

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MAY 3, 2001

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, May 3, 2001 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Thirty-seven of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Dhinojwala, Gelfand, Gibson, Hajjafar, Hanlon, Kim, Lavelli, Lee, Lyons, Marino, Pope, Schmith, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Edgerton, Garn-Nunn, Graham, Holz, Keller, Louscher, Purdy, Saliga, Stinner, Turning, and Weaver were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

*** APPROVED THE LIST OF SUMMER 2001 COMMENCEMENT CANDIDATES.**

*** PROPOSED CHANGE IN FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS, 3359-10-02 HELD OVER UNTIL NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING.**

*** APPROVED THE PART-TIME FACULTY DOCUMENT BROUGHT BY APCC TO AMEND RULES 3359-20-061 AND 3359-20-032 OF THE FACULTY MANUAL.**

*** APPROVED CFPC RESOLUTION REGARDING REDESIGNATION OF SOME FACULTY-ONLY PARKING LOTS BY FALL 2001.**

*** APPROVED A MOTION TO REFER FUNDING OF LAPTOP PROGRAM TO PBC.**

*** AUTHORIZED THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO ACT ON PBC'S BEHALF IN APPROVING THE FINAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRESIDENT PROENZA UPON CONCLUSION OF THE BUDGET PROCESS.**

*** REFERRED MOTION TO INCLUDE MEMBERS OF UNIVERSITY OF AKRON RETIREES TO SENATE MEMBERSHIP TO OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL.**

*** AMENDED FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS REGARDING FACULTY SENATE MEETING ATTENDANCE.**

*** ELECTED SENATOR SPIKER TO SERVE AS OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE FOR 2001-2002.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Chair Sheffer began the meeting by calling for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Filer-Tubaugh made the motion which was seconded by Senator Sterns. The Senate then voted approval of the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 5 - The Chair then asked for consideration of the minutes of March 15 and April 5 meetings. Secretary Kennedy stated that there were two corrections to the April 5 minutes. The first dealt with curriculum proposals that the Senate had passed last time. From the College of Education, proposal ED-02-26 should have read as having come from the Department of Counseling and Special Education. The other correction to the minutes was on pg. 27, where it read that Senator Qammar had moved to substitute draft 11 for draft 10 of the RTP Guidelines document. The last phrase, "approved by the Senate at the last meeting" should have been deleted. Following the last paragraph of this section the statement, "The Senate then voted its approval of the amended draft 11 of the RTP Guidelines" should have been inserted. The Chair then called for additional corrections, and, none forthcoming, asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the meetings of March 15 and April 5. Senator Lillie made the motion; Senator Ofobike seconded it. The Senate then voted approval of the corrected minutes.

III. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS - Chair Sheffer then began his remarks by stating that he hoped everybody had a very successful summer. Senate had had a very busy academic year, and had passed some things that had needed quite a bit of deliberation. He thanked all for the input and willingness to debate and move along with the business of the Senate. He wished all well this summer.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Senate was then asked to approve the Summer 2001 commencement candidates. Chair Sheffer stated that Marilyn Quillin had a copy of the list of candidates available if anyone wanted to review it. Senator Ritchey made the motion to approve the list. Senator Sterns seconded the motion. The Senate then voted approval of the Summer 2001 commencement candidates.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy stated that the Executive Committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting - once with only committee members present, once with the President and Becky Herrnstein. One of the things the committee had done was to certify the election of new Faculty Senators from the College of Business Administration. At the meeting with the President and Mrs. Herrnstein, we discussed the budget. At that time the legislature had not yet determined its budget, so the discussion had been limited to what the current status of the process was. Relatedly, however, the deans had been asked by the Provost to develop scenarios for their respective college's costs. The Executive Committee expressed to the President that there was some concern among faculty regarding when those proposals might be enacted. More specifically, some of the changes the deans were proposing could possibly occur over the summer when faculty might not be present to provide input. The President suggested that it might be possible to freeze positions over the summer and wait until fall to discuss this. It was stated that the deans' proposals were just that, and that no decisions had been made at this time. Regarding the Conflict of Interest document, the Executive Committee had been informed that the revised document would not be available for review until fall. The Executive Committee mentioned to the President that faculty had expressed concern regarding filing of disclosure reports. It appeared that there was some confusion over this issue as well as filing of forms. These items would be addressed by the President today. The Executive Committee also brought forth

concerns regarding the amount of money needed for maintenance of existing computers and inquired about the status of the laptop program. That was to be addressed by CCTC today as well.

(For Senate budget report and Senatorial attendance record see **Appendix A.**)

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - Chair Sheffer invited President Proenza to address the body.

"Thank you, Dan, and good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Before I begin, let me say that I'll return to the budget in a moment, but I think you need to know that there's still nothing definitive so we'll spell out some scenarios inasmuch as we discussed that day.

Let me begin with the first of five topics that I have this afternoon by congratulating the Senate for its prompt deliberation and action on the RTP process. As I've said to the Executive Committee and as I've said to our Trustees, you are to be commended. You worked diligently and rapidly on an issue that usually bogs down other campuses for years, and I truly appreciate your diligence on it. It has meant a great deal to The University of Akron, and it speaks very positively for the work of the Task Force, the Provost, and this Faculty Senate in moving an important issue forward.

Secondly, let me address the budget. The operative word is, please be calm. There is no impending doom. There are of course some serious constraints which our state is facing, which certainly means that we're not likely to be awash in money once the legislature acts, but the early warning signs of potentially very serious cuts appear to have been exaggerated. As Senator Kennedy indicated, the budget is now moving forward within the legislature. The House presented one version last Friday and some additional details are emerging today. It has gone to the Senate, and the Senate will now make its own recommendations, and depending on how quickly the Senate makes its recommendations is how quickly the conference committees will begin to work to adjudicate the differences between the House proposal and the Senate proposal.

That said, let me back up and give you a little bit of what has transpired and where we find ourselves so at least you'll have a sense of what the best guess set of scenarios are that we have to work with at this present time. First of all, you will recall that during the last two and a half years I've been with you I've shared with you the fact that the other university presidents, certainly this university president, have been collectively very outspoken about the fact that Ohio is a high tuition, low state-support state; that we have been discussing that and providing the legislature with the kind of information that we believe they need to have to understand the relationship between the state's failure to invest in higher education and the specific economic conditions that the state faces. Those discussions have been exceptionally fruitful. For one thing, as you may know, the word 'subsidy' has been dropped at least from the formal vocabulary and in its place has been substituted the concept of state share of instruction. It's not what I would have preferred and is certainly not completely operationalized in anybody's mind; in fact, we still find some people making the mistake in referring to state appropriations as a subsidy, but I think we've made some progress.

Secondly and more importantly, we find that both the legislature and members of the Board of Regents as well as the business community, are increasingly understanding the issues. So much so that the Board of Regents was willing to propose a very significant increase to the Governor, which of course has not materialized but they talked about a \$350 million Ohio plan requesting a 7-1/2+ percent increase in operating funds and many other special initiatives that obviously would have been nice to have. Indeed, they were warmly received both by the Governor and by the legislature as these things were being discussed. Ironically, as you know, in late November and early December the U.S. economy as well as

that of the state of Ohio began to do a bit of a downturn, and as such all of a sudden all bets were off. The bottom line is that as the Governor then began to formulate his budget, revenue projections given the declining economic scenario were such that the best he could do was to recommend in the executive budget a 2% increase in the operating funds and a roughly \$40 million down payment on the Ohio plan as well as some other small initiatives dealing with success challenge, access, and so many of the challenge lines. That is the proposal that he presented to the legislature.

Two other things are on the horizon - a marked shortfall in the state's account for Medicaid and the need to pay those bills. Secondly, as I think all of you know, the pressure of the DeRolph decision to come up with a plan for adjusting the funding for K-12. The Governor's budget for K-12 was an increase of \$600 million. As it's gone to the legislature, the legislature seems to be focused, tightly focused on making that \$1.2 billion and in fact may be as much as \$1.4 billion. Needless to say, in a declining economy those extra dollars have to come from elsewhere. As a result, two things have happened. First of all, because of declining revenue the state had to call back 1% of this current fiscal year's operating funds including from higher education. You're not going to notice the difference because it was possible within the University to take anticipated salary savings for just those positions that were currently vacant and were not going to be filled in the second of the next three months, the April-May-June time frame, and use that to balance our books for this year. No positions were cancelled; these are simply salary savings that would have accrued for these three months. No other salary savings were taken; in other words those that had already accrued to the departments remained there, and we simply look to those.

