MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2002

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Thursday, September 5, 2002 in Room 202 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Chair Dan Sheffer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Fifty-two of the sixty-three Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Conrad, Matney, Riley, and Svehla were absent with notice. Senators Pope, Redle, Trotter, and Wyszynski were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

***REQUESTED CFPC TO INVESTIGATE THE DESIRABILITY OF MAINTAINING HISTORIC NAMES OF CAMPUS BUILDINGS IN VIEW OF SENATE'S REQUEST THAT THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES MAINTAIN THESE NAMES.**

***REFERRED PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGE TO (E) (2) (a)TO INCLUDE ONE SENATE REPRESENTATIVE FROM RETIREES ASSOCIATION AS MEMBER OF WELL-BEING COMMITTEE TO WELL-BEING COMMITTEE.**

*** ELECTIONS:**
VICE CHAIR OF SENATE
SECRETARY OF SENATE
AT-LARGE MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
PBC REPRESENTATIVES
PBC CO-CHAIR
OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE.

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Chair Sheffer stated that the first order of business was to approve the agenda. He called for amendments to the agenda. None coming from the floor, he stated he had one addition to the agenda. This addition was to add, under section VI. Elections, the election of the representative to Ohio Faculty Council. Senate voted its approval of the amended agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 11, MAY 2, AND JUNE 6, 2002 - The Chair directed the body to consider the minutes of April 11, May 2, and June 6, 2002. Secretary Kennedy stated that she had not received any corrections to any of the minutes. Senator Gerlach then indicated he had corrections and asked whether they could be taken in order, separately, or all at once. Chair Sheffer replied that we would take them one at a time.

Senator Gerlach referred the body to the May 2nd Chronicle, page 3, second paragraph, which began with his name and ends with the remarks that..."he was here to be of whatever help he could after 32 years on the faculty and participating all that time in departmental collusion and University governance." He did not think he was in a collusion, and preferred that the word be changed to "business."
Senator Gerlach then stated that his second item was just a question, not a matter of correction. On pg. 29 (of the same Chronicle mentioned previously), regarding the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee's reported disposition on grievances. He wanted to suggest in the future that that committee ought to specify exactly what the disposition was. That was, in what cases did the committee support the claims of grievances, and in which did they deny. That was the old way of doing it that he remembered, if Senators would pardon the reference, without naming names. Otherwise, we did not know how the committee disposed of these matters.

Chair Sheffer indicated to Senator Gerlach that his last item was not a correction to the minutes but a suggestion for the future. No other corrections forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the amended minutes.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR - Chair Sheffer introduced himself to the Faculty Senate, stating this was his third year as chair. He welcomed all, particularly returning Senators, as well as newy elected members of the Senate. He hoped all had had a very productive summer with perhaps a chance to have had relaxation and recreation. As we moved into this year, we would find that this year promised to be just as challenging a year as we had had last year. Foremost on our minds were budgetary and state-funding issues; these would be preeminent for the next period of time. He was sure that President Proenza would be addressing these issues in his remarks to the body today. Senate would certainly be dealing with budgeting and allocation in both the Senate and in the Planning & Budgeting Committee, as well as working on the Return on Investment. That process would continue with the determination of the quality measures and the means of assessing those measures. The Senate also needed to discuss its role in the Balanced Scorecard Program and the effort that would take place on campus in developing a comprehensive Academic Plan. These issues, both budgeting and planning, were going to be components of what were to be addressed in the NCA visit next spring. The Senate would deal with the work in the reports of the Well-Being Committee as they continued to deal with the issues of health care and spousal hiring to name several. These were just a few of the challenges the Senate would be facing this year. We needed to keep in mind that we, the Faculty Senate and all of our committees, must be committed to serving the students, the faculty and staff of this University. We would work hard as a Senate to establish and keep open lines of communication with all parts of our community while we addressed these challenges. He wished all a most productive and satisfying year.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - Chair Sheffer then introduced the new Senators in the body and asked each to stand and remain standing until all the introductions had been made. New members were: from Arts & Sciences, Tim Matney and Lance Svehla; Ravindra Krovi and Timothy Wilkinson from the College of Business Administration; LaVerne Yousey from the Community & Technical College; Walt Yoder from Education; Jack Braun and Al Sehn from the College of Engineering; David Witt from Fine & Applied Arts; Bennie Robinson from University Libraries; Mark Soucek from Polymer Science & Engineering; Katharine Kolcaba from Nursing; Debra Johanyak and Richard Maringer from Wayne; Student ASG President, Mike Dalton, and Vice President Leslie Crain. All were welcomed to the Senate with a warm round of applause.

Next, the chair introduced to new Senators, Marilyn Quillin, who was the Administrative Assistant of our Senate, and could be reached at extension 7896. Senators would find Marilyn to be very helpful in their work on the Senate. Lastly, the chair introduced Mike Cheung who was serving as Parliamentarian (at least for the day, which was as long as he had committed to).

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy stated that the Executive Committee had some business items first. She stated that she appreciated the Senators that sat in the orange chairs toward the front of the room and asked that all do so at future meetings also. It was easier for the recordings so that Senators weren't misquoted in the Chronicle. Also, in terms of attendance, Secretary Kennedy reminded all that it was very critical to attend all meetings (she realized she was speaking to the choir). Attendance records were published in the last edition of the Chronicle. This was going to be a very busy and important year and attendance was very important to meetings. In case Senators were interested, we did have a record of the attendance published and available as a handout. Senators might want to review the list and look to colleagues who were not here. If a Senator did need to miss a Senate meeting, he/she was asked to please call and notify Marilyn Quillin who would excuse him/her for that.

She continued. One of the things the Executive Committee had worked on in the summer was a handout regarding activities of the Faculty Senate last year; Senators should have received this handout before the start of the Fall semester. This was done to provide an update of some of the more important issues we had addressed, as well as other items of business that were coming up for discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting. So if anyone had not received a copy of that, seek out Marilyn and she would provide one. The Executive Committee had met several times over the summer and our main focus was on the rewriting of the Faculty Senate Bylaws which covered Faculty Senate committees. The Executive Committee had been addressing both the charge and the composition of those committees and planned to finish that process soon.

Our most recent meeting was on August 8, at which time we requested a meeting with President Proenza to discuss issues related to the budget and enrollment. At this meeting Provost Hickey and Mrs. Becky Herrnstein were also present. Relating to the budget issues, as Senators might recall at a special meeting of April 11, the Faculty Senate passed an amended version of the budget that was presented by the PBC. In particular, two items had been amended - items 7 and 8. Item 7 dealt with the proposed tuition differential for the Law School and the CBA graduate students. This had been referred back to PBC for consideration this semester; PBC had been asked to investigate and report a clear rationale as to how this would be operationalized. Item 8 concerned the estimated 2.2 million shortfall between the planned expenditures and the revenue estimates of Fall 2002. The amended version of item 8 replaced the originally proposed proportional cut with a 60-40 split between administrative and academic units respectively. This item was not presented to the Board of Trustees for action. At the Aug. 8 meeting President Proenza stated that at this time cuts must be proportionate. Without an Academic Plan in place, the President had no basis for supporting any other plan. This discussion led to an update on the Balanced Scorecard initiative, which would support the development of an Academic Plan for the University. As she believed that President Proenza would be addressing some of these issues in his remarks, she wanted to refrain from stealing any more of his thunder. The Executive Committee was also briefed on allocation of the salary adjustment dollars as well as on the first ROI allocations that were made.

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

"Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon colleagues, and welcome to a new academic year. I prefer to think of the delivery of this as just-in-time service. The Provost informed me, however, that because of budget cuts we had sold the other one and this one had to be moved around. Anyway, let me be brief today - many of you attended the Convocation yesterday, and those remarks are being put on the web as we speak and you're certainly welcome to review those. First, let me thank Provost Hickey for his service and his humor yesterday, as always; Dan Sheffer, your chairman, for his remarks and welcoming our new colleagues; and indeed Mike Dalton, the President of Associated Student Government, for his remarks, which were very well received.

As I noted yesterday, it is important that we recognize that our University is very clearly on a rising trajectory. We have had a great deal to make up for during a period of
time in the 90's when our competitors quite clearly got ahead of us, but we have come back very strong and all of the indicators are very positive. That of course does not decline or in any way neglect or deny the very real exigencies that all of us are facing, not just The University of Akron, but in Ohio and throughout the country. So our immediate year will continue to bring some very critical budgetary pictures.

Those pictures are of some pressure, and all of our institutions are similarly affected. What's more, as I visited with your Executive Committee and as I reported yesterday in ways that made absolutely no sense to me or most of my colleagues, the office of the Board of Regents, to safeguard a formula that has never been appropriately funded and for which I will continue to be very critical, first proposed that it would be needed to cut the budget of The University of Akron by an additional 1.2 percent which

would have been in excess of $1 million beyond that which we were facing. Fortunately, I can tell you that that will not happen. We have brokered a compromise that is much more favorable to the University, but still a modest loss of .63 percent which amounts to $543,000.
I am hopeful that the revisions and continued examination of our enrollment data for last year will ameliorate this amount by still some additional dollars, so there is at least some movement on that. It is important that all of us recognize that the state budget continues to be in some pressure and that although there is discussion about tax increases for some other ways to increase revenues, even from the words coming out of Senator Finan, it is still too early to tell and, hence, whatever happens in November and whether we continue with the current administration and Senate and House leadership or change, a lot of things could happen. So we will have to await that period of time and see what that has to tell us. Most importantly, what this teaches us and tells us is that we, as a University, must focus on those things that we can control. Within certain margins we know what the state is going to do, we know more or less what the Board of Regents is going to do, although they pull some things out of the hat and some things don't make any sense.

In that regard, let me do one very modest parenthetical insertion here - I've spoken to you before about the way in which we can change the priorities in the state of Ohio and in which we can address some of the ways in which we are caused to come forward and face such silly shenanigans as that of the Board of Regents. It is imperative, ladies and gentlemen, that each of you to the extent that you are comfortable, write to your legislator on your personal stationery and ask that they consider on the basis of your being a constituent their increasing the priority for higher education. Senator Finan is quite clear that he does not hear from you; he does not hear from your neighbors; in fact, he doesn't hear from anybody except university presidents about making higher education a priority. So please, I think you hold higher education as a priority or perhaps you wouldn't be here, and consider writing sooner rather than later. I've not yet received a single copy of a single letter from any of you going to a legislator. I hope it doesn't mean you have not written, but since I ask that you try to share some of this with me, I can only surmise and again repeat, you are a constituency of these representatives and senators; you are a citizen of the state of Ohio. You can make your voice heard. There's only so much that I can do, and needless to say when I go down there they think it's self-serving for The University of Akron, and yes it is, but it's also important to the state of Ohio. While that mood is changing, we had Governor Taft on our campus yesterday for the second time this year focusing on the promise of this University and what it can do. But again, there is only so much that he can do.

So what are those things we can do something about? Again, 93 percent of our budget is derived from enrollment-related criteria, primarily the tuition and fees paid by our students now to a larger percentage than the state's share of instruction. Freshman enrollment has increased for the fourth consecutive semester and again exceeded the numbers that we reached last year. So we continue to attract new freshmen very competitively and we need to continue to focus on that. We can and will continue to grow grants and contracts and private giving.

As I said yesterday, grants and contracts last year increased by 19 percent, and private fund giving again was at record level in a very difficult year -$25 million. Thank you, John Laguardia and colleagues. Our previous highest year was $27 million and before that the University had never exceeded $15.5 million. So for the last two years we've been in the $20 million range, 25 and 27 respectively this year and past. However, this fall semester, although we are ahead of last year and while we projected in a conservative fashion a 1-2 percent increase in our budget model, we clearly appear not to be likely to reach the 4 percent that would be needed to create a completely balanced budget.

Next, obviously since we are doing very well in freshman enrollment and in new students and transfers, we need to be working very hard on retention issues. Once we have students here enabling them to work through their full curriculum, whether it's an associate, a baccalaureate, a masters or a Ph.D. degree, is something that favors us as well as the students and we need to pay very careful attention to

the issues of retention. I invite the Senate's attention and recommendations in these matters. Of course we have taken steps, and I so informed the Senate Executive Committee, to minimize impact of these budgetary pressures and to ensure the security of our current faculty, staff, and contract professionals.

Throughout the budgeting process for this fiscal year, as you know, we held back a certain portion of every unit's administrative and academic unit - nobody was exempted - in escrow against these possible contingencies of the fall enrollment. In addition, faculty, staff and administrators all are working together to revise planning and budgeting calendars for better informed decision making processes to respond to shifts in fiscal and political landscape pressures. All of those actions will help us to sustain our capacity for providing the high quality teaching and diverse student services that are among our strongest tools for attracting and retaining students. Again, we need your active involvement, your active ideas, as to how we best address those things that are under our control. But I repeat also, please take a moment and write in your own handwriting on your own stationery from home, address your representative or senator and tell them the state of Ohio needs to redress 30 years of progressive neglect of higher education. I invite you to do so, please.

Finally, I join with your colleagues and the Executive Committee, in particular Chairman Sheffer, who has articulated that for you, and looking forward to a very productive year and to continue the open dialogue that has enabled us to do as much as we have done already and to continue the promise of this University as positive as that is. So I will end as I said yesterday - this is a time not to fall back, not to lose our resolve. It is a time to be optimistic, because there's far more going for us than against us. We are gaining on the competition everyday, and believe me, they are worried and our positive steps we are seeing give us the ability to redress some of the issues. I thank you and welcome any questions you may have."

Chair Sheffer then asked whether there were any questions for the President.

Senator Yoder stated that she knew we were all very committed to having an Academic Plan formulated over the next year, and the Balanced Scorecard had been an effort in that direction. She also knew the President was committed to having the Senate play a role in formulating the Balanced Scorecard. Toward that end, as an academic, one of the things she liked to do was read. Were there two things that the President could provide to Senators- one, with her understanding that the Balanced Scorecard had its own literature, was there a chapter that might explain the BCI that could be provided to all Senators? The second thing - was there a draft of what the Balanced Scorecard looked like at this time which Senators could read with the idea that we could be prepared to have a good question and answer session on that particular issue?

President Proenza replied by asking Nancy Stokes to provide Senator Yoder with some of the references.

The President then stated, “The Balanced Scorecard Leadership and Core Teams were in the midst of taking the Balanced Scorecard discussion to every unit and college and area. We've been working in the summer, particularly with the administrative units since you were not here. We want now to have an opportunity for very broad campus discussion, particularly because as the end result what is needed at this point is for you to take the generalities that your colleagues have devised, and advise them whether there are some more important and others less important that were perceived by the very large group that was consulted by the working core team. But more importantly, to begin to take that and apply it within your department, within your unit, within your discipline, within yourself if you wish. Because ultimately I hope that at the end of this process you will have your own personal Balanced Scorecard that says how you as a member of a particular subprogram, discipline or department are relating to the overall goals of the University. In other words, will you personally define a way to relate to it at a very individual level. So yes, we'll be happy to do that, and please if you're not seeing an announcement in your area, call Nancy and be sure we get it scheduled. We're not going to do anything without people

having plenty of time to look at this. It's exciting to see what's emerging, but there's a lot more work yet to be done. Thank you for your question."

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

"I want to update you or alert you to something, which is the first time I've talked about this to you. Two ongoing discussions that really started this week, on Tuesday, a task force that has been working over the summer on a freshman year experience program at the University. We met with the deans on Tuesday morning, and a group of department chairs will be most affected, and then individuals who are associated with Jeff Wallace and his colleagues in Multicultural Affairs and the University College people. These discussions will be ongoing and will end up coming to the Senate after they go through the APCC. The first discussion is about the possibility of a very extensive freshman year experience and a whole host of activities focused on undergraduate student retention. So you'll hear more about that in the future.

The second discussion is the proposal to move from an honors program status to an honors college status. This was also presented to the deans on Tuesday, who enthusiastically embraced the idea. Dale Mugler and Karyn Katz are scheduled to make a presentation to the APCC in the near future. So that too can come to the floor of the Senate for discussion.

Back in the spring the issue of differential tuition came up and how that tuition should be allocated. Over the summer I utilized a list-serve available to provosts at large institutions similar to ours and asked the question about differential tuition and have received 33 responses from provosts around the country. I have compiled the information and will be presenting that to the Planning & Budgeting Committee when we meet for the first time. Then that committee will bring its recommendation as to the allocation of differential tuition back to the Senate floor sometime early in the fall.

For those of you who may not be aware, we did make the first allocation of Return on Investment money this summer. We allocated $554,000 of ongoing base budget money to several colleges, with Arts & Sciences and the College of Education being the two receiving the largest amounts of money. If I remember right, Arts & Sciences received about $220,000, and Education about $146,000. The other colleges to receive money were Fine & Applied Arts, C & T, and University College. We were only able to allocate an amount equivalent to 5 percent of the tuition dollars over and above an ROI of 1.7. Our goal had been to do 10 percent and phase the ROI in over five years, but because of severe budget constraints we didn't see any way to move more than 5 percent this year. I can tell you that the money that was used came out of one of the auxiliaries of the University and that no money was taken from any academic college for this first allocation ROI money. So all of those colleges who were not eligible to receive more money were held harmless and did not lose any money, but rather, money from one of the auxiliaries was permanently moved to this function.

Finally, I think you're all aware of the salary allocation dealing with equity and compression. Thanks to Chand Midha and the task force members, that first allocation has been made. I'm told it will appear in the September paychecks. The task force will now be looking at the allocation of the remaining money in the pool. We don't know the exact amount yet because we're still waiting for benchmark comparison numbers for the College of Polymer Science & Polymer Engineering, but as soon as we have those and we make those allocations, I anticipate there will be somewhere in the neighborhood of $150,000 yet to be allocated. The committee will do another assessment early in the fall semester, and we will allocate whatever money remains before the end of the fall semester.

The task force has also been charged with planning the multiple year allocation process including building some models to show what kind of allocation we will need to do each year assuming different average increases at other institutions. I can tell you that the first allocation we did moved the average salary of professors to the 50th percentile in the state moving us just ahead of Ohio University. It

moved assoc. professors to about the 30-35 percentile, but in saying that, I need to tell you that the total range of difference for assoc. professors is quite narrow. Between the 35th percentile where we are now to the 99th percentile represents a spread of only about $4-5,000. So further increases in assoc. professor salaries will dramatically move that up into the pool, and it's conceivable if we can focus a good bit of the money remaining on assoc. professors, that we can have full and assoc. professors at their immediate position in the state of Ohio as a result of this first allocation. I should tell you that we did an analysis of asst. professors, and asst. professors at The University of Akron are already at the 75th percentile in terms of salary comparisons at other institutions within the state of Ohio. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have on any of these issues or others."

Chair Sheffer asked whether the body had any questions for the Provost. Senator Calvo then asked whether there had been a decrease in enrollment in Summer 3 as compared to Summer 2 of the previous year? Provost Hickey replied that he did not know the answer to that. He could tell Senator Calvo that the credit hr. production for this past summer was substantially higher than the credit hr. production for last summer as a whole. But he did not know about the production within the different subunits of the summer semester.

Senator Calvo then stated that there had been problems in that some students would not continue on in sequence in courses, because the end of Summer 3 was bumping up against the start of the school year at other schools which they attended.

Provost Hickey then stated that the division of the summer semester into three sessions was designed to align with our starting date and not necessarily the starting date of other schools. He did not know what kind of impact that had had on enrollment of Summer 3. Perhaps we could gather that information and try to find out whether that was the case. He believed the increase was about 14 percent higher than last year. It was a substantial increase in credit hr. production, and it was in fact one of the things that was helping to buffer the impact of credit hr. production in the Fall semester.

Senator Walter then asked the Provost to comment more specifically on these auxiliary funds tapped into to supply the ROI increases.

The Provost replied that he would be happy to and wanted to thank the willingness of VP Roney to cooperate on this. These were monies that were set aside for the residence halls in the past. It started at a time when the residence halls were down for renovations and there was a need to subsidize some of that. Now that the residence halls were all up and running, and full and we could use several more, those dollars were being escrowed for further renovations of residence halls. But it was agreed to by all involved including Dr. Roney that the implementation of the ROI and the movement of the funds to the academic units was a higher priority, again, escrowing more money toward the renovations of halls. We must take care of residence halls, and we could have filled another residence hall had we had it this year. But we were going to work to deal with the residence halls issue in another way.

Senator Hoo Fatt then stated that she heard a rumor that Polymer and Law were going to be exempt from ROI - was this true or just a rumor? Provost Hickey replied that it was just a rumor and that everyone would be subject to the ROI of 1.7.

Senator Yoder then asked the Provost to speak about the number of the faculty. Senate representation was based on a ratio of faculty to senators, but she believed that the Senate had shrunk. For example, Arts & Sciences went from 18 Senators to 15 Senators this year. Could the Provost please fill us in on what was going on with the size of the faculty?

Provost Hickey replied that he was not sure he knew what the overall size of the faculty was - somewhere in the 700-750 range were the last numbers he had seen. He was not sure he could tell the exact number nor how much it had fluctuated over the last year or two. He was not aware that there

was shrinkage in the Faculty Senate as a result of the number of faculty.

Senator Yoder stated that the shrinkage seemed pretty significant. Would it be possible for the Provost to provide these figures?

Provost Hickey replied that the fact book should provide those numbers. The fact book was always one year behind, so we would have the numbers for last year. It should be fairly easy to collect the numbers for this year, at least in terms of full-time tenure-track faculty members.

Senator Braun then had a question related to Track I and Track II funds. In the College of Engineering Track I funds were allocated only to one department. Objections had been expressed; he had expressed some of them personally. Was the Midha commission doing anything to look at the objections that his colleagues and himself had expressed with regard to the way Track I1 funds were allocated; more precisely, not having looked at the years of service and the rank.

Provost Hickey replied that there was no plan to change the allocation process for this second round that would occur this year. There we planned to use a process identical to that used for the first round. Once that was done, the task force was going to hear input from a variety of places. The deans would be one form of input coming to the task force. He thought the chairs would be another where we would receive input to the task force. But a lot of thought went into the procedures used by the task force. He understood that some segments of the College of Engineering might not be fans of the process. But it was based on clear benchmark numbers and comparisons of average salaries at this institution and other comparable institutions around the country, and that defined the way in which the allocations were made. To the extent that the task force heard good feedback from people that it could incorporate into changes in the future or recommendations for changes in the way it was allocated in the future, he was sure they would be happy to accept input. Please understand the Track II allocation that occurred this year was a one-time only allocation. It did not mean the money coming through Track II was one-time money; it was ongoing money that went to the base of salaries as well. But there would be no further Track II allocations. All further allocations would be made on terms of Track I, where merit was a significant component of the Track I allocation process. Concerns have been shared with the task force which has taken them into consideration. He also has asked all deans to provide input, to consult with chairs to provide input for the process as well.

Senator Braun then asked whether these concerns were going to be considered for the next round.

Provost Hickey replied that it depended upon how the next round was defined. He was defining the allocation of this last reserve as a part of the first round, and changes would not be considered for the first round. The second round would occur next spring and summer and input would be accepted and processed for that round of allocations.

Senator Harp then stated that he wanted to express appreciation to the Provost, the President, and all members of the task force for a job that could not have been a simple one. And while it might not be perfect, it was an important first step.

Provost Hickey replied that he appreciated Senator Harp's remarks. He also would echo the President's comments about efforts of the task force. They had done an enormous task and we owed them a huge debt of gratitude. He had informed the task force that no good deed went unpunished and now he was expecting them to continue to work on the long-term plan, to provide the models necessary so that we could really compare ourselves to where we were trying to get and how quickly we were getting there.

Senator Gerlach then stated he had a comment and then a question. Nine years ago when the Faculty Senate began its operations and yours truly was the chairman, we even then began on this problem of

equity and salary compression. So he wanted to say now after all these years, congratulations for finally getting to grips with it. He was very pleased to hear it, as an "old codger." The other thing was, some were bemused to an extent and would like to know whether the Provost and the President too might have anything more to tell us about this miracle of discovery. Out of the hands of the athletics department there was a million dollars for the benefit of the faculty of the University. Something very wonderful, and did Provost Hickey have anything to say about that?

Provost Hickey replied that he did. It was an issue of priorities. We were in a situation now in which everyone in the University was going to have to prioritize what we did because there was not enough money to do everything everybody wanted to do. He knew that the salaries of the faculty, staff, contract professionals were of paramount importance to everyone in the administration in this University, particularly the President. So it was simply an issue of priorities, and the highest priority was placed on faculty salaries.

NCAA FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE - Chair Sheffer then made an announcement regarding the NCAA representative. David Jamison had been our representative for many years, but Mr. Jamison had retired. The new NCAA faculty representative was Dean Carro, who has submitted a preliminary report for the Chronicle **(Appendix A)**, and who would be giving a more comprehensive report some time this semester**.**

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns stated he had a few brief remarks. There had been a special meeting of the Campus Facilities Planning Committee on August 15 regarding the parking issue. He was providing to Senators a copy of the general parking plan that Jim Stafford had provided to our committee **(Appendix B)**. The first regular meeting of the committee was scheduled for the third Thursday of this month.

Senator Gerlach then asked of Chair Sheffer whether it would be in order at this time to make a request of this committee or whether it should be diverted to another time under the agenda. Chair Sheffer replied that the motion should be made under new business.

Chair Sheffer made a special note to Senators who were or would be serving as chairs of any of the Senate committees. Even if the committee had not yet met, chairs who wished to report at any of the Senate meetings were expected to provide a written copy of their report to Marilyn Quillin one week in advance of that meeting. If unable to make that deadline, please contact Mrs. Quillin as soon as possible before the meeting.

VI. ELECTIONS - Chair Sheffer stated that there were a number of elections the Senate must hold today. The first was for two Senate Officers, Vice Chair and Secretary. He called for nominations.

Senator Sterns nominated Dr. Elizabeth Erickson for Vice Chair. She accepted the nomination. There were no other nominations. Chair Sheffer then stated that if no objections came from the body, the Senate could have unanimous consent of the body and bypass a paper ballot.

Senator Gerlach stated that if there were no further nominations, he would like to move that they be closed and that a unanimous ballot be case for Dr. Erickson. Senator Norfolk seconded this motion. Senator Erickson was then elected as Vice Chair.

Chair Sheffer then called for nominations for the position of Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Senator Erickson nominated Senator Kennedy, who accepted the nomination. Senator Dalton then made a motion for unanimous consent. This was seconded by Senator Steiner. Senator Kennedy was then elected as Secretary of the Senate.

Chair Sheffer then stated that there were two at-large positions on the Executive Committee which were vacant this year. We had lost Senators Qammar and Franks, who had left the Senate. Those seats were open for election. He called for nominations.

Senator Yoder nominated Senator Tim Matney. He was not present but had indicated to Senator Yoder prior to the meeting that he would accept the nomination.

Secretary Kennedy nominated Senator Brant Lee, who accepted the nomination.

Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh nominated Senator Virginia Gunn, who accepted the nomination.

Senator Dechambeau nominated Senator Richard Steiner, who accepted the nomination.

No further nominations forthcoming, Senator Dalton made a motion to close the nominations; Senator Steiner seconded this motion. The body voted its approval to close the nominations. Ballots were distributed to Senators Jordan and Witt were asked to serve as tellers.

Chair Sheffer indicated that the next item of business was for each of the constituencies to caucus and select a representative to serve on the Planning & Budgeting Committee.

The Senate began this process.

Chair Sheffer then announced the ballots cast for each candidate for the at-large positions. These results were: Matney-21, Lee-38, Gunn-25, Steiner-18. As such, Senator Lee had a clear majority and therefore won one spot. A run-off between Senator Matney and Senator Gunn was needed. (Chair Sheffer made a motion to eliminate Senator Steiner from the run-off to simplify the process; Senator Dalton seconded this motion. The body approved then approved the motion with one dissenting vote.)

As run-off ballots were being cast, Chair Sheffer pointed out that the Senate had changed the bylaws at the June '02 meeting regarding the Planning & Budgeting Committee. The Senatorial co-chair now was to be elected for a 2-year term by the full Senate at the September meeting from candidates who were either Senators or Senate-eligible designees. Eligible candidates might be Senators or non-Senators. The criteria for eligibility was defined by the bylaws. This allowed the Senate to seek out potential co-chairs with necessary budgetary knowledge and allowed for the term of the co-chair to extend beyond his or her senatorial term. The full Senate needed to nominate and elect a co-chair of the PBC. It could be one of these individuals who had already been selected to the PBC, or it could be another individual.

Senator Norfolk nominated Dr. Mike Cheung. Dr. Cheung stated that he respectfully declined the nomination. Senator Calvo then nominated Senator Ed Conrad. However, as Senator Conrad was not present and his acceptance of the nomination was not known, his name was withdrawn from nomination. Senator Yoder then nominated Senator Fenwick, who accepted the nomination. Finally, Senator Dechambeau was nominated. She respectfully declined the nomination.

Senator Sterns then nominated Senator Norfolk, who also respectfully declined the nomination.

Senator Erickson then moved that the nominations be closed and that a unanimous ballot be cast for Senator Fenwick; Senator John then seconded this motion. The body then elected Senator Fenwick to serve as Co-Chair of the PBC.

Chair Sheffer stated that the Senate needed to elect our representative from the University to the Ohio Faculty Council. Last year Senator Spiker had served in that position, filling a term held previously by

Senator Bob Huff. That 2-year term had ended and we needed to elect another individual as the representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. He opened the nominations.

Senator Clark then nominated Senator Spiker, who accepted the nomination.

Senator Norfolk moved that the nominations be closed and that a unanimous ballot be cast. This motion was seconded. The body then elected Senator Spiker as representative to the Ohio Faculty Council.

Chair Sheffer then announced the results of the run-off election for at-large seats on the Executive Committee (Gunn-29; Matney-19). The two at-large members of the Executive Committee were Senator Lee and Senator Gunn. He congratulated both.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - Chair Sheffer indicated that Senators had received a set of documents attached to the agenda for this meeting. The items contained in these documents had been postponed at the May '02 meeting until the Oct. '02 meeting. He wanted to be sure that each Senator had a copy of the postponed items to review for the Oct. meeting.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Gerlach stated he had two motions. The first dealt with the Campus Facilities Planning Committee. His motion was simply this:

"That the Senate request the CFPC to investigate the desirability of maintaining historic names of campus buildings in view of the Senate's request that the Board of Trustees maintain these names."

This motion was seconded by Senator Sugarman.

Senator Gerlach then opened discussion of the motion. He stated that some had heard odd sorts of rumors (he hoped they were just scuttlebutt), that the name Gardner might disappear from the Student Center, to be re-called The Student Union. He had mentioned this in a previous meeting and wondered what was going to happen to Simmons Hall. Simmons was a president here who saw this University through the dark days of the Depression. His point was, once these names were attached to our buildings, they ought not slightly be wiped out when either the buildings had been vastly altered or destroyed. We had certain precedent for this because when the old Olin Hall was knocked down that used to stand between Simmons and Ayer, the name was attached to our early history, as Buchtel College was given to a new building. He should like to see our committee come up with a little consideration of this to see whether it would not indeed be appropriate to request our Board of Trustees to continue this precedent. Years ago after he had come to the University he discovered that the name Bierce had been removed from the library. Bierce was the man who had given the first library the books to the library. The name was taken off the building in fact, and it was on a plaque, as certain administrative officers thought it might be a good idea to get someone to offer their name for the building by putting the money down. He had thought this was utterly scandalous. What would have happened if John Harvard's name would have been removed from Harvard College just because he had made a minor bequest back in the 17th Century? These were a part of our heritage and we should not remove the ancient landmarks. He thought the committee should look into the possibility of transferring the name Simmons Hall to the building that was now the new College of Arts & Sciences building. So with that in mind he had made the motion and hoped to pass it and get Senator Sterns to work through the CFPC.

President Proenza then spoke, stating that he wanted to assure all that there was no effort to remove any ancient monuments, including Senator Gerlach. On a more serious note, he wanted to inform the Senate first of all that the Board of Trustees was quite sensitive to the preservation of the heritage and history of the University. That said, there were some things that probably did need to change, and so he would certainly be delighted to have additional suggestions. But first, be aware that the Board of

Trustees very much was sensitive to the matters of continuity and heritage, although it may not choose to preserve it in the way some might wish. For example, for at least the time being there would be the preservation of Simmons not in a particular building but in a plaque that would commemorate not only the existence of a previous building, but his tenure as president and the fact that the building existed, and so forth. That was passed by the Board of Trustees at the last meeting. There had been no specific proposals vis-a-vis naming of the new student center, so at this point he did not wish to preclude it being called the Gardner Student Center or it being changed. But he could assure all that the name Gardner would be preserved in some place at the University appropriately.

Chair Sheffer then called for additional discussion. With two votes against and no abstentions, the body then voted to approve the motion.

Senator Gerlach had a second item of new business. His motion was to amend the Senate Bylaws. The section to be amended was section E(2)(a). This was a section dealing with a University committee as opposed to a Senate standing committee, the University Well-Being Committee. Senator Gerlach moved that a simple addition be made in that section, that the Executive Committee appoint one of the Senators representing The University Retirees Association to the Well-Being Committee.

Senator Sugarman seconded this motion. Senator Gerlach and his colleague, Senator Sugarman, had thought that this was one of the committees where the retirees had a particular interest with full-time acting faculty. We were all under the umbrella of the State Retirement System and we were all interested in health insurance. Your Senate committee last year graciously had Senator Sugarman in for some deliberations, so he and Senator Sugarman thought it was particularly suitable for this now to be fixed in stone so that some retiree might have a regular seat on that committee.

Senator Norfolk then moved to refer it first to the Reference Committee since it was a bylaw change. Parliamentarian Cheung then stated that the only requirement in Robert's Rules for amending bylaws was that they be submitted in writing at the meeting prior to the meeting at which they would be discussed.

Senator Erickson then asked whether referral to the Reference Committee was appropriate – referral to this committee was only when the wording was a worry, and she did not think this was the case.

Senator Lee asked what the appropriate procedure would be to get input from the Well-Being Committee. Senator Gerlach then pointed out, as former Parliamentarian, that the Senate could, as of this moment with the motion having been made and seconded and presented to the Senate, refer the motion anywhere. Senate could refer it to the Reference Committee, the Well-Being Committee, or both. By the next meeting the committees might or might not have reports to present on it, in which case Senate could proceed from there.

Senator Erickson then pointed out that it made more sense for the motion to be referred to the Well-Being Committee. Senator Lee agreed and made the motion. Senator Broadway seconded the motion and the body voted its approval.

X. GOOD OF THE ORDER - None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT – Chair Sheffer called for a motion to adjourn. This was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin