

## **MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 1, 2001**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education, Room 201, on Thursday, November 1, 2001.

Forty-five of the sixty-eight Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators K.Clark, Harp, Jordan, Lavelli, Li, and Spiker were absent with notice. Senators Anderson, Binienda, Broadway Chafin, Conrad, Dechambeau, Hoo Fatt, Mothes, S.Pope, Purdy, Stinner, Turning, Wallace, and Walter were absent without notice.

### **SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* APPROVED THE 2002-2003 CALENDAR FROM APCC.**
- \* APPROVED CFPC RESOLUTION REGARDING TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENT OF SPACE IN POLSKY BUILDING.**
- \* HELD OVER AMENDMENT TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT APPROVED AT OCTOBER MEETING REGARDING FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATION BY THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY OF AKRON RETIREES.**
- \* HELD OVER AMENDMENT TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAW 3359-10-02(H)(6)(a)(ii) REGARDING ELECTION OF SENATORS.**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Chair Sheffer stated that the agenda needed to be amended under special announcements to include the approval of the Fall 2001 commencement candidates. The amended agenda was then approved by the Senate.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPT. 6 AND SEPT. 20, 2001** - Secretary Kennedy stated that there were corrections to the minutes, several which had been faxed in. One of the most grievous concerned Senator Erickson's name, which, as Senator Erickson was not related to either the explorer or the psychologist, would be corrected. The other appeared in the Chronicle on page 54 from the Sept. 20 meeting. This was in the last paragraph when Senator John was speaking in regard to an email he had received. As the Chronicle reads, it might be misconstrued that Senator Harp had actually sent that email when that was not the case, so that correction would be duly made. No other corrections were forthcoming from the floor. The body then voted its approval of the minutes.

**III. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS** - Chair Sheffer began his remarks by mention that in the past month Marilyn had not been available in the office and we were very happy to have her back. So if Senators had not received things on time or had had questions and perhaps phone calls were not answered, they were to direct their anger at him and not at Marilyn. We were very happy to have her back in the office at this point. Secondly, if there were any new Senators who did not receive the Sept. Chronicle and would like one, please see Marilyn following the meeting. Finally, the Chair thanked all who had written to him and communicated to him about the health of his son when he had had to run out of the meeting last month. He appreciated that, and his son had now returned to being a very healthy, typical teenager with all of its added baggage. He thanked all very much for the phone calls and letters of concern.

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - The first item under special announcements was approval of the Fall 2001 commencement candidates. Marilyn had that list. Senator Buckenmyer made the motion to approve the list; Senator Franks seconded this motion. No discussion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the Fall 2001 commencement candidates.

The Chair continued his remarks by stating that on Oct. 16 Jane Kaufman passed away. Mrs. Kaufman was a founding member of the Akron Symphony Orchestra and Tuesday Musical Club. Here at The University of Akron she taught honors classes in composition in our English dept. for 38 years and she taught English in the language arts dept. at Woodridge High School for 20 years. The Senate rose for a moment of silence.

To close his remarks, the Chair introduced two new Senators from the College of Fine & Applied Arts: Kristina Belisle and Kathleen Clark. The Senate welcomed both.

#### **V. REPORTS**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** - Secretary Kennedy stated that the Executive Committee met twice on Oct. 19, first with committee members only and then with the President and Provost. With the committee members only, we set the agenda for today's meeting and determined members of the ad hoc committee to review the budget process and PBC. We also developed a list of issues for them to address, at least as a start. When meeting with President Proenza and Provost Hickey, our discussion focused on the budget issues. Senators should have received an email with a summary of that part of the meeting. We also discussed some IT issues. She mentioned that the Executive Committee was meeting with the CCTC in November, and Senator Franks would provide more of that in his report. The Executive Committee also met twice on Oct. 29, first with committee members only and then again with the President and Mrs. Herrnstein. The issues discussed included the University budget, the cuts and how those would be made, etc. That would be addressed in the President's remarks. We talked about the library budget and the cuts proposed, and we also talked about Mr. Ted Mallo's retirement and rehirement which would also be addressed later. Finally, the Executive Committee certified elections of new Senators.

**REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT** - Chair Sheffer then invited the President to address the Senate. "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, colleagues. We are pleased, Dan, that your son is well. Our chairman noted Jane Kaufman's passing away - I did not see her on the last day of her life but had seen her just a few days before, and she had communicated her special love of a book that many of you may know. I'm almost finished with it and I can heartily recommend it to you. It's called 'Ahab's Wife,' and it's a story built around a very brief mention in 'Moby Dick' of his presumably having had a spouse. Truly, it is a wonderful book and perhaps those of you who knew Jane might appreciate her special ear for that piece of literature. Please read it; you'll like it.

I have provided to your Secretary a copy of the chart that I shared with you about tuition differentials among Ohio colleges and universities (**Appendix A**). Equally, I have provided an article from this week's Chronicle dealing with tuition increases across the nation and I've asked that she summarize aspects of it for you. The important things for you to note is that we're not alone in facing budget crises.

We're not alone in having to increase tuition. The national average for tuition increases last year was 7.7%. Among those public colleges and universities that had to increase them by much larger numbers, the range was between 28 and 68%, and I urge you to read those carefully.

Your Executive Committee also asked whether the timing could be improved regarding the letter that comes to you from me regarding Board action. I've initiated some conversations to see whether we can't shorten that process to hopefully no more than 14 days and perhaps even less. I gather that we're simply interested in ensuring that accuracy is preserved, but let us get a statement of time we can hold to. At the moment I can promise you no more than 18 days and hope to bring it down to a week.

You did ask about Mr. Mallo's retirement and rehiring. These are the facts: In June of 2000 the Ohio General Assembly eliminated the 18-month, 85-day post STRS retirement work restriction. There's been a very large trend in reemployment across the STRS system, with STRS reporting in a newsletter which I will promptly make available to you, Madame Secretary, a very large number of such rehires. At your request we checked and fundamentally two things are notable. First of all, Mr. Mallo was invited by the Board to continue in his capacity. They asked whether I had any problems with that and I did not. We further asked HR whether there were any requirements about STRS in terms of posting said retirements and there were not, and so that continues. There's no indication other than positive regard to Mr. Mallo's service to the University.

Your Executive Committee also asked about library budgets, and I know you're going to discuss that later. Suffice it to say that no decisions have been made. The library has been asked to consider some reductions and that will be done. I had promised a presentation to you today, but in the interest of time and in the interest of the fact that I'm sure you may have some questions regarding the budget, I will defer that aspect. The only comment I would make at this time is that in keeping with the continuing process of strategic thinking, you will recall that we said this would be an ongoing process; the charting the course would be a living document we would review over and over again, add to it, and so forth. That process is continuing under the direction of the Provost.

A leadership team has been identified to move us forward with a process called a balanced scorecard that is intended to add depth and objectivity to specifics that we will want to do and to take those down or bring those up, as your language may be preferenced, to the department unit. In the Provost's office Nancy Stokes is the person who is guiding this process, and we invite your questions and comments as always as well as the continuing comments which some of you have chosen to make about the current status of the document. When I do have a chance to present where we've gone since the last time I've presented that, I'll give you some of the depth that's available at this point. But much more is needed before we have specific objectives, time lines and measurements with which to gain our progress toward those goals.

Now earlier this week I sent a letter to the campus community trying to outline as brief a form as I could the current status of the budget issues, and I will want to address those briefly and then ask for any of your questions before I have to depart. I do have a comment that I include in some of my speeches about change and it is this: Where reason and calm prevail, there is always optimism and much that can be accomplished for the common good. So it's in that spirit that I continue the points that I made to you in the letter.

First of all, let's divide the budget issues into two parts - where we were as we came into the budget year, and where we are today given the actions that the Governor recommended and parts of which he ordered and where the legislature is.

First, as you know, going into this budget year with the appropriations made we faced a \$7.8 million deficit in our budget for this year. As a result of increases in tuition and other reassignments, etc., we were able to cut that down to \$6.5 million. The Provost on the side of the academic departments and Vice President Nettling with regard to every other unit including my office, is in the process of accomplishing an across-the-board proportional decrease in everybody's budget. Largely, that is being taken care of out of approximately 50 vacant positions throughout the University, but in those units that did not have vacant positions we're asking them to find their appropriate contribution as they think best.

As you may know, we were aware that a potential continued downturn in the economy would affect state receipts and therefore that additional cuts to the state operating budgets including the appropriations to higher education would be affected. As I said in my letter, that is now a reality. The Governor announced his request that state agencies cut their budgets with a couple of exceptions by 6%, and 6% includes higher education. I think I've already informed you and I regret the reality is that

although higher education is about 14-15% of the budget of the state, the amount that was asked, even though it's only 6%, amounts to 54% of the requested cut. That's just the reality. Now that translates to 2.66% of our operating budget, and specifically it translates into \$5.8 million in addition to the 2.65 million that we're already dealing with. We do not have today the specifics. We have asked your Planning and Budgeting Committee and we've asked everybody to think of what we might do. As I said in my letter, let's look at this as an opportunity in which we try to address priorities as best we can.

We try to look at what we are doing that maybe we ought not to continue, or even better yet, those things we're doing well and can do even better and hence, which may result in revenue enhancing opportunities and for the future maybe some new initiatives that can again result in revenue enhancements. As I tried to indicate to you last time and tried to suggest in my letter, ladies and gentlemen, if we cannot control state revenues and state appropriations, let us try to focus more intently and intensively on those things we can control. So ideas are being generated; you will be asked to provide your ideas, and your Planning and Budgeting Committee will have some ideas.

As of the last time we met, I know that two ideas are, let's raise tuition and let's not give the deans or the vice presidents any raises - those are ideas. Let's examine those and let's examine a lot more. Vice President Roney handed me a very extensive list of very good ideas. Vice President Nettling has been accumulating a number of others, and the options will include anything that is relevant that can be accomplished that does not involve a breach of contract or anything that will markedly impact those things that we need to do. As I said in my letter, I will not compromise the integrity of the institution in ways that compound issues such as deferred maintenance. That's been done too many times, and we cannot do it again. We are not, contrary to some radio reports today, at this point laying off anyone. The paper had it right for once. Is Katie here? She usually gets it right, but didn't want her to think I was picking on her. When asked about it yesterday by the press and by others, I informed them that I had apprised the Board's Finance Committee and more briefly the Board itself yesterday about the budget situation that we find ourselves in. I basically said just what I've said to you and that I was not in a position to recommend yesterday the specifics of how we would go about dealing with that budget cut. I'll await your recommendations and those of others before we build a comprehensive picture of how we're going to deal with them. I am hopeful that layoffs can be avoided at least in most areas, if not all. That is of course assuming at this point that no further cuts come from the state.

It is also assuming that hopefully we will continue to make progress in enrollment and in credit hour production which may ameliorate the \$5.8 million deficit. In fact, the last analysis that Hank showed me late yesterday suggests that the 5.8 million may in fact be a little less than that, possibly as small as 3.8 and perhaps a little less than that. So we need to get our information together; we need to put our best thinking together and again, please let reason and calm prevail so that we can have some degree of optimism and so we can advance the common interests of this, your University of Akron.

Finally, in the context of so many rumors, and indeed I recognize, ladies and gentlemen, that budget concerns such as this bring concern to all of us. There are many things that we want to do; there are many things we want to do to advance the interests of each and every one of you in a salary way. Those are reasons for concern, yet I do beseech you to please be aware that we are reasonably more buffered in this economy than many of our other colleagues in the community. I know you read the paper; I know you hear the radio and maybe even watch TV. You know that some corporations are cutting thousands of jobs. I know you know that many corporations are even asking some employees to take a salary cut or to do some job sharing or any one of a number of things. We are fortunately not in that position and hope not to be there. So we are somewhat more buffered and as the old saying goes, let's count our blessings. I think I've forgotten one thing, so the final thing is to say that we do need to enhance University communications and I've asked the vice presidents to begin the process to advise me and each other in how we improve that so that we hopefully will not have wild rumors and strange happenings. I'll welcome your questions."

Senator Buckenmeyer then addressed the President. He stated that he thought part of the concern was that first, when we had to take these position cuts or lose positions, this affected the quality of instruction yet we also had to keep our student credit hrs. to continue to go up and to generate them. Also, another concern was being able to meet accreditation issues, and having spoken to a lot of people here, not hiring a lot of part-timers for accreditation. The other thing brought up was the issue of another way - through maybe grant monies - to generate that extra money to go to the faculty in order to help keep them happier about their situation.

President Proenza thanked Senator Buckenmeyer for his questions. He replied that there was of course widespread concern. We wanted to minimize the impact on academic quality; we wanted to minimize impact on service to students and on the interaction between faculty and students. Could we avoid it entirely? No. We were not quite in a crisis, but we did have serious budget issues which he had just commented on. Perhaps they were improving because we had found some revenues that were hopeful, and there were some preliminary trend indicators as to our enrollment which hopefully would bring us a little bit more revenue. He did not know whether we could minimize or emerge unscathed with a 6% cut, relatively speaking, but that would help. Concerning Senator Buckenmeyer's comment regarding grant monies, the President stated that he had asked all to be as entrepreneurial in grant-getting as each wished. Vice President Newkome was working very hard with a number of departments and we were working with Washington to bring additional resources in. If you were fortunate enough to have a grant in process that included some of your salary, that obviously buffered things because the generous summer provisions allowed you to earn a little bit more, and that was exciting. So he encouraged all to do that. If any had other suggestions, we were working in a number of consortia whether within Ohio or between ourselves and other universities to generate those opportunities, and some of them were very exciting. Right now we were very well positioned for a series of major initiatives in education, a series of major initiatives in the area of polymers. We were beginning to think with regard to other areas related to the major aspects of life in northeast Ohio, and so on. So we were making some progress. Some of them would come through this year he was sure. The President then added that his letter made it clear that we were going forward with the 3% salary increase pool effective January 1. It also made it clear that we were going forward with the delay of any consideration of cost-sharing in health care. He had charged the University Well-Being Committee last week to get to work and come up with recommendations by May 1. He was sure Dr. Erickson would be pleased to share that with you. And we were going forward aggressively with the schedule that we set through the President's Commission on Equity to get the data we needed on which we could base a credible plan for bringing our salaries to no less than the median off benchmark institutions within Ohio and outside of Ohio. So we were going forward with those things as he had said we would.

Senator Buckenmeyer then followed up on his comments. He asked whether there was an equation or model we could incorporate during the academic year and not just in the summer for money going to the faculty instead of a second source, or replacing what our normal salary was.

President Proenza replied that the acceptable model was fundamentally one in which two things happened. If you had salary money, you could get salary release which your department then had the capability of being used for other purposes. Obviously, the more that you got grants, and this was one of the standard measuring sticks in all departments increasingly, that would tend to make a difference in your merit increase and then obviously be compounded into the summer months as well.

Senator Gunn then asked whether the President could tell us when we might expect that Fall course fees to be transferred to our accounts. It was now November 1st and they were paid in August, and we actually were trying to buy supplies for our students with no money.

The President then asked Vice President Hank Nettling to address that question. Mr. Nettling replied that he did not know transfers had not been made, but would make sure that they got there very quickly.

Senator Malhotra stated that the funds were already there; he had checked the day before yesterday and they were there. Senator Gunn replied that they were not there last week. President Proenza advised Senator Gunn to call Mr. Nettling directly and he would assist her. Senator Gunn then asked about the technology money. President Proenza replied that the technology money was there, and Vice President Tom Gaylord was here to address that. Dr. Gaylord replied that the question was the portion of the technology fees that went to that. He was happy to defer to Hank on that as well. He did not know whether he had his yet, and he was not spending any money, as all knew. Mr. Nettling stated that if it had not been done, it would be done very quickly. Senator Gunn added it was important because we had licensures and things that needed to be paid.

Mr. Nettling then mentioned to the President that in order to bring everyone up to the same level, we did get communication from the Board of Regents this morning, and the 6% was a little bit more - they took another \$261,000.00. President Proenza then asked whether it were six rather than 5.8? But again, Mr. Nettling's figures from yesterday suggested that we would then be more or less around 4. Again, as soon as we had more detailed data it would be available to Senators.

Senator Kahl then asked what the biggest priority to avoid layoffs was. Was there no place that was overstaffed; was there no place that was no longer productive? It seemed like every time one of these happened we got an across-the-board cut, that seemed to lower the general quality of the University and did not solve any of the problems.

President Proenza stated that there were several issues that interacted here. First of all, as all well knew, there were certain notices that had to be given. In certain types of positions there were bumping rights. Frankly speaking, the people that one might wish were ready to leave were not ready. If they were laid off, one would bump the person one would much rather have. So candidly, at least his philosophy had been to try to create an environment, an institution where people's jobs were not threatened.

We had tried to build an environment as we were trying to do but we were not there yet, of shared leadership and empowerment to give you the information with which to know how what you do made a difference and to gradually get more and more people to value their contributions and get more engaged and so on. Those who could not get into it would figure that this was probably not the place for them and would want to go someplace else. But he guessed the short answer was that we believed that given the constraints under which we operated for layoffs, it was far better for morale as well as an economic perspective to avoid layoffs. For example, if we had a program which one college suggested might not be very productive that we would like to close, first there were probably several of those faculty who were tenured. You would have to shift them someplace else; you could not lay them off. If we were talking about staff, depending on when they were hired, there were notification periods that were required. Then there was again the bumping-rights issue that came into play. So all of those things came into play. Fundamentally, layoffs typically would not bring you the required solution, and, if the required solution was simply money, it typically took at least a year to get that money to operate in the system.

Senator Steiner then stated that he had two questions, somewhat unrelated. The first was just a clarification about the budget situation. There was originally a 2.65 million deficit that we were facing; now there was an additional 6 million. So now what we were facing was 8.65, was that correct? President Proenza replied that that was correct. Senator Steiner continued by stating that the President had also mentioned maybe considerably less than the 6 - how could it be so much less?

The President asked all to remember that we had set aside a reserve fund and that we were still sorting out the exact economic impact of our increased tuition. So when that was fully accounted for, the 6 against the general fund that was budgeted may be less.

Senator Steiner stated that his second question was regarding the study on salary equity. He had noticed in the President's letter that he had mentioned that that was nearly complete. Senator Steiner wondered whether the President could inform the Senate of the timetable as to when some results could be expected. The President then asked Mrs. Herrnstein what the completion timetable was more or less. Mrs. Herrnstein deferred to Dr. Midha who replied that last week it was to have been decided which institutions we were going to benchmark within the state of Ohio and outside the state of Ohio. According to the institutional office we would be getting the data for salary for those institutions within two weeks. At that time that information would be sent to outside consulting, George McCabe. Then whether it took two or three months, as soon as we heard that we would let all know.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - The Chair then invited Provost Hickey to address the Senate.

"I'm having trouble remembering what I told you and what I haven't, so if I've told you this before, please forgive me. But there has been a lot of joking about the number of arrows I absorb in this role, and I wanted to let you know I feel much better now because one of your Senators pulled me aside after one of those meetings and pointed out to me that she's a 2nd-ranked archer in the United States and that she seldom misses.

Let me just give you some clarifications here on some points and then I want to take a moment to thank the PBC for some other efforts. The issue with regard to open positions and whether or not they're going to be filled, and I'm just talking about the academic units and the process that's being followed now - I have asked all of the deans to be very cautious in filling faculty or staff positions that are currently open, while I realize that some need to be filled in order to move forward. So what I'm asking each of the deans to do is to look at the number of positions they have open now and then talk with me on a one-on-one basis about which of those positions are crucial to go forward with and which ones can be held in order to deal with other budget cuts. So some JRF's are going through, some searches are continuing. Others are not going through and it's really being dealt with on a position-by-position basis and in consultation with each of the deans. So it's not a freeze, but it's certainly not every position going through. Now does that slow the process some? Probably, but hopefully not much, because we're trying to deal with these as they come in. To give you an example, recently I took the stack from the College of Education and simply sat down with the dean and went through each of them, and within a period of about 15 minutes the decision had been made about which would go forward and which wouldn't; I signed the forms and those went forward. So that's the way the filling of positions or not filling the positions within the academic units is being handled.

The second item in terms of rumors, and I always love reading these; it seems like they always come in my last reading of my email at night. I usually read my email as soon as I get home and I read it again usually around 8:00 and then again around 10:00, and the 10:00 one seems to be where all of the rumors are. I guess people have had time to get home, have a glass of wine, and I get it about 10:00. We are not firing adjuncts or part-time faculty. All of the deans have their part-time budgets for the entire year. How they use that budget is totally up to the deans, but there is not any overall institution-wide, cost-cutting measure that focuses on part-time faculty or adjuncts. So that can be put to rest, hopefully. I look forward in about 7 or 8 hrs. seeing the next round of rumors that will come up. Let me tell you about C & T because you know there have been discussions about possible reorganization of C & T leading to possibly the formation of a free-standing College of Technology and a free-standing Community College probably known as Summit College, which could in fact involve a combination of the C part of C & T and University College. Those discussions are continuing. I met for about 2-1/2 hrs. with the transition committee last week, and I think it was a good meeting. Based on body language and the relative proportion of those smiling versus those scowling, it appeared to be a good meeting and I received some positive feedback afterwards as well. They're changing my mind on some points and I think I'm changing their mind on some points, and so hopefully in the next few weeks this

may all surface on the floor of the Senate for a more in-depth discussion. But I don't think there are quite as many people mad at me in the Community & Technical College this week as there may have been early last week.

Finally, later in this meeting you will hear a resolution from the Planning & Budgeting Committee. I want to take just a moment to tell you how important this resolution is and to applaud the PBC, not only this year's PBC but last year's. Last year about this time we started a discussion about a productivity-based way of allocating budgets in the academic units based on the return on investment, credit hr. production with a component related to credit hrs. and a component related to measured quality in the units. This discussion went on throughout last academic year; it continued through the summer with a small group of especially dedicated PBC members who were interested in not letting this idea die. Then it came back to the new PBC this year, and I'm pleased to relate to you today that the PBC recommended unanimously with one abstention to go forward with an ROI model for the University. I think in the resolution today and the discussion that will ensue we can talk a little about the next step. But I really do want to applaud the PBC. I think this is a significant step for an on-top-of-the-table, totally objective and totally open incentive-based, productivity-based approach to budgeting within the institution. I hope you will be as excited about this as I am and I think the PBC members are.

Those are the only points I would like to make now, but I will be happy to answer any questions that you have. You can ask me the same questions you asked the President and we'll see whether the answers are the same - they will be."

When the Chair called for questions for the Provost, Senator Buckenmeyer stated that he wanted to point out a bit of hardship relative to putting together RTP documentation, criteria issues associated with benchmarkings. Most of the benchmarkings we had looked at thus far in the College of Education dealt with criteria that were college level. We were trying to put them into department level or academic level criteria. Part of the problem we were having was trying to find department criteria with benchmarks that fit as closely as we could. Part of that confusion had taken a lot of time trying to sort out. So he was wondering about the Provost's timeline of December 15 for getting a first draft of all the documents coming in. Could that be extended?

Provost Hickey replied that we would see what the first draft looked like. No, he did not want to extend this. He thought that the RTP process and the criteria were so fundamentally important to where this institution was going that we needed to move ahead. There had to be a deadline set and then we would evaluate what came in as of that deadline. So he understood the pressures everyone was under, but at some point in time you just had to say this is when things were due, so he was going to stand by the December deadline.

WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson began her report by stating that during this past month the Well-Being Committee met twice, Oct 2 and Oct 25, and essentially discussed the issue of health care costs and how they could be used. That discussion was in its early stages so there was only a short report (**Appendix B**). The President mentioned that he had discussed his charge with us, and she had outlined that in the report. He spoke to the committee on the 25th and that was of course after the 6% additional budget cut by the state. As the President had said here today, he would recommend that cost sharing on health care be postponed until January 23 and would see whether it was necessary at that time. However, he also added that the committee might find that health care contributions should commence on July 1 if there were further and as yet unknown cuts in the budget. At this point the budget share to be paid by faculty and staff for 2003 would be (if it were necessary) 50% of the increase in health care costs as had been suggested initially. However, the budget situation for January 2003 was truly unknown, so she passed this on and hoped this was right.

At the second meeting the Well-Being Committee identified several areas and options for health care cost investigation. There was a list of them. For example, retiree dependent benefits - not to get rid of



retiree dependent benefits but to look at wholesale type of coverage issues as well as to look at negotiation versus open bid with carriers and the possibilities for a state-wide health plan. Now obviously those three were longer term in the sense that we had a contract now, but it was part of the issues that we felt you should look at. The committee had started exploring updated data and then a series of issues that a lot of you had brought to us relating to health care contributions if they were needed, the nature of them, the incentives for opting out of UA benefits, and a possible survey to determine potential savings from that. We have started this exploration and were seeking updated data, legal input where it was needed, past experience both here and elsewhere, and consultant advice. Prior to the initial investigation the committee planned to get input from representatives of our present carriers on cost containment. The committee would welcome any suggestions in the cost-reduction areas that we were looking into. Senator Erickson asked that Senators please contact their rep or her with whatever they had in mind.

The final area the committee wanted to pass on was paying health care contributions versus salary increases. When we brought our report to the Senate on September 20, the recommendations allowed for a salary increase and 2003 health contributions, if necessary. Given the further budget cuts, we discussed the preferred option, and members of the committee stated that the position of their constituents was that they would rather have health benefits with no contribution than salary raise, if those were the only options. Clearly, they would prefer both but if forced to trade off in that case, that was what they would want. They spoke of the thin edge of the wedge and the concern that once initiated, employees would pay an ever-increasing percentage to health care costs. Given the overall low levels of salary, health care was a major benefit they did not want to lose. The committee recognized that they could not have polled all of their constituents, and therefore we would be happy to have feedback from the University community on these issues. We understood that the Executive Committee was developing a survey on this and related issues.

Senator Louscher then asked Senator Erickson when she planned to have such a report available for the Senate and whether she had any control over whether or not it might arrive here in a timely fashion so that the Senate and the people who we represented could accurately debate or discuss this issue so we did not have a repeat of the last situation where fundamentally the choices were coerced.

Senator Erickson replied that the President had said we needed this information by May 1. That was his charge to us that we do it by May 1. We would certainly plan to have it to the Senate distinctly before that date. We were working on making it available by no later than the April Senate meeting and would attempt to have it ready earlier, if possible.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Qammar, substituting for Mrs. Nancy Stokes, gave the report (**Appendix C**). The committee had had one meeting since we met last. Senator Qammar pointed out that there were two task forces that reported to APCC - one looking at rules for the annual evaluation and merit pay, another task force that looked for rules for fixed-term faculty. There was a special digest that came by email to the campus community, and the web page was also listed there. APCC would really request, particularly of the Senators since eventually these rules would come to this body, that all looked at that and share comments with those task forces. Finally, we had the academic calendar to present that was approved by APCC. Senator Qammar then noted a few things about the calendar. First, we did have an official 15-week summer semester this year on the 2002-03 calendar. It did mean that at least for the next two academic years, the tentative calendar for 03-04, the fall semester would start after Labor Day and move farther into the December time period. The reason for that additional week was to give the Registrar an extra week of time between the 15-week summer and the fall semester so they could make that transition. The APCC also talked about the future calendar beyond just this tentative 03-04 calendar where that week had been put back, and the fall semester would then in future planning be moved back before Labor Day with the semester essentially ending at the typical time.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the calendar as presented. None forthcoming, the body voted its approval of the calendar.

NCAA FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE - The Chair advised Senators to view (**Appendix E**) for this report and to contact Mr. David Jamison if they had any questions concerning this.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report (**Appendix F**) by stating that one of the purposes of the Campus Facilities Planning Committee was to coordinate and develop solutions to space utilizations. He was happy to report that we were able to be creative thanks to the cooperation of other individuals. In this case Dr. Goggins, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, and Dr. Beisel, Dean of Continuing Education and Interim Dean of Community & Technical College. We needed to find additional space and by working together were able to solve the space problem that presented itself. In order to facilitate the official action on this, he introduced the resolution: **Faculty Senate supports the following temporary assignment of office space in Polsky 451F and 451G to be used to house the McNair Program; Polsky 451 and 451A to be shared with Advancing Up. If the McNair Program is discontinued, this space will be returned to the Community and Technical College. Polsky 465 will remain shared space and be maintained as a conference room for meetings of the Graduate School or the Continuing Education and Evening Division.** The resolution referred to an earlier document, a letter that was promulgated by Dawn Trouard in 1994. He moved for the adoption of this resolution.

No discussion of the motion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval.

Senator Sterns continued his report by thanking Dean Beisel and Dr. Goggins. He pointed out a continuing concern regarding handicapped parking for Daum Theatre. He especially wanted to note a memorandum from Dr. Hickey on Oct. 28 with a temporary solution which instructed the committee to continue to work on a permanent solution. He thanked the Provost for his support in that regard. The committee then turned to a number of other issues that he wanted to quickly alert the Senate to. There had been a change in the University's approach to dealing with hazardous materials. We had been considering in the future building a hazardous waste facility. There were some new solutions that were in the offering that would save the University considerable funding, and the committee was pursuing exactly what led to the change in philosophy and what the solution would be. We did not know that fully at this time but we were pleased to say that we might be able to do something in a very different way.

We were also anticipating some future space issues such as future use of Memorial Hall, and another issue was that of Leigh Hall. The Provost did come to us last year with the idea of it becoming a distance learning center. We were curious to know what the plans and the programs were with Leigh Hall and how that would be used and what Dr. Gaylord was planning for it. So the committee invited all to come to the committee to share that when ready. Another issue was that Dr. Gunn, representing the School of Family & Consumer Sciences, had been concerned about future renovations to Schrank Hall regarding her department and their laboratories and other stations that had been specially designed for them. So again, the committee was wanting to know what we had in our planning process. Senator Sterns also noted the continuing problem that Biology was having - asbestos removal, etc., and wanted to see whether there was anything the committee could do to help them further.

Finally, that classic issue which all so enjoyed, future parking. But the President had called on Oct. 23 a special parking meeting, and we had started further discussion regarding what would happen in the fall. The committee was exploring issues such as construction, potential refinement of the campus loop shuttle service, how to better meet the needs of students and faculty at the time we were undergoing some of these construction transitions. The committee had been wanting Jim Stafford to come and make a presentation, but all the information was not in yet, so even though the committee had promised Mr. Stafford would give a report, it was not timely. The committee had a number of decisions to make and when it was possible to have good information they would bring that forward.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE - Professor Helen Richter stated that she was substituting for Mr. Mike Nelson and began her report by reading the following: **The University Libraries Committee unanimously passed the following motion on October 31, 2001: Until the Planning & Budgeting Committee and the Libraries Committee have access to the specific budget information of Information and Instructional Technologies, Libraries and Institutional Planning, the Libraries Committee strongly recommends that the Faculty Senate resolve that the proposed \$600,000 budget cut not come from the library, but instead from elsewhere in the budget of Information and Instructional Technologies, Libraries and Institutional Planning.**

To give Senators a little background on what was going on, the committee had had a meeting with Dean Williams yesterday. He had been asked to identify right away \$200,000 to cut, and currently that was going to be 20K for professional development including travel, 25K for security cameras for Bierce, 40K for furniture that needed to be put into the science and technology expansion, 10K for University Press. But of more concern was \$105,000 that would come from collections which would be basically at this point come from books, as everything else was encumbered. If an additional \$400,000 had to be cut, \$305,000 of that would come out of collections and \$95,000 from 3 of the 8 vacant positions in the library. We felt the effects of these cuts could be long-term; we would have a big hole in the collections. Her personal feeling was that no matter where the money came from, we should not be cutting the library because it was the heart of our institution. The library had suffered many cuts over the last 18 years. They did not exactly have any extra fat to be trimmed off. The committee would like the Senate to consider passing this resolution regarding that budget.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the resolution. Dr. Gaylord, after being granted permission to speak by the body, stated that he wanted to give a little background on this because he had not known about what was going on until the last 24 hrs. and could maybe represent it in a way that demonstrated more of a rational kind of process that was going on in the administrative support areas of the institution. First and foremost, we were going through a process, and that process included all of us looking at all of the different areas. He had six areas that reported to him and we did not have the targeted budgets. From Oct. 8-18 that target was changing in terms of how much we were to cut. We were looking at doing this process basically once, so we knew we had about \$422,000 reduction in our area out of the \$1.1 million cuts in administrative services. So we took a majority chunk of that from any VP area. What we did was to ask every individual departmental head to take a look at a proportional cut plus a couple percent and then as a second round, the potential for another 3-4% on top of that. Then we were not done with that process yet. Everyone would be bringing to our core team those things we were considering as potential areas to be reduced. Once we got through the give and take in terms of how that affected other operations within the VP/CIO area, it would go to a Buchtel Hall group of VP's, the Provost, and we would look at how that along with other administrative support areas would affect each other administrative support area. Once that was done we intended to go ahead and ask for review by various groups such as the Faculty Senate and other groups, other constituents as well, of the functions and things that we did. So Dr. Gaylord welcomed the good resolutions and the good feelings behind the things. It was great to know that some of the things we were doing in support areas were key and critical and central to the mission of the University. He just wanted to let Senators know where we were in terms of the process and also to let all know that nothing was off the table. Our instructions from the President and the Vice President and Provost group were really putting everything up on the table, and we did. That was where it was right now. Some of these might be red herrings; some of them might just be out there to excite everybody. We had not finished our process yet; as a matter of fact, we had not really jumped the first of the three big hurdles before we started talking to the Faculty Senate committees that were responsible for discreet and distinct parts of our budget. We were looking at it from a wholistic view first, and we wanted to found that in the academic plan and mission of the institution and not look at things itsy-bitsy in an ad hoc fashion.

Senator Hebert stated that he wanted to speak against the resolution. He was a member of the faculty of the College of Business and was very concerned about the way that we were going to have to deal with our cuts in the College of Business. He was concerned about how the dean of our college was going to do that. He did not feel that it was his place to deal with cuts that were being made in the College of Arts & Sciences or in the vice presidents' areas. He thought that that was up to the people in those areas. So he was speaking against the motion because he did not think it was any of his business.

Senator Pope asked for a description of what exactly this would mean to library acquisitions. Professor Richter replied that, for the rest of the year the approval plan was cancelled. That was about 120,000 of cuts. So basically there would be no more monographs this year. The serials are already ordered, so mainly the cut from collections would have to come from books.

Senator Pope then stated that the english department had heard that it essentially would mean there would be no new acquisitions of books after Oct. 31. Was that right? Professor Richter replied that if the \$600,000 went through, \$400,000 would be what was left of the \$2.8 million that was in the collection budget. Senator Pope then asked how long that would last. Professor Richter replied that that was unknown. She assumed that if the library budget was cut by \$600,000 between now and next year they would have to do more, but this year there would be a hole in the collections and then a reduction in the library budget which was already very tight and which was a poor facility for the whole faculty, everybody in every department.

Senator Erickson then stated that as an ex-chair of the Libraries Committee and to follow up on what Professor Richter had said, she had gotten involved with University Libraries essentially because of the situation in the library back in the 80's. For those who had been around, you knew what it was like. Whenever there was a situation where we needed to cut budgets, it would be the library. Why? Because it had a constituency of all of us and a constituency of none of us. It was not just part of the non-academic part of the University; it was a strong part of the academic part of the University as well. It was out of that that she was on an ad hoc committee that tried to set up a system that would help us with the situation by creating a dean of libraries. We knew there were faculty members in the library, but every single one of us were affected by what the library budget got, because it made a difference in our ability to be productive and certainly for our students to be productive. She had stood up in the previous body, University Council, and begged just to get an extra little bit for the library. And it had been an extraordinary situation. That was no way to have one of the most important parts of this academic institution be funded. And it was with consideration of this background that she would support the motion of the Libraries Committee. What they were asking for here was that they needed to see just what trade-offs were involved. That was, if that was going to be the cut - no monographs for a year, then let us look at that in terms of what the cuts would be. As there was no single constituency, it was the constituency of all of us who were affected by certain trade-offs on technology versus trade-offs in books. This was something that the Libraries Committee clearly thought that they needed to be considering at the earliest date possible, and knowing how this process was going on they could not support any kind of cut like this. She certainly could not support that and she felt that all were involved.

Senator Graham then stated that he was a little confused as to where we stood. Based on what he had heard Dr. Gaylord say, plans were being drawn up, budgets were being examined. He had gotten the impression, but may have misinterpreted it, that firm decisions had not been made. Then it seemed to him based on what he had heard from the Libraries Committee representative, the approval plan suspended as of yesterday would put a permanent hold in the collection of the library. So that struck him that, if true, it seemed a decision had been made.

Chair Sheffer asked Dean Delmus Williams whether that were true. The Senate then granted Dean Williams permission to speak.

Dean Williams stated that the task assigned at the beginning of the process was to make available 2 tiers of monies that could be swept as part of the budget renegotiation. The first one was 200,000, the second an additional 400,000. The 400,000 in particular was to be held for contingency if that money was required at a later date, because there was some expectation that there might be a second cut later in the year. We looked at the budgets and the short of the story was that the only place we had anything like 600,000 was in the book budget. The second part of that was if that was the amount of money that we were required to make available to the University as part of the process, that the only way we could preserve a fund of that size was to suspend the purchase of books now. With some exceptions there would be some things coming on standing orders, some orders that were already in transit, and some other kinds of things that were continuing obligations, and also things that were specifically needed to support courses that would be held in the spring. There were always a few things that the Faculty Senate might have to have for core support, and we would provide those. The expectation was that in the spring of the year we would then try to readjust the budget to figure out whether a start of this fiscal year was possible with the idea that at an indefinite time (and he did not know what that time was because he did not participate in the budget process that had been given) when certainty returned to our budget, we would try to reinstitute things. But until then, if our title was that amount of money or our potential title was that amount of money, the only way we could meet it was to hold off purchases immediately with the idea that they could be reinstated when we had a better picture of our budget situation.

Chair Sheffer asked whether that answered Senator Graham's question. To which Senator Graham replied that it did.

Senator Qammar then stated she had a question for Vice President Gaylord. What percentage of all the budgets of all the units who reported to him was the library?

Vice President Gaylord replied that he wished there was an easy answer to that. It was complicated because 18 months ago when he had come here, the Board of Trustees passed a 3-year enterprise systems project that had basically all of its funding from borrowed dollars from ERIP savings. These dollars were part of our base budget, but they went away after next year. So in a very real sense we were doing the prudent thing. We were keeping options open, and we were not going to cut things that were central to the mission of the institution.

Senator Qammar then stated that her point was more along the lines of, right now Dr. Gaylord had a ball park idea that 6% of the library was around \$600,000, so what was his gut instinct?

Dr. Gaylord replied that the gut instinct was after the one-time-only dollars that were going next year that his proportional cut was based on, next year when we were back to our level budget the cuts that were taken this year were really going to hurt a little bit more. So he thought all could see those things. The budget of the library, the pure technology budget was around \$14-15 million and a portion of that, a couple million of that, was temporary dollars for acquisition of enterprise things - servers, and things like that. The library budget was about half of that, so it was a third of the entire steady state budget. So what he thought all were hearing, and we were all aware of the history in terms of how things had had to be reduced in all of these different support area budgets the library notwithstanding, we knew that we were tight. It was going to be very difficult and we would try, as all were trying. When we looked at our library budget, if the bulk was in whether we bought books or not and a third of my budget reduction proportional for my division was in that area, that was extremely difficult for us with or without this resolution. We were going to have to work together amongst all the support areas and the academic side of the house, what those things were now, because the game had changed now. Eighteen months ago when these decisions were made to go forward in some of these things, that was the scenario. The scenario was different now. We had everything up on the table, and we wanted to do those things that as a collection of individuals with a mission, with a common Charting the Course kind of strategic orientation, he did not do something that was going to hurt another vice president in a

support or academic area. That was why we were pushing so hard to work together. On Oct. 8 it had come down to you as it had to himself to make the best of it. That was not what we wanted to do. That was why we stopped that and put in place freezing temporaries, freezing overtime, until we got through this next 2-week period to come up with things that were less baton-tossing and hurting to other divisions.

Senator Pope then commented that when this came to his english department, the first time we heard about it, we were rewriting the guidelines to up the requirements for publications and journals and books. This now added a kind of uncertainty to the whole process in that we were notified that the University would stop purchasing journals and books at the same time. Especially in the field of english where we were concerned with this so much, there was a general desire to express a strong opposition to cutting back acquisitions of books in the library. Consequently, he had with him a couple of paragraphs that he was asked to bring and read (**Appendix G**). He wanted to note that the english department felt that it was really harmful to the University as a whole to cut acquisitions in books. It struck us in general as a kind of... To which Parliamentarian Gerlach completed Senator Pope's phrase with, "barbarism."

Senator Pope then continued by stating that it went against the entire idea of the University. So he had the two paragraphs from the english department that he could either read or pass on to be included in the Chronicle. Chair Sheffer indicated that Senator Pope could pass it on to be included in the Chronicle.

Senator Louscher added that he agreed with Senator Erickson in many ways about the cuts. He had been here 31 years and in fact might be the most senior person in the Senate. If it truly was the case that the library budget was almost a discretionary fund, a point had to be made. But it seemed to him the problem here was whether this body was going to piecemeal, micromanage the budget process. We had a Planning & Budgeting Committee that had the charge of looking at all of the budget cuts and weighing each against the other. He was a little concerned that while this was an absolutely worthy cause that in many ways on the substance he would vote wholeheartedly for, he was very concerned that we did not begin a little more log-rolling here in the sense that we would declare this off-limits and that off-limits, and all of a sudden we would be in a situation where we had no flexibility in dealing with a serious problem. He thought this was a subject that the Planning & Budgeting Committee should look at seriously knowing full well there was very strong support for the library budget and that Vice President Gaylord should know there was very strong support for the library budget. He thought this was a mistake for this body at this point in time to start micromanaging what could or could not be cut in the budget.

Senator Lyons then asked two quick questions. He asked of Vice President Gaylord - a third of the budget - was it absorbing a third of the cuts or more?

Dr. Gaylord replied that as he tried to mention earlier, we were going through the process of all of his chairs or department area heads coming up with a little more than what we had been told at this point the cut was going to be, round 1 and round 2. We were going to go through that because he wanted people to go a little bit further than what their area might be reducing. We did not like the idea of across-the-board stuff any more than anybody else did. But the proportion of dollars we had in the exercise today was relative to the budgets plus some. So we would be looking at that and going through the process he described earlier. We were really not at the point where all of his directors and heads of his departments had actually met.

Senator Lyons then asked whether Dr. Gaylord had considered what effect this might have on the accreditation process. Dr. Gaylord replied that we had quite a bit of information we intended to go ahead and put forward as he would imagine deans were for your areas in terms of how cuts might be made. The flexibility in our area, because we were so tremendously fixed-cost based, did have some

repercussions in terms of things. If anyone thought that there was some absurdity in considering everything on the table, we had already cut down tremendous things. We had shot down the laptop program for the students for next year; it was off the table. The grants and contracts which were going to make money for us, for Vice President George Newkome, were off the table - that's 300,000. So we were pulling these things off, and not all that money was this year. But they had extended it to the next fiscal year. So we had already suspended things that were affecting many people until we got through the 15th of November. We had about two more weeks to get this thing going, and then we would be able to go through the Provost's and vice presidents' group and then the Planning & Budget Council and other constituent groups in somewhat of a reproducible, logical fashion. That was all we were really looking at right now was making sure we had that process. He guessed he would tend to agree that if the Senate started doing this, then it might expand to say looking at student services or some building construction stuff. Granted it was better than last year - looking at preferred parking for VPs and from Buchtel Hall - which was the primary discussion last year at this time. This was a significant discussion and required us to be very meticulous in what we cut. There was nothing going on here and any illusion or implication that anything was being done here in an ad hoc fashion without the consideration of things like the 2003 April NCA thing was not accurate.

Senator Clark added that she wanted to draw the Senate's attention back to the text of the resolution, which said that until the PBC and the Libraries Committee had access to the specific budget that Dr. Gaylord was talking about, there would be little need for this resolution by providing access to that information. On that note she thought it was time to call the question.

Senator Reed then stated that she wanted to support what Senator Louscher had said. When one looked at the language of this, the Senate would actually be resolving where a budget cut would come from within a division. This was really not appropriate for us to do.

Senator Qammar commented that she might not have as much past history as her colleagues here, but she had sat on PBC. This was her third year and a little past history about that bore a little bit toward the discrepancy between what this resolution was actually asking us to do. For the last two years when we had gotten requests from various units on campus that had come to PBC, generally these were under the headings of special initiatives, and the library always had a special request because of ever-increasing costs and maintenance of their facilities, etc. PBC had overwhelmingly supported those elements within the library. It always came as a separate issue - this was what the library wanted, this was why they wanted it, and we voted on that separately. Also, we had gotten a separate budget of University Library to look at when we looked at various budget scenarios. The other thing she wanted to remind the Senate was that on Nov. 13, PBC and the CCTC were already scheduled to meet in order to look directly at this issue. She thought it was not inappropriate to say that the library had administratively been inserted under this vice-presidential line. In the past we had always treated it much as a separate entity with a budget and recommendations and special initiatives, because it did in fact affect so many of the academic units on campus. She wanted to vote in favor of this resolution to bring it to PBC as we had asked for in the past.

Senator Franks then stated that the PBC did have access to information. We had requested it and would be looking at the IT budget as well as the rest of the University's budget in detail over the next several weeks in order to make the best possible decisions on the budget.

The Chair called for further discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was then taken. The motion failed.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Franks began his report by stating that there was a lot of detail in the report available to Senators at the front table (See **Appendix H**). We had been meeting weekly since Oct. 11 and for 2 hrs., 2-1/2 hrs. one time. We had discussed many, many things. The President announced that there had been a 6% callback, and that had been the biggest Senate discussion the last four meetings. In addition to discussing where we might make that 6% recovery, we had also been discussing a lot of serious issues that had come to our attention. The

IT budget had come to our attention, general types of things like the growth of the administrators' statement of the budget over the last ten years as opposed to the academic budget over the last ten years. All of these kinds of things had been mentioned by your constituents on the committee. There was also a list of who these people were. It was a good idea that Senators became acquainted with everyone on the committee in order to express concerns to not only me but anybody else who was on the committee; we were all involved in this together. We seemed to be working very well together this year and had heard from everyone on the committee so far. There had not been anyone who was silent. He had been on the committee 3 years and for 3 years we had been discussing how to link planning to budgeting. We had been asked to do that by the NCA and even if we had not been asked to do that, was not that a good idea?

Regarding the ROI resolution, the ROI working group had been spending a lot of time studying the ROI budget model. We talked about this last year and raised questions as to certain problems with a pure ROI system. The working group looked at that all summer and came up with what was called a magnetic affect ROI which really addressed a lot of the issues we had had. Senators did not know anything about this right now, so what the committee was basically asking was for Senators to come back in two weeks on November 15, at which time the ROI working group would give a presentation to educate all about what this was. In the meantime the networking group would get information into the hands of every Senator, so all would have time to look at this. So at this point in time we were asking Senators to review what was on the table (See **Appendix I**).

Chair Sheffer then stated that Senator Franks, on behalf of the PBC, was in effect asking the Executive Committee to call a special meeting of the Senate two weeks from today at 3:00 p.m. The room would be announced on the notice of the special meeting. Senators would be apprised of the ROI model and would vote on this motion.

Senator Franks then continued his report with two other items. We had to consider a lot of things when we were talking about the budget and yes, it was stated earlier when the President talked about tuition increases. Please note that we were discussing that issue very seriously, giving it careful consideration. We understood that in enrollment there was a formula in there and we were studying this issue. He had asked Dr. Roney for her input. The last thing was that we realized there was confusion on campus about the budget. This was how it worked and the example that was given to him that some people had suggested was why not spend all the money now and then the state could not take it back. That was not how it worked. But there was a lot of confusion, so the committee felt that we ought to attempt to increase understanding of the budget overall on campus. Therefore, we had decided to conduct at some time in the future, once we get past the immediate crisis of where to recoup this 6% monies, town meetings. At those meetings the members of PBC would be there to answer questions and try to clear up some of the confusion.

**VI. UNEFINISHED BUSINESS** - Chair Sheffer stated that the Senate had before it the **amendment of Senate Bylaw 3359-10-02(H)(f) regarding the Association of The University of Akron Retirees as Faculty Senate representatives (Appendix J)**. Secretary Kennedy stated that as Senators might recall, we had passed these amendments and they had gone to the President. However, the President would not sign or agree to these amendments unless the addition as listed on the handout given to Senators was added. Therefore, the Executive Committee was presenting it to the floor for discussion. Chair Sheffer added that basically this was modified and the modification came at a meeting of the Executive Committee. We brought it to the body now for discussion and a vote. Parliamentarian Gerlach then interjected that because it was a bylaw change, it had to lay over for one month before a vote could be taken. Chair Sheffer then stated that the body would come back and this amendment at the December meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Senator Norfolk then asked, with correction from our esteemed Parliamentarian if necessary, was the Senate directing the Association of The University of Akron Retirees to do something? Could we do



that in our bylaws? Senator Norfolk queried about the second bylaw change, saying that it said, "shall." Was that something Senate was telling them to do?

Chair Sheffer replied that that part had already been approved by Senate. Senator Norfolk replied that that did not make sense. Chair Sheffer replied that that was the method by which the Association would elect their Senators. The language was parallel to other parts of the constitution of the Senate. The second portion addressed how they were voting, who could run for this - dues paying members. Now the third portion was **the restriction that they could not serve on the Executive Committee or serve as chair or vice-chair of any of the standing or ad hoc committees essentially of the Faculty Senate.** The first two parts had already passed. Senator Norfolk then stated that he remembered the Senate doing this but that it still bothered him that we were telling the Association what to do. Secretary Kennedy then stated that she could speak to that. The Association had wanted their representatives to come from their dues-paying membership so the Senate was not telling them what to do. Senator Norfolk then stated that he was not questioning that part of it, just the wording. To which Chair Sheffer reiterated that the language was in accordance with other features of the bylaws. Graciously, Senator Norfolk thanked the Chair.

**VII. OLD BUSINESS** - There was none.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS** - Chair Sheffer stated that the body had a bylaw change to consider, **3359-10-02(H)(6)(a)(ii) regarding elections of Senators.** Secretary Kennedy stated that there had been some discussion at an Executive Committee meeting about colleges that were having difficulty with their election process for Senators. It had been suggested that perhaps an electronic ballot be instituted. Before an individual college could do that, the Faculty Senate Bylaws needed to be changed. That was the proposed amendment that the Executive Committee had put before the body. The amendment read: **All nominations and elections shall be made by secret mail or electronic ballot.**

Senator Norfolk stated that while he did not have a problem with the concept, he did wonder whether security could be ensured with such a thing. It was just too darned easy to cheat.

Senator Erickson stated that the College of Arts & Sciences had brought in electronic balloting as soon as it was possible to do so. Further, ASG did its elections using electronic ballots this last year. It was tested - if she was not mistaken and Senator Lyons had made a comment on that - in the political science dept. So yes, it was possible to have that. That was one of the requirements when we had met with the Computer Center to have that anonymity.

Senator Louscher then asked, on the lighter side, who in the world would cheat to get on Senate?

Chair Sheffer stated that since this was a bylaw change, it would have to lay over for a month.

**IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - Senator Hebert stated that he had a minor point to make. We had all been talking about institutional memory and he remembered when we changed over from University Council to Faculty Senate. Now we were getting back to the point where we had faculty, we had students, we had part-time faculty, we had contract professionals, and now we were thinking of adding retirees. Maybe we should go back and change our name to University Senate, because this was not a Faculty Senate. The name Faculty Senate was a misrepresentation of this body. Chair Sheffer thanked him for his comments.

**X. ADJOURNMENT** - Chair Sheffer called for a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.