Now as we do go forward into next year, there's a bit of good news and a bit of not-so-good news. The good news is that indeed the legislature is trying very hard to approximate the Governor's budget. So in other words, we are likely to potentially get a little bit of an increase, don't know what that is exactly. The Ohio Plan is fundamentally gone, and some of the access and success and other challenges are proposed to be adjusted a little bit. So at the present time the best guess scenario of what is going to happen is that we may get anywhere from a continuation budget, i.e., no increase but no decrease in actual state appropriations to possibly a very small increase from a half to maybe 1 or 2% in the operating budget. Exactly what will happen to the challenges - again, we may lose a little bit or may be more or less even with that. The proposals are still being argued about. Please understand that in the middle of an otherwise inflationary picture with regard to some costs such as energy, gas and electric and petroleum and other things, a flat budget from the state and no other revenues would mean that effectively we still would have to find some dollars with which to make ends meet. But at least it would not be a cut in the budget. By contrast, North Carolina has announced a 7% budget cut; Alabama a comparable budget cut, and Mississippi perhaps as much as 15%. However, by contrast there are some states that may not see such a reduction or perhaps even an increase; Georgia appears to be one of those, and we're still seeing what's happening throughout the nation.

Now what does that mean for The University of Akron? Obviously, your Planning & Budgeting Committee has been assisting us in planning several scenarios. You are aware that both from my office, the office of the Provost, and the Board of Trustees, we have long made a commitment to increase wage opportunities for faculty, staff, and contract professionals. That remains very much at the head of our list. So the Planning & Budgeting Committee together with Vice President Nettling and the Provost and other staff have been doing this developing of a series of scenarios. A few weeks ago when gloom and doom might be in the picture, those scenarios did include things as much as a 6% decrease that might have been expected. More recently, because it does appear that the legislature is going to protect as much as they see is possible, we've been clustering more in the no change to maybe a 1 or

2% change in the operating account. So later this afternoon your Planning & Budgeting Committee will discuss with you their recommendations, and I am pleased to tell you that they will be recommending to you that we do everything we can to secure a 3% salary pool for merit increases. They make some other recommendations I'd like them to share with you and we can discuss more at that point.

In the discussion with your Executive Committee I did reflect that I did not think it was absolutely necessary in the next few months that we go into so many final decisions on any program issues since first of all, we don't even know whether those will become necessary. But certainly, that we can manage for the next couple of months and perhaps into early fall by looking at those open positions that are not well along in the recruitment process or that can in other ways be deferred. So we can probably adjust our cash flow situation to enable us to operate comfortably and thereby allow suitable time for you to deliberate with us in the fall and explore other things should those become necessary. Now you are aware that as part of our overall budget planning, the Provost had requested of the deans some scenarios. What would they do if they got a 5% increase, a 3% increase? What would they do if they had to cut 3 or 5%? Again, these are just ideas that were floated. Senator Kennedy indicated that none of those have made it into the form of a formal recommendation that any of us are prepared to add. They remain scenarios that may rise to the level of a recommendation in the fall with other scenarios for other reasons - programmatic change, programmatic redistribution allocation, etc., so we'll take those at hand. For the moment, again, those are not in our offices for anything other than to reflect the Provost's request for ideas. Certainly, you should explore within your college other ideas, because the time involved with that opportunity was short, and we really just want to get an idea, so don't consider that even part of a formal process that is being considered. That will come later, if necessary. Again, the operative word is please be calm; there is no impending doom. Chicken Little is not out there crying and we don't expect any major issues.

We will certainly be also looking at where we may be able to reduce some costs in addition to salary savings, and we are optimistic that we may see some increased revenues given the rate at which applications are being made for new programs. I think the Provost may have already shared that the entering class of honors students has nearly doubled for next year (187 new honors students) coming in for the fall, nearly double the largest class previously. Equally, our application rate has been up. I caution you, however, to not be overly optimistic but I think this is certainly a more positive report than we had last year, although there are a lot of things to yet shake up. What are some of those things? What will other schools do in terms of their tuition? Given the budget picture, I am expecting that every other university will raise their tuition by at least 6%. Ohio State has requested an exemption from the cap, and the word from Columbus this week is that that will probably be granted and that the legislature may well vote to also lift the cap for other colleges and universities beginning in July 2002.

Now please remember and this is important for you to be aware of - if you want to go to Miami University you're going to pay about \$6,500 in tuition and fees; if you're going to go to Bowling Green or Kent State you're going to pay about \$5,000 in tuition and fees. If you go to either Ohio State or The University of Akron, it's about \$4,200. The bottom line is that some of the people that would like to consider themselves our competitors are charging already \$800 or more than we are, so we have some room in which to be competitive. Although our 6% raise got some press a week or so ago, you are very quickly going to see that Bowling Green announced a 6%; we have word that Kent intends to do the same, and so on. We'll see how it actually shakes out. The only tuition that is being held constant or potentially reduced are in the 2-yr. colleges, including our own Wayne and C & T Colleges, where we expect to receive some modest access challenge funds. So in any case, the bottom line is that we are continuing with the positive press of enrollment management, of continuing our construction that

should improve our attractability, and so I am hopeful that as early as this fall we may see a little bit of an enhancement in our revenue picture that may help us as well as whatever internal adjustments we make. I guess before I continue I wonder whether there are any questions about the budget scenarios at least as far as I've painted them at this point. With reason and calm there are all sorts of good things that can be accomplished, so please do remain calm and we promise we will not abolish any programs defacto without your input and consultation. During the next few months, depending on what the legislature does, we'll work with available saving opportunities.

The third point is conflict of interest. There appear to be several issues and I'd like to address three very briefly. First of all, please understand that conflict of interest issues have a second side to them, and that is conflict of commitment issues. We have asked the deans to be the cognizant officers at least responsible to us, for deciding how within your units the reporting requirements, etc., will be monitored and evaluated. The forms call for you to hand those to your immediate supervisor; we are simply asking the deans to assure us that everything is being managed appropriately. That doesn't mean that each of you has to have a conference with your dean; it doesn't mean that your supervisor has to hand the forms to the deans; it simply means that we are going to ask the deans to be responsible for being sure that these things are being managed properly with good integrity, good information, within your colleges and with your departments. The first issue is the conflict of interest and conflict of commitment issues. Please be aware of those both being issues. The second issue is the deans are going to be the ones who have to tell us that things are working well, as we're not going down to ask you and we're not even going to ask your department chair. The dean is going to tell the Provost.

The third issue deals with the summer. Some of our faculty have been concerned as to why, if they're on a 9-month contract, they're expected to file a disclosure form for potential employment elsewhere during the summer. Isn't that, after all, their own time? The answer is yes and no. No, because legally you are a 12-month employee of the University from the perspective of the state and certainly from the perspective of the insurance companies through which we are able to continue your coverage for 12 months. No, we do not object to your considering outside employment during the summer, whether this be over a wonderful grant that you seek and solicit and carry on here which would enable you to earn more than you normally would anyway, or by seeking employment elsewhere. But why must you disclose it? Again, the first reason is that technically and legally you are a full-time employee of the University. Is everybody clear on that and why that is? Secondly, because conflict of interest disclosure is after all a mechanism designed to put it all out in the open, so if there is any perceived conflict of interest, it can be managed; it's fundamentally for your own protection.

What might constitute a conflict of interest that we would be upset about? Suppose that your area of expertise is communications and you have been developing a particular course that we may be wanting to put on the web here, but you take a summer job and you in effect give rights to the same material to another university or organization. That is not in the best interest of yourself or of The University of Akron, and we would probably caution you to not do that. You may teach the course, but not give rights to the course to your summer employee. Similarly, for research issues, if your area of expertise for example is aging, and you are employed here, your responsibilities are with the Institute for Lifelong Learning and you teach Gerontology and your name is Harvey Sterns and you go off into the summer and engage yourself with a hospital - the same things you're doing for the University you now not only get compensated for but you give a property interest to them that you don't also extend to the University - that is also a conflict of interest. I think you can probably use your imagination for other permutations and probably no one has any problem, but disclosure protects you from the perception. It protects you from others, particularly the newspapers, from coming back and saying you were trying to cheat and

trying to hide something because you didn't disclose it. That's what it's all about. Disclosure is just putting it on the table; it's not about somebody policing this or about you being prohibited from it - it is about putting the cards on the table.

Fourth and nearly final item - we have had a number of very special things that have happened in the last couple of months, and I apologize for not being with you at the last meeting. I'd just like to cite three of them. First of all, out of our College of Business and Engineering and Polymer Science, an entrepreneurship team competed in two business plan writing competitions - one a national competition in Kentucky and another one an international competition in San Diego. In the national competition they brought home three first-place awards. In the international competition they came in eighth in the world, ahead of places like Case Western and some other ones of those so-called high-class universities.

Secondly, one of our colleagues, Prof. Ed Lim in Chemistry, was recently awarded the Ho-Am Prize from the Republic of Korea. The Ho-Am Prize is regarded in Korea as equivalent to the Nobel Prize and doesn't carry exactly the monetary award as the Nobel, but it's enough to make Dr. Lim feel very good. More importantly, the distinction that it does carry in the scientific community as equivalent is that it was awarded to one of our own colleagues. There was a television crew that flew all the way from Korea together with a representative of the Ho-Am Prize Committee to interview and film Dr. Lim a week ago and perhaps some of you saw the coverage. Please when you see Dr. Lim, or if you don't know him, write him a note to congratulate him but above all, be proud of one of our colleagues being so distinguished.

Finally, the Provost and I have just come back from a very nice event this afternoon. Frank Samuel, the Governor's science advisor was with us. The Goodyear Co. and The University of Akron hosted his visit and we spent some time in the Goodyear Polymer Building and went over to the Goodyear Technical Center. At lunch we had with us the Mayor of Akron, the Chairman of City Council, Mr. Sommerville, and several members of the Mayor's staff. Suffice it to say, I think we have a friend in the Governor's office; this is a person that is advancing the world of science and technology of higher education and the state's economic well-being. Secondly, the Mayor's presence here was equally significant of his understanding.

Last and final, and I apologize for taking this long - have a great summer and a productive one as well. Thank you very much."

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

"I will be extremely brief. First of all, any of you who bet your neighbor that I wouldn't make it a year, pay up. And any of you who bet that I would, start collecting. I am now two days into my second year.

My only remarks today are to thank the Senate for all of the work they've done this year, particularly that with regard to the RTP process and the curriculum review process. Again, to thank the Task Force headed by Nancy Stokes for all they did, because I think it was a tremendous undertaking, and I join with the President in expressing my appreciation for it. I look forward to another exciting year next year. Hopefully, we will get through this budget situation okay and I'll still be smiling when we start in the fall; I'm confident we will. I'll be happy to answer any questions that you might have."

There were no questions for the Provost.

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE - (Appendix B)

GRADUATE COUNCIL - (Appendix C)

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Qammar proposed a change in the Faculty Manual. Faculty Senate Bylaws did not permit this committee to be chaired by a non-faculty member. The proposed change was to have the committee chaired by the Senior VP and Provost or his designee (**Appendix D**).

Chair Sheffer stated that as this proposal came from committee, it did not require a second. It did, however, need to be held over until the next regular Senate meeting. He asked for comments. Senator Qammar then stated that historically, the Academic Policies, Curriculum & Calendar Committee had been a single committee but had been split into Academic Policies & Calendar, and the Curriculum Review Committee on the other side. At the time when it was a single committee, the Provost or his designee was in fact the chair. When the committees split into two, the Faculty Manual allowed the Curriculum Committee to be chaired by the Provost or their designee but made no mention of the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee. The current recommendation from APCC went to the issue that there had to be a direct connection between this committee and the Provost's office. If there was not someone from the Provost's office coming in to sit and chair that committee, it would generate a very large disconnection between what the faculty needed to accomplish on the campus and all of the administrative work that went into building up policy changes, putting up rules, etc. To benefit from this connection as the Curriculum Committee was, APCC so sought this change.

She continued with her report. APCC had met a number of times since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The committee had been working on a couple of policies, one associated with fixed term faculty which was the new designation of fixed term faculty on campus. There was no mention of this nor any policies associated with this within the Faculty Manual. Therefore, APCC had started to look into this. Since it was a campus-wide type of endeavor, APCC was going to constitute a task force to be able to look into all issues associated with this new designation of fixed term faculty. Any Senator here or anyone else a Senator knew of who would be interested in the policies associated with fixed term faculty was asked to join the effort by contacting Nancy Stokes who would be running the task force. A second task force to be created would address the annual evaluations. There was not necessarily a policy on campus at the moment, but there was a great deal of inconsistency. Therefore, a group would be studying annual evaluation policies and merit raises. Again, Senators or their colleagues who might be interested were asked to contact Nancy Stokes.

Senator Qammar then made mention of the part-time faculty document given to Senators (**Appendix E**). The APCC recommended that this document be incorporated into two existing rules within the Faculty Manual, rule 20-061, and the faculty workload rule, 20-032. There were parts of this document that needed to be appropriately inserted into both sections of the Faculty Manual. This document actually came from a committee which played an important role for part-time faculty. There had been issues over the years that part-time faculty had wanted addressed by this body; hence the current document. APCC recommended these insertions.

Senator Qammar then provided some background on the document. The document tried to mimic the style and the tone of other parts of the Faculty Manual, in particular those that dealt with the definitions of regular faculty by instituting definitions of part-time faculty. Reappointment issues were also

addressed was well as what credentials, what constituted appropriate assignments and the maximum assignments that part-time faculty could have. Senator Qammar argued for this as a need for a consistent policy across campus. Other points to the document concerned things part-time faculty would like to have documented in terms of resources that were available for them to be able to do their jobs and some of the things that they could be recognized for. In particular, there was a change in salary grade table. The minimum required credentials in the classifications for the part-time faculty had been changed, and there were documented salary ranges for those. The Council of Deans had approved these changes in credentials and in salary ranges. Finally, as the document continued, it addressed how part-time faculty could be recognized in much the same way as full-time faculty in terms of annual evaluations and other elements related to merit evaluations. She then asked the Faculty Senate to approve the insertion of this language into the two appropriate portions of the Faculty Manual.

Senator Erickson then inquired whether this document had come from Senator Filer-Tubaugh, who replied that it had come from APCC. As she had worked on it for a year and a half with other part-time faculty members, she could, however, address it. It had been brought to the Council of Deans several times. Everyone had looked at it as carefully as possible and compromised on some items. The document addressed the concerns that part-time faculty had as far as having a desk, a phone, and having predetermined salary ranges. It also set down ideas for merit. In the past, that had been left up to each department with resulting inconsistencies across departments. It stated that part-time faculty were hired to teach, spelling out what was expected of them and what would be considered for merit.

Senator Gunn then asked how would, access to work space and office space be interpreted. There was no space in her college. Senator Filer-Tubaugh replied that the concern was that oftentimes someone who came in as a part-time person was given certain responsibilities to teach but had no place to meet with students. In her department all shared desks. That was a necessity, but at least there was a spot to meet with students. Part-time faculty members' concern was that some type of provision be made to have such a place even if it were shared with other faculty. Hopefully each department could work on finding that space. The document did not ask for a separate space for each part-time faculty member but rather that each have access to a space.

Senator Foos stated a concern that there was not a similar provision for full-time faculty. Senator Foos then stated the importance of the University recognizing part-time faculty but was unsure whether this was the appropriate document where that statement should be made.

Senator Binienda pointed out that on page 2 (c), the constraints of the departments facing budgets would be considered. Senator Gunn then added that there would likely be still inequity because units with 40 some part-time people would not have enough space for offices.

Senator Qammar then stated that this had been brought in front of the Council of Deans three times and they had agreed to all the conditions, including the potential increased costs that these salary ranges would involve. The Senate then voted approval of the motion.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Nancy Stokes made reference to the curriculum proposals which had been approved by the Provost and brought to Faculty Senate **Appendix F**). Senator Lillie had pointed out there was again the same correction in proposal no. The Curriculum Review Committee asked Senate to approve these proposals, and the Senate did so.

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE FOR NCAA - Chair Sheffer invited David Jamison to speak as the NCAA faculty representative.

"Thank you, Dan. There is a document here which accompanies my report, and I hope you will take a copy of it (**Appendix G**). As quick background, I'll just walk you through the elements of the document. The University five years ago was visited by a certification team of university administrators and athletics personnel as part of the NCAA certification process that resembles in essence accreditation for academic programs and looks at facilities and fiscal management, governance of the program, etc. We were certified without condition, one of the institutions that was so because of the management of the department. NCAA originally contemplated that every five years this would happen; everyone quickly realized that was awful quickly. It was going to be expensive; it was going to be time consuming, so they instead went to a 10-year cycle with a 5-year interim report. This is our fifth year and we are mandated to have an interim report on the progress we've made since 1996-97, specifically geared to the plans we set forward at that time as to what we were going to do with our athletics program.

The University has some choices in how that report is written, and I want to say a word about the President's choice. Across the country Presidents use different models - they have this done by staff, in-house, and I want to compliment President Proenza on asking a faculty member to do this report, and I'm honored to have been the scrivener of this report. Obviously, the documentation of the material comes from the Athletics Department. The report format is prescriptive from the NCAA; it tells us what we must include and essentially the points we must talk about. So what you have in front of you follows that mandate of the NCAA. It begins with a discussion of our progress in gender equity, and I think we can cite a number of very positive steps there. Funding is up; opportunities for women, student-athletes are up. Two new sports have been added; full funding including scholarship funding for those sports will be in place within a year. Improvements in locker, office, training, weight lifting, conditioning, and other facilities have been accomplished.

Moreover, if you look at the last sentence of that in transition to the next, we have made significant progress in diversifying the administration of the athletics program at the University. The Associate AD is a woman; the four assistant AD's represent groups that historically have been under-represented in the administration of athletics, and I think it's to the credit of the department that that has happened.

Governance and rules compliance on the back of your page - I think it's to Mike Thomas' credit that immediately upon coming here he set in motion a new mission statement for the Athletics Dept. and a new statement about sportsmanship and ethical conduct for student-athletes. That's been a major bit of progress, I think. We have tightened the oversight of the number of aspects of our program that needed it. The department has enhanced the connection with you, which a year and a half ago led to the first-ever formal 'Missed-class Policy' that we've ever had at The University of Akron for student-athletes, indeed for all persons representing the University in activities. The academic integrity of our program continues strong; coaches are held accountable for the academic progress, the degree progress of their student-athletes at their annual evaluation.

The University has committed every dollar that it gets and so you know, the basketball contract, the million-dollar contract with CBS that is shared with the institutions, doesn't come in one truck - it comes in funds, and one of those funds is an academic enhancement fund. This University uses every dollar of that specifically for programs to support student-athletes. At other places that's sometimes diverted into salaries or other things, and I commend again the department in doing that. There is a very effective

advising, mentoring and monitoring program that's in place and a graduation rate for student-athletes that exceeds that of the University as a whole. We're still not satisfied with that, and Mike has made as a priority significant improvement in our student-athlete graduation rate. I think most importantly from my point of view as your faculty athletics representative, in addition to monitoring the conduct of the program is the welfare of student-athletes which is something that is dear to my heart. We have done a lot to enhance the athletics experience for our 370-380 student-athletes at The University of Akron. Much better education and nutrition in training, in conditioning, prevention of injury, and a fully responsive program when issues do arise. The full content of this report is pretty substantial, and in order that some trees might yet stand in the Cuyahoga Valley, we did not duplicate it for the entire campus, but it is my understanding that the full report will go to the Faculty Senate Athletics Committee for their review so that as we move forward in the next five years, the Senate can be an important part of what we do. The report has been reviewed by a broad-based campus committee that the President appointed, and they reviewed carefully my first and second drafts, made very many useful suggestions, and the final product is an evidence of the shared leadership that we have.

Again, I want to commend the President on his willingness to let a faculty member write this report, his confidence in me and letting me be the one to do it. I would also like to say in this year-end report to you that the President has been fully responsive; his email portal is always open; his physical door has been open whenever I've had an issue about athletics that I need to raise on your behalf, and I think one of the very positive things that we've had in President Proenza's administration and now that Dr. Hickey has been here a year and his oversight of the academic side, is we do have very strong governance of the program. Mike Thomas is here today and either of us can address specific issues before it will go to the committee for a full review and deliberations by the Senate. Thank you."

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns then stated that CFPC wanted to commend Phil Bartlett, who had received the Outstanding Service Award for contract professionals. Mr. Bartlett had been an exceptional co-worker. All had appreciated his painstaking work on space allocation and documentation over the years, and the committee wanted to publicly thank him for all his good work. Senator Sterns stated that the committee would meet over the summer if necessary and would be available for pending issues.

The real purpose of today's report was on the parking and shuttle service issues. The committee looked forward to working with Mr. Stafford on these issues, and the written report had some detail (**Appendix H**). The committee after considerable discussion had asked him as chair to bring a formal resolution to the Senate which stated: **That the Faculty Senate supports returning to designated faculty/staff parking, and that all other areas be designated all-permit parking, and that some faculty/staff parking areas be designated by fall.** The committee was sensitive to the current construction but had been asked to address the need of designated parking spaces near Education for faculty to supervise students off campus. Dorm residence parking was also an issue where these lots were continuously full. Therefore, the committee had taken the position that faculty needed to have some designated areas but that other areas would be all-permit parking.

President Proenza then made a brief comment that, indeed, we would return to some form of reserved parking as soon as possible. Jim Stafford and his staff as well as the campus facilities office had been asked to look very carefully at this issue to entertain these types of recommendations. Further, he would ask Becky to assist him in forwarding this to parking. The operative word in his original remark remained, "as soon as possible." The other item for Senators to be aware of in this context was, 1) we did not want to inconvenience either faculty or our students too much, but at the moment, candidly, we

wanted to do as little as possible to inconvenience our students because they were going to be for the foreseeable future our bread and butter of any increments and revenue that we might have sought. That said, the second thing we had asked Mr. Stafford to do was look at other options besides faculty/staff and all-permit. We needed to look at whether there were 3, 4, or five possible tiers to explore, including recommendations to even consider putting up for bid some special awards, some designated reserved spaces. That had been used successfully in other places. Equally successfully at his last institution was tiered parking for students - B, C, and D parking, with A parking reserved for faculty and staff. Other members of the staff could buy tiers as well. A little choice in the market place might be helpful, but he was certainly willing to forward this recommendation as it stood. If the word came back that we did expect the new parking lot in the fall, if at least one lot could be opened, he would fully support it.

Senator Sterns then pointed out that considering current budget constraints, parking might be a symbolic gesture to faculty. The President then replied that in delightedly good humor there, the Provost had been known to inject into these meetings the fact that he had passed to senior staff an article from a national magazine which highlighted the accomplishments of the former president of the University of Florida, who was a rather colorful character and certainly one of the most successful presidents from the University of Florida. Within the article he cited that he had never seen a university in which parking was not contentious and in fact thought that many universities consist of a faculty and staff commonly united with a complaint about parking - for whatever that's worth.

Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh commented that there were other faculty on this campus that were supervising students all the time who also needed some special permits.

Senator Foos asked whether it had been considered that rather than having student designations, some parking lots have no overnight parking. That would be one way to solve the problem. Also, people in Education could have parking spots with 1-hr. limits which would serve those people who had to come in and get out very quickly. They would be close, would not be occupied by students and would have no people parking all day long. Senator Sterns replied that those were excellent suggestions, some of which the committee had considered. However, he did not feel it correct to do committee work in the full Senate.

The Senate then voted approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns continued his report by stating that the committee had been able to solve the Human Resources training room issue. He was also happy to report that there was in the plans of Phase II a faculty dining room which some people had been questioning. Also, new offices in the JAR were going to be created. He also mentioned deferred maintenance which of course was an ongoing issue. He thought the current figure was about \$52 million. That was something that needed to be kept on the table.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - (Appendix I)

COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE - Senator Dechambeau began her report by stating that CCTC had received several questions from Prof. Witt and faculty from Family & Consumer Sciences. The answers to those questions were in the handout and would appear in the Chronicle (**Appendix J**). At the end of her report she would try to answer any other questions. Provost Hickey and Tom Gaylord had met with CCTC to discuss those questions as

well as other issues. They had made a very strong argument for using money from either House Bill 640 or from the unallocated salary pool to fund the pilot laptop project for full-time faculty. There were approximately 800 full-time faculty, and it would cost about \$350,000. This was about one month's amount in the unallocated salary pool. CCTC voted to recommend that the Faculty Senate secure the use of House Bill 640 money and/or unallocated money to fund a pilot laptop project for full-time faculty.

Senator Reed had a two-fold question. The first part of the question was, since that ended up calculating out to about \$400 per faculty member, was then the rest of the cost being subsidized and this was being proposed as a one year project? Senator Dechambeau replied that the lease on the laptops was actually three years.

Senator Reed then stated that given it was a 3-year project, she assumed then at some other place they were subsidizing the difference between the actual cost of the laptops compared to the \$350,000 for 800 faculty. That was one question. The other question was that one of the recommendations PBC had was to have the administration explore opportunities to maximize flexibility for the units in light of our budget constraint, including giving them the budgets before the beginning of the next budget year. One of those was unallocated salary savings. So if that were distributed to units, were we really going to give the units a charge versus taking out? Senator Reed wanted all to understand that there was not necessarily some big pool of money in unallocated salary savings out there that was not allocated to the units. It was about the cost difference.

President Proenza then interjected that a lease cost was obviously less than a purchase, and that was one of the benefits. Another benefit of a lease situation was that at the end of the lease one could turn the old machine back in and did not have to worry about disposal and renewing it. A new machine could be obtained as long as one was willing to continue a lease contract. So it was less than the purchase of a new machine. That was where the difference came in. The second question was obviously more complex. He thought we all needed to sit here with some degree of anticipation. The recommendation that was being made was that we use either House Bill 640 or possibly, depending on how the budget emerges, some combination of the two. He could not begin to address what the budget was going to evolve into, but he could address one aspect of the suggestion. There was certainly a very great benefit of giving the units all the flexibility possible in budgeting. There was one place where that did not hold and that was in the purchase or lease of major items of equipment, because he could assure quantitatively that at the moment we were spending far more for the acquisition, disposal and management of computer equipment than we would if we managed that centrally, providing still the kind of flexibility that was necessary to satisfy specialized research needs that require high-end machines as opposed to whatever machine was the current state-of-the-art. Here he guaranteed that we could manage it more effectively as a university than individual units could.

Senator Erickson asked what the time line on this was. Senator Dechambeau replied that CCTC hoped to have laptops for faculty by fall. Senator Erickson then asked whether everybody would have their present computers replaced by fall. Senator Dechambeau replied that there would be additional computers and that a laptop was essentially a better CPU. Senator Erickson then asked about money for the maintenance of present machines. Where will those funds come from if not from this fund? Senator Dechambeau stated that Senator Erickson was correct - part of the lease came from insurance money and covered software, some maintenance. Our maintenance was done through the learning and technology center.

Senator Erickson stated that there might be faculty for whom this kind of laptop was not going to be effective because of obvious reasons. What about faculty from the C & T who used CAD or who could not work effectively with the laptop? Would there then still be money for new machines if needed? Was that correct, or would there be another whole different set of funding for that separate need?

Senator Dechambeau replied that her understanding from the discussion was that about \$3 million was spent on equipment. But \$3 million did not all come out of the \$500-per that had not been distributed anyway, or even the 35% technology money which should not be used for faculty equipment. The money was coming from somewhere that people were using to buy equipment for their departments. She did not know where, but it was not coming from where Senator Erickson had spoken of.

Provost Hickey then said that about \$3-3.5 million was currently being spent on the academic units annually on computer or computer-related equipment. This program would cost \$700,000 - \$350,000 that Dr. Gaylord proposed was taking about 10-15% of that amount of money that was being spent on computers already and devoting it to covering the first \$350,000 of the lease cost. The other \$350,000 would come from one of two sources - House Bill 640 money, which last year was about \$1.8 million total. But we only got that every two years and that had to cover equipment other than computing equipment. If we just used House Bill 640 money, it meant that we would take \$700,000 off the top of House Bill 640 money to support the program for two years because we only got that money once every two years. Alternatively, we would just earmark the first \$350,000 of unallocated salary savings each year to go toward the support of this program. So it would provide at its maximum \$700,000 a year, more or less every full-time faculty member. It was not a requirement up front that every full-time faculty member take advantage of this program; that was why it was called a pilot program. We anticipated of the 750 faculty here, probably at least half, if not two-thirds, would want to take advantage of this program. Nobody was going to come in and take the computer off your desk. Those individuals who wanted to continue using the PC- based systems and the MAC systems were going to be allowed to do so. It needed to be understood that part of the savings that came from the use of the laptop was a common maintenance system and a common software upgrade system that did not work on the MAC's, at least not for now. So those individuals who wanted to continue using those machines would be able to, but would need to work within their departments to determine how the maintenance of those machines and the upgrade of the software of those machines was to occur. In order to maintain a service force large enough to do all the different configurations, the cost would be astronomical given the cost of the service people required to service and upgrade the computers.

Senator Qammar also had questions. The first question was to what extent will the campus be wireless by fall? Senator Dechambeau replied that she did not know the answer to that. Senator Qammar stated that there had to be 600 nodes on campus, and there were nowhere near 600 nodes, as far as she could tell. It seemed a tad premature for a pilot program to generate essentially a continuing type of effort.

President Proenza then provided two answers. One, of course you could use your laptop with any plug-in situation that you had. The plan currently called for a schedule that would finish those 600 nodes by December. Obviously, there may be some time lapse in there, but that was approximate.

Senator Qammar then stated that she did not understand the House Bill 640 funds since a subcommittee of PBC had made recommendations for the allocation of those funds already. Provost Hickey replied that that would occur in 2003. Senator Qammar replied that it was then actually somewhat of a

misnomer to talk about House Bill 640 since we really did not know the extent of that money. Provost Hickey replied that while he did not know the long history of it, the number the University had received had been the same for the past two years, the 1.8 mill this past year with an amount designated for Wayne College, and the rest allocated by a subcommittee of the PBC. What this would be agreeing to was whatever the amount was, we would pick a defining amount right off the top as a first priority allocation. That would go on indefinitely, because the lease program would go on indefinitely.

Senator Qammar then stated that in answer to both her questions, she strongly disagreed with this resolution. She thought it premature; that it was asking us to judge coming from a committee that did not deal with the budget. She thought this issue had been discussed at PBC and we had not been able to get Tom Gaylord to speak to us. This latter remark reflected mostly a timing and scheduling problem; she did not mean it to sound as though he refused to speak to PBC. But it was definitely on the agenda for PBC as a continuing issue. When we allocated the House Bill money, there was a huge number of requests for computing services. PBC said there was a need to be able to do this in a procedural way that was consistent, fair, and that really met the true needs of the faculty. The House Bill money was not necessarily automatically the way to go. She wanted PBC to look at this issue and have the recommendation come out of PBC instead of CCTC.

Chair Sheffer asked whether Senator Qammar wanted to make a motion to that effect. Senator Qammar replied that she wanted to reject this recommendation first.

President Proenza then stated that there were many ways to get to some consensus. This was a recommendation that had been made, but there may be some other options that would appear between the time that we got to the next House Bill 640. This was an approach to extend a program that had been met with considerable success where it currently was deployed - the Library, the Law School, one of our sororities, and a group of faculty from CCTC. If we did not begin moving that way in the voluntary fashion that the Provost had explained, what Senator Qammar would be recommending was that we continue to expend a much larger amount of money institutionally than we needed to. We were not suggesting that those of you who had the specific requirements or were happy with what you got trade now for this - not at all. You had the option, but he hoped that all became converts as many other colleagues had found that this was very useful. He would hate for some concerns to keep us from moving toward a process that was guaranteed basically to begin saving us money beginning in the fall even though there were obviously some uncertainties with House Bill 640, etc. So for whatever it was worth, he would suggest that this proceed.

Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh then stated that her concern was designating unallocated salary money repeatedly for this kind of support in addition to the House Bill. If we had spent \$3 million and continue to spend \$3 million each year, what money was used for that? Why couldn't we use that money instead of unallocated salary money?

President Proenza replied that part of what was happening was that departments were using unallocated funds to make all of these purchases. There was no designated budget. And please, let him again correct - the laptops did not force faculty to use them in the wireless configuration. You may stick the little card in and could then go anywhere there was a wireless access. He thought that by the end of fall every place on campus would be accessible. But in the meantime, if there was a place that had not been addressed, all of you had connections at the moment in your offices to use. You could take it home and plug it into roadrunner.

Provost Hickey added that it probably was unallocated salary money within colleges that had been used for this. Tom Gaylord was actually trying to track where some of those purchases had come from and we had not been able to do that. But in colleges, too, the unallocated salary money tended to be one of the flexible sources of money they had. His guess was that many of these computer purchases had been done using the unallocated salary money in colleges.

Senator Midha added that if the House Bill money was going to be used, we should be a little bit concerned that a substantial portion of that money was spent for chemistry, biology, physics, but for instructional purposes. So he hoped we would not be hurt if we went in that direction.

Senator Lillie added that he did not know where the money had come to get his current desktop computer but he did not know what he would do without it. As far as he was concerned if given a laptop, he would be happy to take it because he could think of a lot of uses for it. It was going to be something that was useful not only in class, whether wireless or not, but also when going to a conference, or doing a power point presentation. Over and over again you were not fighting over the laptops; you had gotten your own. It seemed to be a faster, newer, better CPU, the best of both worlds. He was speaking in favor of this.

Senator Franks spoke. CCTC had looked long and hard at this issue all year long. Part of the reason that this resolution had been brought to the floor was the fact that we felt since the program had been a success so far and was clearly moving forward, it was important that the laptops come into the hands of faculty as soon as possible so that faculty could begin to explore the various ways they could use these laptops. As far as faculty desktops went, the Provost had indicated that no one would be coming to take your desktop away from you. In his case he had an excellent Dell, but he knew this laptop was still more powerful than what he had. One month's salary savings really was not a whole lot of money in terms of the whole scheme of things and the big picture, and the committee had really felt this was a fair way to go and a very economical way to go. In the long term, the fiscal implications were enormous, and the cost effectiveness of the maintenance and all the other costs that came into play in keeping everyone's computing at the state-of-the-art was drastically improved if we went this way. He wanted to speak strongly in support of taking this next step forward. We could not just stop the experiment now, and to not go forward and not have the faculty involved directly in going forward put us in a position to not have had all the facts and all the information.

Senator Erickson stated that she wanted to support Dr. Qammar. This was a major budgetary issue. Not in the total scheme of the huge budget, but when considering budget allocations, you had to think about punitive cost. She would be very happy to have a laptop, there was no question about that. But she wanted to know what she was not going to have at the University as a result. What did we use those unallocated salary funds for at the moment? What were we giving up if those funds went into this project? Should we put it all into this or should we do it in part, because the costs in terms of what we would have to give up were too high? She did not know the answer to those questions, but she did not think CCTC was in a position to make that judgment. That was the point of PBC. The Budget Committee's job was to look at allocation of funds and how they should be allocated most effectively at the University. If for no other reason, the process was such that we wanted that budget committee to allocate more effectively for us. We could not just say to them, allocate funds but do spend it on this which we really want. She felt that that was what the committee was doing without looking at what we were giving up. From a process point of view it should be asked to go to PBC. Certainly, if they looked at it and said great, we think that that makes sense, then for sure. But it needed to go that way.

Senator Qammar then spoke in case there was a misunderstanding about something she had said. She was actually one of those people who spent about \$5,000 a year on computer technology. All of her research was done in computer technology; all of her Ph.D. students were given a laptop out of her grant money. It was what they did; she wanted them to do their work 24 hrs. a day if they had to. So she understood completely the benefits and the distinct advantages of having laptops and of faculty having laptops. That was not at all an issue. And when we got to the point on campus where there was a significant university savings such that laptops would be the standard issue for faculty, that was a wonderful idea. But the dilemma was that right now PBC had looked at this issue, had looked at the numbers. We were going to have a presentation from Char that talks about the budget. We were already risking unallocated salary in the proposed budget. It was just a tad premature for us to approve this now without PBC having looked at it. She considered it to be just poor timing, but it absolutely would come and it should come at some point.

Chair Sheffer then asked Senator Qammar whether she could make a motion to refer this matter to the PBC. She did so and was seconded. Senator Franks asked whether PBC would be able to convene during the summer once budgetary figures were available and look at this. Chair Sheffer replied that the PBC could convene any time. Senator Mothes then agreed with what Senator Qammar had said about PBC looking at it but we needed to move quickly on this, because we needed to order these by July 1 to have them here on time.

Senator Dechambeau added that part of this was in response to our recommendation last month that we really felt strongly that the faculty needed to have the laptops before the students, and if we wanted to move on this with students, we had to move on it first with the faculty. The faculty were going to need time to figure out how they were going to integrate and use the laptops in their courses, if in fact they were. So this was one of the really important reasons why we had wanted to move quickly on this. If we all got the laptops at the same time, the students were going to know far more than half of the faculty.

Senator Reed then added that maybe we were having a kind of consensus that we strongly supported the idea of the laptop project and that of getting them into the hands of faculty. Maybe what we were talking about more was how comfortable we were with the financing mechanism, which to some degree could be approved as a concept. PBC was asking the Senate to authorize the Executive Committee to approve a budget. We were recognizing there may be some contingencies in that, so maybe the Senate could approve this and forward it along with the other budget recommendations. Then the financing could be looked at in the time period we're still looking at for the rest of the budget.

Senator Dechambeau asked whether the resolution should be rephrased. Chair Sheffer stated that we had a motion to refer this resolution to the PBC at this point and asked for further discussion on this motion. Senator Foos asked whether the motion was referred, and would it come back to Senate before acting upon it? Provost Hickey stated that the recommendation that Senator Reed would put forward later was that with regard to budgetary issues, the Executive Committee of the Senate be empowered to act on behalf of the Senate in the summer. He assumed they could act on this along with other budgetary recommendations.

The motion was then passed by the Senate.

Senator Dechambeau mentioned that at the last Senate meeting there had been a question about who was doing the survey. She had determined it was the Law School and Bierce Library. Senator

Erickson asked whether it was in process and starting now. Senator Dechambeau replied that it was put into place during spring break. The other question was who was studying the educational proponents of the technology - the answer was Dr. Hirschbuhl and Dr. Savery.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Charlene Reed presented the following PBC report:

"I brought along a written report (**Appendix K**) in which I tried to summarize the work of the committee this year, both in regard to taking a longer-term approach to planning and budgeting where we have spent a lot of time in the semester, as I reported to you on a month-to-month basis. Also is the enviable task of continuing to follow the budget development for the 2002 academic year.

I'll start first with a couple of comments, and the President gave an overview of development of the process. In looking at the process long-term, we are looking at working on an academic model that recognizes all complexities to present at the beginning of the fall semester. Although it has been frustrating at times, we've spent a lot of time on this issue and we have reached a consensus that this is important and we don't want the work to start over again with a new committee next year.

There are a lot of other tools coming together, as you can see looking at a balanced scorecard approach which we've supported. Development of an on-line budget and planning request system is going to start very early in the fall that Dr. Gaylord is working on. We know that we will be getting the Delaware study data shortly and some other different data resources that are coming together, so we do feel fairly positive as far as our progress this year and looking at the whole process from a longer-term view.

As far as this year is concerned, and we wish we could come to you with a solid budget proposal, but as the President has described, there is really a lot of uncertainty at this point. I would echo what he said about it looking better than it has recently, so we do appreciate that and if our wishes came true, the whole budget would look much better when it comes to the Executive Committee for approval. But in the absence of any definitive at this point, what we are bringing forward as of Tuesday is the best information we have as far as what the House Finance Committee was proposing for higher education. We felt comfortable and optimistic about enrollment, but we still felt for budgeting purposes that we need to be conservative. We're holding at a flat enrollment but will certainly be thrilled if it comes out better than that.

Some of the other considerations we've been working with and we know the budget office has been doing a lot of work on, is looking at utility costs and trying to shave off savings wherever possible. So this is a work in progress, but as of Tuesday this is the best information that we have. As the President also indicated, we had a lot of discussion about this over a period of meetings and we feel strongly to make sure that we support a high-quality, competitive faculty that a salary increase needs to be the number one priority in the budget, and that should this scenario be the one that is approved by the state eventually, that that will involve cuts to the academic and administrative units. We supported the notion that as far as planning program cuts and changes, we want there to be considerable time put into that. We recognize in the short run that each of the deans and vice presidents, if this budget is realized, may get a bill of some sort they're going to have to come up with the money to cover for next year. That's part of our thinking about trying to maximize flexibility for them, but we do feel strongly that that is very important and we recommend that to you as a number one priority in the budget.

As I just mentioned in keeping with number 2 on our motion, we do urge the administration to explore all opportunities to maximize flexibility for operating units with regard to managing resources, including assignment of all budget lines. For example, personnel, part-time faculty, unallocated salary, summer school, to units before the start of the new budget year and talking about the budget year because we're not sure whether we'll have a continuation budget and so forth. We think this is important because consistent with the principles that we've accepted from the work group and our continuing work on this Senate model, the closer we can get to the units as far as decision making is where the best decisions can occur. We don't want to micromanage deans or vice presidents from the Planning & Budgeting Committee as far as how they can best deploy those resources so we don't want to talk about line items.

One thing, and I really appreciate the Provost's work in this regard, is to try to get information in the hands of people as early as possible. As some of you know that manage part-time faculty, there have been times when we've gotten the part-time faculty budget after the semester already started in the fall. So I think he's been committed to try to get us information about summer, part-time, and all the different pots of money that come to the units as early as possible, and we appreciate that.

Finally, unless the Senate wants to call a special meeting, what we are recommending is that the Senate authorize the Executive Committee to act on its behalf in approving the final budget recommendations to President Proenza upon conclusion of the budget process so we can actually move forward. We hope it doesn't include this, but we did include the contingency that we all recognize that should there be some significant change in higher education funding; for example, from the court case in June or some other big change, that this could include the Executive Committee altering our recommendations. We understand that, and would recommend that as part of this motion."

Chair Sheffer then assured all that if there was reason to call a special meeting, the Executive Committee would certainly do that.

Senator Lillie thanked the committee for coming up with something that was probably the best that could be done under the circumstances. There had been a lot of concern and worry over it, and he wanted them to know that their work was appreciated.

The Senate then voted approval of the motion from PBC.

President Proenza also thanked the PBC and Vice President Nettling and Provost Hickey. This had been a difficult set of scenarios to contemplate. He stated he was also equally supportive of the recommendations that they were making and at the moment had every confidence that this was the one we would be able to implement again, barring unforeseen circumstances. Finally, it was at the request of the chair of PBC with regard to the motion that was transferred to them, that they needed an answer by July 1.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - Chair Sheffer stated that there were three Faculty Senate Bylaw membership changes that had been held over one month which the Senate needed to address. The first change had two portions in it referring to the membership of the retirees of the Association of The University of Akron Retirees, and the other had to do with reasons for absence. Discussion of this began.

President Proenza then suggested a modest amendment. While he had not had a chance to review this legally and had absolutely no problem with any constituency advising us, he did have a problem with there being a precedent that could open up the opportunity for other constituencies requesting seats on the Faculty Senate. Accordingly, he respectfully suggested and recommended to the Senate that it consider bringing these two representatives in as an advisory or ex officio or any other status than one with voting capacity.

Senator Foos made a point of order, asking whether there needed to be a quorum in order to pass these bylaw changes. Chair Sheffer replied this was the case but there was a quorum present.

Senator Qammar then agreed with President Proenza's point and moved that the document be amended to include non-voting status. The motion was seconded.

Senator Erickson pointed out that this was an issue which had been discussed at length when Faculty Senate was started. What constituencies did Senate represent? She remembered at the time arguing strongly that this was the Faculty Senate and it should represent faculty. That was what it was about, and of course that it was replacing an institution (University Council) in which there were administrators. We worked through this and we all agreed that this was for the faculty. Then other people said that students wanted to belong, and another group wanted to belong, and she thought at least we had thought it through. Frankly, we had this faculty majority with voices from the students, from contract professionals, from part-time faculty, and from staff. We considered the reasons for including each of those and said they do represent constituencies of this University; people who had an input into the decisions of the University. They had some point of view to present within the University. She was not sure she could understand the issue the President was making. As the Senate stood now, a body that represented more than only faculty, we should take into account other constituencies. This was one that had been part of the University Council. They used to be voting members of University Council in the days when we had administrators on as well. But these were people who at least had a great deal of wisdom about the past, and this was a University that had a way of losing the past as people came and went. At least they had as much reason for having a vote as most other of the constituencies Senate had added.

Senator Sterns said that members of the Association of The University of Akron Retirees had spoken to him and wanted to communicate to all that this group represented a large number of individuals who had given many years of service to this University who had an active role to play. They still had a great deal of interest in what happened to our campus. As a result, they wanted to be able to participate in its campus life. There was precedence on many other campuses for faculty retirees associations to have that participation.

Senator Sakezles remarked that she assumed all of the other constituencies were voting members, so this would make only this one constituency non-voting. If the reason for the concern was legal, could it be referred to Legal Counsel to find out whether or not there really was a problem? Because if there was not a legal problem, there was no reason to say this constituency could not vote. If Senate allowed them to vote and there was a legal problem, then obviously that should not have been granted.

President Proenza stated he would welcome the input from Legal Counsel because if Senate voted in favor of the original motion and there was a legal problem, he would hate to come back and announce the bad news. He would much prefer that we knew what that issue was if there was an issue, so that when acted upon, it would make it much easier. He pointed out that the retirees did have an

organization, and he met with them and received their input on a regular basis. There was a subcommittee of the retirees that occasionally met with him, so there was another mechanism that was in place for them. Obviously, he did not know that he wanted to change it if Senate acted on it and it was appropriate from the legal perspective. As he thought of a corporate entity that defined a University in its governance structure, he thought of faculty, contract professionals, staff, and students, period. That was the corporate entity. Yes, students came and went, but you could say that about faculty and administrators. Many had come and gone as well. He certainly assured you that he did not want to see three emeritus presidents sitting on the Faculty Senate as voting members, please.

Chair Sheffer reminded the Senate that a motion was necessary to refer this matter to Legal Counsel.

Senator Lillie then made the motion that final consideration of this motion be postponed until the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, during which time period the Chair of the Faculty Senate will ask for advice on the legal issues from the Office of General Counsel.

Senate passed this motion.

The Chair then presented the other Faculty Senate Bylaw addition under Membership, (H)(5) which read, **"Senators who become unable to regularly attend meetings due to conflicting professional duties, imperative personal affairs, or illness will retain their seats if approved by a simple majority of those voting in the constituency. If not approved, the seat shall be considered vacant."**

Senate then voted approval of this addition.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Vice President Marlesa Roney provided an update on the University's enrollment management strategies.

"I appreciate very much the opportunity to give you an update and am very mindful of the time and will do the best job I can running through this very quickly. I want to start off with some of the leading indicators that we have right now and I think first, that across the University I'm seeing signs that people recognize very clearly the importance of enrollment. In the budget discussions even today we're very cognizant of the fact that enrollment will help us get through difficult budget times. As I talk with people I recognize there's an interest in students, there's an interest in enrollment, there's been very good participation in many of the events we've had this spring.

Our overall applications right now are up - over 700 students from a year ago, which is a very positive indicator. Our registration compared to a year ago is up about 16% of continuing students who have now registered compared to a year ago. Our residence halls are full, another wonderful leading indicator. Our honors program is at an all-time high; our orientation figures in March were filled at a faster pace than they had been in previous years. Again, that means that all of the things we're looking at tell us that things look very positive. I am unwilling, as Char indicated, to translate that into an absolute yes, we will have an increase in enrollment because a lot happens between now and when students arrive in the fall. But it's much better to have these leading positive indicators in front of us than decreases in applications, etc. So we need to keep pushing hard, but I think some of our efforts may be

beginning to show some improvement. So again, we have very positive indicators.

Where we're going now and what I wanted to do is give you an update on what we're doing with strategic enrollment planning, tell you what some of the next steps are, and then next semester we will continue our discussions. Most of you are aware that we are developing a strategic enrollment management plan, and that is data-driven. It's not pulling a number out of the air; it's not having no number at all. We do not have a projected enrollment for this fall. Our admissions officers do not have target numbers to bring in x number of freshman or transfer students; next year we will have that in place. I am 90% confident that we will be able to be successful when we have a data-driven plan in place. I'm 100% sure we will never accomplish anything if we don't have a plan in place, and we need to work in that direction. It needs to be driven by our academic programs rather than pulling numbers out and saying, 'I think our enrollment should be 25,000.' It needs to come from the academic departments, and in light of that a small group of us have been meeting with our academic deans to talk about enrollment planning. The goal right now is to put the pieces in place over the summer so that at the department level we will have target enrollments for Fall 2002. As we gear up our recruitment cycle next fall and hit it hot and heavy, we will know the numbers of students in terms of new beginners, new transfer students, and we will also have additional information about retention of continuing students.

Those are the primary factors that we need to get a handle on in order to develop this enrollment model. So we'll start by focusing on Fall 2002, then we will roll out a model that will look at demographics in the state. It will look at births of students 18 years before and high school graduates so we get a handle on our traditional-age students. Also, look at other population statistics to help us project nontraditional-age students as well. We need to factor in retention of current students and retention of our transfer students, and we put all of those factors together in a model to help us look at over time. Initially, we'll probably look at a 3-year plan; then we will build it to a 5-year plan, and eventually what we'll have in place is a 10-year enrollment projection and we will use that to help us in our planning. If changes in the demographics cause a spike or a depression in any of the enrollment trends, we will then need to make plans as a university for how to accommodate those demographic impacts.

So that's where we're headed. In addition to numbers we obviously also want to look at factors like quality and diversity. Those are things we need to put into this overall package. We need to paint a picture out there of what we want our University to look like in the years ahead, and then strategically and based on research we figure out how to make that happen. Some of the things we're doing require us to look at a lot of data, and Dr. Gaylord's area with Greg Rogers in Institutional Planning have been helping us get a handle on who is our competition. We've learned that Kent State, Ohio State, and Bowling Green are the top three competitors in terms of where our undergraduates also send test scores. Right now I'm doing my best to learn what those competitors are doing; what did their view books look like; what did their financial aid packages look like. We need to know the competition so we can address that head-on and know how to get those students to come to The University of Akron. So everything we're doing I think fits a lot with what we've been doing as a university in terms of using data and using information for decision-making.

So that's where we are right now, just in terms of the overall model. The steps that come ahead - we are in the process of initiating a search for our Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services in Student Affairs. Some of you are aware that we launched a search last fall and did not come up with a candidate that we were really excited about, and chose to end the search rather than taking someone that we really didn't enjoy all that much. We're using a search firm now, and we believe that the candidate we want to have on campus is someone who isn't looking for a job right now, but is someone

who is being very successful and someone that we need our search firm to tap on the shoulder and say, 'Wait until you hear about The University of Akron - there's lots of exciting things going on there.' I am very hopeful that that individual will be with us in early fall. We also need to hire a permanent Director of Admissions. Kim Gentile has been serving as our Interim Director of Admissions and has been doing a fabulous job for us. The Director of Admissions will report to the Associate VP for Enrollment Services, so we need to stagger those searches so that the Associate VP will in fact be able to make the decision with input from the rest of us on that Director of Admissions. So those are two key appointments that we need to put in place.

Other things we're doing have to do with the focus on service improvement. We've been rolling out People Soft and yes, there've been bumps in the road and glitches along the way, but down the road People Soft will allow us to provide better service. In fact, I think our students have voted in terms of web registration. Instead of only 20% using the web to register, we're over 70% now. Part of it's been advertising, but part of it is that the tool does allow students to get their job done. As the Spicer building is vacated in October when we move to the interim student and administrative services building, the old Good Will building, we'll take that opportunity to build a customer service center. Students, faculty, staff and visitors coming in in person, via email, via the telephone will have points of contact. Our hope is to quit passing people around. We will have highly cross-trained employees who will be able to answer the majority of questions that anyone comes in the door with, or as I said, by phone or email. So we're excited about that, and it will help us try things out before we actually build a new student services building.

The other area of emphasis is really working hard to get a handle on data. We still don't have graduation rates at department levels. Greg Rogers is helping us in planning some methodologies there so that we can provide information back to you for academic planning. It's hard for us to know how many students we'll have in the fall when we don't know how many of our current group will return for the fall. So there are a lot of measures that we need to get into place, and a lot of it has to do with understanding our competitors better.

So to wrap this up - we do have leading positive indicators. We have a lot of data that we need to understand. We are trying our best to work with each of the academic colleges in providing assistance in planning, and next year we'll keep working at it. I appreciate your support, and I tried real hard to take 30 minutes and crunch it down into 5."

The other item of new business was to elect a representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. Senator Huff would not be returning to that position next year. Senate needed to nominate and elect someone for that position. Senator Ritchey then nominated Senator Spiker, who had been the alternate in the position this year. No other nominations forthcoming, Senator Sterns moved that the nominations be closed and Senator Spiker be elected on behalf of the Senate. The Senate then voted its approval of this motion.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Chair Sheffer asked all to congratulate Senator Midha, who was retiring from Senate after eight years of service. He had been the longest serving individual in the Senate at this point. The Chair also recognized the people from Public Address Systems who were in charge of recording our meetings each month.

Senator Lillie stated that as one of the many people from this body who had been active in the conflict of interest policy and documentation, he wanted to encourage that as the work on this continued and to

maintain the spirit of shared leadership. He liked the fact that people were listening. He pointed out that within this policy there was a clause for yearly review to determine what worked and what could be fixed, if necessary.

Mrs. Nancy Stokes then thanked the 163 people who had already answered the NCA survey. She urged those who had not to please do so. It was very important, and was on the web at: uakron.edu/provost/nca, but only until the 11th of May. All had received information from the President and from the Steering Committee about it.

Parliamentarian Gerlach asked permission to address the Senate. He asked that Senators cast a friendly eye toward retirees like himself. He had served as parliamentarian for 7 years, and he continued to find the Senate interesting and rewarding. As to the retirees, he did not know what the President of the University meant by retirees not still being an essential part of this University. He said that with a simple reminder that he held the title of Professor Emeritus of History, which he thought still gave him a little clout around the place, including some privileges that other retirees with the emeritus status had. These included library access, parking, office space. Retirees continued to do work. When we published our works, The University of Akron's name was attached to them with our rank and so on. We brought no discredit on this University. He thought retirees still were, those who expressed this kind of interest, an integral part of the University. He liked to regard himself as such and hoped Senate would give that very careful consideration, legality or no legality. The point was, too, if all the other constituencies were voting members, he did not see why a few old people like himself could not have a vote as well as a voice. As Senator Erickson had aptly put it, we provided some historical memory for all having been here a little bit longer. He thanked Senate for its indulgence.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin