

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBURARY 6, 2003

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Thursday, February 6, 2003, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. The meeting was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:02 p.m.

Forty-six of the sixty-three Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Covrig, Garcia, Graham, Harp, Jimenez, Matney, Wyszynski, and W.Yoder were absent with notice. Senators Broadway, Crain, Dalton, Krovi, Maringer, Redle, Stinner, Trotter, and Wallace were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * APPROVED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTION SUPPORTING RETURNING THE LIBRARY AS A UNIT REPORTING TO THE PROVOST.**
- * APPROVED APCC RECOMMENDED POLICY CHANGES REGARDING: INCOMPLETES; TRANSIENT WORK; TRANSFER CREDIT; DEAN'S LIST GPA; ADVANCED STUDY FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY.**
- * APPROVED CRC RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PREREQUISITE STATEMENTS TO APPEAR IN BULLETIN AND ON-LINE.**
- * APPROVED ADDITION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE 3359-10-02(B)(6).**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Wilkinson so moved; Senator Yousey seconded the motion. The Senate then approved the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 2002 - Secretary Kennedy reported that there were two corrections to the minutes of December 5, 2002, that appeared on page 12. Donfred and Hezzleton had been spelled incorrectly; these would be corrected. No other corrections forthcoming, the Senate then voted to approve the minutes.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR - The Chair began his remarks by welcoming all back for the spring semester. He thanked all who had sent comments to the Senate office in the past few days regarding the NCA self-study. He knew time had been very limited for those comments to be sent. The work group putting together the self-study would review those suggestions tomorrow and would send a draft to the outside editor either Friday evening or Saturday. The draft must go to the printer on February 14.

Since last meeting two task forces had formed. One was formed by Senate directive to review and make recommendations to the APCC related to the University calendar. Members on that committee were Senators Jan Yoder, Julie Drew, Debra Johanyak, Prof. Dudley Turner, Jason Smith, the student member, and the University Registrar, Don Fox. This task force had had an initial meeting and was beginning to gather information. A second task force had been formed for studying all the decision-making entities on campus. That particular task force had already met twice. The task force was sponsored by President Proenza, the Provost, and the chair of Faculty Senate. The chair of the task force was Prof. Mike Cheung, who was currently preparing a letter to the campus community detailing the mission and objectives of this task force. At a later time requests for information would be sent forth from that committee to all members of the University community.

PBC had met regularly, including several times over the winter break, and would be advising the Senate later today of its most recent activities.

Chair Sheffer concluded his remarks by stating that he was sad to say that he had a few special announcements which dealt with the deaths of a number of our colleagues. These included: Ruth Victoria Fuquen was a part-time lecturer in Spanish in the University's department of modern languages, who died on Dec. 30. Vernon Elliott died on Dec. 31. Mr. Elliott was in The University of Akron Police Dept. for 18 years and retired in 1989. And we have just learned that Lionel Haizlip, Assoc. Prof. of Engineering & Science Technology passed away yesterday. Details were not available at this time.

Chair Sheffer then asked the body to stand for a moment of silence.

IV. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met several times over the last two months and addressed the following issues. As stated by the chair, we had been very active in dealing with the NCA draft self-study reports. She would not reiterate those comments. The Executive Committee also had been discussing the Balanced Scorecard. In a meeting with the President and Mrs. Herrnstein we discussed the status of that process. The issues we addressed included the level of faculty involvement and the development of the measures of standards within colleges, schools and units, as well as the time table for implementation, especially with regard to the upcoming NCA site visit. We also discussed the budget as a group and as part of our regular meeting with President Proenza. Two members of the Executive Committee were on the PBC. The Executive Committee also had a resolution to present to the body regarding the Library. We were informed that the Library was going to be returned as a unit reporting to the Provost. In support of that the Executive committee drafted a resolution, now presented to Faculty Senate for consideration. The resolution from the Executive Committee was as follows: The Faculty Senate very favorably supports the return of the Library as a unit reporting directly to the Provost of the University.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the resolution. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body approved the resolution.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - Chair Sheffer invited President Proenza to address the body. "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and given your Secretary's comment I'm pleased to advise you that the Trustees enthusiastically accepted my resolution to indeed move the Library under the Provost, so that is already done.

Let me spend a few minutes providing you an update on several issues including the state update. In the spirit of winter humor I guess it would be helpful if I remind you that if only we could collect a toll on all of the rumors that seem to circulate on campus we might well indeed take care of all of our budget woes, but since that perhaps is not to your liking, let me dispel some other rumors. First of all, contrary to what appears to be common knowledge, I am not going to Florida State or the University of Florida or to the university system of Florida, choose A, B, or C of the above, or any other institution other than The University of Akron, where I am committed to continue to work with you on capturing all of the rightful destiny that I believe belongs to this institution. So sorry to disappoint some of you, and I trust that it may please a couple of you.

Second, again contrary to rumor, I have already asked Provost Hickey, Vice President Ray, as well as the PBC, to consider within the budget, planning appropriate salary increases for faculty, staff, and contract professionals. Specifically, I have asked that they consider within any proposed increases that they be consistent with the following two possible options providing that it is possible at the very least, we maintain the relative gains we have made relative to other institutions within the market place. Secondly, obviously again if possible, that we improve that relative position, and there are several scenarios that are being considered by the PBC and the Salary Task Force which continues to work on our plan to move those salaries forward.

Third, some of you may think that the fact that I spent a few years in Alaska does not preclude me from ever closing The University of Akron due to inclement weather. I might note for you please, that during the time I was in Alaska the university remained open, in fact never closed on any of the seven years that I was there despite the fact that during two weeks of that time the temperature descended to minus 60 degrees Fahrenheit and that's not including the wind chill, although if you know anything about interior Alaska there is not much wind there in the winter. That said, you may also wish to remember that my first official act as President of this University was to close the University as a result of inclement weather. That said, let us deal with some other factual issues.

I am pleased to inform you, as I just did, that our Trustees approved the recommendation with regard to the Library and all other Faculty Senate recommendations presented to them at their meeting last Wednesday. Specifically, those included rule modifications regarding candidates for early tenure that were unsuccessful, minimum credits required for additional degrees, limits on repeating courses for a change of grade, and the establishment of a direct link between annual faculty evaluations and the award of merit pay, all of which you recommended and which we forwarded to the Board and which they approved. In addition, I also recommended that the division of Human Resources move from my office to that of Vice President Ray, and that too was approved.

In addition, the Board approved faculty improvement leaves as recommended, the resignation of Dean Stephen Hallam from the College of Business Administration, and phase B of the first year allocations for the compression salary equity dollars. These were the final small amount of dollars, in this case primarily effecting associate professors, as recommended by the Academic Salary Affairs Task Force. If you wish to have details, I believe Dr. Midha would be pleased to share them with you. As a result of what we have done this year again, we are in approximately the mid-level at the professor levels within Ohio, very near the mid-rank for associate professors, and still above mid-rank for assistant professors. So we've done a much better job of bringing in our younger colleagues at market, if you will.

I've asked Professor Midha and the Salary Task Force to continue to look at different scenarios so that we do not lose ground on these rankings even in these difficult times, and indeed to couple their continued analyses to include staff and contract professionals so that we finally will have brought the Mercer process and the work of the Task Force to parallel places in our ongoing plan. I've also asked the Task Force to look at summer compensation here and at other Ohio universities. From time to time we again hear speculation, read `rumors,' that our summer compensation may not be very good. Preliminary data suggested it might be far better than we think, but until we have the actual data I would hope you would regard anything else as just unadulterated speculation, innuendo, and otherwise not worth paying any attention to whatsoever. So let's find out where we are, and Chand, we look forward to that data.

In my report to the Board I also shared excerpts from a letter received from the Executive Office of the President in relationship to the work that the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology has accomplished during the last year, and I'll provide your Secretary with a copy of that letter, but let me share a little bit of it. The letter is signed by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, John Marburger, indicating that PCAST (President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology) had its first report on research and development priorities result in the facilitation of the enactment of the National Science Foundation's authorizing legislation, which the President signed into law in December. In case you've missed the humor, that means there will be more money for you to compete for and not just in the health sciences. A very important recommendation we made had to do with the fact that our nation needs to rebalance its investments to pay more attention to the physical sciences, chemical sciences, and engineering relative to the biomedical sciences not to diminish its continued investment in any, but to rebalance the portfolio in further investments.

In addition, the report of PCAST also led to implementing a recommendation for which the Office of Science and Technology Policy has asked the Science Committee of the Interagency National Science and Technology Council to assess how best to establish new research and development fellowships and scholarship programs to address the very strong need for enhanced U.S. participation by U.S. students in science and technology programs, read, more graduate fellowships and assistantship opportunities, and that will continue to be a major topic for our ongoing deliberations in the next few weeks. While the PCAST report also affected the new Department of Homeland Security, energy efficiency and broadband deployment strategies of the administration, I thought you would be most interested to note that the results of PCAST funding is going up, and some of you will surely benefit from that.

Now our state funding is another story. As we have heard the news from the media and from the Governor, the budget picture is daunting. Nevertheless, let me touch briefly on two related issues and certainly understand that the budget that the Governor has presented is far better than any of us may have had a hope of. But it does depend on the enactment of his proposed measures in a timely manner lest we be called upon yet this year for some significant reductions. At the present time the Governor has proposed an executive budget that includes a number of reduced expenditures as well as a number of revenue enhancements throughout state agencies. Fortunately, the Governor's plan proposes increasing the state share of instruction by 3 percent in fiscal 04, and by 4 percent in fiscal 05. He also proposes increased financial aid and approximately \$525,000 in new research funding through the Third Frontier Network, plus the capital expenditures that are already on the books and which are being competed for. On the downside, any new funding is dependent upon the legislature's acceptance of the proposed revenue enhancement or taxes. The executive budget also includes the reinstatement of a tuition cap and a cut of a modest percentage in line-item appropriations, the details of which are still coming forward.

One other note-worthy element in relation to higher education is the Governor's announcement of a proposed Commission on Higher Education and the economy which he articulated in his inaugural address. Let me read some language from that speech so that you understand that some of what you're hearing isn't all that the Governor appears to have in mind. In that speech specifically the Governor said that he would, 'ask the commission to recommend within a year how to improve the quality of our higher education system, increase efficiencies, eliminate unnecessary duplication, broaden the use of technology and determine how higher education can most effectively support the state economy and add to our quality of life.' Now I underscore all of those things in punctuating with commas so that you understand that what you've been hearing from the press has almost exclusively focused on reducing duplication and increasing efficiency, important elements but not all that the Governor has in mind. Yes, we are hearing that they want to close a law school, we are hearing that they are not sure, Senator Yoder, why we should have a psychology department in every one of our schools and colleges. I tell them that maybe we shouldn't have a high school in every city, but that will take some time to penetrate. Perhaps you can understand some frustration.

Now the members of the commission which are to include 'leaders of government, business, labor, and academia' will be named within the next few weeks, expectedly by the end of February, and I have been told that I may be considered as well as some others, not knowing what the size and composition will be. Regardless, I and other colleagues as well as supporters of higher education are working very aggressively to continue positioning The University of Akron in the very best possible light. As I had reported to you earlier, at the request of Representative Jim Hughes, Chairman of the House Select Committee on Ohio's System of Higher Education, I submitted a white paper that calls for enhanced and restructured funding of higher education among other recommendations. The paper has been published on the committee's web site and is in the hands of legislators. I am providing a copy which had been shared in draft form with your Executive Committee and all of those who asked for it at that time. For now though, I want to consult with all of our faculty and colleagues in order to obtain your input, on a brochure that I hope we can develop fairly quickly to attempt to describe in lay terms the benefits and advantages that our University of Akron provides to our students, to our community, and to our state. This external communication piece, which certainly will help us internally as well, is an important and time-critical effort in this political environment, and to meet that tight frame I will be visiting beginning next week and in following weeks with each of the colleges throughout the campus so that we can discuss some items in a rough draft that we've developed to date so that I can benefit from your input.

Ultimately, the result of that work and all of the other work will continue to communicate to us that our destiny is strictly in our own hands. The state is certainly not going to help us in the next year or two in any significant fashion. No third party is going to come down the pike with 60 or 100 or 300 million dollars, and it's up to us to determine how we do out business well, increase our enrollment, increase our revenues, and in short, do our business well. We need to identify and seize opportunities to raise additional revenues and we need to do so ourselves, together. We cannot delegate that responsibility to anyone else. The legislature has not been listening; it is beginning to wake up, but I cannot expect miracles and cannot promise that to you. That said, I thank you and will be happy to take any questions that you may have."

Senator J. Yoder then addressed President Proenza, stating that, independent of what the state did and at least in the short-term given what we had seen with the PBC's budget report, we were looking at some deficits. So she would like to ask two questions about the distribution of the cuts that were likely to be coming down the road. The first part of the question had to do with what we discussed last year in Senate. This was, when we looked at the college side of the house versus the non-college side of the house, we discussed the idea of having the college side, which counted for 60 percent of the budget, to absorb 40 percent of the cuts, and the reverse was true for the academic side. As the President knew, he had elected not to take that forward to the Board; cuts were made proportionately. As she had heard President Proenza state on Friday when he had talked to the Executive Committee, he, again, would not consider any distribution of cuts at that level that was not proportional. To avoid rumor, would he comment on that?

President Proenza replied that indeed, Senator Yoder was correct. There was no rational basis on which to recommend any major other redistribution of resources at this point. For context of this issue, he referred to three books, a book by a colleague at Cornell entitled, Tuition Rising, by Ronald Ehrenberg, or, alternatively, Senators might wish to read Donald Kennedy's Academic Duty, or the work of Frank H. Rhodes, the former president of Cornell, who wrote, The Creation of the Future. All of those would help in understanding that moving the budget of a major institution in any significant way as that of the original Senate recommendation was next to impossible for a variety of simple but very important reasons. These were things such as contractual obligations, delayed realizations of savings from elimination of departments, programs, and/or the unanticipated consequences of revenue reductions caused by seemingly very simple choices.

The President also noted that in every institution that he had been, any such adjustments had taken considerable time even when very specific, long-debated priorities were agreed upon. For example, in Alaska the Geophysical Institute was the prize possession of the university and everything was to be done to not reduce its budget in times of fiscal constraints. It was impossible to protect it absolutely 100 percent, even from 4 percent or 2 percent cuts. So until we agreed on priorities, which we had not, or found a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow which he did not think we would find, he did not think he could responsibly make any other recommendations. He would repeat to all that he would not compromise the basic infrastructure of this University as it was compromised in the 70's, 80's and early 90's, period.

Senator J. Yoder then began by stating that the second part of the question was, once this decision that 40 percent of the cuts would come from the administrative side and 60 percent from the colleges...

President Proenza interjected that that was a wrong impression; the cut was proportional. If 4 percent of a cut came from 60 percent of the budget, that was 4 percent of that portion, and 4 percent of the rest was 4 percent of the budget. Senator J. Yoder was creating a false impression.

Senator J. Yoder continued. In the colleges - at least at this point - what we had done in both houses was address cuts across the board within units. The colleges at this point at least had an alternative with ROI. Even though ROI was half done, it did offer something other than the possibility of across-the-board cuts. So her question became, what was going on with ROI on the non-academic side of the house?

President Proenza replied with the suggestion to ask PBC; it was in their hands. He did want to add a few points, however, and stated, "First, on the current portion of the ROI - the Provost did make some allocations proportional to that ROI this past fiscal year. In short, we had begun to make some differential allocations of new resources, but we were not prepared to go forward with cuts on that basis for a number of reasons, not the least of which was the PBC had not finished its full analysis and the elaboration of the ROI. Secondly, ladies and gentlemen, please let us stop talking about one side or the other side of the house. We were engaged in the University - the University was The University of Akron. If we started picking apart one versus the other, he thought we were making a serious mistake. Let us clear our language - the University."

Senator John asked whether the President could please comment about a presentation that was made to the Board of Trustees about a stand-alone college possibly here at The University of Akron?

President Proenza then replied with the following:

"Certainly. For the past two years roughly, the University community has been engaged in a dialogue particularly within the University College and the C & T College about some possible alternatives that may better serve the professional needs of our faculty and the educational interests of our students. That dialogue has been ongoing and has suggested that we may wish to consider forming a very well-recognized Summit Community College, a division of The University of Akron much like our Wayne College. The benefits to that would be that those students who now don't think there is a community college in Summit County would know that there is one. Secondly, those students who want to go to a community college but don't know there's one in Summit County and who do not want to go to the University, even C & T, because they have this psychological impression that that's too demanding for them are not coming to The University of Akron, but are going to some other school. So that would help that. It would have some other potential benefits. What we reviewed for the Board is the discussion that it had taken place during this past year and indicated that we would be continuing that dialogue with the hope of coming forward with a proposal or set of proposals perhaps by the end of the summer or early fall."

Senator Sterns then addressed President Proenza, stating that, at the last Board of Trustees meeting and following the next day in the paper, there was a report on new dormitory expansion and some creative approaches in that regard. Senator Sterns did not think we had had an opportunity to hear from the president our philosophy about housing and what we planned for the future.

President Proenza replied with the following:

"Actually, you had in a report on various things we need to do over time, and I don't recall at what meeting, but I've talked about residence halls and other facilities that we'll need to begin planning. The Master Plan called for three parking decks and we're in stage 2 of that and only the first one was part of the initial funding. All of that of course is paid for not by operating funds but by fee reimbursements, etc. That said, if you recall at one of those times we noted that we had approximately a capacity currently at the University of about 2,100 beds. We noted that a large fraction of these were at the time undergoing remodeling and that others would be needing remodeling and would need to come in line. However, we were seeing an increased interest in residence hall facilities and in the last two years we have had more interest than we've been able to accept for students and have had to either rent facilities or simply provide a very strong dialogue with the community in order for the students who want to live near campus to at least be able to do so.

As a result of all of that, we began to explore options for creating residence hall facilities as well as continuing to remodel those we have that would not put any pressure on the basic operation and maintenance budget of the campus or on any other aspect of the budget. In other words, which would be self-financed and not complicate the other things that are on our higher education capital list; in short, which would totally be off-line, so to speak. We have not come to any final determination on how many facilities we need. However, the very large increase in the Honors Program together with the very strong response that the honors students have given to the availability of Gallucci Hall which needs to be completely replaced to a learning community has made us feel that a strong priority ought to be in a residence hall for honors students with a learning community appropriately designated.

In addition, that we would begin to build in a reasonably modest fashion some additional facilities for students so that we could begin to accommodate a larger fraction, and that we would not make any commitments on further ones until we saw that the demand would justify the additional building, since we must recover the cost from residence hall fees and not anticipate that anyone else is going to pay for it. How much in the future? I do not know, but let me tell you what my working parameters are in my head. If you look at other urban-situated institutions that have made a commitment to residence halls; for example, The Ohio State University, Toledo, and a few others, you find that approximately 20 percent of the students are able to find on-campus housing. For us that would probably mean in terms of our full-time equivalent something in the order of 3-4,500 spaces for these students approximately.

Likewise, that we would need in the near vicinity to the campus an additional 5,000 spaces of good quality not owned by the University but accessible to the students within distance to the campus, but of high quality and not of the sort that most of you if you saw some facilities that are often made available to our students, would not want to live there yourself and you might not wish to have your sons and daughters there - approximately 3,500-4,000 on-campus that we manage to control with our housing abilities."

Senator Sterns replied that he respectfully requested that the President let the Facilities Planning Committee know so as to have a chance to explore and add our ideas to the planning process. He thought recently we had been forced into more of a reactive position than being able to be part of the up-front decision making. He mentioned it because many times we did much better, but on this one he thought we needed to use it as an example.

President Proenza replied that that would be no problem. He then asked Dr. Roney to invite our good colleague Dr. Sterns to all of the planning meetings that would ever take place in the future. The President then asked that any time anyone wished to offer input on anything, would he or she please offer it.

Senator Lee then stated that he had a question, just actually in the nature of going forward for PBC. The President probably knew we were working on trying to find ways to bridge the gap on the current deficit. Senator Lee wanted to be sure that the President was not committing himself to something he did not mean. When the President had said across-the-board cuts, Senator Lee presumed the President had not meant that, as PBC went through the budget line by line and we found particular lines to cut, and PBC could not do that.

President Proenza replied that he knew this and apologized for not phrasing this as best he might have. He continued by saying that we were looking at anyone that had an idea that might work – he encouraged the bringing of it forward. For example, in our discussion last week we talked about the possibility that we might reorder the way that we allocated overtime. Currently, we were actually paying for it. One way to save money and hence enact a cut that was not proportional in across-the-board sense was to simply, for whatever period of time we needed, not grant overtime except by compensatory time. There was no added expense that would reduce our budget because we currently had thousands of dollars we were paying in overtime. So it was simply creating a more flexible approach for the allocation of our work force to reduce our expenditures. There were many other such possibilities. He had asked Vice President Ray to construct a preliminary list to share so we could debate as to how many of those might be approachable or not, but beyond our ability to identify such things, then the across-the-board would kick in. If anyone wanted to abolish his or her department we would do that, but only if he or she volunteered.

Senator Witt then asked whether it had to be one's own department.

President Proenza replied that, in this political environment, as there was about six years ago, the legislature was going to be thinking about lobbying this, lobbying that, so please, he asked of Senators, think about what each would want him to say.

Senator Gerlach then spoke, addressing Chair Sheffer, As the Senator recalled, several months ago the Senate requested the President to carry to the Board of Trustees a suggestion that the Gardner name be retained on an appropriate building on this campus. Senate had not heard what he determined to do about that request. Perhaps the President could say something about it now.

President Proenza stated he would do so gladly. He had asked several of you who wanted to provide input to provide him rationale. Some had been provided. George Knepper had provided some wonderful analyses, and Senator Sterns just provided a wonderful piece on Simmons. Vice President Roney had provided a very fine piece on Gardner and his contributions. The President stated that he had asked for a set of option recommendations appropriately backed up with that and whatever other material could come forward so that he could deliberate with the Board and provide them a set of recommendations from which they might take. The President stated that he could assure the body with 100 percent certainty that those two names would live on in the campus. In what fashion, he was not in a position to say.

Senator Gerlach then asked if there was any notion of a kind of timetable for this, or was this to be strung out ad infinitum. Senator Gerlach then asked what he could do personally to help things along beyond what he had already gotten through Senator Sterns' committee, etc.?

President Proenza replied that in the spirit of collegiality, he thought we could get it done in the next six months. He could not promise that, so please add that caveat to the minutes, but it would be done he trusted, before his lifetime was done. To which Senator Gerlach added that the President might think about the Senator's lifetime as well.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE – Senator Erickson stated that she would give a very brief oral report to inform Senators that the committee was working on the health insurance contract, both the subcommittee and the committee as a whole. That was in process so we had not got a detailed, end-result to report, but hopefully would have one for the next Senate meeting. The other issues were ones that we were looking into, in many cases, again. One was the expansion of child care which was in subcommittee spearheaded by chairs under John Zipp. The committee was bringing up the issues again of banking sick leave and domestic partner benefits. Finally, the committee was working with difficulties faced when trying to get any expansion of wellness activities on the campus. Again, this was ongoing; we had not gotten a final report. If any had any input into any of these issues, please either see or email her.

GRADUATE COUNCIL - See (**Appendix A**) for monthly report.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Stokes stated that the committee had several motions that were forwarded to the Senators a couple of weeks ago. She directed the Senators' attention to the proposed changes in the rule that dealt with incompletes (**Appendix B-1**). A suggestion came from Senator Norfolk that the words be changed to say that, "Failure to make up omitted work satisfactorily by the end of the following term" be changed to, "Failure to make up the omitted work satisfactorily by the date that grades are due for the following term." The way it reads currently indicated that the incomplete had to be completed before final exams. By changing it, it allowed completion of incompletes through exam week. This came as a motion from APCC.

Senator J. Yoder then stated she wanted to speak against the motion, because if faculty got work on the day the grades were due, we had no time to grade it. So she would like to leave it the way it was, which was due at the end of the semester. Students had had a full semester to work on it, and she thought by the end of classes they should have their work completed.

Chair Sheffer then called for further discussion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote on the motion. Division of the house indicated 15 votes in favor of the motion and 24 opposed. The motion failed.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with the next motion which dealt with transient work at another university (**Appendix B-2**). Suggested changes were that, "Prior written permission be obtained before transient work can be applied towards the degree, and it needs to be obtained from the student's degree-granting college. This question was brought by the College of Business. They were concerned that too much transient work was being requested and applied towards degrees here at the University.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. Senator Sterns stated that there were certain agreements among state universities, that if people took courses at other universities, there were certain formal agreements between Ohio universities where work done at one was to be recognized by the others. He was not trying to be problematic about this, but he remembered being involved in this discussion a number of years ago. He thought there were certain rules and regs. that applied to all state universities that might go against this motion. Associate Provost Stokes replied that the motion did not state that the university would not accept the credit.

Senator Erickson then stated that she was a little confused about permission being granted before. It needed to be clear to every single person that permission had to be obtained in advance. The fact it absolutely had to be done before and not afterward did not give any flexibility to an adviser. It was not clear what the College of Business had in mind here. It seemed to her there was a degree of flexibility that was needed in this situation that would be eliminated with this motion.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that part of the discussion in committee was to put prior written permission so as not to disadvantage the student who took a class somewhere and expected that it would be transferred, came back and then found out that it was not accepted and they had already paid for it.

Senator Norfolk stated that he felt it did not have much to do with Senator Stern's comment; it really had much to do with the residency requirement issue, because we still must accept the credits once we officially said they were actually transferred. It was a question of whether we were going to let them modify the residency requirement for a degree to bring the credits back.

Senator Steiner then asked, is it not in the current policy that there is no need to be approved if they were transferring credit in? Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that this was correct.

Steiner then continued. So it was just that permission had to come beforehand rather than after the fact. The second thing was, did we know anything about the policies of other area universities in this manner, because it also worked the other way if they were enrolled in programs at other universities that took transient credit here and transferred it. He would not want to jeopardize that if our policy was more stringent than that of our competitors.

No further discussion forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote of the motion. The Chair ruled that the motion carried.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. Moving from transient to transfer credit, Senators also had a chart attached to this about addressing Senator Steiner's question; we did know what the transfer policy was at neighboring institutions (**Appendix B-3**). APCC was recommending that the transfer policy be changed so that only grades of C or better transfer, except for the Ohio transfer module for general education classes.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the motion. Dean K. Mugler indicated she would like to address the body. Chair Sheffer sought permission from the body for her to do so. Granted, Dean K. Mugler began by stating that she did have some responsibility for the course equivalencies and transfer services. Her office did the general education evaluation of the students' records when they arrived. She also knew that our transfer population was increasing. This last year we had over 900 new students in the fall as transfer students. If the students were transferring in on probation with less than a 2.0 GPA, in University College they had to do a contract. She would say that a lot of our students who were coming from other institutions did choose The University of Akron because we were liberal and allowed D work to transfer in. Whether it met college's requirements or not or department's requirements or not would be up to the department. Sometimes students must retake a course here that they got a D in somewhere else. But in allowing students to transfer in with a D, we have found that, when students have done a contract - we had about 75 this term - only 22 of those students were dismissed as related to having to do well within one term. She was presenting this as evidence as to how our students had succeeded when they had not done well somewhere else but were still able to use those courses to meet either general education requirements or other requirements.

The Chair called for further discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The motion carried.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with the dean's list policy (**Appendix B-4**). APCC proposed a change as being made to have the dean's list GPA be consistent with the GPA for honors. Currently the dean's list GPA was 3.25 and the lowest GPA for honors was a 3.4. So consequently, a student could make dean's list their entire career here at the institution and still not graduate with honors. So we were suggesting that we raise the GPA for dean's list to 3.4 to be consistent with the honors and that developmental programs that were not considered in determining dean's list honors.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote. The motion carried.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. The next motion coming from APCC dealt with advanced study for University faculty and University programs (**Appendix B-5**). This was brought forward by Vice President Newkome, who wanted to have a policy in place that addressed what our faculty could do in order to obtain an advanced degree here at our University. We currently had no rule that addressed that at all, so this was first forwarded by VP Newkome. The committee had worked on it to expand it because the original request only dealt with doctoral study. The committee felt that we should also include master study and the juris doctor study. This came as a motion from APCC.

The Chair called for discussion of the motion, and Senator Sterns obliged. He stated he wanted to raise a couple of issues that were worthy of our spending some time on in regard to this policy. That was, we had to understand that each university had its own unique way of bringing departments together in different clusters and in different colleges. When he reviewed this, we had under the College of Education that someone could be in the department of sports science & wellness but want to pursue a degree in counseling. Now counseling was also under the College of Education, an entirely different department, whole different area and faculty but it was in the same college. He thought this piece was fine if we just brought it down to the department level. He thought we had to be real careful about this. He could look around this room and know a number of people here who had done advanced degrees right here on campus that would violate this rule. Also, one of his distinguished colleagues who was an expert in this area, Dr. Michael Sugarman, actually sent a message along these lines. He stated that the tech.ed. program had been a major vehicle for many faculty on campus to get special degrees; often they had been within the same college. The questions also could be raised as to how this applied to spouses and dependents. Senator Sterns stated that his wife had a Ph.D. from the joint sociology program which was in the same college cluster; his son had a Ph.D. in IO psychology. He had recused himself in all aspects of that program as he went through it, so his family totally violated this.

Chair Sheffer then asked Senator Sterns whether he proposed any amendments or whether he was speaking against the whole thing. Senator Sterns replied that he felt it deserved further study.

Associate Provost Stokes then offered a timely suggestion. If (A)(1) were reworded to mirror what (B)(1)(a) stated and it was added that a full-time faculty member may not become a doctoral candidate within his or her own department or school, would this be acceptable? Senator Sterns replied that it would be closer to what he had in mind. He then made this motion to amend; Senator Norfolk seconded this motion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion on the amendment to change the wording in (A)(1): A full-time faculty member may not become a doctoral candidate within his or her own department or school. The same would follow on (B)(1)(a): We would take our (a) and (b) and just make it (1): A full-time faculty member may not become a master's candidate within his or her own college.

No discussion forthcoming, a vote on the amendment was taken. The amendment passed. Senator Jordan then began discussion on the amended motion. He stated that he had at least a proposal for an amendment and then another concern. The document referred to juris doctorate study, and there was no such thing as a juris doctorate. He would move that the term juris doctorate be replaced by the term juris doctor in the places in which it appeared

This was seconded by Senator Lee. No discussion of this amendment forthcoming, a vote was taken. The amendment was passed.

Senator Jordan then continued. The second problem was that in (D) it said that a faculty member may register for no more than 6 hours of formal course work in any semester, etc. If you wanted to come to the Law School you had to take a minimum of 9 hours to be in our part-time program. We did take a look at whether we could arrange some kind of special program, and it did not appear that you could get through the Law School within the time required by taking a 6 hour load. Our concern in part was that it said in the end of (D), in no case shall the opportunity for advanced study be denied, which would have to mean you would be given permission to take the juris doctor despite the general 6 hour credit limit. So he proposed the following language as an amendment, which would be after the reference to 6 credit hours of formal course work in part (D), to insert the parenthetical (9 hours if pursuing a juris doctor degree).

Senator Lee seconded this amendment. Chair Sheffer then called for discussion.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that she understood Senator Jordan's concern to the Law School and appreciated that he had looked into whether or not the Law School could readjust scheduling. However, she would be concerned that if we did that, that meant that department chairs would not be able to say to anyone who wished to pursue a law degree, "No you cannot because your work load is too great," or, "We need more attention and taking 9 hours was too much." This would not allow any flexibility for the department chair to make that kind of a decision. If the person wished to pursue the juris doctor degree, they would have to be allowed to.

Senator Jordan added that at the end of (D) it said, "However in no case shall the opportunity for advanced study be denied." The problem was that it would create a misimpression among faculty because they would not be able to take less than 9 credits at the Law School. So there really was not an opportunity to go to the Law School under some arrangement that you took fewer than 9 or fewer than 6 or just 6.

Senator Braun then spoke in favor of the amendment. This was taken as a part-time student, so it was taken outside the framework of what you were doing here at the University. Secondly, if you selectively denied some people the right to go and improve themselves, then you created a second tier of people versus all the others. Including this exception here because these were the rules of the Law School should be allowed. Now if you wanted to put something there saying department heads of their departments should be notified, he would agree with that. But he strongly disagreed with them having a veto to tell you what to do with your life. He strongly supported this amendment.

President Proenza suggested that this might be handled with a qualifier that in a sense goes to the issue of conflict of commitment and enables that to be a management plan developed for people that would need to take more than 6 hours.

Senator Gerlach then called for a reading of the amendment as proposed by Senator Jordan. Chair Sheffer did so and called for further discussion of the amendment. None forthcoming, the amendment to the motion was approved.

Senator Erickson then pointed out to Senator Jordan that a similar issue existed in (E) in this same proposal. Senator Jordan then offered a similar amendment to this section of the motion. No discussion forthcoming from the floor, the Chair called for a vote. This amendment was passed as well. No further discussion forthcoming on the motion as amended, the body then voted. The amended motion was passed.

Associate Provost continued with the last motion coming from the committee. This dealt with changes to the academic reassessment policy and reflected current practice at the institutions across the state of Ohio and beyond (**Appendix B-6**). The revised version was sent to Senators yesterday and the revisions came in an email from joint conversations with people who had concerns when the first version went out. Again, she thought that it was very good that we were sending things out ahead of time because that way the system worked.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the motion.

Secretary Kennedy stated that she had been talking with the colleagues in her college about some of this. There was the feeling that this was still a very punitive policy even though the revisions had been made. One question that needed clarification was item 3, the “new” item 3 which was previously item 5. Could Associate Provost Stokes explain exactly what that item meant?

Associate Provost Stokes stated that in the case of an associate program, 50% of a student’s degree would be 32 hours, where normally it’s 64. So following re-enrollment the student would have to come back and take 32 hours here - 24 of those or the first 24 they have to take at 2.5 average, so that means they would have 8 remaining credit hours to take to meet the 50 percent requirement.

Secretary Kennedy then asked that, if a student completed 60 percent and then took off some time, grew up and came back and decided to pursue the same degree, they would not be allowed to do that?

Associate Provost Stokes stated no, the student would have to retake anything they got a D in.

Secretary Kennedy stated that that was part of her point. The policy said students had to have completed a minimum of 50 percent of the total hours required – or what? Associate Provost Stokes replied that they were not reassessed. So, if a student did not have 50 percent remaining, he or she would not be reassessed. Secretary Kennedy then asked, if a student had 60 percent completed and then came back for reassessment, he or she could not? Associate Provost Stokes replied that the student could, but would be told that a D credit would have to be repeated and then that would count in the new number because the D or the F would not count.

Senator Braun then asked that if these decisions made it harder to come back, what was the thinking behind it? Why would we implement a policy to make it harder for the people to actually come back? Associate Provost Stokes replied that they could come back; they just may not be reassessed.

Senator Braun questioned what the consequence would be if they were not reassessed? Did they pick up where they stopped, or did they have to pick up from the beginning? Because assessment basically said, "I'm going to see what you are doing and am going to tell you how much of this still can count."

Associate Provost Stokes stated that what reassessment did was to state that any grade at D+ or lower would not count toward a student's degree. In the reassessment it would remove those GPA grades from a student's record so that his or her new GPA would not reflect those D+'s, D's, D-'s or F's. Reassessment is so a student can raise his or her GPA. Senator Braun then asked whether this were a compulsory thing. Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was elective.

Senator Erickson asked for clarification of statements under 2: "Only courses taken prior to the first 3-year absence will be subject to academic reassessment." She had had discussions with people in her college who had said that when dealing with a student who got their act together and was coming back, there was only one chance here. What happened if a student came back and dropped and came back again? Wouldn't we want some flexibility here?

Associate Provost Stokes then stated that the intent of the policy was to aid students who came and were ill-prepared for the University in the first place, if they did very poorly, quit and went out and worked in the world. Then, they came back years later and were more mature and were ready to actually learn and do well. So now they had to get 24 credits in order to apply for reassessment at 2.5 or above and it did not matter how long it would take them to get that 4 credits. They could be here for two semesters and then out for a year, here for 3 semesters, out for 2 more years until they get those 24 credits.

Senator Erickson then asked whether it did not matter what grades these students got. Associate Provost Stokes replied that it did. These students had to have a 2.5 or above in those first 24 credits, and then they were reassessed for the time where they were not prepared and not ready to come to school in the first place.

Senator Erickson replied that while she herself did not have to go through this situation, listening to those who did, she felt they were concerned that what had before been a fairly flexible policy was now a very, very inflexible policy. It seemed these people would consider this to be to the detriment of students who were trying to get an effective degree at The University of Akron.

Secretary Kennedy added that she would like to echo that as well as Senator Braun's concern that it was punitive and in effect would be driving students from the University. Senator Braun then added a final comment. This policy was optional; students did not have to have it if they did not want it.

Senator Spiker then responded to the terminology, in reference to things being referred to as "punitive." She would ask people to consider that this was an elective policy and the fact of the matter was, if there were no policy at all students would be stuck with whatever they got in bad grades. The fact that the policy even existed was a benefit for the students. She asked that terminology be used which did not include the use of the word punitive.

Dean K. Mugler asked for permission to speak to the body. This was granted. Dean K. Mugler stated that in 2001 we had 32 students in University College reassessed; 19 in 2002. This was a way for students to come back. Yes, we had had students with a lot of credits reassessed, but they still had to do 60+ credits in their program. Sometimes there were students who had earned an associate degree, got on into taking a certificate, and then finally decided what they wanted to do with the rest of their lives so they used it. Regarding what Professor Erickson said about the first, second or the third stop-out, we had had students in the past and we've been able to use the second 3-yr. break in attendance. Take for example, a student who had done very poorly in the very beginning, was out for three years and worked a little while, came back and just earned 2. grades and did 30 credits at about 2. level. Then the person was out for ten years, had kids, came back, and now wanted to get into nursing or education. That person was going to have to work and work to take at least 30 credits of B or better work to get to a 2.5 to be even considered for that program. They wouldn't qualify, because the first 30 credits they did after the first stop-out didn't work for them. So as a dean she used the flexibility of whatever worked in the best interest of the student to come back. She knew that the committee had chosen not to do it that way. She knew that Deborah Gwin, who was director of Adult Focus, had said that the proposal as written did disadvantage mothers and others who had more than one stop-out in their college careers.

Senator John then added to the discussion. Overall, he thought we were headed in the right direction, but it needed a little bit more fine-tuning. Like the new no. 3. After reading the statement in the new no. 3, the first thing that came into his mind was - or what? Maybe we could put "for example," and give an example. He felt it left too much open for interpretation. Secondly, he had a problem with the very last statement about the conditions of this policy. That it could not be appealed. Who did the assessment? Was it the Registrar's office?

Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was the dean of the college first, and then the Registrar.

To which Senator John asked whether there were any way a student could appeal this decision. He had a problem with the lack of flexibility there. Overall, he was heading toward a motion that this be tabled and sent back to committee for more input.

To which Secretary Kennedy added that the motion would also include APCC considering input from the Academic Support Services Committee out of VP Roney's office, which had also worked on this policy issue.

The motion was seconded. The chair called for discussion on the motion to refer this back to APCC with additional input from Vice President Roney's committee. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body passed this motion.

Senator Sterns asked for the chair's indulgence; he wanted to raise one point with regard to advanced study for University faculty. To clarify the rule we passed, how would this rule affect those faculty already in graduate programs? If someone was already pursuing a degree who did not meet this level, he would like to make a recommendation to consider grandfathering.

Senator Witt then raised a concern about the reporting mechanism as to how Faculty Senate was notified of regulations when they became policy. We amended and forwarded on, and then he was not sure what happened. Chair Sheffer advised that that be taken up as part of New Business.

Senator Norfolk then made a motion that the Senate move to committee of the whole. Senator Steiner seconded this, and the body voted its approval.

After discussion during committee of the whole, Senator Norfolk made a motion to rise and report. This was seconded; the body approved this motion. Vice Chair Erickson rose to report that regarding the incomplete policy that had been voted on earlier, there were suggestions that the wording was a problem, and with rewording it could well be reconsidered.

Senator Hebert, who voted against the motion initially, so moved to reconsider. Senator Norfolk seconded this motion. The Senate then approved the reconsideration of the motion.

Associate Provost Stokes then provided language to amend the policy: "Failure to make up the amended work satisfactorily by the end of exam week and the grade to be reported on the date the grades are due for the following term."

Senator Norfolk moved to accept this amendment; Senator Wilkinson seconded this motion. No further discussion forthcoming, the body then approved the amendment. Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion as amended. President Proenza stated he wished to recognize a wonderful achievement. The body then voted to approve the amended motion.

Dean K. Mugler, with permission to address the body once more, asked, with regard to the grades coming in for transfer students, when would that go into effect? We already had students applying and we needed to be able to have the admission officers inform those students coming in. So would it be for summer or for fall, 2003?

Based on discussion of possible suggestions on the floor, Senator Soucek then moved that this policy go into effect Fall of 2003. Chair Sheffer called for further discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, the body voted its approval of the motion.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Stokes reported that the committee was bringing a motion to the Senate so that language can be placed in the Bulletin and on-line to say, "Students who wish to substitute equivalent course work for course prerequisites may be unable to register on-line. These students must contact the department to register." We had had students try to register and then not be able to because of equivalencies and course substitutions. We would like to notify them that they may be unable to do that.

No discussion forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried.

See (**Appendix C**) for list of Curriculum Proposals.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns promised to make his report quick. He presented to Senate a write up on President Hezzleton Simmons done by Dr. Simmons' daughter, Patricia. This was the background information that we all had been waiting for to understand better the role that President Hezzleton Simmons played in the history of our University. Senator Sterns had asked Mrs. Quillin to provide each one of the Senators an emailed copy of this document (**Appendix D**). He hoped that we would be able to find a way to recognize Dr. Simmons' contribution. He had made a number of suggestions to Patricia Simmons; he had steered her to Mr. Laguardia because he thought we had an opportunity here to do some significant development for the University. There were many people who viewed Simmons Hall as part of their history at The

University of Akron, as a major part of their life here in the 30's and 40's, right up until just a few years ago. There might be a fundraising aspect there, and he has also addressed this with Mrs. Graves who was in charge of that area of our Board of Trustees. He would like to say to Dr. Proenza that we had an opportunity here to do something good for the University from both a developmental perspective and also to meet the concerns of some alumni who had spoken to him personally about this issue. Dr. Simmons might be the person who could most relate to running this University in tough times, because so far the Great Depression probably was more of a challenge than the current era.

President Proenza again rose to recognize the due diligence and excellent work on behalf of the committee and all who had supported that. Given that this was perhaps the largest change in the stock market since the Great Depression, he was not sure about how that particular historical fact would fare in future years.

Senator Gerlach wanted to briefly reiterate something that needed to be kept in mind by Senator Sterns' committee and everyone else. That was his strong, strong urging that these two names in particular, Gardner and Simmons, be attached to buildings. That we have a Gardner Hall or Student Center or Student Services Building, and that we have a new Simmons Hall. Because, if nothing else, it was in keeping with the precedence that we had had in previous years. Old Crouse Hall was replaced with a new Crouse Hall; old Olin Hall was replaced with a new Olin Hall. The Bierce Library which disappeared for a while resurfaced, and was now on the library. We owed it as an act of filial piety to these people in the past of this University to keep their names alive in this particular way. Since the names were affixed to buildings, let's follow the precedent.

Senator Sterns replied that while he could not speak for the committee as a whole, he as an individual did support Dr. Gerlach. Senator Sterns felt the committee would have to address this officially.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - See (**Appendix E**) for 2003 Summer Fellowships.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Fenwick began his report by stating that he hoped Senators had had a chance to read the report that had been put out on the Senate listserv (**Appendix F**). Fundamentally, the PBC had been working on the budget, which had doubled in the size of the deficit since December. Now we were looking at trying toward zero. We were working with the same set of assumptions we started in December with one exception. The assumptions we were making included a flat enrollment, a flat subsidy from the state, a 6 percent tuition increase in a cap. The one assumption that we had in December that had changed was that we had accepted the Well-Being Committee's insistence in a recommendation that health care insurance costs would be \$2.4 million instead of \$1.2 million. Based on those assumptions the budget deficit had gone up from approximately \$7 million to 14.5 million. The last draft we were working with, draft 4 which was presented to the PBC last week, included the following major scenarios. We included a 3% merit pay pool that came to little over \$3 million; salary compression pool that came to \$1 million; an increase in payroll-related fringes that were not related to health care to \$1.3 million. Not all those increases in the fringe benefit costs were due to the salary pool compression. There was about a \$600,000 increase in fringe benefits in our December draft with no pay increase and no compression. No. 4, a \$2.1 million increase that was earmarked for the upgrade to Peoplesoft 8. This PBC saw was the first of a 3-year spread out of costs that would take the University to upgrade Peoplesoft 8. It was projected by Vice President Ray that the cost would be \$6 million in total. Then finally, an increase in the campus budget reserve of \$1.7 million from approximately \$300,000. Again, Senator Fenwick cautioned everyone that these were not final numbers, but the numbers we were using in further discussion. These numbers might go up or down in the next month. The other point was, in an attempt to gain more information

about the budget, PBC met in December and had asked the various vice presidents and unit heads for more detailed budget information. We asked for prioritizing of their budgets and budget cuts under the following scenarios: with 5%, 10% and 15% budget cuts. We asked for the impacts those budget cuts would have on the overall mission of the University. Again, there was some misinterpretation that we were implying across-the-board cuts by asking the unit heads for these budget numbers. Everything was on the table. The memo was sent out not to imply any scenario or strategy for cutting the budget. Again, this was something that was in process, and at the current time we as a committee were in the process of evaluating these responses and putting them into budgets.

The other action PBC engaged in was to recommend to APCC approval of the creation of an Honors College for the current University Honors Program, the change not to involve any additional revenues or resources.

President Proenza then offered the following comments on Senator Fenwick's report.

"I might just make two observations - I thank you, Senator Fenwick, for the report and the due diligence. Indeed Senator Lee expressed very well some of the struggles that we're all going through in trying to figure out how we're going to adjust to the current budget scenario. It is not easy and any and all good ideas are welcome. One good piece of news which may not have been appropriately signaled to you is that while going into the beginning of spring semester we had anticipated the possibility of a shortfall because of enrollment in spring semester, the news at the 14th day is very positive. We actually had in head count a little over 1% increase and in semester credit hours also a little over 1% increase. So both of those will make the current fiscal year scenario a little bit better, particularly in light of some possible yet year-end cuts that may result from the legislature and the Governor's recommendation. Secondly, I am pleased that Senator Fenwick reported on the request of PBC to all of us, the entire University, for these various scenarios. This request was reported by another group in the University as not coming from the PBC, and as is often the case, rumors abound, and I did not get the chance to collect a tax, but since you've dispelled that other rumor, I thank you."

Senator Fenwick pointed out that the memo in question really came about from the Senate members of the committee. The Senate members got together over the Christmas break because we wanted more information. So the response was really kind of a grassroots movement to obtain more information from units. It implied no strategy for raising or changing numbers.

Senator Norfolk spoke, stating that he had raised both of these issues last year when on PBC. With the situation as dire as it was now, PBC should seriously consider doing away with a plateau - the 12 to 15 credit plateau. The other thing, given what he had seen of the ROI figures, he thought we should seriously consider differential tuition in every one of the professional schools - Nursing and Law already had it; but in Engineering and Business also.

Senator Witt then asked whether the report considered any state reductions. Senator Fenwick replied that it did not; it was just flat. Senator Witt then followed with a question about the four scenarios. Everything was on the table? These four were brought to our attention for a specific reason?

Senator Fenwick replied that it was for informational reasons. It was important to keep the Senate notified of what PBC was doing and what we were working with.

Senator Witt asked whether PBC was considering these things and the rest of the budget. Senator Fenwick answered that these were the major changes that had been put in the budget since the first

draft came about in December - the merit pay, which was not in the Dec. budget, compression was not, the payroll fringes were \$600,000 and there was no upgrade to Peoplesoft put in the budget. Looking back, he thought the budget reserve increase was zero. What he wanted to do was go through the budget and look at the line items with increases of a million dollars or more and highlight those changes.

Secretary Kennedy then stated that she wanted to direct a question to Senator Norfolk regarding his comments about the plateau issue. In particular, which college was he talking about? Secretary Kennedy knew that when the plateau was in place before for the C& T college, it disproportionately affected our students. Our students were seeing up to a 38% increase in their tuition. She wanted clarification of who Senator Norfolk was addressing when he discussed removing the plateau.

Senator Norfolk replied that we would have to readdress it for all students; we had to. We might be able to juggle it so that we did not increase tuition by 6% per credit, but essentially, giving students free credits when we were \$14 million in the hole, we could not afford.

Senator Calvo asked, when a Senator wanted to make a recommendation on something in the budget, what was the best way to go about doing that?

Chair Sheffer suggested that a Senator wishing to do so contact his or her college's Senate representative on PBC and that individual could forward it to PBC.

Senator Calvo then asked a question regarding how PBC is considering priorities. To which Senator Lee replied that it was important to convey that all the line items were being focused on really hard because it was hard to get \$50 million. There was nothing exempt. There were particular concerns about the Library; they were being as fully heard as any issue is on BC. There was a very strong contingent on PBC that wanted to protect the Library, but no decision had been made that it would be held harmless or that it was going to have to share the cuts. So that was a report on how the process was going but not on any specifics.

Senator Soucek then asked whose responsibility the budget was really. He had served on other senates at other universities and he had never seen so much detail and almost taking over administrative caveats than this in his whole tenure. Whose responsibility was it to do the budgeting and to choose where the cuts came from?

Chair Sheffer replied that from our bylaws, it was a consultative process. The Planning & Budgeting Committee was made up of Senators and was also made up of the Provost, VP of Business and Finance, several other individuals who could be there for informational purposes. PBC formulated a budget, brought it to Senate, Senate would approve, modify, amend it, and as all other decisions in Senate, we made a recommendation to the President who took that budget either as it was, amended it, sent it back for reconsideration. But the President took it to the Board of Trustees, so that was the final authority.

Senator Soucek then asked whether the Senate had real input other than advice? Essentially, the buck stopped with the President because he was the President and he was appointed to do so. Chair Sheffer agreed but stated that by Faculty Senate bylaws, we had to give him a recommendation.

Senator J. Yoder asked whether Senator Fenwick could report on the progress of the ROI for the administrative units. Senator Fenwick replied that PBC had two subcommittees who were working on the ROI reassessment and ROI quality measures. However, they had been primarily concerned with

measures on the academic side.

Senator Lee added for clarification that he was working on one of those ROI subcommittees. It was not on our agenda to talk about a way to apply ROI to the administrative side. So if that was on PBC's plate, he did not think it had been discussed at all.

Senator Lee then asked Senator Fenwick to report with regard to the information we asked for from all of the units. Had PBC gotten reports back from all the units?

Senator Fenwick replied that with three exceptions, PBC had gotten reports back. Those three with no response were from Dean Newkome in the Graduate School, from Kathy Watson in Human Resources (that had been sent late because Amy Gilliland said that for purposes of budget she was a vice president), and from Ted Mallo in Legal. PBC was informed that Mr. Mallo's office worked directly under the Board; we might not have the authority to ask for those numbers. But everyone else had timely sent them in and some were very good reports. We were in the process of evaluating those reports now.

President Proenza then offered these comments on the plateau issue:

"Just to inform of a suggestion that's been made - the concept of altering the plateau is meritorious to look at. As with anything, it's important that we be sure to address all of the subtleties associated with it. For example, the fact that we're not collecting tuition on those hours within the plateau does not necessarily mean however that we're not collecting state subsidy. So if we alter the students' behavior and they drop back, do not pay tuition and we do not get subsidy, we actually have a net revenue loss. To that end, because we do have a window of experience, I have asked Institutional Research to begin to inform that question with the behavior that has taken place over the last year and a half. I think we did alter the plateau about a year and a half ago, so we have a year and a half of data and we will certainly provide that data to inform the question. But again, here's an example of the subtleties in which a very simple and on the surface immediately obvious suggestion may in fact cause a negative budgetary result unless we actually understand what the outcome will be."

Senator Clark asked for information as to what the plateau was. Senator Norfolk stated that essentially, a student taking between 12 and 15 credits pays the same price in a semester. They pay for 12 - no additional. Senator Clark then asked why. Senator Norfolk offered one answer, which was tradition.

Senator Sterns had a question for Senator Fenwick who had mentioned there was one area that PBC was not able to get information from. As this was a public institution of the state of Ohio, and all financial information was open to the public, why was that not possible? Senator Fenwick replied that he would check into that.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - Chair Sheffer directed the body's attention to the one item of old business, the consideration of the proposed addition to The University of Akron Bylaws of the Faculty Senate 3359-10-02(B)(6): "Motions or resolutions which embody major recommendations shall be posted on the Senate listserv at least seven days prior to a scheduled meeting at which a vote is to occur. All messages must include a statement of the rationale in support of the motion. The Senate may by majority vote override this provision to bring a motion to the floor." That was moved and seconded at our last meeting and is now on the table for discussion.

The Chair then called for discussion of this motion.

Senator Gerlach stated that he wanted to make a motion to amend it slightly, because as he read the rationale for it, a great deal of emphasis was placed here on the work of committees. We ought to make clear that these recommendations were coming from committees, not necessarily from individual Senators. Because if the language was adopted as it was originally proposed, it would put a gag in every Senator's mouth unless he or she had done his advanced homework. He begged to point out that the rationale that all Senators could both receive and post messages through the Senate listserve – he could not receive anything as he was not on that line. So he wanted to make a simple motion so as to insert the words, "from committees" after recommendations in the second line. So it would read then, "Motions or resolutions which embody major recommendations from committees shall be posted..."

This motion was seconded by Senator Steiner. The Chair then called for discussion of the amendment.

Senator Sterns pointed out that the Senate would probably have to change totally how we did business. For instance, resolutions that regularly came from the Facilities Planning Committee, as we have to meet quickly the week before, would now not be eligible without Senate voting to override. He wanted to point out that it affected all committees that way.

Senator Gerlach mentioned that the last sentence should save Senator Sterns from this concern. This did not, however, safeguard individual Senators who might want to bring something up at the last minute, at least for consideration because it could always be voted down or referred to committee. He asked Senators to defend their senatorial right to speak and introduce things and yet at the same time back this motion to bring business in a timely way before the Senate in advance of its meetings from the committees.

Senator Kreidler then moved to amend the amendment so that the word "major" was changed to "committee." Senator Gerlach accepted this as a friendly amendment. Senator Sterns seconded it.

Secretary Kennedy asked whether the amendment then stated that **any** recommendation from a committee had to be posted. She felt that the reason for putting major in there was to indicate motions of significance that needed some time for discussion. She then asked Senator Yoder whether that had not been the original idea as coming from the Executive Committee. Senator Yoder replied it was one on which the Executive Committee had disagreed. She had wanted major out.

Secretary Kennedy then pointed out that this now said every committee recommendation had to go on the listserve. To which Senator J. Yoder replied that they should. Senator Kennedy replied that that did not take into account the point made by Senator Sterns; some committees are unable to meet until right before a Senate meeting. They would now either have to wait for the next meeting or spend meeting time going through a vote. Speaking as Secretary and on behalf of Marilyn Quillin whose duty it is to collect reports from committees before meetings, timeliness is not the norm.

Senator Kreidler replied that it just left such an opening; what's major, what's minor and what's in between. We did this in most of our colleges, and then if something came up you dealt with it.

Senator Jordan asked whether the body could hear why this was proposed in the first place. In order to vote on the amendment he needed to understand why the main motion itself was proposed in the first place. His impression was that committee reports had already come in sufficiently well in advance and we knew those things, and that it was more a matter of addressing individuals.

Senator J. Yoder replied that the intent was to have committee work come to us soon enough that we could have an informed discussion of it among ourselves and with our constituents.

Senator Dechambeau then stated that the motion needed to be amended; there were copyright concerns regarding the word "listserv". It would be best to change this word to the phrase, "electronic discussion list" to be safe.

She proposed this amendment as a motion to the body; Senator Steiner seconded her motion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the amendment. None forthcoming, the body approved the amendment. The Chair called for further discussion of the motion as amended. Associate Provost Stokes asked for permission to address the body. As to intent, was it for informational purposes so people had a chance to talk to their constituencies? Was there also the intent to have feedback come to the committee so that it could make whatever alterations it might be able to make before it went forward to facilitate? This was affirmed.

Chair Sheffer called for additional discussion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote on the motion. The Chair ruled that the motion passed in excess of 60 percent.

VI. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Witt made a request of the Executive Committee. He wanted to know when the rules and regulations that Senate passes are implemented as University policy. Regarding the University rules, there was sometimes a lag time between that sort of thing. He did not want to have to check a website or wait for postings. He would like a scoreboard.

Chair Sheffer replied to Senator Witt, stating that the Executive Committee would work on a mechanism to make sure he got this.

Associate Provost Stokes offered her assistance in this process.

Dean Capers then asked for permission to speak. She asked as to when the new policy regarding Dean's list and GPA was going to go into effect and whether that would affect students currently enrolled in our programs that might be graduating this spring?

Chair Sheffer replied that the Senate would send the recommendations to President Proenza, who would deal with it either himself or send it to the Board for approval. Then he would inform us of his decisions. He had 45 days to do that from the time we sent him the results of our vote.

Senator Gerlach added that it would be an ex post facto law; it had to take effect somewhere in the future.

VII. GOOD OF THE ORDER – Per Mrs. Quillin, Secretary Kennedy asked that Senators arriving late be sure to sign an attendance sheet posted on one of the doors to the meeting room.

The Chair then called for a motion to adjourn. This was so moved and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin