

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 2002

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Thursday, October 3, 2002, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Chair Dan Sheffer called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Fifty-two of the sixty-three Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Broadway, Conrad, Drew, Gunn, Harp, Jimenez, Riley, and Schmith were absent with notice. Senators Carri, Redle, and Trotter were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

*** PASSED MOTION THAT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARGE RELEVANT SENATE COMMITTEES TO INVESTIGATE THE FEASIBILITY OF AN HONORS COLLEGE AND FORWARD FINDINGS TO APCC FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION.**

***APPROVED RESOLUTION FROM CFPC THAT THE FACULTY SENATE RECOMMEND TO PRESIDENT PROENZA THAT HE RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES THAT THE NAME GARDNER REMAIN ON THE NEW STUDENT UNION BUILDING.**

*** APPROVED A MOTION TO REFER TO CFPC, PRESIDENT PROENZA'S REQUEST FOR A RATIONALE AS TO WHY THE NAME GARDNER SHOULD BE USED FOR NEW STUDENT UNION BUILDING TO ACCOMPANY THE ABOVE RESOLUTION WHEN PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES.**

*** APPROVED PBC RESOLUTION STATING THAT SENATE CHARGE APCC WITH DEVELOPING A WRITTEN UNIVERSITY POLICY CONCERNING UNITS REQUESTING DIFFERENTIAL TUITION.**

*** APPROVED PBC RESOLUTION THAT THE ESCROWED MONEY COLLECTED FROM THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S DIFFERENTIAL TUITION BE RELEASED TO CBA ON A SEMESTER-BY-SEMESTER BASIS PER ACADEMIC YEAR UNTIL A UNIVERSITY POLICY ON DIFFERENTIAL TUITION IS APPROVED BY THE BOT.**

*** APPROVED MOTIONS FROM APCC:
CHANGE TO FACULTY MANUAL SECTION 3359-20-037;
STUDENT SUCCESS POLICY;
CHANGE TO FACULTY MANUAL 3359-20-061.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Chair Dan Sheffer called for the approval of the agenda. Senator Yoder made the motion; Senator Steiner seconded it. The body voted its approval of the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2002 -

Consideration of the minutes began with Chair Sheffer asking Secretary Kennedy whether she had received any corrections. She replied that she had not. The Chair then called for corrections from the body. Senator Gerlach rose and addressed the Chair. He stated that on page 23 there was a reference to a motion that he had made with regard to the Campus Facilities Planning Committee, almost to the middle of that page. He thought that the language ought to read, "...historic names of campus buildings with a view that the Senate request..." That's what he thought he had tried to convey, but perhaps he had not written it out properly. But it was not to indicate that the Senate had a view already on this; rather that it might have a view if the committee gave one.

Secretary Kennedy then stated that she wanted to make two comments regarding corrections. If Senators would please notify Marilyn Quillin before meetings, it would be most helpful and a more productive use of our meeting time. Also, she wanted to point out that what was printed was what had been recorded - as close to verbatim as possible. She did try to take down the gist of what was said. However, she was not anyone's professional speech writer nor did she wish to be. So she would note that correction and check the transcript.

Senator Gerlach replied that he understood that and did beg the Chair's pardon. He had just gotten his Chronicle today and had just begun to read it. Otherwise, he would have said something earlier.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR - Chair Sheffer began his remarks by stating that yesterday he had attended a portion of the University Leadership Team meeting. This team was made up of President Proenza and vice presidents of the University. The meeting consisted of a report and update on the development of the Balanced Scorecard Initiative's Strategy maps of the various units represented by the vice presidents. The Initiative was going to be carried on to the deans and to the rest of the academic side of the institution in the very near future. At that time it would involve all of the academic units. This among other things was a very vital part of our development of an Academic Plan which we spoke about last month. At last month's Senate meeting Senator Jan Yoder requested informational items from President Proenza regarding the theory and the use of the Balanced Scorecard, including examples from academic institutions. President Proenza asked Associate Provost Nancy Stokes to provide these materials to Senator Yoder. Senator Yoder then put the documents on the Senate list serve for the members to read. As a result, the Executive Committee had scheduled an information meeting/discussion with no motions or official business among the Senate members, along with the University chairs and members of the Core Team of the Balanced Scorecard Initiative. That had been scheduled for Thursday afternoon, Oct. 17, here in BCCE 201, at 3:00 p.m. The Executive Committee felt that understanding the Balanced Scorecard and its relationship to the Mission of the University and the institutional or Academic Plan was critical. The purpose of getting these materials to

Senators was to enable all in the Senate to have ample time to read these documents before the Oct. 17 meeting. The Chair stated that he looked forward to seeing all two weeks from today.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS -The Chair then introduced new Senators who had joined the body - from Arts & Sciences, Tim Matney, and Lance Svehla. From Education - Duane Covrig; from the Contract Professionals, Rose Marie Konet, and Hector Jimenez. The Senate then welcomed the new members with a round of applause.

The Chair also stated that the final committee assignments would appear in the Oct. Chronicle. If Senators noted problems with committee listings, they were asked to please notify Marilyn with their corrections. As a final note, the Chair introduced to all Professor Bill Rich, who hopefully was not

serving as our Parliamentarian "du jour," but perhaps our Parliamentarian for the rest of this year. Professor Rich was then welcomed.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met twice in the month of September. At the first meeting on Sept. 16, the Executive Committee set the agenda for this Senate meeting, and also discussed the library budget situation. It was the Executive Committee's understanding that the Libraries Committee was studying the budget and funding issues related to the library. Senator Harp was chair of the Libraries Committee for the Senate and would be reporting to the Senate at the Nov. meeting. Also, on a related note, the Executive Committee had received a resolution from the faculty of the Dept. of Psychology supporting restoration of the acquisitions budget of Bierce Library as well. Also on Sept. 16, the Executive Committee met with President Proenza, Provost Hickey and Mrs. Becky Herrnstein. At that meeting the committee was briefed on the status of the budget, and status of campus construction. We received clarification regarding funding for the ROI initiative; the auxiliary funds that were used this time were ongoing and not one-time. The Provost also mentioned that he and Phil Brown were working on a formula to provide ROI data on the department level. We were given an update on the compression and equity salary efforts, and regarding the first-year experience, the FYE Initiative. The Executive Committee requested that the chairs of the APCC, CRC, and Student Affairs be included on the Task Force. Further, we asked that the Provost and Dr. Angelo present the initiative to these groups for informational purposes at this time. As Chair Sheffer also alluded to, the Executive Committee met on Sept. 26 with the chairs of these committees. We discussed the Balanced Scorecard Initiative and ROI issues. We also were informed about a faculty list-serve that was created by Dr. Zipp for faculty members. And there was one last item regarding the Senate attendance record. Secretary Kennedy had been asked to read the following statement for Dr. Stinner, as he had noted that there was a discrepancy in his attendance record for spring semester of last year: "Dr. Stinner's absences were listed as unexcused when in fact he was taking a leave of absence due to an accident where he shattered his elbow and broke his hip." His absences should have been marked "excused."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, colleagues. We are rapidly moving into the fall semester, and it is indeed exciting to see so many on our campus. Let me begin by introducing a new colleague of the University. Most of you I think have known him over the years, since he served with the distinction as the Mayor of Akron and subsequently as a Senator for the State of Ohio - our recently appointed Chief Financial Officer, Roy Ray. Roy, welcome. (applause)

I do want to make one modest correction to Chairman Sheffer's remarks, and that is to remind us all that we are all engaged in a single academic enterprise that we call The University of Akron. I would encourage all of us to refer to that as one enterprise rather than this side or that side, so please let us try to do that.

I have just returned, ladies and gentlemen, from the most recent meeting of the Presidents' Council of Advisers on Science and Technology. Many of you have asked that I try to brief you very modestly about activities of this Council, as it is a window for the University on national affairs at the highest levels.

You may recall that when I was first appointed, I informed you that the President has asked that we focus on four principal questions, those being the traditional question of the balance and nature and impact of our nation's investment in research and development. The second question involved the very important issues of the applications of science and technology with regard to our nation's homeland defense and combatting of terrorism. The third question involved our nation's very real need to enhance its energy security and its utilization of energy in an effective and efficient manner with continuous applications of better and better technologies. And the final question, being the very important topic of how can we best utilize and make available to as many citizens as possible the growing benefits of Broadband and access to Broadband for a variety of purposes, particularly towards communications and education and the internet. The four panels that were formed to examine each of those questions have been hard at work. This week we approved reports with the panel on terrorism, with the panel on energy savings, and the panel on Broadband. We'll by next week make those reports available to any of you that wish.

The panel on R & D investment is editing a final draft of its letter to the President. It is the panel I've been most closely associated with. We have taken into our work two principal foci of work - one is indeed the assessment of the R & D balance, and the basic observation is one of growing concern about the relative proportions of investment in which our nation is currently spending - about 70 cents out of every research dollar on biomedical sciences, and only 30 cents of every research dollar on other sciences. We're asking the president of the agencies to examine that balance, not with the intention of reducing biomedical expenses, as we consider those very important, but with attention to our concern that relative to other nations we are risking falling behind in the important areas of science and engineering that are tied to so much of the economy and that support that economy - basic physics, basic chemistry, material science, etc. So expect to see some dialogue on that issue.

Likewise, we have begun to examine the productivity of the R&D enterprise and in particular, how that productivity translates into enhancements into our quality of life, and in our economy, and we are taking considerable time and hopefully will have a more detailed report on technology transfer and economic impact sometime in November. I'd be happy to address things in specific ways with any of you that would like, and again, if your Secretary will remind me, I will provide copies of those reports that have been approved.

As your Secretary indicated, we did discuss with the Executive Committee the implementation to date of the salary adjustments which were made in addition to the 4 percent salary pool that was made available in the spring. That initial adjustment has now been completed and I'd like to thank several of you here, certainly Professor Sheffer who served on the task force, and Chand Midha who is the chair of the task force, for that very important first step. It has been a dynamic process; it has required great diligence and important analyses of data and a great deal of input from many.

It is a first step in a continuing process, and I will now ask the task force to turn their attention to begin to suggest to me a process that we follow for moving us from where we were able to move ourselves to. If I understand correctly, and please correct me Dr. Midha or Mr. Provost, the adjustments we made between the 4 percent and the adjustments for market and compression brought both full as well as associate professors to the mid-point of salaries among Ohio universities."

Provost Hickey interjected that these adjustments had brought full professors only (and not yet associate professors) to the midpoint of salaries among Ohio universities.

The President continued:

"Thank the Provost for the extra achievements. Again, thank you to all of these colleagues, and we continue to seek your input. Dr. Midha has been meeting with different faculty groups, because this is not a staid process; it's a dynamic process. We are learning about things we will need to modify, things that we overlooked. So we will be committed to making the process better.

Both Dr. Sheffer and your Secretary have commented on the Balanced Scorecard, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. In order to continue promoting full and open communications, I am not only going around to each and every unit of our total academic enterprise, but I'm also scheduling a series of open conversation opportunities, the first of which is scheduled for Oct. 14 from 9:30-11:00 a.m. I invite any of you who wish - faculty, staff, students, to please attend, and I thank Mike Dalton also for arranging several forums in which I will be working with our students. He is providing great leadership; thank you, Mike, and all members of the student body.

I have relatively little update on the budget; however, I am encouraged by some reports that state revenues have improved a little bit. That doesn't mean that our total potential deficit is abolished, but it's certainly the first positive sign in the state's revenue picture which so much impacts potential additional cuts or potential additional allocations that we might receive. So that is a positive note on the horizon that we hope will continue in the months ahead.

As you know, together with the Faculty Senate, we are in the process of working to appoint a task force that will review our decision-making entities throughout the campus and we look forward to finalizing that task force and moving forward with a comprehensive review that will ensure that we improve the way we do business on the campus.

A few bits of news - first, you may already know, but if you didn't, it's important that this body know that we have had two appointments to our Board of Trustees - a regular appointment, i.e., a full member of the Board, Mr. Ed Bittle, a distinguished community business leader and long-time friend and supporter of The University of Akron who was named by Governor Taft to the Board two weeks ago. Simultaneously, a new student trustee, Robert Preston, who is a professional post-graduate student in our School of Law. Both of them are welcome and both of them attended their first meeting last week, and we are pleased to have them both.

Likewise, the Governor announced three new appointees to the Ohio Board of Regents - they are Donna Alvarado with Aguila International in Columbus, a strong supporter of higher education broadly, and someone whose judgment I've greatly valued already having served with her in the Higher Education Funding Commission, and having the pleasure of being able to talk Spanish with as well, as you might expect by her name. The second appointee is Bruce Beeghly, President of Altronic, Inc., in Gerard, just east of here in the Youngstown area. And Edward Rigaud of Cincinnati, who is with the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center. All three are indeed distinguished and should be very good appointees. I have met each of them, and as I said, have worked with Mrs. Alvarado. I have written letters to each of the three, congratulating and inviting them to visit the campus. Mr. Beeghly will visit our campus on November 1, and I trust that the others will follow fairly shortly after so we can more properly inform them.

Secondly, we as a University, presented testimony before the House Select Committee on Higher Education. Dr. Hickey was kind enough to represent us most admirably and was kind enough to be

willing to read my testimony in the sense that we restructured it and submitted it under my name. But he did distinguish himself at that forum, and as a result of that, there were several very good questions about the testimony. Also, based on the fact that we ended with several of what I think are very important recommendations for the future of higher education, we've been invited to submit a white paper to support and amplify the points that we make. I would invite your suggestions to those, and again will happily make that testimony available, Madame Secretary. So that hopefully will be helpful, and obviously I'll be providing that white paper to the Board of Regents, to the Governor, to the legislature, and others who may have a role impacting the process.

Along these lines, we are actively engaged in continuing to tell The University of Akron story and on promoting higher education in general. Yesterday I was part of a panel with Barbara Byrd-Bennett and Jerry Sue Thornton. For those of you who don't look to Cleveland very often, Barbara Byrd-Bennett is the Superintendent of the Cleveland Public School System. Jerry Sue Thornton is the President of Cuyahoga County Community College or Colleges, because they have three campuses. It was moderated by Leon Bibb, and several of you were there. Michael, thank you again for your presence there, and Marlesa, thank you, and those others who were there- Bill Beisel was there, thank you. In short, we had a good dialogue and got some good exposure for The University of Akron.

On Oct. 9 at the Akron Press Club I will be part of the panel that will also include Kent State University President Carol Cartwright, Hiram College President Richard Scaldini, and Akron Chamber of Commerce Chairman Robert Reffner, a partner with Brouse & McDowell. That noon program takes place in the Martin Center and will be taped for rebroadcast, but there are probably still seats available if you care to attend.

Lots of other things - let me just skip to one modest reflection and then I'll entertain questions or just simply sit down and shut up. As many of you know, just a few weeks ago we formally dedicated the new College of Arts & Sciences building. It was a grand occasion on an absolutely splendid and beautiful day, and it caused me to reflect on the history of the University. As you know, this University began life as the Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences, Buchtel College. It is the college that has our legacy resident and inherent in it, and as such, I turned to our historian emeritus George Knepper and asked him to reflect on that occasion and in particular asked him to imagine with his in-depth knowledge of John Buchtel and on the history of the University, to imagine what John Buchtel might have said or experienced were he with us on that day.

This is what our colleague, George Knepper, had to say: `John Buchtel would have been delighted. He was a builder. He demonstrated that thoroughly in his business affairs and through his participation in community affairs involving construction of a city library, the Glendale Cemetery modernization, the University Church in Akron, and a number of other worthy projects. Most of all, he was a college builder, a striking accomplishment for a man lacking in formal education but wise in practical matters. John Buchtel watched with care the emergence of the first great college building of the college that was named in his honor, Buchtel College. And as one of the managing trustees of Ohio's new Agricultural and Mechanical College, soon to become (The) Ohio State University, he selected the Neil Farm two miles north of downtown Columbus as the campus site, and he hired an Akron architect, Jacob Snyder, to design the college's first building, University Hall.' George continues, `What a reward it would've been for him to see a brand new structure arise to house the Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences offices as well as several key departments of that college. If this new building is imbued with his spirit, the teaching, learning and research that go on within it will prosper and so may it be.' Ladies and gentlemen, thank you, and I welcome any questions you may have."

Senator Steiner asked the President a question regarding the residual balances for the previous fiscal year. As he understood it, the residual balances had not been moved forward to accounts for use by departments and units in this current fiscal year as of yet. Did the President have any information as to when that might happen?

President Proenza directed that question to Vice President Ray. Vice President Ray stated that this had been a PeopleSoft problem. Hopefully, it would be solved in the next week to ten days.

Senator Pinheiro then stated that he knew the President was working with the state on the budget. Some of the University faculty wanted to know whether the President had it in his plan for the faculty and the staff to get a raise this year. Had he made a decision on this and, if not, when would he?

The President continued:

"I am an optimist and believe that things are going to improve. Also, as many of you know and as we've been talking with each other already in several units, I have worked to convey to all of you and will continue to do so that we recognize that the budget of the state currently is seriously constrained, but that given that that is the case, we should not abandon those things that we can do for ourselves. So basically, I've been asking and holding a number of conversations to begin to explore those things that are fully under our control that can enable us to create a positive future for ourselves.

Now as I mentioned at the beginning, I've asked the task force chaired by Chand Midha to begin to take stock of what we've accomplished and to begin to plan for the process and the time frame by which we can approach the goal of having all faculty and staff salaries at market competitive levels. We are defining that for faculty since most of you in this room are faculty, at moving us from where we are, which means that we're already for assistant professors at the 75th percentile. Soon we will be at both associate and full professors at the 50th percentile within Ohio universities, and we want to move to the 75th percentile among peer institutions.

Now remember that that involves a set of dynamic calculations, because those universities that we choose as our peers today may not be the same ones we choose 4, 5, 6 or 10 years down the line as we move our University to its rightful destiny. That's a long way of saying that we're going to plan optimistically; we're going to help the state achieve its budget. Most importantly, we must help ourselves to achieve a positive budget so that we can make a positive recommendation to the Board of Trustees at its spring meeting."

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

"These remarks should be very brief, but then I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have. First of all, PBC is hard at work and you will get a report later today. But the PBC is meeting every Thursday morning 8:30-10:30, and I see some PBC members shaking their heads in the audience thinking, what did I get myself into here?"

But today we had a presentation by Vice President Ray and Amy Gilliland on the fund accounting and on the closeout of last year's budget. Next week the PBC will get a briefing on the Return on Investment model.

Let me turn to the equity compression money. The first round, as the President said, has been made. I think I may have confused people last time, and it was brought to my attention last time when I talked about the first and second rounds. Let's think about the first round as having an A component and a B component. The A component is complete now, and I think that you are aware of that and those who received increases probably have already seen it reflected in their paychecks.

We are now focusing on the B component - A and B added together equal \$1.2 million. There is approximately \$160,000 yet to be allocated through the B component. As the President said, the A component allocation brought the average salary of full professors to the median position in the state. The A allocation brought the average salary of associate professors only up to being 7th of 9 in the state. However, the range within the associate professors is very narrow, so that an additional average allocation of \$800 per associate professors would bring The University of Akron to the median position in the state with regard to associate professors.

Therefore, the task force has been recommended and I have concurred that the B component of the allocation should be focused just on associate professors. That allocation should bring both full professors and associate professors to the 50th percentile in the state institutions, which is a rather tremendous gain I think in only one year. I've pointed out to the committee that Dr. Midha's calculations show that our assistant professors are currently at the 75th percentile, but we must continue to monitor their relative position so that as we bring both the associate and full professors to the 75th percentile, we don't let the assistant professors drop down below that level so that we have to turn around and do this process all over again. So I anticipate within the next few weeks that you should be seeing the B1 round of allocations so that we can finish up this first year allocation of \$1.2 million.

The President touched on the budget issues so I really won't expand on that. There are still things that we don't know about, including what we affectionately refer to as the Board of Regents' compromise in terms of how the monies will be allocated. We don't know what the total impact of that is going to be yet. It might be as little as a half million dollars; it could be as much as a million. We probably aren't going to know that until sometime much further in the fall or early in the winter.

In addition, because of our relative lack of enrollment increase in comparison to the enrollment increases that occurred at other institutions, Vice President Ray informs me that there will be a recalculation of the state's share of instruction that will occur this year, and we are again vulnerable at that point too. But we don't know the extent to which we are vulnerable.

Regarding the doctoral share of instruction, the 85% rule, I think some of you know that we've actually fallen below the 85% mark, at about 82% now. That may have an impact on us as much as \$360,000. Again, that isn't final yet and we don't know how that will play out.

What appears to have happened is while our overall graduate enrollment and credit hr. production is up, because of some new definitions coming out of the Board of Regents, a number of doctoral students in the area of business and education have been reclassified as masters professional doctorate I and taken out of the doctoral I/doctoral II category. So we saw a drop in doctoral I/doctoral II credit hr. production, but we saw a huge increase in MPD I. What we don't understand yet from the state is will the increase in MPD I allocation offset the loss in doctoral I/doctoral II allocation?

Mr. Ray is going to make what I described as a phone call to ask a simple question of the Board of Regents, and the suggestion was that there may be no simple questions that can be asked. But we'll try

to get an answer to that sometime in the next week, hopefully. Let me stop there, and I too will be happy to answer questions if I can."

Senator Soucek then asked the Provost how many doctoral students were we short, if the 82% held or the simple questions got answered?

Provost Hickey replied that he was not sure he knew the answer to that question. In a way we were not short in the students; they had just been reclassified. The end result was that the University came out short. We were actually up in graduate enrollment slightly and credit hr. production was up slightly, but because of the classification, we were negatively impacted. He did not know how many more doctoral I students we would need to get back to the 85% level. He was sure that Dr. Newkome either knew the answer or could find the answer.

President Proenza asked the Chair whether he could interject an item he had forgotten to mention. He wanted to thank several Senators for taking the time to write their legislators. He had asked that all please consider doing that, and many had begun to do so. He would invite those who had not yet done so, to please do so. Some Senators were involved in the political process in our state, in our city. Please counsel your colleagues about the importance. The single biggest feedback he got from legislators was that they did not pay attention to higher education because their constituencies did not tell them that it was important. Senators were their constituents; please write and tell them so. And tell Mr. Hagan or anybody else that tuition caps was not the answer.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson stated that a written report of the Well-Being Committee would be in the next Chronicle. The Well-Being Committee had its initial meeting in September, and it discussed the issue of the request by the retired faculty for a seat on Well-Being. This had been referred to the committee at the Sept. meeting of the Senate. The representative of the retirees gave a presentation to the committee, and the committee then reviewed the issue. After some discussion, the committee decided that the retired faculty had a legitimate interest in being part of the committee. The representative constituency's as well as their dependent's well-being was directly affected by University policy. At present there were over 700 persons using this insurance, half over and half under 65. In the future this number may be greater. The committee considered that they reasonably should have a vote on this major issue relating to well-being. It was also noted that emeritus retirees had other items that related to well-being, i.e., parking, office space, and several other issues. However, the committee was concerned that a member of the retirees would be chosen for the committee. They considered that as this is a committee directly elected by its constituencies, the same method should be required for retirees. The committee voted the following unanimously: "The Well-Being Committee recommends that retirees should have a seat on the Well-Being Committee, but that their representative should be elected from retirees in the same way as their Senators."

She continued by stating that the committee then discussed future issues to examine this year. We noted that the health plan for 2003-2005 would be put out to bid this academic year. They also noted that under the Senate resolution passed last year, consultant information on a likely increase in health care costs needed to be provided this fall. Apart from that, any Senator with well-being issues he or she thought needed to be discussed should contact the Well-Being Committee. The next meeting was scheduled for Thurs., Oct. 10, at 3:15 in the Faculty Senate conference room.

Senator Gerlach stated that he had a motion to amend the bylaws related to the retirees issue. Chair

Sheffer stated that that would be brought up under old business. Then we could introduce the amendment basically to change from "one Senate representative" to perhaps the wording of, "one representative elected by the Retirees Association."

GRADUATE COUNCIL - Newly-elected Vice Chair Rex Ramsier introduced himself to the body. He stated that he had been instructed by the Graduate Council to attend this meeting to inform Senators of the Council's actions and to take information back to the Council.

He continued by stating that the Graduate Council served the Graduate School and the Graduate Dean. The Council served to make comments and recommendations concerning issues that directly affected graduate education, including the issue about the 85% mark. The Council had met twice thus far this semester. We had three standing committees, one of which, the graduate faculty status committee, had recommended, and Council had approved, 15 applications to graduate/faculty status.

The Council had also requested and was currently reviewing new criteria from every unit, department, and college for graduate/faculty status. Along the same lines of revising RTP guidelines that took place last spring, everyone had been asked to look at and revise (if they so wished) their criteria for grad/faculty status. The Council was reviewing those and would make recommendations on a case-by-case basis to the Graduate School.

The curriculum committee was currently looking at the Graduate Council's role in web-based courses for graduate education. That had become an issue on campus. The Council supported in concept the idea of web-based education. We would be meeting with Dr. Tom Angelo to find out exactly what we should be looking for when our curriculum committee looked at proposals involving web-based instruction. The Council was also looking at the bylaws of the Graduate faculty and the Board rule, because it appeared there were inconsistencies in these documents. That was basically something we had to mesh.

The last thing, and the reason he had been directed to come here, was that the Graduate Council was extremely interested in finding out the role that the Senate was taking in the ROI model and the new budgeting initiative. Since his directive to come here, he had met with Phil Brown, and he understood that PBC was the body through which Senate had its voice in ROI. Graduate Council was obligated to be part of this discussion, and he was here to serve that purpose. So we were here to help; we definitely felt that this was a faculty-driven institution. We had the obligation to stand up and help make these decisions. He thanked the body and stated that he would be happy to answer any questions.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Nancy Stokes presented two new items of business coming from the committee. One dealt with the timelines that were handed out from the RTP document. This was to inform all that Academic Policies had voted to make an editorial change in these timelines. On the back of the page Senators would notice that there were two words in bold, both of which were "candidate" for Friday of week eight and Friday of week twelve. It was the intent of the RTP document to have the candidate notified, and through an oversight the candidate was left out of the timeline. So the committee had made an editorial change and wanted to bring that to Senators' attention. This information had been circulated to department chairs and to deans so that they knew they needed to notify the candidate as well.

The second item was that Dr. Mugler from the Honors Program had brought to APCC a proposal to change the honors program to an honors college. After two meetings worth of discussion, the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee had a recommendation to present as a motion to Senate.

APCC recommended the concept of an honors college and asked that Faculty Senate charge PBC and any other relevant committees to investigate the feasibility of such and forward their findings to APCC for further discussion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. Senator Gerlach had a suggestion. As he had had a hand in creating that program years ago and as it was a program and not a college, it had been decided that the head of the program should not be known by anything so esoteric a title as "director." Chair Sheffer added that he thought it had been changed to director. Senator Gerlach then stated that if we did have such a college or such a program we should have a more distinctive title for the person who runs it, such as "warden."

Senator Norfolk then asked what this would mean in terms of courses, faculty, degree-granting status?

Dr. Mugler was then given permission to address the body and answer Senator Norfolk's question.

Dr. Mugler stated that they were not proposing grant changes. They wanted to keep departments where they were. Otherwise, they would not have the pipeline to faculty that they had now. Students would remain within their graduating colleges. They would get an extra honors college seal on their diploma; they thought that would carry a lot of weight, but it would not change much.

Senator Erickson asked for clarification. What was it that APCC was asking Senate to do? Associate Provost Stokes replied that as Academic Policies recommended the concept of an honors college, they were asking that Faculty Senate charge the Planning & Budgeting Committee and any other relevant committee to investigate the feasibility of such and to forward their findings to Academic Policies & Calendar Committee for further discussion.

Senator Sterns then asked for extensive clarification because obviously this was a program change. He thought that that was more important than the actual financial aspects. Senate was being asked to vote on something which was about as ambiguous. He certainly supported the motion if it were a change in name. If it were a change in program, then it was a different matter. He called for clarification so that all would know on what the vote was.

Associate Provost Stokes stated that the APCC had written the motion this way because they felt there was more information needed from more Senate groups to discuss further before they could bring a real proposal forward to the Senate. We were asking Senate to charge PBC and any other relevant committees to investigate this and provide their findings to Academic Policies. Senate also was being asked to determine the relevant committees.

Chair Sheffer then asked whether Associate Provost Stokes would consider a motion to refer the issue to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee would then determine to what committees this proposal should be sent.

This motion was then made by Senator Sterns and seconded by Senator Dalton. The motion read as follows: **APCC recommends the concept of an honors college and asks that the**

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate charge the relevant Senate committees to investigate the feasibility of such and forward their findings to APCC for further discussion.

The body then voted its approval of the motion.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - See (**Appendix A**) for approved proposals.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report by stating that he had been re-elected as chair of the CFPC. A more innovative aspect was the co-chair arrangement this year where both Elizabeth Erickson would continue to serve as co-chair, and Mike Dalton who was President of Associated Student Government would serve as the other co-chair. Dr. Charles Monroe had agreed to serve as secretary.

The main message he wanted to bring this afternoon was that the way the Campus Facilities Planning Committee worked most effectively was based on a set of good faith relationships. In terms of the Vice President for Planning, the Provost's office, the office that deals with space assignments, and the committee itself, for all to work together, there must be an organized and good faith relationship. During the summer we seemed to have wandered a bit away from the usual procedure. He was trying to be diplomatic. The fact of the matter was that we had a very complex summer. As Senators knew, with the new Arts & Sciences building opening there were many moves. However, there were a number of space assignments that were made without properly going through the committee. This was the first time in many years that that had happened. He was hoping that this was just a minor departure from the usual, because he had always had the complete support of the President and the Provost in his many years of doing this work. He hoped that we could affirm today together that we would go back to doing that.

Leigh Hall was one example where things had broken down. Moves had not been officially approved nor had the paperwork been officially filed with the committee in order to have been signed off by the President. This was not accusatory; it was not the usual.

Senator Sterns continued. The committee requested that Mr. Haskell bring us up-to-date with all moves and all space assignments that had taken place whether approved by the committee or not so that we knew exactly where we stand. One of the things he was most proud of was the fact that we had finally gotten all of the space on campus documented. All moves were being approved by the committee; the committee had played its appropriate role in the process. Therefore, in the spirit of the good relationship that the President had asked for in his earlier remarks, the committee asked that it have reaffirmation of that.

As a result, the committee chose not to approve things that had already been accomplished. It made no sense if things had already happened for the committee to approve them. As an example, we had a request from Benefits Administration to move into what was formerly the Psychology Dept. Clinic. Planning meant looking ahead to the future. The committee was aware that the Counseling & Testing Bureau would be moving from Schrank N. later this year for renovations. Since they had a counseling function, it might make more sense to assign that space that had been designed to be a counseling clinic and find another space for Benefits Administration. There were issues of confidentiality and sound-proofing related to the space needed by the Clinic which were present in the space in question. We think that we have excellent space and should assign it for the very best use possible.

Other examples would be the request for the card reader in Gallucci Hall. Since that already had been installed, we didn't feel that that was necessary. There was also a list of plans for the upcoming year; this was in the committee report, (**Appendix B**).

Senator Sterns stated that there was one resolution for the Senate to take action on. At the request of Senator Gerlach, the committee had been asked to address the issue of building naming. After extensive discussion the committee did vote to present a motion that the Gardner Student Center name remain on the new student union building. Since we had been instructed and reminded by the Senate that this committee was to have this function, even though for many years we chose not to have it, we were doing what we were told.

The resolution read as follows: **The Faculty Senate supports that Gardner Student Center or Union name should remain on the new student union building.**

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. Senator Gerlach accommodated this request. He offered a little bit of rephrasing of the motion to make it what he would call more felicitous. He thought what Senate needed to do was refer this to the Board of Trustees as the superior power here. Therefore, he wondered whether in the spirit of what had been moved, what he had to offer would do it a little more elegantly. His rephrasing was as follows: **The Faculty Senate urges the Board of Trustees to retain the name Gardner for the new student center or union building.**

Senator Gerlach stated that he thought we needed to make a reference in there to the Trustees. He hoped his motion was accepted.

Senator Sterns stated that he would be happy to accept that.

President Proenza then offered another friendly amendment. That is, in all cases by our rules recommendations to the Board of Trustees must be made through the President. Senate must make its recommendation to the President and request that he consider recommending it to the Board. Which he would be happy to do so, in this case.

This was so moved by Senator Dalton and seconded by Senator Soucek.

President Proenza then added that there had been a discussion, as Senators knew, about naming at the last meeting. He asked that Senators consider providing some other background than just a recommendation without a rationale. There were very good reasons why the building was named after Mr. Gardner that might constitute a far more powerful basis for that recommendation to go forward. Mr. Gardner happened to not only have been a distinguished member of this University community, but he was one of the founding members of the whole movement of student services and student activities and student affairs. For this to be recognized in the recommendation as one of the bases and as well as bringing in others, would help strengthen the case. Frankly, he thought it would be very helpful for all of us to keep in mind the reasons why ancient monuments should be named in terms of those good people who preceded us in time. Not as monuments, but as real contributors.

Senator Lee then wondered whether we were foregoing any possibilities of fund raising or gift giving that might commence with the naming of a building, and if so, he assumed that the committee had considered that.

Senator Sterns responded to that. Obviously, as President Proenza mentioned at our last meeting, development was absolutely one of the essential functions of our University at this time. The committee tried to balance maintaining the continuity of historical names on our campus with the idea of also providing some future development. That was the kind of creativity and balance that we wanted.

Senator Dalton stated that the discussion actually came up when we were talking about the significance of Dr. Gardner and the role that he played not only at our University, but also with student services. The committee had stated that it wanted to give recognition of all his accomplishments. We did not want that to be just put on a plaque. We wanted his name to be on the student center.

Senator Jordan then asked whether there had been any exploration of the possibility of funding related to naming of that building. Chair Sheffer asked whether President Proenza had an answer for that.

President Proenza stated that the issue was a continuous and ongoing matter which was explored on a daily basis with potential donors. There was no proposal pending at the moment, but certainly the Trustees were very sensitive to the fact that these large, new facilities provided those opportunities. We did not want to preclude that option. By the same token, he was particularly sensitive to recommending ultimately that the Gardner name be appropriately acknowledged, if not as the name of the building, in a very prominent fashion. We had in our history some exceptional people who served the University with distinction and brought it to national attention by being the founders of such as the beginnings of the profession of student services. It behooved us to ensure that we document, that we place that in a framework that reminded us of how we had distinguished this University and could continue to do so in the future.

Senator Gerlach then stated that there was a distinction in his mind between erecting brand new buildings which could be named for sizeable donors and removing names from old buildings that were put there to award those persons for their contributions. There was a service in the English Book of Common Prayer which was a service of curses, "Comminations," it was called. One of the first things in that service was "Cursed be he who removes his neighbor's landmarks." Now the Gardner building was a landmark; Simmons Hall was a landmark. We could give anyone who needed it the lessons in history from George Knepper's works on this University, in reference to his special little book, "Summit's Glory." In there we had a rousing account briefly put of Hezzleton Simmons' contributions to this place.

If his name were not to appear on a building as Simmons Hall, we would be violating a trust that was established years ago when the name was put there. According to Dr. Knepper, in the depth of the Depression when the University was short of buildings, Simmons went to work on two buildings for the students who needed them. He said the first business was a good faculty and that we had; we would work on the buildings. He got the WPA Project and the PWA Project. Did Senators know how his name got put on the present student building? The students asked for it out of respect for his contributions to the University. Now if the Board of Trustees or anyone else was going to remove that name and not put it on another building, they would have violated the most solemn trust that could ever be made between generations. If we put names on other new buildings and you could get fund raising for that, fine. But in the meantime don't remove a name and then try to slap a new name on it because of someone giving the money. That was attempted at the library. Back in the 70's when someone said we were going to have a learning resources center, he had suggested the name Bierce, which had been on the library because Bierce gave the first books. We got the faculty interested and University Council, and President Guzzetta took it to the Board of Trustees and they agreed. That was how the name Bierce was on that library; we got it put back after it had been so callously removed in view of trying to raise money to put another name on a new building. Let's raise money and put them on new buildings. Let's not take old names off old buildings in order to sell. That was the most crass thing he had ever heard of. He hoped that Senator Sterns' committee was going to have something yet to say in the future about the Simmons Hall issue. In the meantime he guessed we were about to vote on a resolution that in effect said that the Senate requested the President to urge the Board of Trustees to do this.

Secretary Kennedy then read the amended motion to the body: **The Faculty Senate recommends to President Proenza that he recommend to the Board of Trustees that the name Gardner remain on the new student union building.**

A vote was then taken and the body voted its approval of the motion. Senator Pinheiro then made a **motion to refer to CFPC the President's request for a rationale as to using the name Gardner for the new student union building.** Senator Norfolk seconded this motion.

Senator Lee stated that he supported the motion to refer because he also wanted to see the information.

No further discussion forthcoming, the body then voted approval of the motion to refer this matter to CFPC to provide a rationale as requested by President Proenza.

Provost Hickey than stated that in the same spirit of communication, he needed some clarification on Leigh Hall. His understanding was that renovations at Leigh Hall had been approved by this committee and actually had been approved enthusiastically. He was confused as to what step the committee felt had gotten missed here.

Senator Sterns reported that this was an unusual sequence. Many of us first learned about the Leigh Hall plan when it was presented to the Board. That was the initial presentation where he had heard about it as chair of the committee. The Provost had personally come to the committee to sketch out in broad terms the planning for Leigh Hall. We were expecting the paperwork to come through during the summer. Senator Sterns reported that in a very unusual move, he had requested that the committee give him the authority to sign off on the paperwork during the summer. That was the enthusiastic endorsement; however, the paperwork never formally appeared.

Provost Hickey replied that if he understood it right, the committee did in fact support it. He remembered that Associate Provost Angelo met with the committee and answered a number of questions. The committee had supported the changes that were proposed for Leigh Hall. It was only the signing of the document that was overlooked?

Senator Erickson then added that the committee looked at the issues relating to Leigh Hall in general. But with no formal paper signing, Leigh Hall was being scheduled considerably further on down the line because there was no official information. The building was scheduled by the Registrar's office. The Registrar's office then had to hurriedly try to find extra space because the whole system had not gone through in an organized fashion. Then there was a whole lack of information regarding what was happening to the people in Leigh Hall, where they were going, and the issues relating to those moves that did not go through in the appropriate manner through the committee.

Senator Sterns added that all knew that Senate committees did not meet in the summer. However, CFPC had met always so that we would not delay University deliberations. All he was trying to say was that the committee was trying to do the right thing. On behalf of the committee, he wanted to say that this committee had often been a focal point for creative problem solving. The committee did not plan to make major departures as we moved down the pipe during the coming year.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - See (**Appendix C**).

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Fenwick reported that the PBC had met three times. This morning's meeting had been an informational meeting from Mr. Ray on the budget. On September 26, PBC had met and appointed two working subcommittees, one to develop the ROI quality measures and the second to assess the impact on ROI as it was being implemented now. Those subcommittees were to report to the PBC by Nov. 21, and PBC was to report to the Senate by Dec. 5th, (**Appendix D**).

The second action item on the agenda was from the Sept. 19 meeting taking up an issue that was started in the spring concerning the differential tuition request from the College of Business Administration. Over the summer Provost Hickey had surveyed 33 institutions of higher learning to find out whether or not units charged differential tuition and to what extent, if at all, the central administration or the general fund taxed or kept a portion of that differential tuition. According to the survey, 28 of the 33 schools responding allowed for differential tuition. Most of those units charging differential tuitions were professional schools, law and business. There was no general agreement as to how much was taxed or repaid by the central administration. Anywhere between 0% and 35% with about 20% as the average. So taking that information into consideration, the PBC then approved two resolutions which were taken to the floor today.

Senator Fenwick then read Resolution 1: **The Planning & Budgeting Committee recommends to the Senate that the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee develop a written University policy concerning units requesting differential tuition.**

Senator Jordan then asked for clarification. What was a differential tuition? Was there a basic tuition that was the undergraduate tuition? What was the base from which differentials were determined?

Provost Hickey replied that it was the difference between whatever the standard tuition rate was. It was a differential tuition at the graduate level. So it would be base rate of the University plus a differential that represented in effect the market forces of that degree or that program. For instance, Law had long had a differential tuition, but it has been allowed to keep 100%. The base rate would be the general graduate program tuition.

No further discussion forthcoming, Chair Sheffer called for a vote on Resolution #1. The body then voted its approval.

Senator Fenwick then read Resolution 2: **The Planning & Budgeting Committee recommends to the Senate that the escrowed money collected from the College of Business Administration's differential tuition rate be released to the College of Business Administration on a semester-by-semester basis PER ACADEMIC YEAR until a University policy on differential tuition is approved by the Board of Trustees.**

Secretary Kennedy then asked whether that were 100% of the escrowed money. Senator Fenwick replied affirmatively.

Senator Yoder then proposed an alternative to Resolution 2. She proposed that the Planning &

Budgeting Committee recommend to the Senate that 75% of the escrowed money collected from the College of Business Administration differential tuition rate be released to the CBA on a semester-by-semester basis until the University policy on differential tuition was approved by the Board of Trustees. The remaining 25% would be released to the general fund. Senator Gerlach seconded this motion.

Senator Yoder stated that the rationale for the proposal was that there should be a share in the administrative costs. The administrative side of the budget was about 40% of that budget. She thought that although that amount would be excessive given what other universities were doing, 25% seemed to be more appropriate.

Senator Kahl then asked whether that would apply to the Law School's differential tuition as well. Chair Sheffer replied that this was strictly CBA in this resolution. Senator Wyszynski asked whether the Senate could release the money. Chair Sheffer replied that, no, it was a recommendation. Senator Wyszynski stated that the amendment was worded in such a way to state that the committee recommended that the Senate release money. The Senate was not doing any recommending in this resolution nor in the amendment.

Chair Sheffer stated that Senate would entertain that in a separate motion to amend, should this one pass.

Senator Hebert stated that as a member of the College of Business, he would like to speak against Senator Yoder's amendment. He thought that all units that had differential tuition should be treated the same. The pattern at the University's Law School did not face the same thing. We should do it exactly the same way. The differential tuition ought to be released in its entirety to the unit.

Senator M. Huff then spoke against the amendment as well. In PBC, we had decided and talked about the fact that the College of Business was anticipating that amount of money for this year. We have included our original motion that we would look at that in the future, but right now in order to operate they were counting on the 100%. That was what their budget was set on.

Senator Erickson stated that she did see the point that PBC was making and why they wanted to do that. But nothing in the resolution we passed earlier gave a date for APCC to give it back to Senate. If purely on a semester-to-semester basis, the Business College would then proceed to plan on it for the following period. She did not mind it being done on a one-year basis but not any further than that. We needed to see where we were with these differentials for any further policy; she wanted modification.

Chair Sheffer redirected attention to the amendment on the floor, the 75-25% split.

Senator Walter then spoke against the motion and in support of what Senator Huff had said. Had CBA known about 80-20 or 75-25, they would have planned for it. If there were to be a split, it would be an increase presumably in the differential tuition.

Senator Sehn then pointed out that counting differential tuition did not increase the administrative costs, and paying the portion of the tuition that was already regular tuition was contributing to the administrative costs that they were hoping to cover by this 25%. Having a higher tuition did not increase the administrative costs, and therefore the full differential portion should be able to be returned to CBA.

Senator Jordan stated that in light of Resolution 1 about setting the policy, it was not appropriate at this point, as this was a major policy decision by changing from the full payment to the 75-25. Senate should not be making that kind of policy decision here on the spur of the moment. Further, it seemed to him that there was considerable confusion about what specifically we were talking about. Surely, the College of Business had a differential tuition from the graduate tuition before they increased tuition this last time around.

However, Senator Norfolk replied that this was not the case. Provost Hickey added that the only differential tuition currently at the University prior to this fall was the School of Law.

Secretary Kennedy then had a question about the planning issue. As she recalled from our Senate meetings of last year, this had come up as a line item in the budget. CBA should have known that that money was put into a fund and that it was going to be escrowed. She was not sure why they had made plans to use it if Senate were still investigating this.

Senator Lee then spoke, stating that he could partly answer the question as a member of PBC. The planning function PBC was trying to accomplish by Resolution 1 had to do with the fact that we were sympathetic to the idea that it should not be a done deal presented at the last minute. That should have been something that came before us as it was such a major policy decision. Having said that, the CBA had gone forward not having had our input. CBA had made plans for their new program expansions based on their budget assuming they would get all that differential. Those plans had already been made by the time we saw the line item and approved it provisionally. It was not that they had made plans after that knowing that the money was necessary. The whole reason they proposed a differential in the first place was based on the plan for how they were going to apply that money. He was sympathetic strongly to the idea that there ought to be a policy for this. This wasn't something that should be presented to Senate at the last minute as a line item on the budget. That was what Resolution 1 was all about. With regard to what had already been done and planned and relied on, it seemed to him that Senate ought to go forward and let CBA have the money. His concern was actually that Resolution 2 was too stringent for CBA because it was not clear how they were going to spend money and make plans for the future in their programs when the money was released on a semester-by-semester basis. If that was the best we were going to get for them, then he supported it.

Senator Norfolk also chimed in that it would not be fair. Of course, the easy solution would be to propose that Senate "ding" the Law School 25% of the differential tuition. However, most were aware that all the operating budgets had just been hit 26%, at least in our college. So taking 75% of this differential and putting it back to help offset budget deficits did not seem to be such a bad idea.

Senator Fenwick added that part of the rationale for the 100% give-back to CBA was the lack of a rationale for anything else at the time. There was wide variation in what they tax in their differential units, but it seemed that there was no underlying rationale for why they did or did not. In other words, for those who were familiar with the organizational theory, it was the perfect garbage can model. These schools apparently just pick numbers out of the hat. Also, there was a precedent for the Law School having 100%. PBC wanted to create a policy in the future; whatever we decide should be rational.

Senator Kahl then stated that when the CBA supported this, there was precedent at the University with the Law School. That had been in effect for some years, and that precedent was the basis for that differential tuition. The differential tuition was to pay for some very expensive parts of those students' education. There was no increase in the administrative cost to the University. That was just a silly

excuse to dilute some of his students' tuition money to support other things at the University.

Senator W. Yoder added that it seemed like the semester-to-semester issue in Resolution 2 really addressed the fact that we did not know how soon the Resolution 1 decision would be made by the committee. It might take a semester or two until that committee reported back.

Senator Erickson then added that it was not the purpose of this resolution to try and make a decision for APCC on what should be the breakdown. As an economist, the whole notion of how these allocations were made were way too arbitrary. There were issues here that really needed to be addressed. This was whether Senate wanted to recommend that the entire amount of money for CBA be allowed out for just this period.

Senator Lee stated that before it got lost into concrete knowledge, the Law School differential at 100% was not always obtained by the Law School. The Law School had had a differential in the past. However, the Law School's tuition had been higher than the undergraduate tuition sometimes without any return to it. The Law School generally contributed to the general fund, but a particular tuition increase differential in the 95-96 or 96-97 year was dedicated 100% to the Law School. So a particular part of the differential came back to the Law School, but not all of it. He did not know the exact history, but before it became part of the common lore, he wanted to say that for the record.

Chair Sheffer then called for further discussion on the amendment to change the resolution from 100% to 75%. None forthcoming, the body failed to approve this amendment. The Chair then directed discussion back to Resolution #2.

Senator Erickson offered an amendment to the resolution, that it be released to the College of Business Administration on a semester-by-semester basis this academic year, and that Senate try to put some constraint on how long it took.

Associate Provost Stokes requested permission to speak. She reminded Senators that the University rules define the academic year as Fall and Spring semester; that was it. It did not include the Summer.

Senator Hebert stated he wanted to speak against the motion. He thought the statement at the end of the resolution, "until a University policy on differential tuition is approved" was clear enough and precise.

Senator Soucek then offered to second the motion to amend Resolution #2.

Senator Sugarman asked for a point of clarification. For Fall semester, there was not yet any differential tuition? Chair Sheffer replied there was but it had been escrowed. Students had already paid this money, and it had already been escrowed.

No additional discussion was forthcoming on the amendment. The body then voted its approval of the amendment to Resolution #2. Similarly, no further discussion was forthcoming on Resolution #2. The body then voted its approval of Resolution #2.

Provost Hickey stated that he wanted to try to nip in the bud rumor 10,012 initiated by Dr. Norfolk here about the 26% cut in his operations budget. He was not really sure what Senator Norfolk was referring to, but he assumed that the Dean of the Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences, in meeting recent budget reductions, must have chosen to take a significant amount of that out of the operations budget.

The Provost wanted to simply point out that that was a decision made at the college level and no other level.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - Chair Sheffer stated that the main piece of old business were the three APCC motions postponed from June. Senate needed to consider these today. Senators had had these in their possession since June or since joining the Senate. He then asked Assoc. Provost Stokes to read Senate through these motions. She began with the first which dealt with the following change to section 3359-20-037 of the Faculty Manual: **The decision of the tenure committee is final and cannot be appealed.** See (Appendix E.1.).

No discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken. Senate then voted its approval of this motion.

Chair Sheffer read the next motion dealing with student success: **Students must successfully complete with a grade of C or better any developmental courses they may be required to take within the first thirty-two credit hours attempted.**

Senator Gerlach stated that the words, "successfully complete" are tautological. To complete something was to succeed at it, to fill up, so there was lacking no component part. It was full, entire, brought to a conclusion, ended, finished, thoroughly accomplished. He offered the amendment to strike the word "successfully" from the motion. Senator Steiner seconded this motion. The amendment passed.

A vote was taken on this amendment; Senate voted its approval. Associate Provost Stokes then stated that she had a friendly amendment coming from APCC. For point of clarification, APCC requested that at the end after the word attempted, to add "Both credit and developmental hours are included in these first thirty-two hours." The rationale from the committee was that otherwise developmental courses which did not carry credit would not be counted. Senator Sterns seconded this amendment.

The body voted its approval of the amendment.

Chair Sheffer then introduced the next motion for consideration. This concerned a change in the withdrawal policy and read as follows: **The deadline to withdraw from a course shall be Friday of the tenth week of the semester. This deadline shall be prorated for courses less than fifteen weeks; this date shall be provided by the Provost's office and listed in the course syllabus.**

Senator Dalton began the discussion. He felt that students had reason for concern with this, considering professors often give only one test before the 10 weeks.

Senator Crain echoed Senator Dalton concerns, speaking very strongly against the motion.

Senator M. Huff then stated that she wanted to speak against the second piece. At the present time nursing students may not withdraw after the mid-point of the rotation in a clinical course. This would significantly alter what was currently done. The purpose for doing that was so that students could not repeat and repeat a clinical course because of safety issues. In place of that she would like to suggest that courses with a clinical component would develop permission to withdraw policy that enhanced student well-being and the individual course objectives. In other words, a clinical course could set their own drop policy. The amendment read as follows: **Courses with a clinical component would develop a permission to withdraw policy that enhances student well-being and the individual course objectives.**

This was seconded by Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh.

Senator Norfolk stated that he felt this amendment was unnecessary. We were moving the date back as the last date a student can withdraw from 12 weeks to 10 weeks. All it was doing was preventing students dropping after the ten weeks. There were some hoops they could jump through by contacting deans and what-not, but it was not doing it in that direction. It was pulling it back. We used to have it at the 15th week, and offices were quite busy on the Friday of the 15th week.

Senator M. Huff stated that faculty had the understanding that as long as we don't sign the withdrawal slip, that was OK. So, in light of that, she would withdraw her motion. She wanted to make it clear that that would markedly impact what they had been doing in the College of Nursing.

The body then agreed with unanimous consent to permit Senator M. Huff to withdraw her motion.

Senator Witt asked what the reasons were.

Dean Mugler was then asked to speak to this issue.

Dean Mugler stated that they had received from a number of units on campus the idea that they wanted an 8-week drop date, or a 10-week drop date. Two or three years ago when Martha Booth was in the position of University Registrar, the ASSC, the associate/assistant deans and people from Admissions and various colleges and student affairs groups got together and surveyed all of the 4-year universities in the state. We had the latest drop date of any university. Most of them had 8 or 10 weeks. Knowing our student body and looking at all of the other things they were doing besides taking classes and being engaged in learning, we felt that an 8-week was much too early but that a 10-week drop date, if faculty knew that that was going to be the withdrawal date, could change perhaps the way they taught the course and the number of assignments. We would still do mid-term deficiency grades for our first-year students, but now because of the new student information system, we could get information out to students and the faculty would not have to have any earlier-graded papers or tests. We could still keep it at the 8th week and get information out to students and give them enough time. We also looked at whether students could access their grades on the web. She wanted to tell Senators that that was not possible according to Assoc. Registrar Debi Hayes. Those grades that faculty gave as mid-term deficiency grades to first-year students were never posted. They were just there for the deans and various offices to have access to and warn students and send students deficiency grade letters. But students did not have the ability to access the grades; those were not posted to their permanent record. So by having it at the 10th week, we were moving it up for various colleges that wanted an earlier date. We were not going as far as the 8th week.

Senator Dalton then stated that the way professors structured their classes, if you had three tests and an exam, the first test came in the 5th week, the next in the 10th week. Student grades were not there in that 10th week. Students took a test on the 15th and one as the final exam; 75% of the grades were there, and he did not think it was fair. One week or two weeks could make a difference. He did not feel this was going to revolutionize how professors provided tests or that they were now going to start changing because of this date. They were still going to give three tests and break it up in that same period.

Senator Hoo Fatt then stated that regardless of the test, if by the 10th week you as a student did not know whether you were going to do well in the class, 10 out of 15 was a long time. She felt that too much emphasis was put on the grade. Students would know whether they knew the material or not.

Senator Barrett asked for clarification regarding students being able to access mid-term grades and whether they were mailed to them.

Dean Mugler replied that they were mailed a letter from the dean's office. Currently we had 8,835 students in University College. University College would probably be sending over 2,000 letters to their permanent addresses as soon as their grades were posted by the faculty.

Senator Barrett then asked whether this would give students enough time. Dean Mugler replied that, now with PeopleSoft we were able to get it - one place PeopleSoft had really helped.

Senator John asked about the rationale for this. Just because other universities were doing it, did that mean it was right or it was wrong, and what was the advantage? When he first came to this University it used to be the last day of classes, and he said that was ridiculous. He started the second year to put on his syllabus that he would not sign after the 12th week. Finally, the University came around to his thinking. But he still did not see what was advantageous of 10 weeks or 12 weeks, and that a student should have been able to make up his/her mind after three quarters. He saw the students' point of view here, that if they were not given enough feedback in time to make a decision, they might still be able to pull it out and put the effort in, but he still did not know the reason for 10 weeks.

Senator Crain asked that Senators consider it from the point of view of a student. Faculty knew very honestly that a majority of time the reason students withdraw from classes was because of grades, whether students wanted to admit that or not. If the purpose of withdrawal was personal problems, illness, or anything else that was a reason for withdrawal from a class, what happened if that problem came up in the 11th week? By leaving it at the 12th week faculty give students 3/4 of a semester to deal with things like that. After that it was the student's fault, but she thought faculty would have a really bad response from the student body if this were done.

Secretary Kennedy pointed out that to address what Senator Crain had stated regarding personal problems, if a student was not failing a class, he/she would take an incomplete. He/she did not have to withdraw.

Senator Dalton then stated that in all honesty, there were some students here who were simply here to get a C or to get a B; they were not here to get A's. So going into that second, third, or fourth test, if they were just getting by, they might have a high D, low C, on the fringe there. There were some students who were here just to get a degree; they were looking just to get the grade to pass and were looking for that diploma that they needed for a job. He had to represent those students too. So in all fairness to them, it might not be the best idea, but look at the students that we had on this campus - it was not Ivy League. We were trying to get up there, sure, but we weren't. We had a different personnel of students.

Dean Mugler then pointed out that this was not looked at as a punishment. This was looked at as an opportunity for students to succeed. By having an earlier drop date, if a student was on the bubble and was trying to see where they fit and were not a first-year student and didn't get that feedback, they would have the opportunity to counsel with the professor to make a decision earlier in the term. The

other reason that this did come forward was that right now there were some professors here who would not sign after the 8th week, after the 6th week, after the 10th week, and those that would sign all the way to the 12th week. It was very confusing for students. The task force that looked at this and was bringing this forward would certainly urge as well if we had a University new drop date that people endorsed that and used that as the University withdrawal deadline.

Senator John then stated that the University had a policy - 12 weeks with the instructor's signature. The instructors that were refusing not to sign should be made to adhere to the policy that stands right now. What was there to make them change? If we said 10 weeks, why would the instructor not say, "I still won't sign after 8 weeks?"

Senator Soucek stated that he had two issues, and that Senator John just bit himself because he stated that he had made his own University policy and the University followed him. But just for a point of clarification, we were talking about 12 weeks. Could students withdraw and then not have to pay any tuition for the 12 weeks? Chair Sheffer pointed out that students had to pay by the 5th week.

Senator Sugarman stated we were not doing a favor to the student if we changed it from 12 to 10. There were some students who would drop below 12 credits, lose their hospitalization, and they would lose it for two more weeks. So this definitely could be a punishment to them.

Senator Dalton then called the question. No objections to this forthcoming, the body voted to reject this motion. (This then made number 4 of this motion moot.)

Chair Sheffer stated that now the body could turn its attention to the motion regarding part-time faculty. See **(Appendix E.2.)**

Senator Witt had a question on recommended privileges, that sort of thing. Throughout this whole proposal there were items listed, such as access to work space, that a lot of departments did not have. The motion stated within the constraints of departmental space and budgets - that meant if we did not have it to give, then we were not going to have to go out and build an annex building, correct? There was a considerable amount of time involved in peer evaluation, supervisor evaluations, these sorts of things. The administrators that he knew were concerned about having to essentially double their RTP work as we moved toward 50% of our offerings being taught by part-timers. He was not so sure that this was a doable thing if we were to pass this in its current form. It was just a few things - for example, supervisor evaluations. He did not mind his department having to spend all of their time evaluating other people, but having to pay for standardized course evaluation for part-timers? Right now they only paid for course evaluations for untenured faculty or faculty seeking a promotion. This was a pretty extensive thing.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that the motion did not require that. Senator Witt replied that it said that it required standardized, student evaluations using a standardized departmental form. Was that not what it meant? Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was not the Idea form.

Senator Erickson then took issue with no. (E)(3)(c), "No more than twenty-one total credit hours shall be assigned to any part-time faculty member for any academic year. The academic year is defined as fall and spring semester." Unfortunately, that number had caused a problem for allocating in Arts & Sciences; 22 was fine but 21 was not.

Senator Norfolk stated that it had always been 21. That was so that the part-time faculty would not have the same theoretical load as a full-time faculty member to in fact protect tenured faculty members from being replaced by part-time. That 21 figure had caused a lot of problems, but it had always been the case. In fact, it had become more flexible now because we could now allocate 12 in one semester, which we could not before. Associate Provost Stokes added that in consultation with the Office of General Counsel, that was the legal limit.

Senator Maringer had a question dealing with the appointment of the various salary grades, (H)(2)(a) and (b). The current standard to go to associate lecturer was masters degree with 6 semesters of teaching. In the new proposal it was 60 semester hours. That seemed to be a significant increase. The next one was from associate to senior, 10 semester hours of teaching experience. Now we were saying we wanted to move to 100 semester hours. That was a significant increase to get those additional hours. His constituents had asked him to check the rationale for making such a drastic change.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that with 21 as the total allowed, that would be 10 hours per semester as an average. And 60 was 10 times 6, and 10 times 10 was 100. Senator Maringer then asked whether it were not impossible to teach that load, as many of the part-timers were only teaching one or two? Associate Provost Stokes replied that that was where they came up with the number, and it was the part-time faculty who put these numbers here.

Senator Erickson then joined the fray. She asked for clarification. Was it going from 6 semesters to 60 semester hours?

Senator Maringer replied that before, for a part-timer teaching only one course, six semesters would be six courses. Now the change was to 60 hours. If that was what part-timers wanted, that was one thing, but that was an awful big increase to get to that next level.

Senator Erickson stated that it seemed to her that there were two kinds of part-timers. There were part-timers who wanted large numbers of hours, and then there were other part-timers that we use for a course or two. She wanted to comment on the former.

Associate Provost Stokes then stated that there was also an "or" between (ii) and (iii). So if the person had the master's degree with 60 semester hours or they had a master's degree with 15 credit hours of related post-master's level coursework. So they could have one or the other.

Senator Lee had a question regarding that same section where it talked about salary levels which was (H)(2)(c)(ii) and (iii) Senior lecturer. Subpart (ii) talked about part-timers needing the relevant doctoral degree in order to qualify for senior lecturer and therefore qualify for that salary range. There was a special thing added in (iii) with (a) and (b) which singled out the J.D. It stated that if you had a J.D., the J.D. should only serve as a doctoral degree in order to get you to senior lecturer status if you're teaching law-related courses. But that seemed true to him with all doctoral degrees. That if you've got a doctoral degree in english and you happen to be teaching a computer science course, that that degree should not necessarily make you a senior lecturer. Presumably that was taken care of by the word "relevant doctoral degree." Why did we need to make a special case for the J.D.?

Associate Provost Stokes stated that she agreed with Senator Lee. The reason that the part-time included that was because there were considerable questions about when the J.D. counts as a doctorate and when it did not. Because they did not want to deal with them on a case-to-case basis, they put in the rule. Senator Lee was right; it was not necessary.

Seantor Lee then made a motion to strike letters (a) and (b). This was seconded by Senator W. Yoder. No discussion forthcoming, the body then voted it's approval of this amendment.

Provost Hickey then called for a point of clarification. Was he to assume that Senate had made this change with the clear understanding that a person having a J.D. degree, that that did not count as a doctorate to teach anywhere outside of the Law School or a law course being taught in another college?

Was that the body's wish, because he could guarantee that he would get some of these people with J.D.'s wanting to now teach in other colleges. His understanding for why this was in the rule was that in the past that very thing happened. People with J.D. degrees were now trying to teach english, and sociology, and a variety of other areas. So he just needed to understand what the interpretation was that he was supposed to apply.

Associate Provost Stokes also asked for a point of clarification because she was the other person who had to look at these. A person with a Ph.D. in english, teaching mathematics, would not be automatically a senior lecturer.

Senator Dechambeau then offered a friendly amendment for part (A)(1)(e) in the definition of part-time faculty where it said, "Be available for students a minimum of one hour per week per course taught." Her amendment was to go back to the original wording where it stated, "and maintain office hours or another method of allowing students in their classes to meet with them," to provide for more flexibility. This was seconded by Senator Norfolk.

Senator Dechambeau then offered her rationale for the amendment. She could not find anywhere that there was a one office hour per course requirement for full-time faculty. Full-time faculty rules had a statement that addressed setting appropriate percentages of amounts for each activity. The need for flexibility was recognized. So it was recognized for full-time; why not for part-time? It was a burden to schedule a specific amount of hours for part-time faculty; they were part-time and may have other jobs elsewhere or were teaching part-time for a reason. There was another point that needed clarification. Did a course mean a single course with a single course number, or did course mean sections of a course? Was teaching four sections of the same course one hour or four hours?

Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was one hour per course.

Senator Dechambeau stated that that would still be a burden. There were 800-900 part-time faculty. Where were most of them going to hold their office hours? Logistically, it could be a problem.

Chair Sheffer asked whether anyone wished to speak to that amendment to revert to the old wording, **"and maintain office hours or another method of allowing students in their classes to meet with them."** As no one did, he called for a vote. The amendment was approved.

The Chair directed the Senate's attention to the next motion which dealt with Salaries, 3359-20-091. However, Senator Sterns then asked whether there was a quorum present. A count of those Senators present indicated there was not. Therefore, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin