

## **MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MARCH 7, 2002**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order on Thursday, March 7, 2002, at 3:05 p.m. in the Goodyear Polymer Auditorium.

Forty-eight of the sixty-eight Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Buckenmeyer, S.Clark, Marino, R.Pope, S.Pope, Reed, and Schmith were absent with notice. Senators Anderson, Brouthers, Chafin, Conrad, First, Louscher, Purdy, Redle, Stinner, Turning, Wallace, and Walter were absent without notice

### **SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* APPROVED CFPC RESOLUTION ASKING COLLEGES TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON OFF-LINE CLASS SPACE AND ITS USAGE BY DEPARTMENTS.**
- \* APPROVED APCC MOTION TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING.**
- \* APPROVED APCC MOTION THAT THE COMMITTEE AND PROCESS FOR THE AWARDING OF HONORARY DEGREES BE PARALLEL TO THE PROCESS FOR THE AWARDING FOR DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR.**
- \* APPROVED APCC MOTION FOR CORRECTIONS TO RTP RULE 3359-20-03.7, TO ADD: THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR SCHOOL DIRECTOR IN THE APPEALS PROCESS; AND FACULTY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM LEAVES COUNT TOWARD THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR TENURE.**
- \* APPROVED APCC MOTION THAT THERE SHOULD BE AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE CREDIT FOR TRAINING PROGRAMS EVALUATED BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.**
- \* APPROVED FRC MOTION TO RECOMMEND ACCEPTANCE OF THE POLICY ENTITLED UNIVERSITY RESEARCH, COPYRIGHT AND PATENT POLICY.**
- \* APPROVED FRC MOTION TO RECOMMEND ACCEPTANCE OF A POLICY ENTITLED CONDUCT AND ETHICS POLICY EMPLOYEE FINANCIAL INTERESTS IN COMPANIES LICENSED UNDER THE UNIVERSITY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the agenda. Hearing no corrections or additions to the agenda, he called for a vote. The Senate approved the agenda.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 7, 2002** - Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the minutes. Senator Wyszynski made the motion, and was seconded by Senator Harp. No corrections or additions were reported. The Senate then voted its approval of the minutes.

**III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIRPERSON** – The Chair began by stating that he wanted to comment on two things this afternoon regarding the agenda items we were to deal with. Later in today's meeting we would have an opportunity and perhaps pass a resolution regarding the role of the Faculty Senate in shared leadership. As he had said before, we hoped to be moving from a position of being reactive to one of being proactive. In doing so, we would all hopefully be taking on additional tasks in the planning necessary for determining and achieving the goals of this institution. We would discuss this in more detail as we moved into that segment of business today.

The Chair continued by stating that he needed to clarify a misunderstanding about the email which Senators had received yesterday that contained an alternate version of what he was going to call the second resolution that all received in the mail last month. They were both to be included in our discussion and in our formulation of a resolution to be moved and voted upon by this body. Secondly, he incorrectly had told Senators yesterday by email that we would go into an executive session following old business to deal with the resolution. Our bylaws prevented us from going into executive session; our bylaws stated that all of our meetings must be open to the community. However, in an effort to enable a frank discussion of the resolutions which would deal primarily with the faculty issues, he was going to recess the Senate for approximately five minutes following old business to allow any non-Senators who wished, a chance to leave the meeting. He thanked the Senators.

#### **IV. REPORTS**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** - Secretary Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met twice on March 1, first with committee members only present, and secondly with the President, Provost, and Mrs. Herrnstein. Some of the issues discussed included: The Executive Committee's concern regarding the increases in enrollment, and who would be teaching the new students. Also, given past criticism of NCA, we presented our concerns with an over-reliance on too many part-time instructors. The response to this was stated by the Provost, that several fixed-term, full-time positions had been created out of part-time positions. For example, two part-timers would now equal one fixed-term. There would also be money coming back to units as part of the ROI's ongoing dollars, which could be used to create new faculty positions. We then wondered, given the increase in the freshman class and the resulting increased need for freshman classes, whether there was a plan in place to deal with this likely contingency? We were told the Provost also had some stop-gap funds to allocate to colleges where additional section offerings were needed as a last-minute measure. Related to this, the Executive Committee was concerned about long-term planning on the freshman class demand issue. We were told that the enrollment manager would start March 4 and would address this issue. Concern was raised regarding academic reassessment of students. The policy currently stated that if a student was out of the University system for three years, then came back and started taking classes again, his previous record could then be expunged so as not to affect his G.P.A. However, there have been some problems with how this policy has been interpreted in the Registrar's office because we had been told that the APCC was reviewing this, as well as the VP of Student Affairs. Evidently, what was happening was if you had a student who went to school for a while, did poorly getting C's, D's and F's and then took three years off, came back and took 22 credits and then took a year off, after that year they would be starting over again in terms of reaching the 24-credit requirement. It had to do with the misinterpretation of the policy. We brought that up, and the President had asked Mrs. Herrnstein to follow up on that. The Secretary stated that she had asked Mrs. Herrnstein to make sure she contacted the advisors in the C&T office and apprised them of that situation as well. We had some issues regarding registration. Also again, C&T students who had 32 credit hrs. or more were not allowed to enroll early. We understood per the minutes that were distributed to the Executive Committee following our meeting with the President, Provost, and Mrs. Herrnstein that that was a problem in the registration protocols. However, that problem had been corrected and would appear as corrected in the fall semester class schedule. The Executive Committee had a concern about the reduced number of phone lines available for students who wanted to register over the phone. The Executive Committee brought this as a concern to the meeting, and again in the minutes that we received, we were told by the assistant registrar there was a need to reduce costs by still offering maximum flexibility to our students. The telephone system was therefore maintained as an option for students but with fewer lines. The last concern we brought forward as a committee had to do with difficulties with Barnes & Noble. In particular, students had reported having difficulty getting a book list on-line without reserving or buying them at Barnes & Noble. The Executive Committee had queried whether the University was pursuing a contract and where that stood. We were told that a contract for a vendor for the on-campus bookstore had been put up for bids and bids were being evaluated. Book lists would be a key to that negotiation.

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, colleagues. I noted that our Parliamentarian is again wearing his kilt, and I couldn't help but comment to him that I saw another kilt a couple of days ago, but not in Scotland - so you have a colleague there. I want to thank all of you for the increased dialogue we are having. It is very reassuring to see so much participation. I'll make some brief comments and then in keeping with the request of your Chair, I will absent myself.

Ladies and gentlemen, as academics we frequently create ironies out of the conflict between ideals and reality. That is because by definition, ideals represent conditions that we live for, not conditions that we live with. In some cases ideals become illusions that sometimes blind us from the needed hard work to accomplish those things that will advance our common good. That viewpoint interestingly has also been voiced by Richard E. Miller, and some of you may recall that he was a recent visitor to our campus in conjunction with the teaching academy endeavor, and he expressed that viewpoint through his 1998 book that many of you read at that time entitled, "As if Learning Matters." Such too it seems to me is the situation that we face today as you consider whether or not you want to continue the demanding and sometimes frustrating work of pursuing the ideals of the University.

Before you today will be two versions of a resolution of shared leadership, as Dr. Sheffer has indicated. One speaks of positive action and commitment to the hard work needed to continuously approach the ideal, the other understandingly speaks to anger and frustration which we all share but which will not help us to address the issues. I've clearly heard you, as I've said, and I am as upset at the failure of communication and consultation as you are, for I would assume that effective processes were in place when they were not. Still, the question is not has shared leadership been realized, but are we to learn from our experience?

Two weeks ago we gathered as a community to discuss budget issues and to talk with each other about our concerns. I think that we learned much from each other, and additional forums are scheduled during the next few weeks to address other concerns that you, the faculty, have voiced. Our goal is to enhance open, collegial dialogue and to listen to each other's thoughts and ideas, and we will continue to strive to create an environment in which discussion and decision-making are based on solid information and a clear picture of what is happening around us. Again, I trust that you understand that we, and I certainly mean by that, me included, have heard you and that we are taking steps to redress these matters.

Please understand that this is not a sudden or a temporary phenomena. Consider for example what happened last October after we heard your concerns about how the delay in legislative action created a difficult budget schedule at the end of the summer. We acknowledged your concerns and we took action. As outlined last October, we are now moving forward to work with you to develop the plans that will address salary and health benefits with the appropriate data and consultation with the committees of the Senate.

Shared leadership is an ideal, and one that has clearly not been fully realized at The University of Akron; on that we clearly agree. This should not surprise us as we are attempting to do our work

and lead our University in many new ways, and one that requires not only hard work but also a sustained environment and a growing environment of trust, mutual respect, and shared responsibility. This kind of leadership is more difficult than resorting to simple hierarchies, and it is clearly less common. I remain committed to shared leadership, but it will take hard work by every one of us, myself included. So I ask you as you consider the resolution versions that will be before you today, to commit to the hard work we must do and to what that joint endeavor can and should mean to our University community.

When I first enunciated the concept of shared leadership, I referred to it as a process, a process that learns from mistakes and welcomes change as the challenge of opportunity and as a process that must be disciplined by ambitious goals and aspirations. Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, I ask that you refrain that the Faculty Senate can be the primary partner in shared leadership with the administration and to join me indeed in redressing the common concerns by engaging with each other in the hard work that will be very much ours to do. In short, I ask that you choose to pursue our common ideals rather than declare them false. Thank you very much, and I'd be happy to take a question or two on that theme, and otherwise I will indeed absent myself."

Senator Broadway then asked the President a question. In looking at the resolution and hearing his comments, what would necessitate changing the bylaws and rules of Faculty Senate? How would those need to be changed?

President Proenza replied that he thought it was a matter for us to determine together. He did not have any preconceived notions about them, but clearly there were processes that were not working that we needed to sit down together and enable them together.

Senator Yoder then stated that she had a question about the implementation of the faculty salary raises. In the President's comments to the Faculty Senate on Oct. 4, he had indicated that the raise would be effective Jan. 1. That had come up in repeated discussions about the salary increase. When we talked about the salary increase, we talked about it in terms of a 1.65% effective raise, yet the implementation had been a Jan. 15 date, giving faculty essentially a 1.5% raise. Would he comment, please?

The President replied that Mr. Nettling was reviewing the exact formula which would be reviewed with the Planning & Budgeting Committee to show it was precisely balanced, so let PBC review that in detail with you. It was precisely balanced half and half.

Chair Sheffer asked whether there were any objections from the Senate for someone who was not a Senator asking a question? Susan Speers was then given permission to speak.

"President Proenza, I've been at The University of Akron for 14 years, and I feel right now like I'm at the University of Enron. I don't mean that simply because (inaudible) at the top           , but I also mean it in the sense of middle-management, time to get to the top. and report some very serious violations and I've been condemned for my attempt. Now we are in a federal lawsuit that makes all of this uncomfortable. It takes my personal money and state money to deal with this. I'm extremely disappointed that I could not have one hour of your time to deal with the problems

I could've easily explained to you, and I'm very saddened by this because I consider myself a very good employee and I've been treated as a very bad employee."

The President replied that because Susan Speers was in litigation with the University it would be inappropriate for him to comment on the specifics that she asked, but in regard to many issues that were shared of concern with us, there was no question that The University of Akron was at a stage in its development when there was much that we must do to put in place the appropriate faculty, staff, and supervisory development processes that would enable all of us to have strong confidence and understanding of those processes. In many cases those were working well, but in many they were at least perceived not to be working well. In others he was convinced they were not working well and we must address them. You cannot change things overnight; we were a very large organization, but we certainly would be remiss if we did not commit to redressing them effectively and efficiently as best we could as a community.

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

"My remarks will be very brief because I know you have a very full agenda today and some items you want to discuss. Let me also say that I too will leave right after my remarks to allow you the opportunity to discuss whatever you want to discuss. I would also suggest to various members of the administration and deans who may be here today that you honor the wishes of the Senate as well and that you too depart at the break that's going to occur later in order to give the Senate the opportunity to have the discussion they wish to have. I want to give you a very brief update on two activities. One is the activity of the Planning & Budgeting Committee with regard to next year's budget. We met again today, and are meeting every Thursday, and we have had some extremely good meetings. Today's meeting was particularly productive and a number of alterations in the proposed budget have been put in place based on the recommendations of the PBC. I think we now have a budget that we're comfortable in moving forward to the next step with, and I'm sure there will be a report on this later today.

We still have one problem, however - the current budget we have has an end of the year deficit projected at \$5.3 million. So clearly, the next step now is for the PBC to work on making some recommendations regarding a prioritization of cuts, if cuts become necessary. The current budget does not include any provision or does not account for any increase in enrollment, so it is a conservative budget in that regard. It does include a probable increase in tuition, but again, that has to await action by the PBC, recommendations by the Senate, and ultimately actions by the Board. But it does not include any projected increases in enrollment, so we could deal with most, if not all, of the deficit out of increases in enrollment. So I think the PBC is taking a very conservative approach, and I can assure you that Vice President Nettling and all of his colleagues have been working very hard to provide all of the information to the PBC.

The second item I want to make you aware of are the results of the efforts of one of your colleagues, Chand Midha, that are starting to really bear fruit. Chand has been working on an analysis about how we might reasonably go about dealing with the compression with the \$1.2 million that the President has talked to you about before. Chand has come up with a quite elegant and quite fair analysis I think, or an analysis that leads to a quite elegant and fair approach, and I have asked him to describe that to the Planning & Budgeting Committee at its

meeting next Thursday so they can start having a discussion around that as well. But it really is a very sophisticated analysis, and Chand is to be congratulated, because he really has been taking an enormous amount of his own time to gather data and compile all the information that the PBC needs.

Those are my only prepared remarks, as much as I ever prepare remarks. But I'd like to say something else to you and I'm saying this to you really from my heart. You will be debating two resolutions, maybe more, this afternoon. One of those resolutions, the one I've seen of the initial shared leadership resolution regarding the role of chairs when they are Senators, neither the President nor I have any problems with. The first version of the second resolution I have to tell you is a very hurtful resolution. Now I'm perfectly aware that some of you may have wanted it to be hurtful, but it is hurtful not only to the individuals involved but it has the potential to be very hurtful to this institution. Because any resolution that you pass, please do not assume it will be confined to the walls of this institution; it will not be. Somebody will make that resolution very publicly known. That resolution in my opinion will do significant damage to the institution as a whole and to what we're trying to accomplish here. So I would just ask you to keep that in mind as you have your discussions this afternoon and you arrive at whatever resolution you're going to put forward. I think the President and all of the members of the administration are working very hard to address your concerns, and I hope you will accept that and think about that when you're deliberating this afternoon."

Senator Sakezles then wanted to express a question. She had heard from many of her constituents who had wondered how much we were paying Rudy Giuliani to speak here, and she was guessing it was a big number. How could we afford that given the budget crisis? And third, why was he coming during spring break when there was no faculty or staff here?

Provost Hickey replied that he was not sure he knew the number. His sense was it was a big number. He could tell all that we were not using institutional resources; these were gifted resources to the institution for this specific lectureship. So there were not institutional dollars going into this. Why it was scheduled when it was scheduled – he did not really know. He would guess, and it would be purely a guess, that it was probably Mayor Giuliani's schedule, that it was that time or no time. But again, he did not know whether there was anyone here who could answer the question.

Chair Sheffer then asked the body whether there were any objections to a non-Senator speaking. None forthcoming, Mr. Bruce Vernyi, Senior Public Relations Representative for the University, stated that Rudy Giuliani was being brought here by an outside foundation, the Hood/Meyerson Foundation, and it was their scheduling, their contract. The University was only providing the venue, which was EJ Thomas Hall. No University money was involved with his being brought to the campus.

Senator Erickson then stated she had a question about mid-term grades. As there was no announcement sent out to remind faculty to put in mid-term grades by March 5, as a result many

departments and many faculty did not put in mid-term grades. She understood that an actual decision was made not to send out a reminder, and her constituents had passed on to her their concern that one should be sent in the future given the problem that we had for retention. We needed to have that, and also under this circumstance there were options available that they did meet.

The Provost replied that he did not know the answer to her question, but would be happy to discuss it with Dean Mugler, who was out of town today.

Senator Erickson then asked the reason for the decision that was made not to remind faculty even though that had been part of the system before. What her constituents were saying was we would like passed on to the Registrar's office and those people who were involved that the system be reinstated in which the faculty were reminded about putting in their mid-term grades. There was a great deal of publicity and effort put into getting people to understand how to do it on-line last semester, but at this stage we were told that it was listed in the list for the dates and that that was enough. She thought she was representing her constituents that a simple reminder would have made a great deal of difference in this case.

Provost Hickey replied that he was certainly a proponent of mid-term grades. It helped out faculty and our advisors in working with students, particularly identifying those students who were in academic difficulty. Again, he did not know the answer to the question but would be happy to get an answer and perhaps if not before, provide it at the next meeting of the Executive Committee.

Senator Fenwick then stated that for the last few weeks there had been what he guessed you could say was a rumor that we were moving all of our courses into the Web-CT environment, and in the last couple of days he had heard that that was not the case. This had caused a lot of confusion and consternation among many of his colleagues. He wondered whether the Provost would comment?

Provost Hickey stated that he was aware of no mandate to move courses to Web-CT or any other mediated format, but this was clearly a desire of many people in Columbus. There was discussion among the Ohio Learning Network, of which he was a Board member, about trying to make opportunities available for those faculty who wished to move their courses to

Web-CT to have the opportunity to do it. He was at an OLN Board meeting and he asked the question specifically of the director, whether there were ongoing efforts through the OLN to push to have courses put in Web-CT. He was told, absolutely not. But he did believe there were efforts underway to try to identify resources or attract resources from within the state in order to provide grants to individuals who would like to move their coursework to Web-CT. But there was no institutional mandate to move courses to Web-CT.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson began her report by stating that the University Well-Being Committee had met every week since the last Senate meeting. We planned to bring a draft report of our recommendations with respect to health care to a special meeting of the Senate on Thursday, March 21, at 3:00 p.m. In this case it would be in

Olin 124. The final report on health insurance was not due to the President until May, but we wanted members of the Senate to have time to have input into the recommendations. In other words, we wanted to put the draft version out for you to discuss so we could let you know why we did things, and you could also give us feedback as to what you would like us to change. So the issues we were looking at were essentially those set out in the February report of this committee. We had been looking at retiree dependent benefits and we met with members of the retired faculty this week to discuss the idea of making available HMO's and PPO options to dependents under 65. We were looking at contribution levels for present employees. After having looked at the data on cost increases nationwide, we considered that at some point employee contributions would be necessary to maintain high-quality benefits. We were looking at what would be an appropriate cap on such contributions, and we were also reviewing two possible free options in addition - one with only catastrophic coverage and one with only in-network coverage. We found that the possible situation we talked about last month with one free individual giving us a cost reduction - when the numbers go down, this increased the amount for each person, and so we did not solve anything. So with wellness and disease management options there were some possibilities here and we were looking at them and hoped to see all at the meeting of the 21st. It would be to meet this deadline before we go on spring break. Senators would not be getting this until the day before, as we had a meeting on the Tuesday before to finalize it. Senators could expect to get their report on email on the Tues. or Wed. before this meeting.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns stated that he had one resolution to bring today, and there was a written report that was available. In our most recent meeting one of the big concerns was that 21 classrooms would be lost when Leigh Hall was renovated along with 2 more in Whitby Hall, which brought us down 23 classrooms starting in the fall. So the committee had suggested the following resolution: **That the Faculty Senate supports Campus Facilities Planning Committee to make a request to the colleges to provide information on off-line class space and its usage by departments. Campus Facilities Planning Committee wishes to explore whether there are open times for these class spaces and whether time sharing might be possible.**

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the resolution. Senator Steiner asked whether Senator Sterns could help and define what he meant by off-line class space?

Senator Sterns replied that every department had small seminar rooms, meeting rooms, areas that may have special equipment they wanted to keep the general public away from. People had been concerned in the evening about having people flocking through a department to get to a room because of security issues, but we knew there were spaces like that all over campus, and we were really in a very difficult situation. So we thought the way to deal with that would be to at least get approval of the Senate to find out what was out there, and realized once again that this might not be the popular of moves. He thought if he shared the blame, we could approach it in a constructive way. He did not know how to say this any other way.

Senator Qammar questioned whether the time share would involve wanting to schedule a class in there? Senator Sterns replied that yes, that was the implication because of the shortage of classrooms, since there were spaces available, and he could think of many all over campus. He

thought we all had treasured these spaces because they gave us maximum flexibility. He did not think we would approach this if we did not have such a dire need.

Professor Midha was then given permission to address the body. He stated that Senator Sterns had mentioned 23 classrooms would be lost in Leigh Hall. We would be gaining 14 classrooms in the new Arts & Sciences building, so essentially we were out about 9 rooms here.

Senator Sterns replied that the committee had discussed that. In fact, if you looked at the minutes, one of the things we did was look at the usage of classroom space in terms of dealing with the issue of energy efficiency, and we found based on that analysis that it really did not make a lot of sense to close buildings in the evening. We had early morning times and we had late times that were certainly available. One of the suggestions was that we put more required classes in less popular times. He did not think that was the answer. He thought the answer was to try to schedule classes so they met the needs of the students to the best of our ability. It did sort of open up a door to do this analysis; he certainly admitted that.

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

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Professor Stokes began her report by stating there were four items the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee was bringing before the Senate, and there were handouts also. **The first being a name change for the Department of Electrical Engineering, which has requested that its name be formally changed to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering to reflect the degrees that it offers. APCC supports the request and presents it as a motion to the Senate.**

The Senate then voted its approval of this motion.

Professor Stokes continued by stating that President Proenza had brought a request to APCC concerning the awarding of honorary degrees and had requested that the faculty-based review process be put into place to consider the requests for the awarding of honorary degrees. Therefore, **APCC recommends that the committee and process for the awarding of honorary degrees be parallel to the process for the awarding for distinguished professor, which is attached at the back of your handout. If Faculty Senate agrees, APCC will create the necessary language document and rule amend it and present it for approval at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate. It comes as a motion to the Faculty Senate.**

The Chair called for discussion of the motion. Senator Hebert then asked how the process occurred now. Professor Stokes replied that there was no process now. Senator Hebert followed by asking who approved it; somebody approved it. Professor Stokes replied that it depended on who asked to have the reward and where it was coming from. Senator Hebert then asked if she were looking for an out, and Professor Stokes replied, no. In the case of Mr. Arshinkoff, the honorary degree was retiring from the Board, so the Board recommended it and there was no discussion about it. In the case of an honorary degree that she was aware of for the Sylvia Smith Archive that was presented to the institution, it was requested through the College of Fine & Applied Arts and sent directly to the President. Those were the two she was aware of.

Senator Jordan then asked whether Professor Stokes had any vision of how long such a process would take if it were instituted. Professor Stokes replied that the distinguished professor process took about eight weeks.

Senator Jordan then stated that at the Law School we had an honorary degree that we gave to our speaker every year. We had a faculty meeting in which we all approved it. He could not say there was any substantive debate; it was the sort of thing one did, he guessed. He was concerned that if we developed an 8-week process it was going to become cumbersome and difficult to make the kind of award for these degrees that apparently everyone wanted to make.

Senator Qammar added that she could see where the distinguished professor system would take eight weeks being a significant award and it ought to take an 8-week process to do something like that. Her question was, how long did we have; for instance, from the time that somebody recommended to the time we needed to be able to make a recommendation and have that recommendation acted on by the Board. What time term were we talking about in terms of when people made these suggestions?

Professor Stokes replied that one current request that was coming through was a request for an honorary degree to be awarded two years from now. That was one she knew of, and another one came in the fall to be awarded next spring. We could exclude the School of Law if you would like to.

Senator Jordan replied that the Law School had no problem, but a few years ago we had a very prominent speaker, Morris Dees, who certainly deserved an honorary degree as much as anyone we had given one to, but things came along too late. Now that was a time when all there was was a final deadline. Now if there was a final deadline, did Professor Stokes know what it was? She replied that it was usually the April Board meeting.

Senator Jordan continued. So, you had to have it all done before the April Board meeting, and he knew that every year we were struggling to get the best graduation speaker for the Law School we could, into the second semester. It certainly posed potential problems for the Law School.

Senator Lee stated that it struck him that the resolution Professor Stokes represented was broad as to what specific language would be adopted. He wondered whether she would be amenable to trying to work out language that would accommodate the greatest flexibility. To which, Professor Stokes replied, certainly, the request was only that we went ahead and proceed with language and then bring it to Senate. We just did not want to write a rule.

Senator Riley then had two questions. The first was, could Professor Stokes clarify what was meant by honorary degree? And had anyone come forward with a suggestion that someone received an honorary degree, and then denied?

Senator Stokes replied that she did not know whether it had ever been denied. There were several honorary degrees but most of them were doctor of humane letters, depending on which discipline, and where the request came from. But there had been a proliferation of these

requests, and part of this was so that we were not awarding 15 honorary degrees every graduation. Because there was no process by which the faculty could say, that they were doctoral degrees even though they were only on paper. People liked to go out and use them.

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

Professor Stokes continued by presenting the next motion which was to correct the RTP rule 3359-20-03.7. There were two corrections suggested by faculty members to APCC, and the first one was in the appeals process, to add: **"The department chair or school director"** recommendation that was inadvertently omitted, so that had been added. Second of all, in the definition of what equaled active service, prior to the change in the rule, **"Faculty improvement program leaves count toward the probationary period for tenure."** **That was not included in the new rule. So this was just a reinsertion of an existing piece of the rule that was left out inadvertently. APCC supports the request for both changes and presents it as a motion to the Senate.**

The Chair then called for discussion of the motion. Senator Wyszynski asked whether Professor Stokes was saying faculty improvement programs might count toward the probation period. Was that "might count," or "do count"?

Professor Stokes replied that they did count. It was very unlikely that a person in the probationary period would be granted an improvement leave; however, it did happen in the case of an instructor. A faculty improvement leave was available for instructor, so if someone had been an instructor and then moved into a probationary period, that time would count. She thought that was the only case in which that actually existed.

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

Professor Stokes continued by stating that finally, the task force on prior learning assessment recommended to APCC that **there should be an acceptance of the credit for training programs evaluated by the American Council on Education. The second paragraph is the most important in this recommendation - individual colleges, departments and schools have the right to evaluate the American Council on Education credits to determine whether or not they're acceptable for either GenEd majors, minors, certificates, electives, or level credits 100-200-300-400. Academic faculty, including directors and chairs, will make the recommendation to the dean, the credit be awarded in a major, minor, or certificate, and the Dean of the University College in consultation with GEAC will make decisions regarding general education equivalencies. A form for setting up these transfer credits will be completed in consultation with the Vice President of Student Affairs and the Registrar. APCC supports this request and presents it as a motion to the Senate.**

The Chair then called for discussion. Senator Clark asked, when Professor Stokes said it was acceptable, did that mean that a unit could deny it? Professor Stokes replied that yes, a unit could deny it.

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

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - Senator Kinion began her report by stating that the Faculty Research Committee met on Feb. 15 to discuss the policies that were referred from the Senate back to the Research Committee. At this time I would like to make **a motion to recommend acceptance of the policy entitled University Research, Copyright and Patent Policy, and if I understand right, I don't need a second.**

The Chair called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the motion.

Senator Kinion continued her report by stating that she was also coming to **recommend acceptance of a policy entitled Conduct and Ethics Policy Employee Financial Interests in Companies Licensed under the University Intellectual Property.**

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

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Franks stated that the PBC had been working diligently and meeting weekly for the past four weeks. We were attempting to come up with a credible, reasonable budget proposal prior to the April meeting so that Senators would have time to review our recommendations. Some of the key points that were coming out of our discussions included the recommendation by PBC to preserve a 4% raise pool for the next fiscal year and this raise pool would, depending upon the outcome of recommendations from the APCC, be a mixture of across-the-board and merit. The other item we were attempting to preserve is a \$1.2 million line item for the equity and compression adjustments all had been told about. One problem we faced right now, and the biggest problem was that we were short about \$5.3 million if we preserved these things. But PBC felt very strongly that departing from past practice we ought to preserve these items in the budget and then look for other areas to cut. So that was what we were about to do beginning next week. One other item we would attempt to preserve was a \$750,000 increase in health care costs. Again, we were going to attempt to do that. It should be interesting to sit down and see where and how we would do that. There was a written report, and that was about all he had to say, but he would take questions.

Senator Harp then stated that he had two quick questions - the first was pursuant to the Faculty Research Committee report that we had a written version of. Had PBC figured in the \$200,000 for faculty research grants?

Senator Franks replied that that had come today as a new item. It was met very favorably and we were going to pursue that. The next step was going to be to talk to Dr. Newkome about it and then bring it back. He guessed that the Research Committee was going to meet next Friday and then Senator Kinion would bring the results of that discussion back to PBC.

Senator Harp had a follow-up question. Would \$1.2 million cover the compression problem? Senator Franks replied that he did not know.

Chair Sheffer then asked Dr. Midha whether \$1.2 million would cover the compression problem. Dr. Midha stated that, no, it would not cover it entirely but if we moved it for the next 3 or 4 years, it would eventually.

Senator Franks added that in his discussions with Dr. Hickey a few weeks ago, he had suggested that this possibly could take three years. We talked about 3-5, but he thought three was more reasonable.

Senator Qammar then made a point of clarification to follow up on that point - the budget numbers as we itemized this morning actually ended up at \$5.13 million, and the extra \$200,000 to get what we need to work out at 5.3 actually included that additional \$200,000 in some way. We had not actually worked out the formulating way to keep it an ongoing piece of the research initiative, but it was in there already.

Senator Hajjafar stated that it was mentioned that the compression would fade away in three years. Was PBC considering that in the budget or not? Was that part of the budget to consider some money for the salary compression each year?

Senator Franks replied that this year we were attempting to set aside \$1.2 million for salary compression with the intention of doing that for the next two years or however long it took to address the problem. Part of this included the President's desire to bring us to the 75th percentile in the state with salaries, and it was all related.

Senator Hajjafar asked whether that were part of the budget. Senator Franks replied that it would be a line item in the budget that we had already inserted in the models that we were looking at. We were going to make every attempt to preserve that, and the 4% raise pool at PBC's insistence and look for other places to cut. Also, he did not think the whole 5.3 million would come from cuts - some of that might just be adjustments made. He thought the Provost had said earlier that we had not put any increase in enrollment in this model yet. We had left enrollment flat, and it might be that we would adjust for a 2% increase in enrollment and that would account for some of the monies. It was a tricky job; it was not an easy task.

Senator Erickson then asked whether Senator Franks could comment just one more time on the health care, because he just threw that in there.

Senator Franks replied that as all knew, the President had made a statement a while ago about trying to keep employees from having to pay the health care cost increase this upcoming year.

Senator Erickson then asked how long the contract was in effect. Senator Franks replied that the contract was good until December of 2003, so it would be for the entire year. Vice President Nettling added that the contract was in force until December 31, 2003. Senator Franks asked Mr. Nettling whether the amount was then \$750,000? To which Mr. Nettling replied that we needed to put back into the budget after being previously credited out. Senator Franks added that that was one of the things PBC was trying to preserve. Senator Erickson then asked whether that were half of the 1.6, to which Mr. Nettling replied that it was.

**V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None.

The Chair then called for a five-minute recess.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS** - Chair Sheffer called for order following the recess. He stated that, for the items of new business this afternoon pertaining to the Senate resolutions, there were essentially three of them - one of them referring to the role of the Senators, actually multiple roles. Then two that dealt with the Senate as part of the shared leadership and our concerns with shared leadership. He then asked Parliamentarian Gerlach to explain the process the Senate was going to use.

Parliamentarian Gerlach stated that use of committee of the whole was simple – it was to avoid a lot of voluminous note-taking, minute-keeping and so on, and it offered a free-wheeling kind of discussion. But once business was referred to committee of the whole there were only three things Senate could do - adopt what had been suggested, or amend it and then adopt it, and finally to rise and report. At that time the chair of the committee of the whole reported to the chairman of the Senate what the committee of the whole had done. It would have gone through its business and proposed something, or it had not finished its business and moved to sit again.

A question was then posed as to whether this meant that the vote would take place after committee of the whole is finished.

Chair Sheffer replied that, yes, the committee of the whole would rise and report to him. Then he would bring it back to the Senate for a vote. This was a mechanism for a more free-wheeling discussion.

Senator Wyszynski asked whether free-wheeling meant that it would not say in the minutes, “Senator Wyszynski, a non-tenured faculty member...” Chair Sheffer replied that that was exactly right.

Senator Lyons then asked for a clarification. It had been stated that the Senate would either have to accept it or amend it, but could we also reject it? Chair Sheffer pointed out that the body did not vote as a committee. Senator Lyons then asked whether the body could decide not to accept it. Chair Sheffer replied that that could be the report.

Senator Hajjafar then stated that consensus could be reached in the committee of the whole.

Chair Sheffer stated that he hoped we would have some consensus. These documents would be shown in our new business as what was going into committee of the whole. People were concerned whether or not these would be shown in the record, and we did want them to be shown in the record of the meeting.

Senator Norfolk made the motion to refer these matters to the committee of the whole. Senator Sterns seconded this motion. The body then voted its approval of the motion.

Senator Hajjafar asked whether the tape recorders would get turned off. Chair Sheffer asked whether it were the will of the body to turn them off. Mrs. Marilyn Quillin stated that she needed an official record for the office, but it would not appear in writing. Chair Sheffer replied that we only needed the final report.

Senator Qammar then took over as chair of the committee of the whole.

*\* Official report of the Chair, as per the Parliamentarian: Following the Senate's session of committee of the whole, the chairman, Helen Qammar, rose to report. She reported that the committee recommended the adoption of resolution 1, and the melding of provisions of resolutions 2 and 3. This matter is now referred to the Executive Committee for the rewording, and to bring it back to Senators at the special meeting of March 21 for further action.*

Senator Qammar announced that the Senate was back in session.

Chair Sheffer stated that the body could refer this to a subcommittee to work on the language to bring to a special meeting of the Senate to be held on March 21. We could go into committee of the whole again at that time to discuss the resolution, and to discuss the University Well-Being report at that time as well.

Senator John made the motion that the Senate take it to a committee to draft the language and present it at the special meeting of March 21. Secretary Kennedy added that it would be circulated to Senators before that date so that we could vote on it at the March 21 meeting. A motion was then made that the Executive Committee be charged with this task and the Senate voted its approval of this motion. The instructions given were to meld resolutions 2 and 3 into one resolution. Senator Steiner stated that he wanted to recommend that Senate not vote on this until the next regular meeting. Chair Sheffer replied that Senate could make that decision at the next meeting and go into committee of the whole to continue working on it.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT** – A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

**Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin**