fact, for probably half of what you're paying. Recently we also were able to reduce the cost for off-campus access for people that dial in from outside the 330 area. There's an 800 number, and for some other students the rates were reduced to about one-third of the original rates, a considerable savings. You know about all of the other things, so we're making considerable progress.

The other thing the Trustees approved yesterday in parallel with the laptop pilot program is the implementation of a Tivoli software agent that will enable us to work smarter and more effectively by enabling our staff to interact with your computer and service it without having to come to your office. That would be a major step in savings. It is being estimated that corporations are spending as much as \$8,000 per year to service each machine. That clearly is something we cannot possibly sustain or even begin to approximate if we wanted to. But the Tivoli agent would be one of the ways we would work smarter and better.

After the Board meeting we went down to the Computer Center and had a brief ceremony and celebration with our industry partners and exhibited the new equipment that is part of the IBM, Cisco and PeopleSoft partnership. Any questions on that issue? Do we have enough caveats on the table to not spook anybody?

Just a couple other highlights from the last few days - many of you perhaps attended 'River Dance' at EJ Thomas Hall - 22,000 people joined you. In the eight shows that ran between Nov. 21 and 26, EJ Thomas Hall enjoyed a capacity rate of 98.8%, and that is an unprecedented experience and one which made Dan Dahl a winner, because he proposed that this would work last year and we weren't sure. But again, in the spirit of being willing to run a pilot, it was successful and it appears we are on the road to potentially making Akron and particularly EJ Thomas Hall in partnership with the Civic Theatre a viable venue for major shows of the Broadway-type variety, Chicago-type variety right here in Akron.

You'll find beginning sometime next week that EJ Thomas Hall is also going to serve this year as the new backdrop for our next rollout for commercials for The University of Akron. In it, we are going to be trying to appeal more broadly to students, so we're going to not be singling out any particular program per se but talking more about what the University can offer in breadth, in depth, in excellence, in career advantage to our students so you'll be seeing that probably as early as next week.

Your University of Akron Press has published several volumes over the last month and is on schedule to be a record year both in terms of volumes published as well as in revenues, and I call your attention in

particular to the volume entitled, 'When Giants Roamed the Sky' which of course harkens to Athens history when dirigibles, the lighter-than-air ships, were being made right here in Akron.

Let me close with three things - you've heard me allude to the wonderful little metaphors we're using for Zippy, our bullish kangaroo; welcome to the land of the bullish kangaroo, etc. You'll recognize that also in the letter I sent to you last week with regard to Charting the Course, if you had a chance to look at that document. Again, much as we've shared right here, I solicit your input.

But if you'll notice at the opening of that, we have another kind of metaphor, perhaps a more serious metaphor and one that speaks to the University more broadly. Let me speak those words and comment on them briefly. What we're saying in that brief section that opens with who we are is, 'We make the new materials for the new economy and shape the communities that we serve. We are the University in, of, and for Akron, the public research University for northern Ohio. We are you.' Now let me reflect on those words.

The first phrase is not intended for you to connect hard stuff necessarily. Yes, we make materials; we make polymers and medical things, but the intention there is to talk about materials in the new economy in a much broader term. Because the most important materials that we make for the new economy are talented men and women with new ideas - the people of The University of Akron. And 'shape the communities that we serve.' Communities plural is intentional, and the whole phrase intends to reflect that engagement that we derive so much of our life and indeed that we will continue to derive so much of our competitive advantage from.

The next phrase very simply echoes that - 'we are in, of, and for Akron.' We are here for this community, and again harken back to the previous phrase - we shape far more than just Akron. We serve far many more communities and shape them in uncountable ways.

The next phrase, 'the public research university for northern Ohio,' speaks to that excellence that we've discovered as well as to our strategic intent of being nothing less than of the caliber of Ohio State or Cincinnati, and to be recognized as such in northern Ohio.

And, finally, the last phrase speaks again to that prominent theme of people, and the fact that the University is its people and together with our staff and faculty and students, with our community. Ladies and gentlemen, the happiest of holidays, and thank you very much."

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - The Chair then introduced Provost Hickey.

"Many of the letters and phone calls regarding the 35 percent technology fee came to my office, so let me just reiterate. If you talk to your fiscal officer and he or she says those funds aren't there, I suggest you call the police. They have all been sent to the colleges; actually, they were in the colleges when the questions were asked and when the phone calls came. What hadn't happened was the typical communication that went from the fiscal office to the deans did not go, and that was in part because the person sending that email was in Chicago at a PeopleSoft meeting and the email was sent but apparently never made it out of the hotel in Chicago. So in any event, the hard copy showing the distribution is now in the office of the deans.

Let me share some good news with you; hopefully, it's all good news actually. First, I want to share some numbers for Marlesa Roney, our Vice President for Student Affairs. The search for the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services search is in process and there are currently viable candidates in the pool but none that they're ready to pursue at this point in time. They will do some advertisements and telephone interviews will be conducted in the near future.

In terms of admissions, applications are up 5 percent at this point in time. The key is the conversion of applications into enrollments. Fall visitation day attendance was up 39 percent, and I'm told it's the largest

fall visitation day we have ever had, and those of us who were there know there were many students and parents all over the campus. During the fall semester visits have occurred to over 650 high schools in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York, and during that time they made contact with 3,558 students. Representatives attended 110 college fairs, at which they contacted another 3,374 students. A variety of follow-up activities have taken place, including letters, note cards, postcards, telephone calls, email, holiday cards, etc. Counseling is going on congratulating students who have been admitted to the University; calls to potential honors students to encourage applications have taken place, and invitations to orientation programs.

I had dinner last night with a candidate and one of the members of the search committee for the Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning and Faculty Development. Karyn Katz was there and recounted a story in which she and Dale Mugler recently made a presentation at Firestone High School about the honors programs, and they were covered up with students interested in our honors programs. It is the largest, most enthusiastic group of students they have talked to, so maybe our efforts with regard to enhancing the honors program are taking place.

Upcoming events - President's Day visitation is Monday, February 19, and there will be a number of yield receptions for admitted students. This is where we try to convert students from admitted to enrolled, and 14 events have been scheduled between February and April. I should also point out to you that in February we're having our first ever Scholarship Saturday. Hopefully, your deans have distributed my memoranda to you asking for volunteers to participate in that day's events. We will have a large number of high-quality students on campus, and every student invited to attend will be guaranteed a \$1,000 scholarship if they attend The University of Akron. What they're doing that day is being interviewed and competing in a mild competition for greater scholarship support. So these will all be top-quality students we would like to attract, so we could certainly use your help. Marlesa wants me to convey that so far all the signs are very encouraging, but a lot of hard work is still ahead of us to try to increase the enrollment in our freshman class and the University in general.

Yesterday the issue resolving the rehire of ERIP's was presented to the Board and we now have a new Board policy that I hope you will find clarifies the situation and is to your liking and ERIP faculty's liking. I would like to summarize for you the rule, and the deans know this now and will be getting a hard copy of this within the next day or two.

The calculation on the number of ERIP faculty to be rehired is based on the number of part-time load hours taught, or load hours taught by part-time faculty is another way to put it. During the rest of this academic year and summer, faculty who left the University through the early retirement incentive program can make up to 15 percent of the pool of part-time faculty as measured by the percentage of load hours. Starting next academic year and going through fall, spring, and summer semester, they can make up 10 percent of the pool. The following year they can make up 5 percent of the pool, and it remains at 5 percent in order to give units the flexibility of rehiring ERIP faculty members as the need arises.

Now in determining these numbers we did load calculations based on fall semester, and at this point in time only two colleges are hiring ERIP faculty that exceed the 10 percent limit. No colleges are anywhere near the 15 percent limit, so the current behavior of hiring ERIP's for this year is fine. Next year if the trend continues, two colleges will need to lower their use of ERIP faculty, but only by a very small amount. One college is at about 11 percent and the other is at 12 percent; all of the other colleges are under that number. In fact, the vast majority of the colleges are already under the 5 percent limit that will continue indefinitely. So this should have no negative impact on any of your hiring of part-time faculty.

The other good side of this, both from your perspective and mine, is you no longer have to send me these canned explanations about why you're hiring ERIP faculty, where all that seems to change from one to another is the name. So I know you didn't like writing them; I even liked reading them less. Justifications are no longer necessary for the hiring of ERIP faculty, but they must remain within these percentage guidelines. So this policy will be in the hands of the dean within the next few days.

Finally, let me call your attention to today's paper which I haven't seen yet because I leave home before the paper arrives in the morning, but in there are some advertisements, the first of a series of advertisements for Weekend College. You will see there are some programs coming out of the Community & Technical College. These are accelerated programs leading to an associate's degree in 18 months. The ads are targeted on those individuals who really want to change their lives by getting into more exciting positions that pay better. You'll see us do a fair bit of advertising in the newspaper that won't appear on TV but is in the newspapers, talking about these opportunities in Weekend College. Any other units that would like to offer programs of instruction leading to degrees in the Weekend College, I'll be more than happy to help you in marketing those programs as well, just as I've helped the Community & Technical College in doing that. They already have enrollments, even though they just started advertising.

I should also tell you, and this number may be off a little bit, but as of a week or so ago our enrollments in the Evening College were up about 350 students by this time last year. So I think our efforts there are starting to bear fruit in terms of bringing additional revenues in enrollments to the institution. This concludes my report."

There were no questions for the Provost. Before continuing with reports from the remaining committees, Senator Sterns asked whether the body would go ahead and formally welcome Dr. Yoder who had arrived during the Provost's presentation. Chair Sheffer stated that, yes, this would be an appropriate time to welcome Dr. Janice Yoder, Professor of Psychology, as the new Senator from the College of Arts & Sciences. The body responded with a round of applause.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson stated that the University Well-Being report this month was informal because the committee had had a meeting just this morning and she had not had time to type up a report. (There would be a written report in the February Chronicle.) The next Well-Being Committee meeting had been scheduled for next month on Thurs., Jan. 25, at 8:00 a.m. in the Faculty Senate conference room.

At today's meeting, the committee had discussed the time line on the new contract for the University's health carriers, starting in February and then to the Board by August. As most Senators knew, representatives of the Well-Being Committee had worked on that contract. Senator Erickson wanted to thank the body on behalf of the Well-Being Committee for all of the input given this semester. If there was any other information Senators wanted to get to her, things which needed to be considered as to whether they should be included in the health coverage, please let her know. Senator Erickson stated that she had gotten a lot of email, but if something else was to be included, she asked that Senators please try to get it to the committee before the February meeting.

The Well Being Committee also discussed issues of maternity leave and sick leave. The committee had decided to form a subcommittee whose charge was to try to work on developing a proposed maternity leave policy for the University. Senator Erickson said that the committee was looking for people to be members of that subcommittee. Subcommittee members did not have to be members of Well-Being, but members of the Well-Being Committee would be selected first. If anyone had any names for consideration, they were asked to let Senator Erickson know.

Because the committee had asked the Center for Child Development to look at issues of child care and child care problems, the committee also had a presentation done by the head of the Child Development Center. Senator Erickson reported that the committee was now in the process of getting updated from the report that came from CFPC on this about a year ago. Essentially, the problem still existed and the committee still has to work on that. Senator Erickson stated that at this stage, all the committee had gotten through was the initial discussion.

Again, in January '01 the committee planned to meet to discuss child care issues, food service issues, and to look at the initial criteria on the health care policy.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - As Chair Nancy Stokes was in Hawaii, Senator Qammar made the report, stating that APCC had two pieces to discuss (**Appendix A**).

The first piece was a cover letter that went to the deans and department chairs from the RTP Task Force. The members of the Task Force who sat on APCC had really spent a great deal of time trying to develop what would become University procedures, to ensure that the process of RTP worked as smoothly, fairly, and efficiently as possible. Senator Qammar stated that right now both processes, the procedures and criteria, sat with each academic unit. That turned out not to be a particularly workable system when all the different places on campus were considered. The criteria though still always resided back in the academic unit.

That having been said, Senator Qammar stated that meant that each of the academic units would have to generate guidelines that would come into play with the RTP document. So first and foremost, the Task Force needed to have each of the colleges at least, if not academic units, thoroughly go through this document. The document was listed on the web. Deans and department chairs had copies of it. The Task Force really wanted to stress that the draft form of the document was as complete as they could make it, given that additional input was needed. She said that there may be phraseology, even spelling mistakes in the RTP document, but that the Task Force had tried to really nitpick over the intention of each of the elements in the document. She said that there were obviously differences of opinion, possible misinterpretations and things like that which desperately needed to be ironed out by the end of the spring semester. She further stated that the Task Force dearly needed each of the colleges and academic units to really scrutinize the document and send to Nancy Stokes, who chairs the committee, all their additional comments. Senator Qammar concluded her report by stating that it had really been wonderful to work with this group of people; they were very dedicated to getting this document as far along as possible.

The second piece was the proposed calendar for the academic year of 2001 and a tentative preliminary calendar for academic year 2002 (**Appendix B**). Senator Qammar stated that there had been a number of rumors that had scurried around about this proposed calendar, and she wanted to stand here and officially dispel most of them. First, the committee had looked at a variety of different elements that might be changed within an academic calendar, and had really developed a very conservative approach - one step at a time. For instance, Senators would notice that for the fall semester, it was the same fall semester. It was 16 weeks long; there really was no difference in the fall semester. Spring semester, again, was 17 weeks with a spring break, making it a 16-week academic semester. There was no change. She knew that there had been rumors about three rotating 15-week semesters. The committee had decided it was not the time and the period to do that at the moment, so fall and spring were left absolutely in place.

What the committee did though was to identify some very specific needs for the summer semester. The committee now had decided to call it a summer semester as opposed to summer sessions I, II, etc. The committee had proposed an official 15-week summer semester. This would allow two very important things. One, it would mean that researchers on campus who had lengthy grants could in fact, through their efforts of 15 weeks, get paid for 15 weeks of remuneration for the summer session. Secondly, the University formerly had a small intersession between spring and summer. As it turned out, those intersession courses were never billed until summer session actually started. This meant that intersession was completed before a student ever had to pay for a course. So if a student didn't like the grade he/she had gotten in a session, he/she simply did not ever have to pay for the course. The University, however, still had to provide the salary for the faculty member who was the instructor for that course. Extending to a 15-week semester, of course, eliminated that problem.

The schedule that the committee had proposed for the summer semester then would allow for a little more flexibility in scheduling. Senator Qammar stated that the 8-week block of time or two 5-weeks in the middle of the summer might not necessarily work with everyone's schedules, either faculty or students' schedules, so the committee had developed the idea of having three 5-week terms or the corresponding shifted 10-week terms. The basic idea was to try to allow faculty to schedule the courses meeting both the students'

needs and also the faculty's needs. So faculty would not have to teach a summer class 8 weeks right in the middle of the semester. If primarily a large number of students were able to take it early on in the summer or needed to take it later in the summer, faculty could schedule their classes that way. Of course, a very important issue was the salary faculty received for teaching summer classes now that it was no longer a 5-week, 8 or 10-week type of situation. Senator Qammar stated that from APCC's point of view, remuneration faculty received for a course would remain exactly the same. Formulas that had been used in terms of the amount of money faculty would earn from teaching a 3-credit hr. class was 3 load hrs.; faculty would receive that amount of pay. If faculty happened to teach a summer course previously taught for 5 weeks over a 10-week period of time, that was their choice. It still was one course that involved a certain amount of load hrs. Nine-month salaries and summer salaries were still separate and still exactly the way they were right now. The calendar did not change those things.

Senator Qammar then asked that this calendar be approved by the Senate. Chair Sheffer stated that since this had been put forth as a report from the APCC, the motion did not need a second. He called for discussion regarding the calendar. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion to approve the calendar. The motion passed.

Senator Qammar then reported to the body that there were three student financial aid dates that had not been placed officially on the calendar. She stated that APCC wanted to make a motion whereby the Faculty Senate would allow the committee to insert those dates without having to come back to the body. Senator Gunn seconded the motion. Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The motion passed.

Provost Hickey then stated that the calendar would have to go to the Board for approval. Assuming the Board approved it, while the calendar didn't officially start until next fall, he stated he would send out a memorandum to the deans which would declare this summer a 15-week session. This would enable those faculty who wished to pay themselves for 15 weeks off their grants to do so starting this summer. He stated that he thought that with this in place, with the long-term planning in place, it was quite justifiable to go ahead and declare this summer 15 weeks in terms of paying people off their grants.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Senator Redle stated that he was reporting for Nancy Stokes as well. Senator Redle presented three curriculum proposals (**Appendix C**). His understanding of the process was that these proposals had passed through the process without objection and, there having been no objection from this body at this point, would be approved and made a part of the regular record. There were two proposals from the C&T and one from Polymer Science/Polymer Engineering. Chair Sheffer asked whether there were any discussion of the report. None forthcoming, he called for a vote. Approval was given.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - See (**Appendix D**).

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns stated that he had provided Senators with a written CFPC report available to all (**Appendix E**). He further stated that he wanted to introduce Becky Herrnstein, the Executive Assistant to the President for Organizational Development, who was going to report on the parking retreat which she so ably conducted on the 13th.

Chair Sheffer then asked, as Ms. Herrnstein was not a member of Senate, whether there were any objections to her speaking to the Senate. Hearing none, Ms. Herrnstein began her report.

Ms. Herrnstein said that as probably a lot of the body knew, there were significant faculty concerns about parking availability. These concerns had been expressed both by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and through what could be called "numerous" email messages, sent to President Proenza directly to his office and to other places at the University that ended up coming to the President's attention. Rather than trying to answer that piece-meal and certainly rather than becoming defensive about those kinds of comments, President Proenza had thought it would be much more productive to bring everybody together

and make sure that everyone had a full chance to be heard. So, Ms. Herrnstein stated, that was what we did on November 13; we had a 4-hr. parking problem solving retreat. She was really very glad to see that everyone attending the retreat had been so engaged in the dialogue. The group not only took the four hours but insisted working through lunch. She thought that was a very good sign. The retreat was collegial; it was productive, and it was all the things one would hope would happen in a university community. She stated that she found it actually kind of fun.

What the group did was to spend about an hour making sure that everybody's concerns had been expressed. We posted those things around the room, and then after that first hour where everyone vented and made sure all the issues were on the table, we turned our attention to possible solutions, recommendations for change. We tried to conduct this brainstorming opportunity so people would be pretty free with their comments. We generated an awful lot of recommendations, and she said that she thought some of them were really very good. It was a perfect example of a bunch of bright folks like this body getting together and coming up with good stuff. We wrote all those down and posted them around the room. Then we prioritized the recommendations that had been made.

Although the body had been encouraged by the Executive Committee to ask a committee member or Ms. Herrnstein for a copy of the minutes, Ms. Herrnstein stated that rather than share all of the four hours of minutes with the body in full, she thought it might be more productive to simply make a list and a summary of the concerns and a list of the recommendations that were made without any kind of rank ordering (**Appendix F**). She said that the group had spent some time trying to prioritize those recommendations but really wanted input about what the body thought to be the highest priority. She asked Senators to consider which recommendations seemed best. Ms. Herrnstein reported that she had provided a page, an executive summary and list of recommendations which she would make available for Senators to pick up on their way out.

She further stated that she really would like Senators to go and share with their constituencies and to simply assign a numerical ranking of 1 through 5 for the various recommendations. Very few of them were mutually exclusive. If Senators really hated any of the recommendations, she asked that they please make a marginal note that they had some very strong objection to it and why. When those were completed, Ms. Herrnstein asked Senators to return the form to Dr. Sterns, who had very graciously accepted the role of collector. Once he had collected them, Ms. Herrnstein would help him compile in some sensible fashion the numerical rankings which would be shared with the Motor Vehicle Parking Committee, reactivated by President Proenza in response to some of the concerns expressed. Hank Nettling was the chair of that committee; Dr. Sterns had a place on that committee. At that point, both men would review the priorities that had been expressed, evaluate feasibility, and discuss possible implementation policies.

So she thought the bottom line was that the retreat was four hours very well spent. She stated that she thought all had come out feeling that good work had been done, and hopefully some positive change could take place fairly rapidly. She then stated that she would be glad to entertain any questions here, by email or by phone.

President Proenza then added a word of personal thanks to Ms. Herrnstein for having conducting this retreat with the body's help. That indeed had been very helpful and he had been fully briefed on it. He stated that he wanted to assure the Senate that the administration was looking forward to the body's input of prioritization. He further pointed out that the administration had not sat still on this issue, and, in that context, he hoped that the body would understand that Jim Stafford, Director of Parking Services, had been working very diligently to try to implement solutions. Senate was to believe the President that any copy of any message that he had gotten, Jim Stafford also had gotten a copy - along with the President's suggestions of what might be possible.

As with virtually anything, President Proenza said, 90 percent of the issue turned out to revolve around poor communication. People didn't know another parking lot was accessible, so communication was taking place. There was a website and a phone number and Mr. Stafford was available to suggest places. And in

the process there had been some exceptionally good suggestions. For example, one young lady had written indicating that she thought an additional two parking spaces could be carved in a particular site. Mr. Stafford had gone to look and examined the options of that. So the bottom line was that things were happening and all looked forward to making other things happen.

President Proenza continued. For example, as a result of one of the earlier inputs before this retreat, we had been able to talk with our architect's office; they in turn talked with our construction managers and the people under contract for the Exchange parking deck and Polsky's deck. He stated that the University had been able - with no added cost - to adjust the schedules and bring both of those decks in by Dec. 31 of this year rather than further into the semester as initially projected. So those would be immediately available when the new semester began. Finally, he stated that he knew the body would be a little bit incredulous, but as this issue had been examined and discussed with our other colleagues, there had not been found any campus anywhere in the country or in the world that reported they did not have complaints about parking, for whatever that was worth.

Senator Sterns concluded the report by encouraging all to read the written material.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - See **(Appendix G)** for 2001 Summer Fellowships and Internal Grants.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Reed began her report by stating that she had been ill and missed the committee meeting. Therefore, her report would be brief. She wanted to indicate to the body that, true to Dr. Hickey's report earlier this semester, the committee had started work on a first draft of the annual approach to the budget process. It was very much a work in progress. She reported that the committee was meeting next week and early in the semester so there was not anything to share at this time. She stated that the committee was taking that task very seriously and looked forward to bringing some new ideas to this body in the spring semester. She then said that anyone who had been at the meeting and wanted to make a comment could do so now. She stated that the committee was working very hard and would continue to keep the body updated.

Senator Lavelli asked whether the committee would be issuing to the University community one of the charts which indicated the range of salaries for the assistant, associate, and full professors that had been distributed in previous years. Senator Reed replied that Senator Lavelli had sent her a copy of that document, and that she had intended to bring that up with Provost Hickey.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES COMMITTEE - Dr. Prough began his report by saying that the WOW groups that were started last year had shared some significant results. He pointed out to the body that it already had heard about the RTP procedures becoming part of the Manual, and that the Task Force had embraced a lot of principles that had been a part of that group. He stated that he had learned this morning that the PBC had embraced the principles that had come out of the Innovative Budgeting group.

There were two groups that were working on evaluation of personnel - one dealing with faculty which was the RTP group, and the other one dealing with the staff. He stated that Kathy Stafford had told him this morning that the training programs that had come out of that were going forward in some form through her office. More would be heard about that soon.

Further, the performance appraisal program would be initiated soon, again, having come out of our WOW group. Occasionally, Dr. Prough said that he would hear bits and pieces of some group on campus putting together customer service programs and other things that had come out of the Disney retreat held last year. So the WOW groups had produced some significant results.

Dr. Prough said that he was now in the process of meeting with all of the WOW groups from last year, trying to get some sense from them about their recommendations for the future. What he anticipated to happen in the spring was that some form of those WOW groups would begin meeting, either the existing

WOW groups or new WOW groups to start this process all over. So the committee was excited to be back in place with the WOW groups, and whether they were Wednesday WOW groups or other day WOW groups, that remained to be seen. Nevertheless, that initiative was still in place and the committee would be carrying that out this coming spring.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - Chair Sheffer stated that he had attended the Ohio Faculty Council meeting last month in place of our representative. The minutes of that meeting would be included in the February Chronicle, and he also wished to add that all of the Senators would be receiving a letter from the Ohio Faculty Council and a pamphlet entitled, "Get the Facts - Facts about the State of Higher Education," to familiarize them with the budget issues coming up before the legislature. That would be coming either the end of this month or sometime in January.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chair stated that the Senate had one item under unfinished business. Last month there had been an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws proposed by CCTC, an amendment to 3359-10-02(F)(11)(b). Basically, the change involved a title change from the Associate Vice President for Information Services to the Vice President for Information and Instructional Technologies, Libraries and Institutional Planning. The Chair called for discussion of the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The body then voted its approval of the motion. Parliamentarian Gerlach pointed out that the motion had passed with the necessary 60 percent.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Parliamentarian Gerlach provided the body with an update on the progress of former Secretary, Dr. Gary Oller. Dr. Oller was still in Edwin Shaw. Parliamentarian Gerlach informed Senators that Dr. Oller's birthday was December 12, (when he would turn 52) and suggested cards be sent. Dr. Oller had been having certain difficulties, but a week from today he was being flown back to his home in Philadelphia where his mother and brother lived. He would then be under their direct care.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - None.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - A motion to adjourn the meeting was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin