

## **MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 4, 2002**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Dan Sheffer at 3:05 p.m., in Room 202 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-four of the sixty-eight Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Lavelli, Lee, Li, Marino, R.Pope, Reed, Riley, Spiker, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Anderson, Binienda, Broadway, Brouters, Buckenmeyer, Chafin, S.Clark, First, Louscher, Purdy, Rasor-Greenhalgh, Trotter, Turning, and Walter were absent without notice.

### **SENATE ACTIONS**

\* **APPROVED THE SPRING 2002 COMMENCEMENT CANDIDATES.**

\* **APPROVED RESOLUTION FROM CFPC TO ACCEPT REASSIGNMENT REQUEST 1200-141, ALLOCATING CARROLL HALL 320 A,C, AND D FROM THE GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT TO COMPUTER BASED TESTING, AFTER GEOGRAPHY MOVES TO THE NEW ARTS AND SCIENCES BUILDING.**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Chair Sheffer stated that there was a correction to the agenda. Where it stated, "consideration of the minutes of February 7," it should state, "March 7, 2002." He asked for other corrections. The Senate then voted its approval of the corrected agenda.

**II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2002** - Secretary Kennedy stated that she had no corrections to the minutes. Senator Hebert moved that the minutes be approved; Senator Lyons seconded the motion. The body then voted its approval of the March 7, 2002, minutes.

**III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIRPERSON** - Chair Sheffer stated that he had just a few items here with respect to remarks and special announcements. First, Marilyn Quillin was distributing two handouts for the Senators, and this was part of a report that Prof. Midha would be presenting in a few moments. Secondly, all committee chairs of all Senate committees must submit reports if they had not done so already for the May Chronicle. He asked that those be submitted to Marilyn to be put into the May Chronicle. Thirdly, Senate needed to approve the Spring 2002 commencement candidates. Marilyn had the list here today, and he believed the lists were circulated to the colleges and departments. He called for a motion to approve the Spring 2002 commencement candidates. Senator John so moved;  
Senator Harp seconded the motion. No discussion of the motion forthcoming, the body voted its approval of the Spring 2002 commencement candidates.

#### **IV. REPORTS**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** - Secretary Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met on March 18. At this meeting we considered a request from PBC to check into Web CT and curriculum issues regarding adopting a current web format. Apparently, there was some concern regarding curriculum issues during the approval process. These issues ranged from enforced content to test and assignment security to syllabi, etc., and reportedly these were not being addressed by the current approval procedure. Therefore, the Executive Committee was going to refer this matter to APCC to investigate and report back, and I'll be sending a formal request to the chair of that committee next week. Since the special Faculty Senate meeting of March 21, the Executive Committee had met twice. On March 22 the Executive Committee met with the President and Mrs. Herrnstein. During this 4-hour meeting we discussed issues relating to communication between the administration, the Executive Committee, and the Faculty Senate. In particular, we discussed breakdowns and problems that had occurred during the past year. We also discussed issues related to a breakdown in the shared leadership process and expressed our dissatisfaction with many of the situations that had occurred during the year. Basically, the Executive Committee voiced many concerns regarding the various problems that had occurred, many which we documented in our resolutions. We also met twice on Mon., April 1, once with committee members only present and then with the President as well. At our Executive Committee only meeting, we began an initial discussion of the PBC proposed budget, and as that was part of our agenda today, we would address those issues then. At the second meeting with the President we revisited issues raised at our March 22 meeting, and also began an initial discussion of the budget.

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. Thank you indeed for your continued involvement in the deliberation of the many issues that are facing The University of Akron and for your collective and individual commitment to improving our communication. Because as faculty, that is certainly something we must do and as your Secretary has just informed you, we've certainly begun actively in those discussions and I'll have a few more words to say about that.

Your chairman has provided me a copy of the resolution passed by the Senate at its special meeting, and as I have already advised your Executive Committee, I will take the following actions: First, I will forward it to our Board of Trustees for their information; and second, I've already initiated or will soon initiate a number of specific actions to work with the Senate and other appropriate faculty and campus community groups such as department chairs and deans, as well as special advisory groups to address the issues raised and to work together in improving communication and the processes leading to specific recommendations.

Much of the balance of my report this afternoon, therefore, will inform you of steps that have already been put in motion. Current steps involve three major areas: First, budget recommendations related to salary and compensation, including health care. Second, other processes for obtaining appropriate and timely faculty input. Third, overall communication in University planning. Let me address each of these in turn. Among the elements in current budget recommendations of the PBC is a proposal for \$1.2 million to address salary compression and equity outlier issues for professors and associate professors. This, ladies and gentlemen, as you've heard me say earlier, is the first of two steps to address compensation issues.

The second step will be a plan to move average faculty salaries to the 75th percentile among peer institutions within three or four years. To this end, I have appointed an academic salary affairs task force to work with the office of the Provost, the Faculty Senate, and to advise me on issues relating to faculty salaries. Members of this task force are Professor Chand Midha serving as chair; the chair of the Faculty Senate, Professor Sheffer; the chair of the President's Commission on Equity, Professor Elizabeth Reilly; Professor of Accounting, Tom Calderon; Professor of Economics, Gary Garafalo; the PBC representative, Professor Rasor-Greenhalgh; and a representative from my office, Ms. Becky Herrstein. Dr. Midha is here and because it might be most timely to hear things in order, if you will permit me to interrupt my remarks at this point and ask Professor Midha to report to you on the progress to date."

Dr. Midha then began his report. He requested that because of time limitation, Senators listen to his report and then he would take as many questions as the body might have.

He continued. As the President had mentioned, we had been given the task of looking at the compression and equity issues among the salaries of associate and full professors, and we had been allocated \$1.2 million. We have 11 benchmark schools plus The University of Akron, and all together we had data for 12 schools. The graphs given to Senators (**Appendix A**) would tell that at those 12 schools the average salary of a professor at a benchmark school was \$81,095. This was for 2,465 professors at those schools. For example, for history that ratio was .97, which meant that at benchmark schools history professors make .97 of \$81,095, and that number was \$78,485. So likewise, Senators could calculate their own salary depending on discipline, and these bar charts reflected those numbers - .87, 1.7, and so on. Pages 1 and 2 would give that information, and pages 3 and 4 gave us the reality at The University of Akron. At The University of Akron the average salary of a professor was \$71,616. Market reality told us that they should make  $\$71,616 \times .97$  and that number equals \$69,467. If the market reality held, The University of Akron average salary of a professor should be \$69,467. However, that was not the case on our campus. On our campus the average salary of a history professor was .88 of \$71,616, which turned out to be \$62,873. So the first two pages were telling us the market reality of the disciplines, how much they should make relative to all-around salary, and pages 3 and 4 were telling you the reality at The University of Akron as far as disciplines were concerned.

As could be seen on page 3, almost all the points he read were green; green meant they were doing okay and red meant they were not meeting the market reality. So that gave the pictures of the discipline market on pgs. 3 and 4. Pages 5 and 6 indicated what we are doing at benchmark schools, with the average salary of history professors being \$78,485. At The University of Akron the average salary of a history professor was \$62,873. So pages 5 and 6 were telling you how the average salary of a discipline related to the average salary at the benchmark schools.

The first 6 pages were at the professorial rank, and the same thing was depicted in graphs 7 through 12, the market reality of benchmark schools. Pages 9 and 10 depicted reality of The University of Akron, and 11 and 12 were telling how the disciplines compared. Here was the list of all the schools, and many were aware of how we selected these schools. We got input from the chairs, and then Provost Hickey got information from schools. These were the 12 schools, and because of different disciplines and different schools we had to come up with the best compromise. Again, using history as an example, the benchmark school's reality was .97, and at The University of Akron it was .88. An attempt was going to be made to bring the market reality ratio of .88 closer to the benchmark reality of .97. We would leave other green charts or green bars harmless and not do anything to them, except we would be

adding dollars to disciplines which were in red. We needed to give critical care to some people and simply an antibiotic to other people.

So looking at one discipline at a time, some dollars would be added to bring that ratio closer to the market reality. We were going to do that one at a time, and eventually our goal is to raise the average salary of a professor at The University of Akron. It would take some time but we did not have enough money and had the next 2 or 3 years to do that. Calculations would tell us that if we had \$1.2 million allocated to us, we were going to break it down roughly \$800,000 at the fourth level, and \$400,000 at the associate prof. level. Bridging the gap to bring the disciplines closer to market reality would roughly cost us \$450-500 million, and that would leave us with \$300-350,000.

Professor Midha continued. Senators had another sheet (**Appendix B**), looking at the compression issue at The University of Akron. This reflected the most current data for The University of Akron for the year 2001-2002. When we looked at the average salary of professors for the year 2001-2002 at The University of Akron, that turned out to be \$75,881. What we were trying to do was break that salary into different groups, but for those professors who were here less than 5 years, their average salary was \$74,152, and those here 6-10 years, their average salary was \$72,209. The compression was starting there, so people here less than 5 years were making more than professors 6-10 years, and so on. To explain why this was happening, during the last 5 years we had brought some excellent people from outside and had had to give them the market share. If we looked at the salary of those people who had come to The University of Akron directly at the professorial rank, their average salary was \$103,696, and those who had gone through the ranks at The University of Akron had \$66,874 salary. So something needed to be done for us who had gone through the ranks at The University of Akron. Of the remainder of the money, we wanted to look at this \$300-350,000 and how we should address it, and that was what the task force was working on.

The tentative plan was as follows: That the task force would identify the disciplines for the market adjustment. Then we were going to look at the compression issue. At the same time we had an outside consultant who was looking at the salaries for The University of Akron and said there was no significant difference as far as salary with respect to gender and race. He was in the process of identifying some low outliers as well as the high outliers. Again, they told him we would not do anything to the high outliers, but we needed to fix the low outliers. He gave us some outliers for the 99 data; however, because some people had retired, we were seeking advice to get outliers for the most current data. As of yesterday he had not seen that report, but soon he was hoping it would come so we could incorporate that also for this compression. So we would give that information to the Provost, and the Provost could work with the deans' offices and the chairs' offices and we would move from there. Based on the data that we had this was the best we could do. We would learn from this and hopefully in the second cycle would seek your input and advice and use the mistakes we had made to try to improve the process.

Parliamentarian Gerlach then asked whether Professor Midha could do anything for people who had retired. Dr. Midha replied that he could not do anything for those who had retired.

Secretary Kennedy stated that it sounded as if Dr. Midha had already done the calculations. How did Dr. Midha work the calculations for the C&T College?

Dr. Midha replied that the data given to us at the benchmark schools had not included the C&T, the Wayne campus or the library. Information was given to us by the organization CUPA, which stood for

College & University Personnel Administration. This organization had collected data only for the 4-year organizations, and C&T did not belong to that. Library data was not included because they tracked data at schools where there was library science discipline, and we did not have that. Meanwhile, Dean Beisel had sent him information that we would be looking at.

Secretary Kennedy asked whether that would then be included. Dr. Midha replied that yes, they would try to include as many groups as possible based on the data provided. Our goal was not to exclude anybody, but if you looked at the disciplines, not everybody was going to be included. However, if you looked at pages 5 and 6 and 11 and 12, everybody was in red, so eventually we would get to all the disciplines and it would bring our overall average up.

Senator Hebert then had a question. He knew that Dr. Midha was a statistician and he knew that talking about averages was one thing, but what about the details? Could he tell us anything about what was actually going to happen when you looked at the numbers, and who was going to be deciding who got what? He mentioned that the management department was not getting anything.

Dr. Midha replied that we would be identifying the disciplines and would use the management department as an example - looking at full professors considering the market reality, we had to add \$20,000. So give that \$20,000 to the management department. Now it was up to the dean and the chair of the management department to determine how they were going to distribute that \$20,000 among full professors. If in Senator Hebert's department someone had come from outside during the last 5 years and had negotiated their salary, in his judgment they did not deserve any adjustment, but his job was only to identify the discipline, and he asked that he not be held responsible for the distribution.

Senator Hebert stated that he had asked the question because as a result of the distribution, you could end up with more disparity with no rules.

Dr. Midha answered that the team would like to provide some checks and balances.

Senator Harp then stated that he realized that over the 4 or 5 year phasing period these averages changed, but given the numbers Dr. Midha presented today, how much would he estimate the total dollar amount necessary to address all of these problems?

Dr. Midha replied that he had talked to somebody about how we got to \$1.2 million to start with. If Senator Harp recalled, at one of the presentations President Proenza had shown graphs and information circulating on campus which compared average salaries in the state of Ohio. For one reason or another The University of Akron's professorial salaries were ranked 9 out of 10 for the year 2000-2001. To determine how much more would be needed here the President calculated that if we had another \$750,000, we could go from 9 to 5. But remember, we were mixing 2001-2002 data with 2000-2001 because we did not have data from other schools. To answer the question then, the President had mentioned that the goal was to eventually be at the 75th percentile. As of today, if the situation did not deteriorate further and we continued to receive 3-4% raises and other schools were receiving that also, his guess at this time was that we would need \$5 million for the adjustment on top of the raise we were getting. That was why we would need 3 or 4 years to fix this problem.

The President continued his remarks at this time.

"Mr. Chairman, I'll make the balance of my report fairly brief. Obviously, colleagues, this is a very good step that we're beginning to have the data with which to address the issues, and as you can see, it is not a trivial exercise and I invite you to visit with the task force, ask questions and learn the details. I will ask the task force to work with the Senate in devising a recommended process and procedures, and several of you have already sent some very good recommendations about how we can try to create a very objective process.

Now go back in time a little - we started looking at the position of The University of Akron's salaries against peer institutions, against the market, shortly after I came - first with staff. In the area of staff there is a company that actually does these analyses professionally. We began the process, we made the Mercer adjustments, as you recall; we had a process that was followed. That process will now go into a continuing mode just as this process will be initiated, moved through a period of time of implementation, and then go into a maintenance mode where we will need to continue to collect this data, see what is happening to the disciplines at other peer institutions, and be committed then to maintaining the relative position of The University of Akron against peers at approximately the 75th percentile.

So what we all need to do is recognize that it will take us a period of time to get there, recognize that we may make some mistakes along the way which we'll need to correct, and move forward. So your input will be not only necessary, but necessary, to be redundant. So we finally have that data, and I will also ask the task force as we move forward to assist us in other compensation-related issues such as policies related to maternity leave, spousal hiring, and several other matters where we've been making some progress. But we need to move a little faster.

By the way, Professor Midha did not fully indicate that that money will be available July 1. It is my hope that the process for the allocation of those dollars will be available very shortly, but clearly there is no way I can get that to the Board at their next meeting. But perhaps it might be ready for their June meeting or for the August meeting. In any case, it will be available effective July 1 for that pool of money, with all due caveats to what July 1 means in the fiscal year process.

Now in addition to the \$1.2 million to address these issues we've just described - compression and equity outliers - the PBC's proposed budget continues to contain a proposed salary raise pool of 4% and no additional employee contributions for health care, pending the recommendations that the Faculty Well-Being Committee will make for us to address those issues as we go forward into the next year, and in negotiating a new contract with appropriate health care insurance providers. I intend to endorse the budget proposals that are coming forward to the Board of Trustees at its April meeting.

I further understand that the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee may be coming forward with a recommendation to the Senate for a portion of the raise pool to be designated as an across-the-board increase for full-time faculty, staff, and contract professionals. As I've said before, I'm prepared to consider a modest proposal in this regard, but obviously, such a recommendation will first need your additional review and discussion. As we put this plan in place, let me emphasize that staff salaries will continue to be adjusted to market and once this plan is fully implemented - compression and equity and moving to the 75th percentile - we will need to be committed to continuing then to adjust our salary scales as appropriate to the changing conditions of the market and our peers.

Now, caveats abound. Please remember that any budget recommendation is just that - a plan based on

the best available information. In the case of these matters, we may make some mistakes which we'll need to be committed to correcting. Obviously, should budget conditions change that make us have to adjust our budget upwards or downwards, we will have to deal with those realities. As I mentioned to your Executive Committee, as of last week the Governor personally said to me that he did not expect any further cuts to higher education. The same pledge was made by Senator Coughlin. That same statement appears in the Governor's budget statement issued this morning, and I will quote the first of three. The state is placing an additional revenue shortfall, and they're going to have to deal with it in a number of ways. Here's what the Governor says: 'I oppose further budget cuts in state aid to schools for higher education.' That's what the Governor's position is; obviously, the legislature also has to deal with

that. I trust that what they said by word and what they've stated today will continue, but please be aware, as last fall we got caught by surprise. That could happen, and ladies and gentlemen, I cannot guarantee that it will not happen and neither can anyone else guarantee that for you. Now I'd like to thank the PBC and the Senate Executive Committee for their fine and strong efforts in these matters and we'll continue to work.

Finally, in regard to other issues, we're already working with many individual faculty and I've met with many of you in this room individually, as well as with groups, to enhance the processes for faculty involvement and for the involvement of the special committees of the Senate. For example, I've chartered a chairs' working group on information technology, which is meeting with me, Ms. Herrnstein, and Vice President Gaylord to improve communications and solve the current problems relating to some aspects of information technology. The members of that task force are Professor Midha, Professor Stinner, Professor Kruse, Professor Franks, and David Perry, who has been very active in resolving some issues, Professor Cheung, Professor Norfolk, and Christina De Paul, who as you know regrettably is going to be going to the Corcoran Gallery. That's a great honor for her, a great loss for us. In addition, the Provost and I will be meeting regularly with chairs and will meet with combined chairs and deans, as appropriate.

Then I will be meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to improve communication and cooperation and the very processes that you've identified, and we began that process, as your Secretary informed you. At our next meeting we hope to begin to draw upon some special expertise; for example, that of Professor John Green, who was here when earlier structures were in place, and when the current charter for the Senate was put into rule form, and can help us devise some of the processes we have found wanting.

Let me close then with these thoughts, ladies and gentlemen - faculty and staff engagement and indeed engagement from our students is vital in the processes of determining recommendations and decisions at the University. We need to be consistent in going forward to develop a culture of full and open communication. In this regard, I would say that I've heard from these discussions about some who regrettably don't pass on information or who don't do so with accurate information. Obviously, we need to improve on the transfer of information.

Secondly, I've also heard from some of you about individuals who choose to broker information rather than sharing it openly. That is not appropriate; that is not acceptable; we need a culture of full and open communication. Improvement is possible, and improvement is imperative. History has taught us that good policy develops by trial and error, and we need to be committed to the incremental approximation that a solid, continuous quality improvement process can bring forth. Moreover, the solid use of process mapping tools and other technologies can help to support process deliberations as well as the

implementation of policy, and we need to make those available to ourselves.

We certainly have been listening, and we're beginning to act on these items. We need to listen more, and to act upon what we hear collectively. Thank you, and I welcome your questions."

Senator Qammar asked about the task force the President had noted in terms of his meeting with the IT issue, and whether he also had perhaps a staff person there? Oftentimes, staff were the ones who were having a great deal of difficulty with the interaction, and she also wondered whether there was a plan to put a student there?

President Proenza replied that we have a separate group with students that we could draw from, and we certainly could add a staff person; this was just a beginning point. Professor Cheung was serving, as well as your colleague, Senator Norfolk, but we would begin the process and identify some of the issues and bring others as appropriate.

Senator Qammar then asked whether that could be somebody from SEAC? President Proenza replied yes, a very good suggestion.

Secretary Kennedy then had a question that perhaps might be better directed to Dr. Midha. She wanted to make sure she understood this regarding the compression issues and the formulas that Dr. Midha had been raising. Since he did not have any data available for the library and the C&T, he did plan on having that before July 1, correct? Dr. Midha replied yes. Secretary Kennedy continued by stating that otherwise, the C&T, library, etc., would miss out on the allocation.

President Proenza then stated that first, as the Provost and Dr. Midha had said, nobody was going to lose any money. Secondly, we needed to develop an objective and realistic data base process to move forward, and we would move forward as soon as data is available. We had these data; the others were forthcoming. He trusted they would be available simultaneously. If not, money would be set aside for that purpose, but you might have to wait an extra month.

Dr. Midha then commented on the data we're showing for The University of Akron, and definitely everybody would be included by the compression. Senator Franks was in touch with him constantly about what benchmarks we should look for, so we were not going to exclude anybody.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Chair Sheffer invited the Provost to address the body.

"I'll be very brief because you have a number of items to discuss today. I really just want to extend an invitation to you to a couple of events. Tomorrow starting at 10:30 and going until 11:45 in the Summit Lounge of the Gardner Student Center we have Dr. Barbara Cambridge, who is the Director of the Carnegie Foundation's National Teaching Academy Campus Program, and VP for Programs of the American Association of Higher Education. Barbara Cambridge is the Carnegie Teaching Academy's key person. The title of her talk will be 'Campuses in Action - Structures, Policies and Practices that Foster the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.' I certainly invite you to attend that, and I believe Tom Angelo has sent emails out to all of you, but this is just to remind you.

Then on Friday, April 19, we're celebrating excellence in teaching and learning at The University of Akron, and between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. in the Gardner Student Center there will be a variety of events and activities, including student-led sessions. A keynote speaker for that event is Dr. Mary Ellen



Weimer, and her topic is 'Learner Centered Teaching- 5 Key Changes to Practice.' So I invite you and encourage you to attend as many of those events as you would like. I'd be happy now to take questions."

Senator Hebert had a general question, but wondered how important the Provost thought the Faculty Manual was in the actual running of the University, and how important it was for chairs and deans to actually adhere to the rules that were set forth in that manual?

Provost Hickey replied that he was fairly confident there was a real question embedded in that question. Maybe it would be better if Senator Hebert asked him that question; he might have a better idea how to answer.

Senator Hebert then asked what the Provost would suggest to the faculty if they pointed out to chairs and deans that they were not adhering to those and they continued not adhering to the Faculty Manual - should faculty bring that to his attention?

Provost Hickey replied that he thought there was a process within the institution to deal with this, but if he wanted to bring it to his attention, he would be happy to make sure it was inserted into the proper review process so that it got the attention it deserved. This would not be the first thing that has been brought to his attention through an email message.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Reporting for Associate Provost Nancy Stokes, Senator Qammar stated that she had distributed the recommendation from APCC on the discussion on the across-the-board salary increase (**Appendix C**). APCC had met a few times since the last Senate meeting. We had been primarily working on this issue of switching over from a merit only type of salary pool, which was our current status. There were really three elements we had within this proposed recommendation. The first one was the formula to describe the difference between the across-the-board portion and the merit portion. The second portion which we felt was very important was for those people who year in and year out really did not satisfactorily perform their assigned duties, and that an across-the-board portion really was not beneficial to the University to continue to reward such people. So we had a caveat in there that there was a way in which those people would not be rewarded if their performance was unsatisfactory. Then the last element was what we considered to be the definition of meritorious. If you had an across-the-board element, then what was merit? The first portion was an across-the-board component which would be a 2% raise or 40% of the raise pool, whichever was higher. So the 40% element doesn't kick in until you had at least a 5% raise pool. The second portion was that people who did not have satisfactory performance as defined by the academic unit might not be eligible for this across-the-board portion. That was an element of the annual review that faculty and staff went through, and that merit was awarded for work above and beyond satisfactory performance. Essentially, if you were satisfactory across-the-board, if you did things beyond the acceptable limit, then all those people should be considered for a portion of the merit. This was voted on in APCC and there was one abstention to this vote; otherwise, everyone else voted for it.

Senator Jordan then asked whether, when Senator Qammar had said a faculty member "may" not be eligible - she meant "shall" not be eligible? In other words, was it discretionary that it could be denied them?

Senator Qammar stated that the committee had argued this point and we agreed it should be "may," but it would be up to the discretion of the chair and the dean within the unit who decided. We did not want to tie the hands of a chair or dean who, when you said "shall not," would not be eligible for any of the 2% - they would get zero.

Senator Steiner then asked, when talking about the academic unit, whether this talking about the unit that currently made those recommendations at this time was at a department level where there were departments, or otherwise?

Senator Qammar replied that the committee had left that up to the discretion of where a faculty member's merit raise was decided.

Senator Graham then asked that since Senator Qammar had said 2% raise or 40% of the raise pool, whichever was higher, was he reading that correctly then by concluding that in a year in which there was only a 2% raise pool, it would be entirely across-the-board? Senator Qammar replied that that was correct.

Senator Harp stated that this did not affect his department because there was no one at present who would not meet the 2%, and also no one with a salary that was higher than the norm. But if you took a department, given the compression issues we had been talking about, and you had a high earner who was well above the norm and who was performing satisfactorily, but then you also had somebody who was going gangbusters and we had 2 or 3 years at 2% because inflation had dropped less, we were locked into a situation where there was skating at the higher levels and we were not rewarding people to go the extra mile at the lower levels.

Senator Qammar replied that she would agree with Senator Harp, that that was a correct interpretation. She thought one of the things that APCC looked at was the complete distribution of pay raises last year by different categories - faculty, staff, contract professionals, and we looked at the distributions on percentages. One of the things we found was with a 3% pay raise being the pool, that about 15% of faculty and staff were below 2%. If the cost of living was also 2%, it meant that 15% of the people who worked here really considered that we wanted to give them less buying power, which could only be interpreted as somewhat unsatisfactory - giving less buying power because someone was really not doing his/her duties. That was really the primary problem that the committee was trying to address. The committee did talk about a potential model that could address a portion being for equity, something assigned to a compression element at market value, and the other side of it being a performance. But instead the committee decided that we really did not have 15% of the people on this campus underperforming in an unacceptable way, and they ought to at least have something that kept up with the cost of living or expenses. She hoped that answered his question.

Senator Harp replied that, yes, historically it has been a problem with the size of pools. Senator Qammar agreed that it was a problem, and when you did the across-the-board portion, you did leave less for any meritorious type of award. President Proenza then spoke.

"I'll just make four observations for your consideration. As you notice with the discussion that Professor Midha came forward with, any aspect to really judiciously address all of the issues of compensation is to

say the least, very complex.

So please note the following: First, as we look at the data from which supervisors apply merit raises, defacto very few people get less than some number, so defacto the institution is applying an across-the-board statement in making these judgments. Secondly, please note that actual raise pools, that is the actual end result in compensation, have generally always been larger than the allocated raise pools. In other words, if we budget as a university 3%, because directors, deans, chairs, etc., have the discretion to address other problems with other dollars, defacto every time the raise pool has been greater than the announced raise pool or the budgeted raise pool. Thirdly, all of you understand this conundrum of the department that has people that are already performing very well - what do you do to address that? This may require some other considerations that perhaps we could learn from the work of the task force. Finally, do recall that the cost data that Vice President Nettling reviewed with you earlier in the year shows that we have been ahead of the cost of living issue, and cost of living and across-the-board are two different aspects. One does not necessarily address the other, or vice versa."

Senator Schmith then asked whether this ATB would apply also to staff and contract professionals. Senator Qammar replied that that was the intent. It was not necessarily also extended to part-time faculty. She asked Dr. Midha whether that was correct, and he replied that he thought so. Senator Qammar then added that she did not think it included part-time, assistantships, and things like that.

Senator Stinner commented that he was a little surprised by this. He had been a chair for 9 years, so he had looked at a lot of salaries, and 2% was a whopping number. He thought frequently our departments only got a 3% raise pool, and maybe 15% of the people got slightly less than 2%. In his department they certainly did not give anybody zero or half of a percent, but they did have a big problem with morale. We had faculty who had million dollar grants, and now to say that we were going to give everybody 2% and then we were going to divide up this other 1%, he thought it was going to be terribly demoralizing, and he did not understand that.

Senator Sakezles stated that what she found curious about this was that this was pretty much the policy in her department. Then last year when we went through our changes in the Faculty Manual, we were coming in to make all raises merit raises. She had spent four months as acting chair going through the Faculty Manual changing it to merit raises, and she thought it really should be left up to the department; it should have been left to the department level originally so that we could all treat our situations the way we deemed fair.

Senator Sterns then added that many departments had gone to considerable lengths to develop all kinds of evaluation point systems and other aspects, which took into account all the issues we had talked about. One of the biggest problems had been that you could have high producing individuals who got very minimal increases. So he thought we had to be very careful, and he thought the point Senator Stinner was making was a good one.

The Chair called for additional comments. None forthcoming, he stated that he had been asked that this vote be taken as a paper ballot. If a Senator voted yes, it meant he/she approved this resolution; a no vote meant he/she disapproved.

Senator Kendra and Senator Drew acted as clerks and counted the ballots.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report (**Appendix D**) by stating that he had one major resolution that he would like to propose today, however he wanted all to prepare for next month because we had many, many moves that would have to be approved at our next meeting - 50 to 100 different individual moves, and we would try to find a way to do that efficiently. The resolution today concerned a rather simple thing that the **Faculty Senate accept reassignment request 1200-141 allocating Carroll Hall 320 A,C, and D from the Geography Department to Computer Based Testing, after Geography moves to the new Arts and Sciences Building.**

Chair Sheffer called for discussion.

Senator Sterns stated that these were three small offices that would allow for individual testing. It was very compatible with the area and this was space that was going to become vacant as a result of the move, so it was a very reasonable request. The Campus Facilities Planning Committee recommended it unanimously.

The Senate then voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns added that he would like to take the Senate's attention for one more moment by looking at the bottom of the page of his report where it said that he would contact Vice President Nettling concerning a very serious issue. Our committee had dealt with the issue of moves, and how they were paid for was something we had addressed before. He remembered cutting his teeth on the move to the Polsky building. One of the most serious things he thought was happening was that it had come to our attention as we moved into the new Arts & Sciences building and many of the other moves that would go with that, that the intention was to charge departments directly for the move. Now our committee had gone down this path before and we had had lots of discussion many years ago that this was not a fair approach at all and many departments' moving costs were bigger than their annual budgets. So he thought this placed us in a very serious position. His job again, as he pointed out each time he appeared before the Senate, was to cause new and different problems, and this was a very serious one. He did not know whether he was being fair by raising it, but he knew the committee was greatly concerned about this. He did not mean to re-discuss or pre-decide, but he was told and the committee felt that at this point we did not know where the money for any of these moves was going to come from.

Chair Sheffer then stated he had a report now on the ballot on the APCC. The vote was 20 votes yes; 21 votes no, so the resolution did not pass. The Planning & Budgeting Committee report was going to be part of new business for consideration of the budget proposals for the fiscal year 2002-2003. The body indicated there were no further reports from any of the committees.

**V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None

**VI. NEW BUSINESS** - Senator Franks began his report. There was only one item other than budget development that PBC dealt with between the March meeting and now, and that was Dr. Midha's presentation which he gave you a brief summary of today. At the May meeting or the special meeting we would give you the full-blown presentation with Power Point and so forth. You had before you several pieces of information including the motion from the PBC to recommend the committee's proposal. The committee met during spring break and passed this budget proposal by a vote of 9 for, 0 against, and 1 abstention (**Appendix E**).

The committee was prepared to address any and all questions that Senators might have. Before we began that discussion, however, he felt it very necessary to give some background information on the tuition situation statewide. You probably had heard this before but the state presently was facing a \$420 million shortfall for the upcoming fiscal year. Beyond that we could be looking at as much as \$1.2 billion for the year after that, so the state certainly was in a dire financial situation. In response to that, everyone in the state had either announced a tuition increase or was proposing an increase, and the tuition increase we were proposing was very much in line with what the other institutions were doing. These were the tuition increases that had been announced to date, and as could be seen, what we were proposing to do was exactly what CSU and OU had done. The Ohio State University was given special permission to have a heftier tuition surcharge than we did for all first-time college students. First-time students included transfer students, or new beginning freshmen, anyone who was coming to the institution for the first time. These were the tuition increases that had been proposed and would be acted on in the next few weeks at the other institutions.

Our major competitor, Kent State, had an 8% increase on the table. So we were in line with what was going on elsewhere in the state. Now what would this mean? Bottom line in terms of where we had been and where we would be was, we would jump from 7 to 6 in terms of overall costs for tuition. The last few times we had raised tuition we had remained static on the matter. This would put us just barely ahead of the University of Toledo. But if you looked at who our major competitors were - Kent State, Ohio University, Bowling Green - those three institutions were still ahead of us and Ohio State was not far behind.

The first part of the motion dealt with the compensation issues. There were no questions or comments about item no. 1. Item no. 2 dealt with the continuation of \$1.5 million in funding for the research initiative plus a \$1 million reallocation to make graduate stipends more competitive. From a request from the Research Committee our response was to put a line item in for \$208,000 for faculty research grants. As you might remember, this past year we only had about \$64,000 to pass out.

Senator Harp asked whether this would mean that this additional \$1 million in graduate stipends would be in lieu of the numbers we had already received for graduate assistantships for next year? Would this be in addition to that because it would be distributed across-the-board to all the colleges?

Provost Hickey replied that it was at the expense of tuition waivers, the reallocation from tuition stand-alone tuition waivers to graduate stipends. Senator Harp then asked whether it would eliminate the stand-alone's. Provost Hickey replied that it would not eliminate all of them but was a portion of the stand-alone. It would reduce the number of stand-alone tuition waivers. Senator Harp then asked whether it would be distributed not just to departments that had stand-alone's before but whether it would increase the overall level of graduate stipend financing for graduate assistants.

Provost Hickey replied that it was his understanding, and he wished Vice President Newkome were here, but his understanding was that it created or elevated the money available for the graduate stipends. Now he did not want to suggest that it was across-the-board, because in many ways just as a benchmark comparison was done of salaries, you really had to look at what a competitive stipend was in some areas. In some graduate areas the stipends we now offered were quite competitive. In other areas they were very, very non-competitive. He thought the idea here was to be able to increase stipends in those areas where we were no longer competitive. Senator Harp replied that that was great, because one of our biggest problems at present was that our graduate assistantships were the lowest in the state and we were using endowment monies to compete with our competitors. Provost Hickey

replied that stipends were having to be supplemented in a lot of different units in order to be competitive.

Senator Gunn then raised an issue. We had been told that we could increase our stipends by reducing our assistantships. In other words, it really was not increasing, we just had fewer students taking the money and dividing it between fewer. So this was a different thing, and she was concerned about how this would be distributed across the campus.

Provost Hickey replied that he knew Dr. Newkome had stated and he had stated the same thing years ago when he was a graduate dean, that the option always existed to take the pool of money that you had for stipends and divide it by a smaller number and come up with a larger stipend. His sense was that that option certainly existed within the allocations given to various units. This in the way it was presented to the PBC did not result in a net decrease in the number of stipends, but rather, the money was out of stand-alone tuition waivers into this. That did not preclude, and again he would encourage you before you did this to touch base with Dr. Newkome, but it certainly did not preclude your taking the amount of money you had and allocating a smaller number of stipends but making them more competitive stipends. Senator Gunn replied that she understood, but she wondered whether it was targeted just to sciences. Provost Hickey replied that, no, it was his understanding that it was in areas where the competitiveness of the stipends was well below what it took to recruit top-quality graduates.

Senator Franks then continued with item no. 3. This was \$563,000 budgeted to new building operations and new maintenance, mostly to the new Arts & Sciences building. This was money that had to be there in order for them to maintain this new building - janitorial services, and so forth.

Senator Erickson stated that she understood the notion of new buildings needing maintenance and operations. This had always disturbed her, and she wanted to make sure PBC was aware of additional expenses that would be incurred as buildings were finished, as these were not minor expenses.

Senator Franks replied that actually we first saw a figure for this in January for this year's budget, and he believed the figure was more like \$1.5 million. PBC had scrutinized this figure a great deal, and the budget office did a little more research and came up with a more realistic figure.

Senator Erickson then added that it would seem to her that as part of the planning for the new building, bringing this building on line and estimating maintenance and utility expenses should be part of long-term planning for PBC, and questioned whether there was any reduction because you were going to take Leigh Hall off line for a month? It seemed that with the kind of utility changes and maintenance changes the whole building program was going to incur, it would be important to know in advance to make sure that the cost of maintenance was also included. The same would be true for privately funded buildings.

Senator Franks wished to ask Mr. Nettling to respond. The body gave Mr. Nettling permission to speak.

Mr. Nettling stated that the numbers that made up the \$563,000 were based upon estimated square footage from Vice President Curtis. If the buildings were going to be much more efficient, there was also the possibility that it might not take 563 when the year was done, but these were the averages that the architects had come up with. And yes, there was a proportion of some money that was going to be

less because the buildings were going down. So this was the net square footage that we would be taking on. He noticed there was a mention of privately-funded buildings - typically, those would be dormitories and so on, and they paid for themselves. So that would not be part of this budget.

Senator Erickson also asked about the new athletic facility, the field house which was going to be funded from outside funds. There would be the maintenance and the utilities here also, and it would seem to her that that was a very important question especially since it was large pieces of space.

Mr. Nettling replied that that would be looked at and would be part of the budget making process when those buildings start to come on line.

Provost Hickey added, and asked Mr. Nettling to correct him if he were wrong, but the 563 was not just Arts & Sciences. Part of this would be for a reduction in revenue in the student center. As one part of the new student center came on line and the other building got torn down because of the design, a number of the revenue-generating operations in the student center would not be there until the second phase was finished. So we had to cover some additional portions of operating costs of the student center. If he remembered right, a portion of that 563 went for that.

Senator John then asked what that number was, that temporary subsidy for the student union. Senator Franks replied that in the assumptions it was \$628,000. Senator Erickson asked whether that was only a one-time. Senator Franks replied that it was during the transition of the student center being built, and Senator Erickson asked whether that were for the next year as well. Senator Franks answered that is was for least two years, but this was for this year only. His understanding was that if we wanted to do the subsidy again next year, then the PBC next year would have to recommend this again. Senator Erickson asked whether there would be less business in the student center when we moved into the new building?

Provost Hickey replied that this was space allocated for businesses that would actually rent space and generate revenue with more of this space in phase 2 of the student union than there was in phase 1. It would be until such time as revenue-generating space was occupied again. So that would be the construction time of phase 2 of the student union.

Senator Franks continued with item no. 4. What we were talking about here was the new server - \$300,000, and 1.4 million for increase licensing costs that already were anticipated. These were costs we could not avoid. The new server was actually a server that was here and we had been using it for some time. We now had to purchase it - \$900,000 of the 1.7 million in the assumption was for increased licensing for third-party software we already had. Then the remaining \$500,000 was for the software for the new server, and that again was a third-party licensing fee. So in essence, unless we wanted to bring all of our systems to a screeching halt, these were essentially fixed costs.

Senator Erickson stated that she understood the issue about fixed costs; it was what she taught her students. If you looked at the actual budget, it was the reason the IT budget went up by 20% - 1.7 million was a 20% increase; she had done the calculation. So it seemed to her that, unfortunately, fixed costs at some point were not fixed. At some point they were part of planning, and then once they were planned for and decided on that was the situation. We had been in this situation before and maybe this was a continuing result of an initial situation that should never have occurred. But she would not want to be in the Senate this time next year hearing again that all of these things including the server, etc., were

fixed costs. How long were we going to have to live with these past decisions, and when would they not happen again that way? She was not suggesting that PBC do that now, because we could not grind things to a halt, but she was extraordinarily concerned because it was so easy for things to overlap the fixed cost. She wanted to make sure that PBC had processes in place and that it would not continue to occur that way.

Senator Franks replied that the committee had not just taken Dr. Gaylord's word for this; we asked Mike Cheung to come and talk to us also. He would have been here today except he had a sudden death in the family and was on his way to Georgia. Dr. Cheung told him that CCTC understood this issue and that CCTC would support this budget. As far as the concept of not letting this happen again next year, he did not think anybody could guarantee that. We were at the mercy of software companies and when they wanted to raise, they would.

Senator Graham then stated that it struck him as unsatisfactory to have an increase in one particular department that was so large compared to flat budgetary figures, with many other departments having very small increases or even cuts, and then be told that the money was already spent or at least committed. He would be concerned about what the process was in committing that money and to what extent the PBC or other relevant bodies were involved in determining how those decisions were made and how that money was spent.

Senator Franks replied that he did not know whether the PBC was involved in that. What we had was a commitment to certain software products that we needed certain hardware to run. They were in place; it was almost like electricity at this point. We saw the figure in early February and we got as much information as we could, and here it was on our recommendations.

Senator Graham then stated that we had commitments to books and periodicals as well, but we cut those when it seemed there was no money for them. And he guessed he did not understand why this was a special category.

Senator Norfolk stated that the \$350,000 was committed to pay for software. The physical installation was in place; this was a multi-process. If you shut it off and we had been using it, you were shutting down most of what services the University - registration, all of those things through those processes. The other 1.4 million was also to pay for the licensing fees for the third-party software we could not get anywhere else. He admitted that he did not like dumping tons of money into it, but if we wanted to run as a 21st century university, we had to pay it. We were committed to this particular product right now. That \$350,000 was a one-time cost to turn that server on. The other licensing fees were ongoing, but he was not sure how they increased each year. He did not think it would be that much per year, but those were licensing fees, and you would have to check with Vice President Gaylord on that matter.

Senator Steiner then stated that he wanted to agree with what Senator Norfolk had said. As a member of CCTC, our committee was consulted on that and we reviewed information with Dr. Gaylord and approved the recommendation that this be part of the budget and move it on to PBC. Also, although this was a large amount of money for one department, it was not just IT. There were benefits from that, as Dr. Norfolk had said. This was something that every unit at the University used and took advantage of having and it was something we needed to do in order to maintain operations of the University.

Senator Sterns wanted to point out that in the minutes of the CFPC there was a brief mention of an upcoming change in the phone system. He just wanted to say that the phone system revision was a



classic example of what we were talking about here. If we were going to change the phone system and move it into a computer-based approach, then the proper planning had to take place now.

Senator Qammar continued with the conversation with why this 1.7 was needed, as she thought it was almost like periodicals at the library. They actually had you at their will, that the enterprise server in this third-party licensing know that they were going to go out of business in fairly short order. New technology and perhaps new web-based software was going to put them out of business, so they were actually grabbing for the money now because they know it was not going to be there in the future.

Senator Hoo Fatt stated that if it made you feel any better, Dr. Gaylord asked for a lot more than that.

Senator Franks then moved on to item no. 5, which had to do with return on investment model (ROI).

Senator Norfolk stated that this was the item we discussed this morning, and that the administration would implement a planning and accountability model. For the people who wanted their history, we passed a recommendation to that effect four years ago that the non-academic areas would also have to provide accountability models.

Senator Graham had a question on no. 5, but it also related to 7. The return on investment model including enrollment productivity; was it true as he had read, that the Law School tuition increase was only going to be 5%? Senator Franks replied, yes.

Senator Graham asked for the reason for that. He knew there were some ROI issues. Why was their tuition increase significantly less than for the rest of the University?

Provost Hickey replied that as Senator Franks had just talked about the relative position of the University as a whole in terms of other institutions, if we were going to go up 9.9% we would still be in the middle of the pack. That was not true of the Law School. The Law School tuition was already quite high, and to go up more than 5% would put the Law School in a category that would probably be detrimental to its enrollment. We would be getting more money from a smaller number of people and at the end could actually lose money as a result of going higher than that. So it was the relative market position of the Law School versus the relative position of The University of Akron as a whole versus other universities.

Senator Hoo Fatt then asked whether anyone had seen quality measures for the other half of the ROI. Provost Hickey replied that the PBC was still working on that. Senator Hoo Fatt then stated that they said it would be applied, and we did not know what it looked like.

Senator Franks replied that the PBC had asked the deans for quality measures from all the colleges and we had those. We just needed to sit down and review them and make sure there were no objections, and it would take a few more months.

Senator Hoo Fatt asked when this would all start. Provost Hickey replied that it would start at the

beginning of the new fiscal year. But the allocations that were based on quality measure could in effect be held in escrow until those quality measures had gone through the PBC and come before the Senate. If that meant it could not occur until fall semester, then that was what it meant.

Senator Steiner stated that in item 5 you were talking about applying an ROI model. Was this phased-in approach being presented to the Senate?

Senator Franks replied, yes, but it would be phased in over 5 years.

Senator Qammar then had a question to follow up on what Senator Hoo Fatt had said. Here was something PBC was recommending, and we as Faculty Senate were going to vote on and approve, yet it was not finished yet. She was not sure Faculty Senate should vote on something until PBC was really done with it, because then it was out of our hands.

Chair Sheffer then reminded Senators that we must be out of this meeting room very soon, so he was going to ask that the meeting be adjourned and that we meet again one week from today. Before we adjourned, he would like to move to the good of the order and ask the Senate's indulgence for the Parliamentarian's speaking to us about an item that might help us.

Parliamentarian Gerlach stated that his comment was a procedural point, and he just discovered it as he was ruminating. You agreed that a ballot vote would be taken as requested by one Senator. There was no provision in your rules for that. What was provided was, "A roll call vote will be conducted if requested by any Senator." So in the future he suggested that if you wanted a ballot, that you present a motion to have a ballot and that motion be duly passed by a majority of the Senate. This roll call vote, which he would have requested, could put you on record and that could be called by just one Senator.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT** - A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

**Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin**