

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 4, 2003

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Thursday, December 4, 2003, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Chair Dan Sheffer called the meeting to order at precisely 3:00 p.m.

Forty-eight of the sixty-three Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senator Barrett was absent with notice. Senators Braun, Broadway, Carri, Conrad, Crain, Drew, Hanna, Kahl, Kelly, Krovi, Pinheiro, Robinson, Soucek, and Zachariah were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

*** APPROVED WELL-BEING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION REGARDING EXTENSION OF TUITION BENEFITS TO DOMESTIC PARTNERS.**

*** APPROVED APC MOTIONS REGARDING:**

- 1.) COLLEGES HAVING THE RIGHT TO RESTRICT BUT NOT EXPAND THE NUMBER OF TIMES A COURSE NEED BE COMPLETED;**
- 2.) CHANGES TO THE BYPASS CREDIT POLICY;**
- 3.) EARNED ASSOCIATE DEGREES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON BE TREATED IN THE SAME FASHION AS A TRANSFER DEGREE AND THAT ALL APPLICABLE CREDITS BE TRANSFERRED TO THE BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM.**

*** CHARGED APC WITH INVESTIGATION OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING.**

*** APPROVED MOTION TO OBJECT TO PROPOSALS IN OHIO HOUSE BILL 227 AND SENATE BILL 133.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Kreidler made the motion; Senator Witt seconded it. The body then voted its approval of the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 2003 – With no corrections to the minutes coming from either Secretary Kennedy or the floor, Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the minutes of November 6, 2003. Senator Yousey made the motion; Senator John seconded it. The Senate then voted its approval of the November 6, 2003, minutes.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR – Chair Sheffer addressed the Senate, stating that this was the final Faculty Senate meeting for the Fall 2003 semester. He knew that all here had had a terrifically busy semester. He hoped that all would have some time now to clear decks and for faculty to have a chance to spend more time either writing or pursuing other creative activities of our profession. He then wished everyone a very joyous holiday season.

Chair Sheffer continued. As all well knew, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate had been very concerned about the lack of opportunity for the various constituencies represented by the Faculty Senate to discuss and have any input in the very important areas of planning and budgeting. So in an effort to address these concerns, the Executive Committee was creating three ad hoc committees of the Senate to deal with the areas of planning, budgeting, and facilities planning. These committees would facilitate communication between the administration and the University community on facility planning and budgeting. In particular, the ad hoc committees would act as non-exclusive conduits for questions, suggestions, or other input regarding the budget or regarding University planning or facilities planning and usage, as well as priorities and decisions as set up by the administration. In turn, the ad hoc committees would help disseminate information that would be disclosed by the administration in response to our questions. Obviously, the ad hoc committees would not be able to make, approve, or recommend administrative decisions on these matters, but they would supplement the University's efforts to communicate these important matters that concerned all of us. He had asked several individuals to serve and begin organizing two of the committees, budgeting and planning; Senator Sterns was doing the same with the ad hoc facilities planning committee.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS – First, Chair Sheffer introduced Richard Shanklin, the new Senator from Fine & Applied Arts, whom Senate welcomed with a warm round of applause.

Secondly, he then announced the death of Assistant Professor Emeritus Rev. Eugene Benedict, who passed away on November 14. Professor Benedict had received both his bachelor's and master's degrees from The University of Akron, and his master's in theology in 1949. He was a member of Phi Alpha Theta history honorary, and served in the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps in England and Germany during World War II. He returned to Ohio and served as a pastor at Peninsula Methodist Church until 1968, and then taught in the social science area of the Department of Associate Studies until his retirement from The University of Akron in 1982. The Senate then rose to observe a moment of silence.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy began by first thanking Mrs. Marilyn Quillin for arranging the refreshments served at the meeting. She continued. The Executive Committee had met on November 20, and as Chair Sheffer described, our discussion focused primarily around the ad hoc committees he had announced. She did, however, have four other business items to report. First, Senator Witt had raised a question regarding the October Senate resolutions that were passed in response to the Board of Trustees' rule changes made in August, 2003. As Senators would recall, Faculty Senate charged the Executive Committee to investigate whether a supplementary report to NCA was warranted in light of the University's reliance in its recent self-report study on the inclusion of the Faculty Senate and the University community in governance planning and budgeting issues. Senator Witt had asked whether any action had been taken or any supplementary report written. The Executive Committee had been discussing the matter and was waiting for the NCA report to be received and released. As she understood it from Associate Provost Stokes, that should be in the very near future. In particular, given that the union vote occurred before the NCA visit, the Executive Committee wanted to see how the governance planning and budgeting issue had been addressed in the official report so as to strengthen any position we might present to NCA. Associate Provost Stokes had indicated notice would be made when the report was available.

The second item was the Well-Being's domestic partner recommendations I - IV that were passed by the Faculty Senate at the October meeting. These had been forwarded to President Proenza. The Executive Committee received notification that President Proenza had forwarded those recommendations to the VP General Counsel for further consideration. The next item concerned the Chronicle on the web. As Senators knew, an online version of the Chronicle was published monthly; however, up until now only the text and not the appendices had been included. Several had asked whether there were any way to access this information. Please rest assured that we are pursuing the matter and should have that capacity in the very near future. Finally, the Executive Committee approved the request coming from Associate Provost Stokes on behalf of the Curriculum Review Committee to make Evangeline Varonis an official member of that committee.

Chair Sheffer then called for questions from the floor for Secretary Kennedy. Senator Yoder asked for a little more information about the three ad hoc committees. Who had initiated those, the reporting mechanisms for those, and so on? And how did they relate to what we had lost with the Board of Trustees' changes?

Chair Sheffer replied, addressing her first question. The Senate Executive Committee had decided that we needed those three committees to replace the committees that we had lost when the rule changes took place at the University. Those committees were the Planning & Budgeting and Facilities Planning Committees. We decided to break the planning and budgeting responsibilities into two ad hoc committees. At this particular point we had asked several individuals who were on the previous committees to help us in organizing those particular activities. They were primarily at this point to be a conduit, a place to receive questions and concerns from the various constituencies that were members of the Senate in communicating those concerns. We could put them together into one package for each of those particular areas. Those groups could add members if they wished, as any committee could do, or break into subcommittees if they wished. That was basically their prerogative to develop their committees any way they wished. Along the idea of having open dialogue with the administration, the committees would communicate questions to the administration. Then if answers were forthcoming, the committee would disseminate that information back to the campus as a whole. It was just one more way of communicating information to and from the administration on those three major areas.

Senator Gerlach then raised a concern. He stated that it sounded like these ad hoc committees would act independently of Senate. It seemed to him that, if they were replacing some of the functions of the old committees, these new ad hoc committees should bring their information, requests and suggestions to this body first. But that was not to be the case?

Chair Sheffer stated that all we had done at this point was to form those ad hoc committees. Yes, the old committees had gone through the Senate, made recommendations to the Senate and the Senate sent them on. We could very much do a similar thing.

Senator Gerlach then stated that he trusted we would have on our agenda in the future a place for each one of these groups to make their comments, provided they're not too long-winded.

Senator Lee then offered some clarification on behalf of the Executive Committee. The new ad hoc committees were not intended to be direct replacements for the committees that were abolished. We were not necessarily taking on the legitimacy of the action of abolishing the committees. But it seemed to us to be two things: The part where Senator Gerlach was saying if the committees were going to make any requests or recommendations then they should come to the Senate. Senator Lee thought that was true, except we were pretty clear that it was not going to be the function of these

committees to pass recommendations about the budget the way the old PBC used to do, or necessarily to develop policy suggestions. The ad hoc committees were conceived as policy-recommending bodies which would be tantamount to the negotiation that the abolishment of the old committees was intended to accomplish. So to the extent that it was part of the communication audit's response, the idea was to enhance communication about budget questions that a lot of people on campus might have, whether they were members of the union or not. This would enable us to have a liaison function to communicate back and forth. It was not out of line with this idea to have all that information be reported to the full Senate as well as in other directions.

Senator J.Yoder then stated that what troubled her was that the main part of communication that the communication report says we were missing was an effective means to communicate upwards. This was missing from this plan. Because what those committees used to have was a mechanism for moving information from us, recommendations from us up through the system. So it sounded to her what these ad hocs would primarily be was a filtering down of communication rather than effective means for influencing shared governance and policy on campus.

Senator Erickson then stated she wished to add to Senator Lee's comments as a member of the Executive Committee and in answer to Senator Yoder. Under the circumstance, as the official method of doing that was no longer with us, at the very least the job here was certainly not to filter things down. It was in fact to ask questions, ask important questions, and that was an important part of what we could still do, ask those questions about those areas. We might not get an answer, but we could ask and that itself told something to the community of which we were a part. Our way of asking questions was not a filtering down but to use those phrases that were around these days - a way of bubbling up.

Chair Sheffer then invited President Proenza to address the body.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few things today. First of all, in keeping with the interest that some of you had on the Council I served on in Washington, I just returned last night from a 2-day meeting. A very exciting meeting at which we received copies of the six major reports that we issued last year, and heard preliminary reports on the four major areas that we're working on this year. If you're interested in the reports that were done last year, they're available at the website for the Office of Science and Technology Policy under the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. I'm pleased to be featured very prominently in three of them, and in going forward in the work force area in the nanotechnology area, advanced manufacturing of materials were again very active.

We met yesterday afternoon with the President himself. He was most appreciative of the reports previously, and in particular the two that have had the largest influence being the recommendations on the balance of RD Funding, and we did notice in these last years that new funding has been increased to the agencies, the highest in approximately 20 years. In addition, the report on science and technology impacts on terrorism. That was very strongly received and it had a major impact on how the new Homeland Security Agency structured its science and technology and responsibilities.

The third one that I'm particularly pleased to have been involved with is technology transfer, and that is a subject that interested us in a number of ways. Again, that report is a significant influence with the Department of Commerce being tasked to do a number of things there. You might find it interesting that the President remarked on his trip to Baghdad, and you might expect that it was

emotional for him.

I'm pleased to share with you that we have received the official notification from the North Central Association about our reaccreditation, and very prominently here is noted that the next comprehensive evaluation is expected to be in 2012, which is the full 10-year accreditation.

Finally, let me just share as I did last time, that the report on our communications audit is on the web, and I apologize for the fact that the program dropped the URL, but it's there and you can find it under my website redisseminated in a special Email Digest which I trust that all of you have access to.

I've received many important feedbacks to that and I continue to ask the Senate for its input and to let you know that I'm receiving additional input through the many brown bag lunches we've now conducted. I forget how many we're up to, at least 6 I believe - 8 of them, but who's counting when you're having fun. In addition, the special wine tastings that have involved many of you; I'm sorry I had to miss the second one but trust that I'll be able to attend all of the others. In addition, I've had meetings with CPAC and SEAC and all of these are enhancing the communication.

So again, I welcome your input and welcome your initiative, Mr. Chairman, on additional modes of communication. You might want to ask your colleagues to certainly discuss with the Task Force on Decision Making Structures how we best meet those ongoing needs of the campus. I'd be happy to take any questions you may have, and thank you very much."

Senator Sugarman asked the President who was on the Communications Committee. President Proenza replied that it was a group of people, primarily Mr. Herold, and Vice President Laguardia who were responsible. He asked that Senator Sugarman send whatever questions she had to Paul Herold with a copy to himself so that he could be sure it got to the relevant people.

Chair Sheffer then invited Provost Stroble to address the Senate.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST :

"Thank you, and Marilyn, thank you for making handouts. I provided most of the information I plan to talk about today in the form of a handout (**Appendix A**). Just to economize on time and because there's quite a bit of detail here, I've given it to you in writing and will hit the high spots.

I decided today to focus on a topic that there's been some discussion and question about in recent weeks. I think many of you know that when I came into office I needed to solve a summer 2003 budget deficit, which had been created a number of ways. But what I soon discovered was that there were cuts made in summer 2003, a 5% instructional budgets cut, that was not necessarily reflected in the budget memos that had gone out to colleges so they couldn't have anticipated that. The money was actually never deposited in college accounts, so what we discovered at the end of the summer was spending beyond budget in some units, below budget in other units, and net a deficit that needed to be covered. So I had to do some balancing of budgets to make that happen, and am trying to avoid that for next summer. But clearly, as you can see under the goals of my plan, and I've given you the condensed version, if you ask your deans you can get every memo that's behind this summary bulleted version that laid out the plan. Then yesterday hand-delivered to every college was the commitment of what budget they will have for instructional expenses next summer. That's the earliest we've ever given colleges budget figures so that plans can actually be attached to a real

number.

Anyway, the goals are: To manage costs for summer 2004, because we can anticipate that next summer our budget situation improves, and so I'm really trying to manage the costs so that we don't get into a deficit situation again at the end of next summer. I know we need to reward the productivity of colleges, particularly around credit hr. production. I'm trying to bring greater equity to policies across units, and I don't think we need to have equality here, but I do think we need to have equity around how load is assigned for various non-instructional uses, and also the instructional uses that are attached to independent studies, master's thesis dissertation direction. So that's part of what my plan attempts to accomplish.

I am attempting to get the greatest possible support proportionally in the funds that we have available for instructional expenses direct delivery to students. I am shifting the research expenditures in summer to external sources of funding because it's clear to me we can't continue to support it monetarily in the way that we have. I'm also signaling a commitment to a plan that will extend beyond a single summer, because I know that's been a point of frustration for all of us - that a plan is in place, the Provost changes, and the plan goes away. As a reminder, given that I've got a 5-year commitment here, I plan to do this multiple summers and I have built into the process that at end of summer 2004 I will discuss with the deans what adjustments need to be made to make it a better plan for the following summer.

Then finally, I plan through the process I'm putting in place to have a small pool of funds that makes it possible even next summer to respond to some strategic opportunities that are always present for us where we say, if we could just add an additional class we could serve students better and we could generate more revenue for the college and the institution. The only way to do that is to hold back some money to make it possible to spend it later. So on this handout are additional bullet points about the component pieces of the plan. This is not nearly as complete a description as you would find in the memos that have been given to your deans, so I really urge you to ask your deans to share the full text of those memos and policies with you. But this is the shorthand version so that we can communicate accurately about what it is that I've put in place for next summer."

Senator Witt then stated it was obvious that the devil was in the details. His question had to do with summer load limits. As he understood it, the University's policy was something like 9 credits in summer session. Does the Provost know of any colleges planning to restrict regular faculty load below the University's?

Provost Stroble replied that every college had to figure out how they were to live within their budgets. She had not mandated anything from the Provost's office that changed the load limits or faculty from last summer. They were the same as a maximum of how many hours one could get load credit for in a single summer session, for 2, and for all 3. That had not changed. So it really was up to a college to figure out how they could live within their budgets. The only awareness that she had of thinking that the strategy to live within one's budget was to reduce the limit was really what Senator Witt had shared with her about his college. She was not aware of any conversation anywhere else. But, she had not had those kinds of conversations, so it was not fair for her to say that that was the only college that was doing it. She really did not know.

Senator Witt then asked that, in terms of making consistent policy across the campus and across colleges, would load limits be part of that? Provost Stroble replied that the load limits that we had established were the uniform policy of the maximums.

Senator Fenwick then asked whether the Provost could elaborate a little bit more on the shifting of research funding external sources. Was she talking about the summer research grants?

Provost Stroble replied that she really was not talking about summer research grants. She was saying that load for doing research in summer session must be funded by grants or external sources. It could not be derived from the summer budget that was provided from general funds.

Senator Hebert then asked whether the budget the Provost was planning on giving to the colleges was a starting point, or was that an absolute limit? For example, if the Provost had given a college a budget of a certain amount of dollars and all of a sudden a lot of students showed up, it would seem to him that one of the things that was missing in the way we were doing things was that we were fixed on the expenditure side and were not looking at the revenue side at all. Why did not the ROI take place in the summer? In other words, you could spend what you wanted as long as you met your ROI.

Provost Stroble stated she thought she could answer some of that as there were several parts to Senator Hebert's question. She started by saying that this was the starting point. As all would see if they requested full copy of the memos and as was highlighted here in these bullet points, she had given the funds to colleges based on an analysis of an average of the past few summers of what was spent on organized course sections. She had requested from deans the funding for administrative load and load for independent study, master's doctoral dissertation direction. As she had stated earlier, a strategic pool would be held back to respond to the opportunities that colleges might seek.

Provost Stroble then continued on to the ROI conversation. The ROI was recommended to her to be on hold as a distribution means until we had quality measures in place. That had come from Faculty Senate. She was trying to honor that request by building that into the Balanced Scorecard, but it was not ready yet. So as the full memos were read, you would see that this was an incentive model. Based on credit hr. production that happened next summer, colleges would indeed receive more funding for the future. She was aware of the need for incentives. The ROI formula as it had worked in the past just needed some more work, which Faculty Senate recognized. She was trying to honor that but at the same time could not wait until that was finished to get something in place for next summer.

Senator Hebert had one final question for the Provost. Based on what she had just stated, it sounded as though a number of people went over budget in terms of instruction. He happened to know that the College of Business kept under budget and used a lot of part-time people. Based on what the Provost had just stated, if the budget was based on the average of the instructional expenses, the CBA would have been a lot better off if it had gone way over budget. He already saw some problems in the plan.

Provost Stroble replied that she understood Senator Hebert's comment. That was why she had done an average of two years in order to try to even out some things that had happened last summer in the absence of accurate information.

Senator Hebert then asked whether it would be true then, that if you overspent your budget that you would get more? Provost Stroble replied that some people who overspent their budgets also had a 60% increase in credit hr. production, so they clearly needed more. Senator Hebert was right in that to some extent the Provost had not done the direct comparison of how spending reflected credit hr. production, which an ROI formula would have gotten at. So again, if particular colleges felt that they needed some adjustment in these figures, she had invited deans to get back to her about that. If

the analysis she had done disadvantaged them in a way that they thought she needed to be responsive to, she was very open to hearing about that.

Senator Hebert thanked the Provost, stating he would pass that along to his dean. Provost Stroble replied that it was not her intent to create havoc here. It was to try to bring some rationality into the future. She did not want to punish units that had managed their expenses well if they had indeed helped to generate good credit hr. production. Senator Hebert replied that the Provost's plan was very much appreciated. Provost Stroble replied that she understood exactly what Senator Witt had been saying; the devil was in the details. No matter what plan was forwarded, there would be some unintended consequences. So her whole approach was to try to stay rational about it, look at the data, and do the best job we could with limited resources. Senator Hebert's final comment was then to laud the Provost on having a plan and having it ready early.

Senator Lenavitt then asked how the subvention entered into the planning with regard to money that came back to the colleges, in particular to colleges based upon the generation of credit hrs. in the first half of the summer.

Provost Stroble replied that she had not built that into this formula. Surely, ROI did; that was why it was such a complex formula because it included all of those elements. We had tried to be smarter about planning for subvention in a couple of ways, not necessarily accounted for by this formula. The best example she could give was Dr. Newkome's analysis of how we really needed to be careful about the number of hours that master's and doctoral students signed up for in summer or through the entire year which were not eligible for subvention. There was that correction in this plan but not probably every piece. Just a reminder that was important to remember was that we counted on summer to generate healthy revenues because that helped us pay for the rest of the year. To go back to just ROI happening in the summer was always going to be a bit of a flawed way to approach it. We needed our summer to do better than what ROI indicated we might have to do in summer. We counted on that revenue to help us staff offices that got students registered, staff our own offices to pay for administrative roles in colleges. The next step was to do a future analysis which showed us what we really needed to do this summer, to help us manage our costs during the year. She had not done it - yet.

Senator Londraville then inquired about two accounts over the past couple of years which had been taxed at the end of the fiscal year. Did the Provost anticipate that that would happen again?

Provost Stroble replied that she hoped not. However, VP Ray was probably the person that had the better handle on what might happen to us financially. She then asked VP Ray whether he wished to respond. Chair Sheffer, on behalf of the Senate, invited VP Ray to speak.

VP Ray stated that it was too early to tell right now, as there were a lot of factors that were going to play out in terms of the state budget in the first 4 or 5 months of the year. He could not really answer that question right now. But we were doing our best to manage the budget as it was today with still a little bit of a deficit in it, and we had to deal with that first. Of course, we needed to wait for what the state would not do for us, do to us. That was the best answer he could give right now.

Senator Witt then had one more question. He represented a lot of people who would like to help contribute to pay for the rest of the year through the summer. One of the problems we were finding out was that it made no logical sense, when we had a class that had 35-40 people in it and we could easily calculate the profits that would come from that class, that an individual faculty member would be considered too expensive to teach it when the savings would be \$2,000 by hiring a part-timer to

teach it. He did not understand this and a lot of other people did not either. The answer to that question was that money had already been allocated. It was almost like somebody would answer a different question than we asked. What we would like to know is why was this not a bargain enough? There were regular faculty members getting paid what they got paid in the summer and there was a \$40,000 profit on the course. Was \$2,000 that much of a better deal? Was that how we were operating?

Provost Stroble replied that she did not know whether she would be able to answer to Senator Witt's satisfaction, as his was sort of a rhetorical question. It very much rested with department chairs to make those kinds of decisions. It certainly was not the decision that the Provost's office made to direct people to hire faculty who were the least expense to the unit for the greatest profit. That varied from college to college how people thought about that and how they planned for it. One of the variables no doubt was based on salaries of the faculty involved, and in some colleges those costs were greater per individual than in others. So she really did not have any good answer to that other than to say, in more flush times this probably would be less of an issue.

Chair Sheffer then asked the body to grant Dr. Chand Midha permission to speak.

Dr. Midha stated that, in the context of what Senator Witt had just mentioned, he had been a chair for the last five years. He, nor a couple of other chairs in Arts & Sciences, had never been given any instruction that they were to provide part-timers or who the summer faculty was to be. So at least in his college that had not been the case to have to use part-timers or other cheap faculty during the summer.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson reported that the Well-Being Committee met once this month on November 18 and was given a report from Desnay Lohrum on health insurance signup. What Desnay pointed out was that a significant number of retiree dependents were choosing the PPO and that would save money for the University. The Well-Being Committee and the Senate had suggested that this was a good idea that retirees paid the difference if they're taking anything but the PPO. If they were taking traditional indemnity, the University was not paying that.

She continued. **The second issue that the committee considered was the domestic partner recommendation on tuition fee reduction benefits. That was recommendation 5 that the Faculty Senate had returned to the committee for further information. (Appendix B)** The committee had been asked to determine the cost to the University with this recommendation. We discussed this at length beforehand and these were the points that were made.

First, operating fund allocations were not affected by tuition remission costs. A check with a number of department chairs provided this information. To quote one, "As tuition invoices were paid, the amount of the tuition invoice was posted to whatever account the employee was assigned to, and then the exact amount of money was credited to that account." They balanced out and there was no effect. The fee remissions by the University on its net revenues were likely to be positive or neutral. Unless classes were full, fee remissions added students who would not otherwise enroll, adding to the state subvention with little or no increase in costs. If fee remissions go to students who would otherwise enroll at The University of Akron and paid, then revenue was lost. Provost Hickey argued that fee remissions added to revenue when PBC considered dropping all such remission. We figured under those circumstances the best you could do was to take a neutral revenue position. Obviously, some might come to The University of Akron, some might not.

Chair Sheffer then stated that Recommendation V was now back on the floor for consideration and possible adoption. It needed no second. Senator Goode asked whether we were putting all of Recommendation V for tuition reduction benefits forward? Chair Sheffer replied affirmatively. No further discussion forthcoming, he then called for a vote on the recommendation. The Senate passed the recommendation by a vote of 32 for, 9 against, with no abstentions.

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Associate Provost Stokes began her report by stating that several motions for consideration were forwarded to the Senate members two weeks ago (**Appendix C**).

First was the **motion for the colleges having the right to restrict but not expand the number of times a course need be completed**. That has to do with Rule 20-05.1, repeating courses. The request came from the College of Nursing to restrict the number of times a prerequisite course may be taken. Academic Policies expanded upon that to address the issue across all of the University rather than just an individual college, and therefore recommended that the colleges have the right to restrict but not expand the number of times a course may be repeated. Because it came in the form of a motion there was no need for a second. We did however have correspondence from Senator Stratton who was concerned about who had control and authority over which courses and for whom. Secretary Kennedy suggested that we could entertain a friendly amendment which Associate Provost Stokes was very happy to do in order to clarify this issue. She did, however, think that the language should come from the Senators rather than from herself since she could not ask her committee.

Senator Stratton offered clarification of his concern. The way the motion was currently worded, it was the college which controlled the course that could make the restriction. The college within whom the student had a major could restrict courses not only within their college but outside their college, so those were three different possibilities. He explained further. Control could be over your own college's courses only, the courses that your own majors can take within your college, or over the courses that your majors took outside of your college. This language did not clarify which of those intentions the committee had had, and he thought that needed to be clarified.

Chair Sheffer then asked whether anyone had alternative wording or an amendment to make.

Senator Stratton replied that he simply did not know the intention of the committee. Did it expect the Nursing School, for example, to control only nursing students and Nursing School courses, or was it also to restrict the uses of psychology as only being done once?

Senator M. Huff replied that the purpose for which Nursing had requested this was for admission criteria so that we could use only the second grade, not the third grade that someone would get for prerequisite admission criteria. That was the reason her college had forwarded it to the committee, for admission into the Nursing College. The reason this had been done was because, with our NCLEX scores going down, we looked to see what the problem was. Clearly, students who had taken science courses three times did more poorly on the NCLEX. If we limited them taking their prerequisite courses twice; in other words, with one repeat just strictly for admission requirements, then perhaps we could increase our NCLEX scores and have better students.

Chair Sheffer then summarized by stating that what Senator M. Huff was stating was that for majors within Nursing, they desired control over repeating courses within the college and in courses offered by other colleges. Senator M. Huff replied that this was correct.

Senator Konet had a question. How did the withdrawal policy fit into this? She could see perhaps a student realizing he/she was in danger of not passing a course, dropping it and then retaking. Her guess was that that same type of student was in danger of not passing the NCLEX later also. So, how did withdrawal fit into all of this, as she did not see it in here anywhere.

Senator M. Huff replied that it was an issue but was not included in this recommendation for admission criteria.

Associate Provost Stokes then stated that there had been discussions about change of grade in the past. The discussion about withdrawal had centered around the fact that if a student so wished to do that, they were going to do it and there was nothing we could do to legislate the issue.

Senator Norfolk stated that actually there was, because originally we were trying to have some limit on the number of times including withdrawals that a student could take a course.

Secretary Kennedy then asked whether that was not a separate policy. That – withdrawals – was not what Senate was addressing at this point in time. Associate Provost Stokes replied that that was correct.

Senator Stratton made a motion to send the recommendation back to committee to consider the issues raised today. This motion was seconded.

Senator Kreidler then stated that she wanted to know what advantage sending back to committee was other than putting us behind. She had heard that withdrawal was another issue. The issue right now that Senate was looking at was repeating a course. How many times could we have that prerogative to say to our students, if they failed it once they could only take it one more time. What was sending it back to committee going to do?

Senator Erickson then pointed out that what Senator Stratton seemed to be saying was that the committee had not defined in this motion; it was not clear at all. Referral would elucidate the committee's intention; if the intent is clear, then perhaps a friendly amendment could be made.

Senator W. Yoder then asked whether this could not be handled internally within the college itself to make that decision as to who and what within their own college and how they were going to count admission requirements. Associate Provost Stokes replied that it could not for repeats because the rule was that they were allowing to repeat twice. So the student would be able to say that the University rule was to be able to repeat twice, and the University rule always superseded the college rule.

Senator W. Yoder then asked whether less than that was being requested. Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was, and she then offered a friendly amendment. If the language was changed to read, "The individual colleges have the right to restrict but not expand the number of times a prerequisite course may be repeated for purpose of admission to the major." She thought that was exactly what Nursing was asking for.

Senator Norfolk then pointed out to Chair Sheffer that currently there was a motion to refer back to committee on the floor. Chair Sheffer called for further discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The motion to refer failed.

Senator M. Huff agreed with Associate Provost Stokes' wording. She asked that it be read again.

Associate Provost Stokes did so: **The individual colleges have the right to restrict but not expand the number of times a prerequisite course may be repeated for the purposes of admission to the major.**

This was offered as a friendly amendment; Senator Rich seconded the motion. No further discussion on the friendly amendment forthcoming, the body then voted its approval with one abstention.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. The second motion brought to the Senate concerned changes to the bypass credit policy. Currently, we had a policy that reads: An ACT English score of 28 or an SAT verbal score of 610 is needed to enroll in 3300:112 without permission. The committee was proposing to change that to read: **"An ACT English score of 28 or an SAT verbal score of 610 is needed to enroll in 3300:112 without the prerequisite. If a student has not taken the ACT or SAT, permission to enroll without the prerequisite may be recommended by the chair of the English department and approved by the Dean of Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences."** The rationale was to assist any of our adult and/or home-schooled students who had not taken ACT or SAT tests and would still qualify to be able to bypass 111 and go into 112.

Again, there was a question raised by Senator Stratton about this. He wanted clarification about what criteria would be used by the English department to determine whether or not that person was allowed to go into 112 without taking the prerequisite 111. The committee's thought was that that was the prerogative of the English department to make the determination that this person was prepared. Senator Stratton asked whether the COMPASS test could be used, as that had been discussed with the committee and with the Council of Deans. We had been told by Dean Mugler from University College that the COMPASS test only was used to get into 111, not to bypass 111. So it was therefore not applicable for bypass credit.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. None forthcoming, he then called for a vote. The Senate approved the recommendation unanimously.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. The third motion brought to the Faculty Senate from APC was the question of the finalized associate degree. In current practice a transfer student who had earned an associate degree from another institution had his/her GPA started over again when he/she came to The University of Akron to continue a 4-year baccalaureate degree. However, if the student earned an associate degree at The University of Akron, his/her GPA followed along. It was not started again and, therefore, was not a level playing field. So the committee was **proposing that earned associate degrees at The University of Akron be treated in the same fashion as a transfer degree and that all applicable credits will be transferred to the baccalaureate program. The student will begin baccalaureate studies with a new GPA so as not to be penalized for grades they might have incurred during their associate degree.**

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the motion. Senator Steiner stated that his only comment was that students might not necessarily be penalized if they had a really good GPA at the end. But it did seem a level playing field might be preferred as for a transfer, so he did not see a problem with it.

Senator Sugarman asked about a student in C & T taking an upper-level course. Would that also not be included in their GPA as part of their C & T program, if they took a 300 or 400-level course?

Associate Provost Stokes replied it would not be included in their GPA.

Senator Sugarman then stated that she did not think that was fair for non-C&T students. Another comment that many might find ridiculous but perhaps it should be considered, is that all students who changed their majors should not have their grades used.

Secretary Kennedy then spoke on behalf of the C & T College. This was something the college had been pushing for for quite some time because it really did even out the playing field and made it more fair in terms of transfer students. Right now, C & T students who went on for their 4-year degrees were often disadvantaged in many ways beyond this when they moved up. So this was just one step to equalize things for them. She could say that the college was 100% behind this.

Senator Goode then asked whether students would have the possibility of requesting that their GPA follow them. Associate Provost Stokes replied that this would not be possible; once an Associate Degree was completed, the GPA would start over.

Senator Stratton stated that he supported the amendment and thought it only fair. If you had completed a degree, whether here or at another community college, once you started your new degree, the credits for the new degree were the ones that counted towards the GPA for that degree. He supported this.

Senator Sterns then stated that he thought it was very important that our own students who chose to study in their first three years at The University of Akron have the same treatment as people coming from elsewhere. We had had for many years a situation of a disadvantage. His question was, did that affect in any way transfer agreements or any other assessment of courses?

Chair Sheffer then called for further discussion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote. The Senate approved the recommendation with one abstention.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with the last item. This was not forwarded as a motion but for discussion as a **possible charge concerning the investigation of experiential learning**. Academic Policies had been looking into experiential learning and had asked to have it discussed at the Council of Deans, and it had been. The thoughts were that the process for awarding credit for experiential learning should be approved. The credit might be awarded at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Credits obtained through experiential learning at other accredited institutions were transferrable to The University of Akron, and that was Ohio law so that had to be done. The credit for experiential learning measures outcomes and was not awarded simply for experience. The credit was discipline-specific and the standards were set by the discipline. There were a maximum number of credits to be allowed University-wide, a maximum number allowed within the discipline. The student enrolled in a course generating revenue and creating faculty load in order to get experiential credit. Portfolios would not be reviewed until the student was admitted to a degree program. University-wide standards, guidelines and principles would be designed, and a committee interview was part of the process. Those were the thoughts currently, and APC requested that they be officially charged to investigate this further and bring recommendation to the Senate.

Senator Steiner made the motion to thus charge the committee; Senator Sterns then seconded the motion.

Senator Gerlach stated that he thought the committee ought to be reminded, and all ought to be reminded, that a college or university existed to give its own instruction. He did not enter the history profession to grant credit for someone else's experience elsewhere. Let the student come to his class

and get the experience there; that was what we existed for.

Senator Sterns then asked, who says growth doesn't happen? He had served on committees in 1970's and in the 1980's where we had discussed these issues. We rejected them at that time. He was delighted to hear that we were willing to consider this. It was almost identical to the way we treated our 2-year students. We could send a student up to Baldwin-Wallace, or we could send a student down to Ohio U and they would complete a portfolio. We would transfer all those credits, but we would not do it here. It seemed to him if we were interested in quality that at least if we did it ourselves we knew what was happening and how it was done and what the quality was about. It seemed to him that most schools, especially those who cared about adult students, had been doing this for 30 years. So get on the bandwagon; we were behind big-time.

Senator Fenwick then added that it sounded like a very reasonable proposals with controls. It seemed to be similar to what a lot of departments already had in their internship programs. In his department they had an extensive internship program, and it seemed very consistent with that.

Chair Sheffer called for further comment on the motion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote on the motion charging APC to investigate and develop a policy on experiential learning credit. The body voted its approval of the motion with one vote in opposition.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE – Associate Provost Stokes stated that the CRC had completed its investigation of web-enhanced and web-based courses and the rule in the curricular changes for the curriculum proposal system and had made recommendation. Changes to that rule had been forwarded to Academic Policies and was reviewed just yesterday. The APC had decided to take that information to the colleges so that we had wider-based input to be discussed in January when CRC met again. That work had now been completed by Curriculum Review and a report would be coming to Senate.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE - See (**Appendix D**).

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - See (**Appendix E**).

VI. NEW BUSINESS – Senator Gerlach then stated that he would like to make the following motion: **The Senate objects to the proposals in House Bill 227 and Senate Bill 133. One, that is proposals that would empower the State Treasurer to hire and fire executive directors of the state's retirement systems. And two, that the systems use preapproved Ohio securities agents in the execution of at least 70 percent of its securities transactions, and when using external managers put 50 percent of the assets with preapproved Ohio managers. We think that it restricts the freedom of the retirement boards to choose the best investments for the income that comes to us as retirees. The Senate urges the University administration, faculty, and staff to express these objections to members of the Ohio Legislature.**

He then suggested that Senator Sugarman speak to the motion. Together, they represented The Association of Retirees and brought this to Senators' attention as an illustration of how retirees were interested in the same things as other Senators and how other Senators should be interested in the same things that they were. This was where our interests nicely coincided.

Chair Sheffer called for a second of Senator Gerlach's motion. Senator Sugarman seconded it. Senator Gerlach continued by adding that the motion was important because it was in both houses of the state legislature at this time. We understood the last report was in conference committee

between the two houses. So if Senators agreed with this and we were going to move, we had better move expeditiously.

Senator Sugarman stated that in this case, the interests of the retirees and active employees were alike. House Bill 227 contained two provisions that were detrimental to all the pension funds of the state of Ohio. Provision 1 was a bi-Ohio provision that required the pension funds to use preapproved Ohio security agents for major proportions of their security transactions. This was going to result in higher expenses for the pension funds because in many cases the preapproved Ohio security agents were not large enough, and they were going to have to go through the wholesalers they used anyway, resulting in double fees. This meant less money available for the expense of the Ohio pension fund. The second provision that the retirees were against and she hoped that the active employees would be too, was that the second provision would allow the Treasurer of the State of Ohio to hire and fire executive directors of the pension funds. This would result in the faculty executive directors becoming political appointees, and would no longer be primarily concerned by the beneficiaries of the pension plan but probably would be concerned about their political survival. She urged Senators to pass this and also asked that everyone contact his/her constituencies to contact the state legislators and express opposition to this bill and to do so soon because we did not know how fast this was going to go through the legislature.

Senator Matney asked whether Senator Sugarman could explain how the current policy and the current means for the hiring and firing of executive directors of the state's retirement systems worked.

Senator Sugarman replied that the boards, most of whom were elected members by active or retirees, appointed the executive director. Now granted, with STRS they probably did not do a terrific job of oversight and there were some things in this bill that were okay because there were some oversight issues that were included, such as audits. That was who hired and fired now - the boards. If you were a member of STRS, you, as an active member, voted for some of the board members. Senator Matney then asked whether that meant the board was elected by us? Senator Sugarman replied yes, and a couple of other people. She also thought that the State Attorney General was on it.

Senator Gerlach then added that the Attorney General was to be removed from the retirement boards. That did not bode well either. Why should not his representative be there to give legal advice?

Chair Sheffer then called for additional discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote. The body passed the motion unanimously.

VII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Shanklin stated that he had an informational question to ask. What was the University policy on fee remissions at other state schools? He had a spouse who was currently getting a master's degree at another university besides The University of Akron. The question she had asked him about this considering as the other university she was going to was also an Ohio state university. Was there a chance for fee remission at this other state school? He had been told that the answer was no. His question was, why for one reason, and why not for another? Could any of the Senators shed light on this? Was there a history behind this decision or lack of a decision?

Chair Sheffer asked whether anyone knew. As no one did, the Chair indicated he would help find an answer.

Senator Gerlach then gave one parting shot. For those who lived in Summit County, the senator to contact was Kevin Coughlin, who was in Cuyahoga Falls. His Columbus address was: The Ohio Senate, State House, Columbus, OH, 43215. If Senators knew their House representatives, they could write to him/her at the Ohio House, State House, Columbus.

Senator Norfolk added that a visit to the website would provide everyone with this information.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – Chair Sheffer called for a motion to adjourn. This was done and seconded by many. The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin

To: University Libraries Committee
From: Tim Wilkinson
Date: December 1, 2003
Re: Minutes of the University Libraries Committee Meeting held on 11/26/03

Present: Tim Wilkinson, Pam Garn-Numm, Paul Richert, Rose Maarie Konet, Provost Beth Stroble, Diana Chleblk, Kevin Concannon, Dean Del Williams, Ravi Krovi

The University libraries committee met on Wednesday, November 26, 2003 at 1:00 p.m. in room 269 at the Bierce Library. The agenda for the meeting consisted of a discussion of the September 8, 2003 resolution [that "all the library fees money be spent to purchase monographs" (all \$800,000 be used to buy books)].

I. Discussion of Library Fee

Dean Williams explained the origins of the library fee. He then stated that due to budget cuts and the rising costs of serials, only about \$400,000 of the \$800,000 raised by the fee has been used to purchase books. The other \$400,000 has been used to pay for fixed cost periodicals. The Provost explained that in the current environment the only way to enhance the library's budget is through reallocation from other units on Campus. She also stated that such reallocation had already taken place when the Deans had agreed to take a larger percentage of budget cuts in order to lessen the impact on the library. Dean Williams stated that his goal for the library is to stabilize this years budget with an additional \$200,000-\$250,000. The Provost stated that this was unlikely. Senator Concannon requested that Dean Williams provide the committee with information about (1) how the library's collection and situation compares to peer institutions and (2) how student library fees work nationally. The Provost suggested that such data could be used in future budget reallocation decisions. After further discussion Kevin Concannon moved, and Tim Wilkinson seconded a motion to table the September 8 resolution. After an update from Dean Williams on recent changes in the library's serials the meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

REPORT

FACULTY SENATE

12/4/03

Summer 2004 Budgets and Related Policies

Goals of Plan:

- Manage costs for Summer 2004
- Reward productivity of colleges
- Bring greater equity to policies across units
- Provide greatest proportional support for instructional expenses
- Shift research expenditures to external sources of funding
- Signal commitment to a plan that will extend beyond a single summer
- Build a small pool of funds for responses to strategic opportunities

Allocations for Instructional Expenses:

- Based on average of instructional expenses from Summers 2002 and 2003
- Instructional expenses: Teaching sections of courses, with expenses for independent studies, thesis, and dissertation supervision excluded

Requests for Additional Support:

- Colleges can request support for expenses related to activities other than teaching course sections—including administrative load and load for independent study, thesis, and dissertation advising (using parameters established by Office of the Provost). Maximums are provided for research/independent study load.
- Additional research load or course preparation load should be provided only through grant commitments.
- Load limits: Faculty summer total load limits same as in 2002; Suggested minimum class sizes are recommended.

Incentives for Productivity:

- If a college generates student credit hours (SCH) that exceed the larger of SCH generated during Summers 2002 and 2003, that college will receive 30% of the additional tuition revenue generated through the increased SCH.
- If a college generates fewer student credit hours than the smaller of SCH (2002) and SCH (2003), the summer 2005 budget for the college will be reduced by 30% of the lost revenue attached to the loss of SCH.

Strategic Opportunities:

- By managing costs in these ways, it is the intent that the Office of the Provost will have a limited pool of funds that can be used to support requests that take advantage of strategic enrollment opportunities during summer sessions. Details will follow.

Ohio Faculty Council
November 14, 2003
Ohio Board of Regents

Attendees

Tom Shipka, Youngstown State University
Dave Witt, University of Akron
Roger Govea, Cleveland State University
Vijay Konangi, Cleveland State University
Paul Sracic, Youngstown State University
Grady Chisolm, Ohio State University
Kelly Phillips, Medical College of Ohio
Harvey Wolfe, University of Toledo
Gene Munry, Ohio State University
Hugh Bloemer, Ohio University
Louis Wright, Ohio University
Phillip Westerman, NEOUCOM
John Watson, Kent State
Rick Karp, University of Cincinnati
Robert Marcus, Central State University
C. Rangi, Central State University

I provided the group with a copy of the Governor's Charge, the membership list, the working draft of the Problem Statement, a description of the committee structure and the timeline.

The Faculty Council members provided the following reactions to and comments on the Commission's work. My responses are in italics.

- The Charge, with its focus on "and the economy" is too narrow. Higher education is much broader than economic development. *(The Commission must be true to the Charge issued by the Governor.)*
- There were several concerns voiced that the Commission will undervalue/ignore the value of a liberal arts education and the humanities in favor of math, science, engineering. *(There is a recognition among Commission members of the breadth of higher education curriculum and of the value of liberal learning. However, the focus of the Commission is on higher education and the economy and the short timeline requires a clear focus.)*
- The Council members send a loud message of dissatisfaction about the fact that a faculty member is not on the Commission. The Faculty Council sent nominations of faculty when the Commission was being formed. *(Neither Chairman Pogue nor I were involved in selecting Commission members. The Governor's Office made all of the appointments.)*
- The Commission shouldn't be looking only at higher education, it is a continuation from P-12. We can only work with the students we get from high schools. *(The Commission's Access & Success Committee is looking at the connections between P-12 and higher education.)*
- There are concerns about reductions in quality that result from "outsourcing" university services such as bookstores and food services. It is a "Walmart approach" to higher education. The people who hold those jobs prior to outsourcing are

Ohioans too. When outsourcing happens, it deprives those people of jobs and brings in people making lower wages and no benefits.

- There are many examples of universities collaborating and many examples of universities prioritizing programs and colleges and making the tough decisions about closing programs and closing colleges. (They provided lists of these examples, which are attached.) *(I will share the materials with Chairman Pogue.)*
- The business advisory councils that exist for university programs ensure the voice of employers in determining learning outcomes for students. The University of Cincinnati is especially strong in this area. *(The Commission has heard a different message from employers and the Commission is looking for ideas on how to strengthen relationships and increase communication between employers and higher education. When President Zimpher addresses Commission on 12/3, we will ask her about the UC strategy for working with employers.)*
- "Don't come to us and tell us we are static." Higher education is constantly changing and adapting.
- The Commission is spending too much time looking at the negatives. There are many positive things happening that need to be recognized.
- Colleges and universities are down to the bare bone in terms of cost-cutting.
- People in Columbus need to put their money where their mouth is, because universities are running out of funds.
- The Commission is operating in a vacuum and doesn't understand what is really happening on college campuses. Strongly suggest that the Commission visit campuses and talk with faculty and students. Is it too far down the street to come see what is going on at Ohio State University? The Commission should either visit campuses or have panels of faculty and students address the Commission. Their level of awareness of what happens on campuses would be much better if they would do this. *(I will take the message back.)* Council members are going to invite Commission members in their regions to visit their campuses.
- The Council will meet again 2/13/2004, 3/12/2004, 4/9/2004. Tom Noe is on the agenda for 2/13. The Council will like Mr. Pogue to attend one of their upcoming meetings.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2003

PRESENT: Karp (Cincinnati), Shipka (YSU), Watson (KSU), Westerman (NEOUCOM), Wright (OU), Bloemer (OU), Gene Mumy (OSU), Wolff (Toledo) Phillips (MCO), Chism (OSU), Sracic (YSU), Konangi (Cleveland), Govea (Cleveland), Witt (Akron), Muego (BGSU), Marcus (Central), Rangi (Central)

GUEST: Katherine Canada, Project Director, Ohio Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy

Chair Shipka called the meeting to order at 12:37.

The minutes of the October 10 meeting were distributed and approved.

Future meetings will be held on the following dates:

Feb 13 - guest will be Thomas Noe, Chair of the Board of Regents

Mar 12

Apr 9

Ms. Canada opened by apologizing for the absence of Dick Pogue, who was scheduled to be the OFC guest. She opened by describing the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy, and distributed copies of the governor's charge to that commission. There are three working committees inside the commission: (1) Economic Competitiveness, (2) Access and Success, and (3) Delivering Results.

Essentially, the commission sees education in the context of economic competitiveness, defined as the need for a more educated workforce and more "high-end" job opportunities. Ms. Canada discussed some policy options currently under discussion at the commission.

Some discussion ensued regarding priorities within the higher education system in Ohio. Many council members saw the report as overly focused on technological issues. Ms. Canada believes that the commission is well aware of this criticism and continues to work with the question of support for liberal arts education.

Several council members criticized the lack of faculty participation on the commission. Tom Shipka pointed out that, in fact, several faculty were nominated for inclusion in the commission.

At this point, Tom Shipka allowed representatives from the various Ohio campuses to present examples of both inter-university collaboration and program suspensions or discontinuations. Reporting institutions were Youngstown, Kent, NEOUCOM, Toledo, Cleveland, Akron, Bowling Green, Central State and MCO. It was made fairly clear that among Ohio campuses there is a wealth of collaboration, and that most campuses had not hesitated to discontinue or dissolve programs for which there is inadequate demand, or, in some cases, faculty attrition.

Tom Shipka pointed out that there will be no meetings until February , and expressed concern that OFC committees, especially Legislative Affairs, need to be active between now and then.

The meeting adjourned at 2:29.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodger M. Govea
Recording Secretary

Dec. 02, 2003

Report from the November 14th meeting of the Ohio Faculty Council.

OFC's 2nd meeting of the academic year began with approval of minutes.

The only speaker was Katherine Canada, Project Director, Ohio Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy. She was a stand in for Richard Pogue who was called away at the last minute.

Ms. Canada explained the commissions charge, which is explore ways in which education can stimulate the economic competitiveness within the state. She pointed out the need for a more educated workforce and more "high-end" job opportunities. Ms. Canada discussed some policy options currently under discussion at the commission.

The membership of OFC were united in their views on the commission and any effect its conclusions may have on higher education in the state, mainly that the commission is concentrating too heavily on technology related fields, leaving traditional educational programs without grounds to compete for any new funding. Ms. Canada assured the council that the commission members are aware of this criticism and that they are also supportive of the liberal arts tradition.

Chair Shipka then asked that council members distribute their information to each other and to Ms. Canada. Last meeting, the chair asked that each representative bring extensive lists of collaborations their respective institutions had in place outside their campuses. Ms. Canada appeared impressed by the extent of higher education's reach into communities and businesses.

The point was also made that "among Ohio campuses there is a wealth of collaboration, and that most campuses had not hesitated to discontinue or dissolve programs for which there is inadequate demand, or, in some cases, faculty attrition".

Chair Shipka then adjourned the meeting with a final reminder that meetings after the holidays include *February 13 (guest will be Thomas Noe, Chair of the Board of Regents), March 12 and April 9th.*

Adjournment (approximately 2:59 p.m.)

Attachments - 1. OFC Minutes
2. Canada's summary of the meeting

Submitted
David Witt
UA Representative to the Ohio Faculty Council