



54 pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held May 4, 2006	2
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of May 4, 2006	29
A. Proposals approved by the Provost	30
B. Executive Committee Report	39
C. Remarks by Senior VP and Provost	40
D. Choices for Facing Institutional Budget Challenges	41
E. Design for Our Future Student Retention Planning Committee	42
F. Well-being Report	44
G. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee	46
H. Academic Polices Committee Report	47
I. Transportation Center Proposal	49
J. Curriculum Review Committee Report	54
K. Ad Hoc Facilities Planning Committee Resolution	55

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle*
may be directed to the Secretary, Mrs. Rose Marie Konet (x6510).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 4, 2006

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, May 4, 2006, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

Of the current roster of sixty-two senators, thirty-eight were present for this meeting. Senators Chlebek, S. Clark, Kriedler, Lyons, Ofobike, J. Paul, Pelz, Siebert, Slowiak, Stratton, and Vierhuller were absent with notice. Senators Brooks, Cheung, Hamed, Ida, John, Kingsbury, Mann, Rich, Riley, Schantz, Taylor and Vijayaraman were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Fenwick welcomed everyone to the May meeting of the Faculty Senate. The first order of business was approval of the Agenda. Senator Lenavitt motioned to approve the agenda, Senator Gandee seconded. The motion carried.

II. Approval of the Minutes – The second order of business was approval of the minutes from the February 16 Faculty Senate meeting. Senator Rich motioned and Senator Steiner seconded. The Chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes.

Senator Gerlach noted a minor correction. “On page 4, there’s a reference there toward the bottom, big paragraph about memorializing Mary Grace Harrington. She was associate professor Emerita, not Emeriti; that is the proper Latin I think for feminine.”

Chair Fenwick thanked Senator Gerlach and asked if there were any other corrections. Hearing none, he asked that all those in favor of approving the February 16th minutes as corrected say aye. Approval passed unanimously.

The Chair then moved to consideration of the minutes for March 9. Senator Lillie motioned to approve the minutes, Senator Norfolk seconded. The Chair asked if there were any corrections to the March 9 minutes.

Senator Gerlach noted a spelling error. “Top of page 17, the top paragraph, the third line from the bottom of that paragraph the word “stealing” is misspelled, it has to be stealing, not eel.”

Chair Fenwick thanked Senator Gerlach and asked if there were any other corrections. There were no other corrections and the minutes were unanimously approved.

III. Special Announcements – Chair Fenwick began the meeting with several announcements. “First of all, we want to say hello to Heather Loughney, Heather if you would stand up. This is the new administrative assistant to the Faculty Senate. Welcome to you. At the same time, this is Linda’s last meeting. She has only been here “pretend” for the last few months, above and beyond the call of duty. Linda if you’ll stand up. We certainly personally and as a body appreciate the service that you have put into your job. Marilyn Quillen set a very high standard for this position, Linda in her year plus met and surpassed that. So Heather, you have big shoes to follow in and it’s just a great job. Thank you Linda. And you’re welcome to come back anytime. And not have to take notes.

There are a couple of sad notes to mention. A couple of passings of former faculty members; Dorothy Dobrindt passed away on April 23. She was a professor of nursing for 30 years at The University of Akron, retired in 1997 after having graduated from St. Louis University. And Dr. Charles Kennedy Moore passed away in March. He was retired from The University of Akron as a tenured professor having served 29 years with the Business College. So if the senate would please rise for a moment of silence in memory of them. (*The Senate body observed a moment of silence in remembrance of these colleagues.*) Thank you.

One other note to make is that one of our colleagues, Loren Seibert, who is a senator from Geography and Planning, is recovering from major surgery. So we send our thoughts and prayers to Loren and his family and we will send a card from the Faculty Senate. And just a few reminders, make sure you sign in. The sign in sheets are on the doors and circulating so you will not be counted as absent if you are in fact here. Make sure that when you address the senate that you stand, state your name and speak clearly. Again, this will be familiarizing Heather with who you are.

Are you glad today’s the last meeting? I’m very glad. I’m very tired, so I hope everybody’s happy. It’s been a long long year, but in some ways it seems to have gone very quickly. I was not sure at times we would make it to the end, it seems looking back on this year that in many ways we’ve lurched from crisis to crisis as a body. I think about how the year started with the healthcare issue and a special session of the senate. And again I remind you that given the history of healthcare issues in this body we’ll be back in four years with a special session on healthcare! We started with concerns over the union contract, concerns about what would happen if a contract was not reached, and the dismal prospects. Fortunately, the contract was signed and we congratulate the administration in being key on that settlement. And now we are in the joys of its implementation. So we’re all looking forward to summer, with this contract.

We started the year with concerns about whether or not the legislature would pass the so-called academic bill of rights, Senate Bill 24. By working together with the administration, with other universities, working behind the scenes, the higher education community in the state of Ohio was able to defuse this bad piece of legislation. But we end the year with what may be a more detrimental threat, and that is in the form of the TABOR (Taxpayer’s Bill of Rights) TEL (Tax & Expenditure Limit) Amendment which would restrict taxation and the state’s ability to raise funds. Hopefully

we will be able to work together with the elements of higher education community and the business community and other constituencies in the state. We will certainly keep you apprised of this in the fall.

Now as I have been thinking about this, I was reminded of Roseanne Roseanna Danna's comment "it's always something". And if there was ever a stark reminder of this, a couple of weeks ago a colleague sent me an e-mail with a report from CNN and Time magazine which called professors the second best job in the United States. A ten-year growth rate is predicted from 2004 to 2015 at thirty-two percent. It rates according to this report, the job's flexibility and creativity as "A". Overall stress level is "B". I do research in job stress. I can tell you from watching the literature of the last 20 years on job stress that job creativity, flexibility and control were the most important aspects of the job in terms of workers and stress. Job demands can be a lot as long as you have the flexibility and control, and creativity to meet those demands. And we enjoy that. I guess I do have a good job. And have respect. And I was feeling good, even after all the trouble, I felt good. I go home, sit at the breakfast room table, get into the latest edition of *Academe* and find the issue is entitled "the devaluing of higher education". Changed my mood!

Some of the facts it gave were; overall faculty salaries have only risen 3.1% between 2004-2005 academic year and 2005-2006. This was less than the rate of inflation. This was the second consecutive year that overall faculty salaries have risen less than the rate of inflation. This is the first time in twenty years that this has happened, not since the great inflation rates of the late 70s and early 80s. Furthermore, academia documented more inequalities within higher education, inequalities between salaries of tenure-track faculty and increasing numbers of part-time faculty; between faculty and administrators; between faculty in public and faculty in private schools. Universities are varied in increasing costs in terms of benefits, retirement and healthcare. The percentage of part-time faculty has doubled since 1971, from 23% to 46%. So taking these two reports together, what are we to make of this? How are we to draw any conclusions? The only thing I could think of, would be well, we have good jobs. But we're in danger of losing the benefits that we have. And not only is this a threat to our jobs, the flexibility, the creativity, the control, but it's a threat to academic freedom because the flexibility, creativeness and control of our jobs is our security, our tenure, our cry to academic freedom. We have our jobs structured the way they are to guarantee the freedom of inquiry, so we will not be threatened by introducing knowledge and unpopular roads. But as we move to part-time, as we see threats from outsiders and influences and see threats from privatization of the academy, this is a danger to all of us academically. So as a group, faculty and administrators, students, and staff, we need to continue to fight for academic freedom, freedom of inquiry and freedom to present where that inquiry takes us. But to those of us who are given this freedom, comes an even greater responsibility. And that is that academic freedom must be used for the public good, not for private agendas. So always think of the public in what we do.

And the irony of all this is that this is the 36th anniversary of one of the darkest days in American higher education history which occurred just fifteen miles from here. Those of us who are old enough should all remember what we were doing on May 4th 1970; how we found out about the tragedy at Kent State, and what we thought about it. I was a sophomore at the University of Oklahoma, and I wondered with two weeks left in the semester if we would even get through the semester. What was going to happen not only to my education but to my school at the time. And I got to thinking that you know I've been involved in education since I was five years old. I've known

nothing else. So the rhythm of my life is the rhythm of the academic year. From September to May. And I always look forward to May because it's the end of an academic year, it's the end of a long process and it's also a way of looking forward to the future.

The nice thing about academics is there's something new around the corner, there's new challenges. But it's also a sad time because you say goodbye in many cases to old friends. Certainly again we're saying goodbye to Linda and we will miss her. And we're also saying goodbye to a lot of senators today who have served this body and this university with distinction. Those senators who have put in endless hours on committees, committee chairs and committee members behind the scenes who have done the real work of this institution and real work of this body. I want to thank them. I also want to thank in particular the people who've been on executive committee this year. Tim Lillie, Bill Rich (who has been re-elected) and myself will be back next year, but the senate terms of the other members of the executive committee are up. Robert Huff, Dick Stein, especially Liz Erickson, the vice-chair of the senate for whom I am very thankful. I don't think anybody else in my experience with the senate embodies the spirit and the conscience of this body. And finally, Rose Marie Konet, who I would not have survived if it were not for her help. Rose Marie, working with Linda. Rose Marie has got to be one of the most hard-working people I have met, she worked tirelessly as secretary. I would get e-mails at 9-o'clock at night on a weeknight, it's unbelievable. Aside from this, she served on the Operations Advisory Committee, and she has served on various administrative searches for IT. And did I mention her day job, she actually has a job other than senate. So again I would like to thank everybody, it has been a pleasure for me to serve with them. And any other time left I'll leave to Rose Marie to give the Executive Report."

IV. Reports –

a. Executive Committee – Senator Konet reported that the Executive Committee met with the President and the Provost on April 19 and then met again on April 27 to set the agenda for this May meeting. “In the meeting with the President and Provost the following issues were discussed. First, the current mileage rate for travel reimbursement. The rate has been thirty-cents per mile for quite a long time and EC has asked the administration to consider raising the rate to meet either the standards used by the IRS, between 44 and 47 cents a mile, or the National Science Foundation’s standard of 47 cents per mile. The Provost stated that Vice President Case was already looking into this possibility so more about that will be coming out later.

We also engaged in a discussion about the potential controversy surrounding the Suarez donation for the Marketing School. The University is carefully checking into this before proceeding any further. The EC also informed the President and the Provost of the creation of two senate ad-hoc committees. The Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Student Disciplinary Proceedings, members are Tim Lillie and Bill Rich – co-facilitators, John Wolf, Frank Bove, Kyle Bohland representing ASG and Jesse Mann representing graduate students. The EC would like two or three more members for this committee so volunteers are welcome. If you’re interested please let Rudy know. E-mail him or talk to him after the meeting today. That’s the student disciplinary one.

The second one was the Senate Ad-Hoc Exploratory Committee on University Senate. Members of the committee recommended for senate approval are Elizabeth Erickson, Tim Lillie, and Robert Huff. A fourth person will be announced at a later point in time.

That concludes the report.”

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any questions for the Executive Committee. Hearing none, he moved to the next item on the agenda.

b. Remarks by the President - Chair Fenwick announced that the President was meeting with the Governor and that he had sent Candace Campbell Jackson to represent him if there are any questions for the President’s office. The Chair thanked Candace for attending then moved to introduce Provost Stroble.

c. Remarks by the Provost - “I’ll speak mostly from this outline, although there are one or two topics that are not in this that are not great in length. I do want to lead off with my thanks. Rudy, your comments were very thoughtful and touching I would say, so thank you for leading off this meeting so very eloquently. And I thank you for your great partnership during this past year. Rudy’s exactly right, there have been a lot of challenging topics that we worked together on this academic year. I think of years in the same way; they come in nine-month packages and three months of summer, and so certainly this coming summer there is still going to be a lot of activity and many of you will be engaged in it and I thank you for that. But certainly the Office of the Provost counts on and depends on and can’t further all the things that it needs to do on behalf of the institution without the partnership of Faculty Senate and I just want to express my gratitude. For several months we

have been attempting to get all the introductions done to this body of individuals who are new in administrative roles and I have with me today Jim Sage, Vice President of Information Technology and CIO. He's had a number of conflicts so we've managed to accomplish this today. I thought Jim could make just a few quick remarks about what's he's observed and what he's been working on since he arrived December 1st."

Jim Sage greeted the senate body then proceeded to introduce himself and share some of his observations since joining the university: "I'm a graduate of the university, of the College of Business Administration. I've been in the IT business for thirty years; worked in the retail distribution and manufacturing medical services industries and now higher education. What's really interesting after being here now five months is that the IT challenges are exactly the same as the IT challenges that I've seen in other industries. So it's very similar. Since arriving, what I've concluded is on the administrative side of our institution we do a reasonably good job, the infrastructure's in good shape, PeopleSoft runs reasonably well. We won't debate was PeopleSoft the right thing or not, it's what we have so we're going to make it work.

I think we've done an ok job on the academic side but what I'm totally committed to doing is placing more emphasis on the academic side of IT. We've recently moved a full-tenured professor on an interim basis into IT, Dr. John Savory of the College of Education and the intent is to have John and the person that ultimately is put in that job full-time, which John will be considered for, that person along with Rose Marie and a number of others in our organization will be focusing a lot on academic technology. There are a lot of opportunities in the classroom, there are opportunities to expand the utilization of our distance learning technology, there are opportunities for new technologies like podcasting, so there's a lot of technology coming that I think is going to enhance the experience that students could have in the classroom.

I've had an opportunity to meet many of you in the last several months, but most importantly what I want to do is meet you all and understand what your challenges are and how technology might be able to assist you going forward. I look forward to starting in the fall, meeting those of you who aren't here in the summer, getting to know you and trying to get around to meeting as many people as I can. Hopefully those folks that I've already met will tell you that I am a pretty good listener because that's the way that I make sure that I bring the appropriate technology to the university, if it doesn't solve your needs, it shouldn't be here. Your needs, our student's needs and so on. So, that's Jim Sage. If you have any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

Senator Clark wondered if there had been any further thought about the Blackboard and WebCT merger.

VP Sage responded that he had had a conversation with Blackboard senior management. "They have committed to me that by December of this year there will be a formal integration plan for the two organizations and a formal product strategy for the two organizations. They've also committed that they're going to support WebCT in its current form until a combined product can be created. So we expect that the combined product won't materialize until the late 2007, early 2008 timeframe. So WebCT is going to be in existence in its current form until at least late 2007. What we are going

to do is put together a group, a cross-functional group to define what it is that we need for the learning management and course management system and then we're going to go over all the alternatives. Great question."

Senator Gehani asked what more could faculty expect in terms of retooling and training.

VP Sage replied "What I can commit to you at this point is that the organization that Dr. John Savory is leading our Learning Technologies team, and the Institute of Teaching and Learning are going to be working very closely together. I think a lot of that training will come from the Institute of Teaching and Learning but we will be working very very closely with them to provide the content and materials for that training. Beth, I don't know if you want to add to that."

Provost Stroble indicated that she would address this when she talked about the status of the searches.

Senator Gandee asked, "Based upon your experience, what is your projection of when you will have all the macros developed so that if someone is working in the classroom they can put the motion picture up there with the lecture?"

VP Sage replied "When will it all get done? Hopefully never because that's my job! What you can count on is that it's going to get progressively better. I think one of the things that we should be proud of is the connectivity here at the university that allows us to connect anywhere in the world and pull down content electronically and embed it in our instructional material, some of the best I've ever seen. That multimedia experience is what the digital "natives", the young people expect, they want that engaging multimedia experience. And so it will continue to get better. And I think you'll agree it's gotten a lot better in the last several months and years. Anything else? Thank you, I appreciate it."

Provost Stroble continued with her introductions. "Just as I know you feel in your departments you're concluding lots of searches and have been up to that all semester, every hire is a key one. And so doing our absolute best job to find people that add great value to this institution and then help support our work is really important and I'm glad the question came up about the training and teaching and developing for all of us. We're in the final piece now of doing the search for the Associate Provost and Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning. I believe an e-mail went out this afternoon alerting you to the fact that two finalists will be on campus next week. I know it's quite a time to have two people coming to campus but clearly we wanted them to come while most of the faculty were still present. You will receive an e-mail note about when they will be here next week and I certainly hope you will attend one of the drop-in sessions with them so that we have the benefit of your feedback. And it is clearly the intent that ITL, IT and all the teaching/learning kinds of units on campus are more in partnership and mutually supported as we move forward. I'm very excited about these two candidates, we have people in this room that are on the search committee and I think they've brought a great slate. These two individuals will be quite interesting.

I did want to give you an update on various searches, so you get a quick summary here. With the departure of Dr. Janice Taylor-Heard from Multicultural Development, I made the decision that during this transition period I would ask Miss Colleen Curry to serve as Interim Director. We are in the process of identifying an individual who can serve as a chief diversity officer for the institution and doing a national search, so it seemed wise to wait on future thinking about the Office of Multicultural Development and what kind of person should lead that until we had the chief diversity officer in place.

I have offered the position of University of Akron/Medina County University Center Director to Ms. Susan Louscher. She has accepted and we're in the process of getting the paperwork done and also forwarding that to Board of Trustees for their approval. No appointment is actually final until the Board of Trustees approves it so this is pending approval. I hope to get an e-mail note out about this next week.

We are also engaged in a number of searches for deans. We've now seen three finalists for College of Business Administration, one more finalist to come. In the College of Nursing we've seen two finalists out of the three. And we have come very close now to formally launching the search for a dean of the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering. The ad should go in *The Chronicle* within the next week. So a lot of this kind of activity is going on that's quite important.

I want to pause a moment to congratulate Senator Londraville and his many colleagues. We were successful last Friday in getting RAGS approval for the new PhD in Integrated Biosciences, unanimous approval for the seven years. It took years to do, congratulations Rich and colleagues!

The last two pieces on the outline are just to give you an update about where we are in implementing the academic plan. You'll recall that you approved as a body the five design principles and said that you wanted a close and intimate partnership with the Office of the Provost as we started to figure out what did that actually mean as we implement it? And as a result of my presentation complete with Johnny Cash lyrics and sound, I think we all agreed that retention was a worthy topic to use as the focus for implementing those five design principles. The result now of selecting that topic as our focus is that we have jointly charged a group that will use those five design principles to look at creating a plan for student retention. So I have given you in the handout what the actual charge was to the membership. We met for the first time yesterday morning, got up and running. It's jointly chaired by Rudy Fenwick on behalf of Faculty Senate and Karla Mugler on behalf of my office. They have a rather aggressive and brisk timeline to meet with very specific questions that they are to answer. And this will be our first test, if you will, of what it means to use those five design principles to inform work that we are developing anew. And we'll certainly build on the good work that's already been done. There are some departments on this campus that have truly done some exemplary work around retention and have tracked the data to show that what they have done as an intervention that's really made a difference. And so there's no need to recreate and pretend that there are not good things happening, but as the data showed, we need to do better. We need to have a very detailed and rich database of understanding of where it is that students fail to

succeed and how we can help to improve that. I'm glad to have the partnership with Faculty Senate in jointly charging this committee. They're up and running and I anticipate by fall we can have their report about what they have learned and what they can recommend to us.

And then finally, I thought it important to share with this body a more elaborated understanding of what you saw last week about the budget and where we are. And so agreed with Faculty Senate officers this week that we would ask John Case, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and our chief financial officer to give us a quick overview of where we are and what the next steps are to head to the June Board of Trustees meeting with a budget."

John Case thanked the Provost for the introduction and proceeded with his comments. "Last Friday we sent out a note to everybody updating them on where we are in the budget process. I think it's been a very good process this year. I'm going to give you a couple of highlights, then open it up for questions. Then we'll talk a little further about what I think are next steps.

In December and January we heard from the deans and the VPs about the requests for this year. A whole packet went out to them, they gave us their requests, they did presentations on the types of increases or additions to operating needs that they wanted, a one-time cost on how to further the institution or their specific college. We went through a time of deliberating with them, making sure we had an understanding of what they really wanted in this budget. After that, our budget office went through a process of taking all the potential revenue which is the tuition, state support and all other revenues, increasing that for any potential increases and then went through the same thing on the operating side.

On the operating side, we have salary increases for all staff, including faculty, we have contractual increases for service agreements, other types of contracts we have where there are multi-years involved and increases in each year. We have inflationary increases. We've got our initial base budget for this year. We add all that in and even with that we have a six percent increase. One of our assumptions was a six percent increase in tuition, with flat enrollment for the next year. Based on the fact that we haven't had a trend of an increase in enrollment that was pretty safe.

With those assumptions, the increases we came into, which was similar to prior years where we've started into this process with a non-balanced budget of about thirteen to fourteen million dollars. Obviously in past years we've gone through processes to refine that and get it down to a budget for the year. After that we went through the process of looking at the Deans and the VPs request to invest in the future. What we mean by that is yes, we could have stopped there and talked to the president and the board about a budget that was minus thirteen or fourteen million dollars and then gone through the process of just cutting back. But like many businesses and many places that want to move forward we wanted to invest in certain areas. There were good ideas that the deans, the vps, the president wanted to put in towards investing in the future. When you do that you come up with about a six to seven million dollar increase and that mostly goes to the top priorities that our academic and administrative budget review committee put in place that says we want to increase enrollment and retention.

We want to look at everything we do here to increase what we call scholarships, try to get increases in scholarships especially in some specific programs like the Honors College. We looked at how we move forward in terms of making sure the student experience is accomplished. That involves everything from the performing arts hall, to athletics which has grown this year, to many other areas that we increase expenses for especially in the operating of some of the colleges. Many of the colleges talked about a flat operating budget for the last five-to-ten years. We took that into consideration. We said okay now we're at probably about a negative twenty million dollars. Then the budget committee goes through the process and says let's look at some of the areas where we want to look at the expenses, see if there are areas where we can consolidate, areas where we can look at exactly what we spent in past years, see if we can save some money, see if we can go back to some of the areas such as consulting. We do about 4.5 million in consulting every year, some of those are mandatory. The annual audits are mandatory and some outside orders are mandatory because we don't have the exact staff on hand to do some of our legal work. There are a few others, architectural items, we'd probably be able to trim that down. We look at one-time expenses that we know were in the budget that we can take out and spend just one time cash for. We also look at some other areas such as part-time employees, are we utilizing them appropriately? Some times we do because they are related to student teaching and part-time faculty. When you bear all that and you take all those numbers into consideration we probably took care of about two-thirds of that 20 million dollars so we are about six or seven million dollars from where we need to be.

Bringing that to the Board, we told them that we're going through a process over the next month of really looking at exactly how we're going to make the refinements on the numbers that we already found. And also how we're going move forward in terms of taking the last part of this process and find the six or seven million dollars. And that just takes groups to really look into some of the data we have, some of the areas that we invested in, are these the right numbers and moving forward.

Our goal to the Board is to bring them a balanced budget in June. With that the Board gave us a preliminary indication that sounds great, they do expect us to bring them a balanced budget and I think that as of this week Beth and I and the senior management team have looked at how we're going to move forward, what types of groups, we have a budget review committee that's going to start almost immediately looking at this. I think it gives us time to talk to our Operations Advisory committee, gives us time to start looking at how we transform the university to proceed to the next level and how we stop what we call "muddling through". I think Beth will talk a little bit about that in a second. So that's where we're at. We're moving forward toward a June approval of the budget with the Board. That was some of my message in last week's e-mail.

Provost Stroble referred everyone to a one-page handout. "We've been using this as we've been talking with deans and vice presidents and others about how we will approach the next part of this exercise, which is how do you make adjustments in expenditures to bring them in line with the revenue you can anticipate? And have you also think about how you maintain the health and the quality of the institution when you're trying to make those adjustments. Certainly any of us who've been here for any length of time remember days when there were mid-year cuts established for us by the legislature or the Board of Regents or whoever, for shortfalls at the end of the year. I would

say that the way those gaps were closed was very much a muddling through kind of strategy, which was “just across the board cuts, give up your money”. And that truly is not a strategic way to go about making the kinds of adjustments that we need. What we’re really about between our two offices and the people we work with is how do we do this in a way that creates better financial health, maintains our quality, and gives us opportunities to improve ourselves, not just a slash and burn method of closing the gap. So this document is extracted from an article that you may want to read, it talks about the difference between muddling through solutions to budget challenges versus transforming solutions to budget challenges. I just gave you a quick summary of the difference between muddling through and transforming and then came to three implications for us. First, that we will have to use some short-term strategies that close gaps between revenues and expenditures, those are necessary but those aren’t sufficient. And to just take chunks of money out of people’s budgets won’t help us maintain quality. It won’t help us do the kinds of things that help us think better in a financially responsible way about where expenditures need to be made. So we’re going to have to do some short term kinds of things but that doesn’t mean that that’s a long term strategy and we’ll have to think long term as well as short term.

The second implication is that we will continue to have to invest. We can’t just stop spending money if you want to think about the health of the institution and the kinds of things that you need to spend money for. So just saying we’ll stop doing everything new and different would not be a productive way to solve this problem.

And then finally the most strategic kinds of reductions that we’ll make and reallocations and investments will be the ones that help us transform ourselves in ways that get us out of the mode of just sort of patching things together using one-time savings. Using one time savings to patch our hole as opposed to thinking about what we do to find additional ways that generate revenue and that give us greater financial health in a time of very constrained resources from state resources, we know that continuing to increase tuition and count on that to close the gap is not a winning solution for anybody involved. So that’s why that handout, to try to say we’ll engage in a study that tries to be as transformative as it can without taking a muddling through approach.

We know we need to have help to do this, that John and I and our staff really cannot do this by ourselves. So in the most recent e-mail note you saw an invitation to submit your good ideas. We have a number of great ideas that have come into that web site already and I encourage other people to do that. We’re also reengaging the group of people who are the subset of Operations Advisory Committee to come back and look at the data we have, look at what John’s projections are about the gap we have to close and get them to give us some recommendations. I think you already know that Senator Konet sits on that group, but we also knew that we needed to add faculty senators who have faculty rank.

I asked faculty senate executive committee today to give us recommendations and I’m glad to tell you that Rudy Fenwick and Kate Clark have agreed to serve. They’ll meet with us when we meet tomorrow at 8 o’clock to get this started. So that’s the next piece that I knew I needed to talk about, but we’ll be glad to take your questions.”

Senator Bohland asked Dr. Stroble if there would be opportunities for students to sit on both the retention committee and the budget committee?

Provost Stroble responded “We put together the retention committee, between our two bodies, so I think that’s something that I have to have conversation in partnership with Faculty Senate Executive Committee, that’s not my call alone. In terms of the Budget Review Committee we certainly can consider that.”

Senator Bohland expressed his concern that something be done as soon as possible given that the budgeting process needed to be completed in the next three weeks.

Provost Stroble agreed.

Senator Gandee asked “May I change the subject away from the budget for just a moment or two? Looking at the TEL Amendment, that is coming up in the fall, what is the university permitted to do to campaign for or against it?”

Provost Stroble stated that the Administration is studying that. “I’ve asked for a statement to come from not only General Counsel but from our public affairs, from John LaGuardia’s office, to help us understand that. Clearly a lot of us have individual opinions about this and I’m not sure without a little guidance, in what role you can act as an individual and in what behalf institutional bodies can weigh in about this. I think that by the first meeting in the fall that may be something that we want guidance for as a body and a presentation about depending upon where things are at that point. But in the meantime, Rudy and I could work together on getting some kind of statement that helps clarify that for each of us as individuals and send it out.”

Chair Fenwick commented “Ohio Faculty Council canceled its meeting for next Friday, but that was going to be one of our conversations. I think it’s probably important that students in this community understand the dire effects this would have on the state, but to the extent that the university’s saying “you shouldn’t do this” sounds like special interest.”

Provost Stroble commented that she also thought it sounded a bit self-serving.

Chair Fenwick said he would keep everyone informed.

Senator Gandee compared this to the situation in Colorado, and how devastating it was.

Provost Stroble responded “And depending upon who’s analysis one listens to and I’ve just really started to read about this, there are a lot of question marks about how comparable it is to the Colorado legislation. It’s just not as clear yet. I haven’t studied it enough to have a definitive opinion on it. I think it’s just starting to unfold. Clearly the primary results gave us a different reality than we had a week ago, so I think that you’re going to start to hear more about this topic rather than less.”

Senator Zingale raised a question. "I'm just curious about this transforming the institution that talks about fundamental changes." He asked if an example of what a fundamental change might be could be provided and what types of input were being sent through the web, the muddling type or the transformational?

Provost Stroble "That's a good question, I think they're both, don't you think John?"

VP Case responded "I think we've received a bit of both. We've had people offering solutions to short term issues or comments they've had about things they've seen, ways that they think we could save some money by things they've seen. There have also been ideas about other types of areas where we could look at as long term, it would be a transforming type I think. So we've had both. We have about 20 ideas through that e-mail address."

Provost Stroble "It's not as though I have a list of transforming ideas. That's why we're meeting tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock with this group, to start generating those kinds of ideas. I think most of those are more long term but I think transforming ideas are much more important business and what is it we're trying to achieve? How do we make sure that we preserve or grow that and muddling through is more like we need this many million dollars, you have this chunk of the budget so that translates to this many dollars for you, here's your allocation. They're more like across the board things as opposed to strategic kinds of decisions. In the past, this institution, even when it had to take severe budget hits, has said to the libraries, we want to protect your holdings and so you avoid taking a hit. That's probably more of a transforming kind of solution as opposed to a muddling through, but even that might be a muddling through. What if, instead, we tried to rethink how we supported the library, then that might be more of a transformative kind of solution. I don't have anything in my head, I'm just trying to frame the conversation at this point."

VP Case, "I think also from the administrative point we have to ask, are we as productive as we should be here, could there be some consolidations, some potential changes in the way we do business? Whereas a lot of times you take other 'best of class' organizations whether it's in the not for profit higher education world or in corporate America and we say can we do business like this, if not, let's transform the way we do business. So I think it's worth it to make a better institution in the long run with efficiencies and effectiveness as opposed to just saying we need ten percent."

Senator Zingale commented that there had been a lot of analogies being used to compare academe to the business environment. "I see that in business in order to transform it, it often means slash and burn, eliminating a lot of programs and culture change. So when I see the word transforming I look at the fundamental changes and I can't help that a part of me thinks that there's a trust factor that we're talking about here and what we're going to see."

Provost Stroble "Well one of the fundamental changes I think that is true for higher ed. everywhere in the country and particularly in Ohio is that at one time we could count on sixty percent of our budget to come from state support. And now thirty percent comes from it so that causes us to need to think differently about where our revenue models are for the institution. We keep trying to make the case with the state of Ohio that we ought to regain a greater measure of that support. And

the TEL amendment has potential to make it even less, so I would say that this is a threat to our fundamental business model. How we do business is to some degree outside of this, but I think the President often says we're going to have to look to ourselves for solutions. And so it may be that we need to enhance the kinds of things that we do that generate revenue from outside. If I think about the building of the student union, now that there is so much public space, it permits us to have more conferences come to campus and generate revenue in additional ways that we couldn't before when Gardner was our main facility for that kind of thing. It may be as much about those kind of things as what you may worry about from a slash and burn kind of sense. A lot of operations on this campus do operate in a business sort of way. All of the auxiliary and the student union and dining services and residence halls and things like that, they are business enterprises even though they support the academic mission of the institution. So are there ways that those things that are truly more business oriented in their function might do business differently or better is a question that I think is worth asking. I don't know what to do about all of us feeling a little bit uneasy about the circumstances that we're facing other than to say it's not our intent to come in and slash and burn."

Senator Erickson thanked Provost Stroble and Vice President Case for their comments. "The issue of dealing with our budget in a long term way has been with us for some time. I appreciate that you are thinking about the initiative to try to do something about that, to really move in that direction. Some years ago when this came up in this body I had asked the President whether he would consider bringing in help in the process of getting an effective budget process for higher education. I had worked on this for some time and eighteen months ago he agreed that it would be a good idea to bring in the person that I had suggested. That was Ronald Erinburg who runs the Institute for Economics in Higher Education at Cornell and was the Vice President for Finance at Cornell. The numbers you probably read about were the issues involving the increase in cost at private institutions. But as I said it's not just private institutions and as you know Cornell is a mix, that strange mix of private and public. It sounds to me that if this is in process of actually seeing how we can do this then he would be a good person to bring in."

Provost Stroble expressed her appreciation and stated that they would look into it.

Senator Gehani raised another suggestion. "Another conversation that you could add is this notion of touch versus non-touch. I don't think we've addressed this concern yet. Our mission is academic, so that is the academic touch. What part of the budget goes into our direct touch activities and then what part of our budget goes into the non-touch part of our activities? I think to cut down non-touch would be very prudent and I think slash and burn touch would not be."

Senator Qammar "I was wondering, it sounds as though there is not a lot of strategic direction that's gone into the budget process so far, is that correctly evaluated there?"

Provost Stroble felt that was not the case.

Senator Qammar asked "Then could we hear more about what type of strategic planning has been inserted into the budget, what you expect to come out of the budget?"

John Case offered to respond. “Let me talk to two things. There is some part of your comment that is correct in the fact that this year is a transitional year. We don’t have an in-place plan. Dr. Stroble has gotten the principals approved but we don’t have an official academic plan to wrap ourselves around that. So we’re in the budget process where we don’t have a full plan in place. We have a new enrollment management person in place and we don’t have an enrollment management plan to put into the budget process too, so I would say we did it strategically in a way but not a full way. We’re in a transition. Next year I would say that as the budget goes out to the deans and the VPs, it would include the academic side of the plan, the enrollment side of the plan, the goals, and a request to adjust your budget to make you a better part of this organization. This year I think we didn’t have that as we went out. It was a transitional year, we did have an enrollment plan, an academic plan. But from my viewpoint it wasn’t as strategic as it should be.”

Provost Stroble agreed. “And I would say that that’s absolutely fair. Where we tend to see the strategic elements in the budget that we’ve looked at so far is in individual units presentations. The College of Engineering clearly has a strategy. And so when they come with their request, it’s pretty clear what it is that they want the funding for because they have strategic goals that they are trying to accomplish. What I think is not in place is a way that those institutional strategies and colleges and VP unit strategies marry up.”

Ms. Campbell-Jackson followed up. “We did ask the units questions about their priorities and to think ahead strategically as they were considering their request or they made their presentation to the budget committee. Certainly we heard about where they want to go strategically. Now we’re in the process of saying okay we’ve got the requests and the units have done their thinking, they’re looking at how we move this institution forward. Now we’ve got to put our heads together and figure out how we’re going to come up with the revenue source to do so. So at this point in time it does look like we’re saying we have to come up with a new way to look at the university and we’ve got to transform, no longer muddle through. But we really have been asking to do the very best strategic thinking every step of the way through.”

Provost Stroble concurred “Absolutely, so I think the transforming piece is which of the great strategies that we have heard about are the best ones to invest in.”

Senator Matney “I agree with you about the importance of retention. I think that’s an issue that we need to think a lot about. I also think your comment about the use of the student center as a possible revenue source for groups coming in for conferences is a very good one. I attended the GSA meeting recently. It was a very good venue and I know other groups that are now thinking about it on the basis of the success there. I’m concerned though, about the projection of a flat enrollment. We’ve got a beautiful campus, we’ve spent a lot of money building a lot of resources, and they are not coming. I was wondering if you could speculate why the enrollment is remaining flat? How long you might see that as a continuing trend or are we expecting an increase in enrollment at any time in the near future?”

Provost Stroble replied that we actually are seeing increases in new freshman classes. “What we’re not seeing is holding onto them so that we hold on to the increased numbers. Certain popu-

lations are up; honors college has seen a steady growth in the past three years, which generally in our population translates to engineers and business and then a smattering of students across other colleges. And applications are certainly up this year, for this coming fall and we could guess that the yield is going to be up. But between first and second year and second and third year we're really seeing numbers fall off in ways that keep us from holding onto that, and our graduate enrollment is down slightly as well. So I think there's some key areas that an enrollment plan and a retention plan can likely have impact on so the total stays healthy."

VP Case added that he thought from a budgeting standpoint, that the board went with the conservative thought process because they don't have the data to show it's increasing. "They do have the data that shows we have campus visits up, applications up, we have increased scholarships going out, so the yield may be much better but when you have a board that hasn't seen that they aren't going to approve an increase in enrollment. So that's why we make that assumption and it's a pretty fair assumption from a conservative standpoint at this point."

Senator Matney asked if he could speculate on why we are losing so many students?

Provost Stroble responded "That is what our summer group is going to dig into. We speculated for an hour and a half and decided that frankly we needed to ask students more about what was going on that caused them to not be here. So we're going to do some intense data gathering from students, and faculty that work with undergrads to try to figure that out because we had probably ten or fifteen different good theories but we don't know which of them might be right."

Chair Fenwick interjected that the data from other schools may not fit here so it's better not to say anything until we know.

Senator Bohland remarked that "As a student I think the biggest reason that they would be leaving is it costs too much. And I'm not blaming The University of Akron, I'm blaming the state of Ohio. But that's the fact. One thing that I think The University of Akron could do is the fact that we advertise a full-time tuition rate that *isn't* a full-time tuition rate. We charge about \$8,000 dollars for 12 to 15 credit hours but in actuality if you graduate in four years you have to average 16 credit hours per semester. So each semester students are getting charged \$2,000 dollars more than they're anticipating. So I think that could be one contribution as well."

Provost Stroble thanked Senator Bohland for his comment.

Senator Qammar raised another question about the budget. "In the past we've done some small things I think to try to enhance revenue streams and I'm thinking of somewhat small things like changing out of state tuition to try to attract more students. I don't know if we have differential tuition or whatever the law school has?"

Provost Stroble replied that "We do, in Nursing Anesthesia, we're doing it for the first time this year."

Senator Qammar continued “There are other things involved with enrollment management. I know that a few years ago we drastically reduced the number of graduate student tuition waivers and those types of things which have a big impact on graduate enrollment. I know we’ve changed now, because of the union rules, the faculty reimbursement formulas that are associated with advising grad students, those types of things. So in this strategic plan, not in the next three weeks, but in the next year, if I ever get to talk to you again, this is my last meeting, so you never have to hear me again, do we have anything in that plan that says we’re definitely going to assess these things, we didn’t just invent them and implement them and our gut feeling is that it will work; but we also have it in the plan that we’re going to test to see that it worked?”

Provost Stroble replied “Well it is one of our five design principles so we’d be remiss if we did not.”

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any objection to Senator Witt speaking. There were no objections.

Senator Witt: “I think you have a good idea of why enrollment is up in the Honors College. Because we put a lot of energy into that very thing. We built the dorm, we’ve really encouraged smart kids to apply. And so, right there is a pretty big hint that when you pay attention to a problem you find a solution. I’m reminded of the old joke where the guy who lost his keys is down on his knees looking under a streetlamp for them and someone comes by to try to help him, but he says well I lost my keys down in that dark alley but the light is better here.

I hear often from my students when they hear of a tuition increase that’s coming up, there’s dissonance here. They don’t understand how buildings can go up and their tuition goes up. They read about new people coming to the university and they seem to make a connection between this new salary line and those sorts of things. I do know that my students tell me that they may not be able to return. These are the students that you’re talking about, the juniors, the second and third year students, that can’t come back because their student loans aren’t even covering their bills now. And their finding that it’s a zero sum game for them, the value of their education, that they’re in too far to quit but they’re going to be in debt for a long long time afterwards. I think we need to address some of those problems. I really don’t think that students look at the long term and can make a financial analysis on how much the cost that’s advertised and how much it’s going to actually be. What they know is I can’t pay my bills next year. And they go as long as they can and then they drop out. What would happen do you suppose if we cut tuition for example, and say we’ll give you a better deal than that school up the road? Make it up in volume like the guy that’s going out of business at that furniture place.”

Provost Stroble remarked “You can see we’re going to have some good conversation!”

Senator Lenavitt “I’m going to be a little altruistic. Because my job is to teach and ultimately the product that we deliver is a quality program for our students, and as we continue deliberating this over and over again we know that quality and support don’t always match, it’s just not possible sometimes. And over my history of being here for thirty-seven years, growth has always been

predicated on not only the fiscal plan and meeting its needs but throwing more students at it, more, more, more, students. And we're at a point where I'm really concerned about and we all have been concerned about quality. There is the idea that every student in the state of Ohio has the right to attend one of the state institutions, on the other hand there is an example of deferred enrollment. At what point does the physical plan quit throwing up buildings and quit constantly saying more students, more students, more students? We get more part-time faculty to teach them, some of them are less qualified than the standards that we have to meet to come here. And some of us, quite frankly, with the metrics that are available right now might not even get our tenure or our promotions based upon the quality standards that we're trying to put into focus. So, if we affect students and their education because we are the harbingers of what they get to look forward to in life, I'm real concerned about quality and perhaps not worrying about whether we get 30,000 people on this campus.

But can the physical and fiscal responsibility for the truth in advertising apply and at what point do the auditors make the suggestion that maybe what we need to do is not throw in more students, maybe what we need is more full-time faculty to fill the holes? Maybe what we need is to engage the rich history of this institution. In the forty years since we have become a state institution the timeline has been almost vertical about our growth in our programs but is it necessarily worth throwing buildings and students at? I'm really concerned about it and I want to know how does that equate? When I look at the word transformation it's an action word and my first thought is not so much what we're going to transform to, I have every confidence of that, because we've done that in forty years but what is the view of the auditing side, what are we transforming from, are we all in the vision? Are we all doing some bad thing with our money? We don't save enough pennies in the bank? What is it that we're doing that we can help? I need to know that, and I'm still very enthusiastic after thirty-seven years. I'm really enthusiastic about what the future holds for us here, but I'm really worried about quality and how does that affect us?"

VP Case "Let me just talk a little bit about the audit side. Quality I think is something that we as an institution want the highest if we can. The audit part of this is that the auditors will come in and make sure that your books from the external auditors, the annual audit that we have to have, they come in and make sure that everything is done from an accounting standpoint, from a required standpoint, from a rules and regulations standpoint. It's not only what you put in place as far as rules and regulations but accounting institutions and AICCA, the institutions that govern the accounting of higher education. So they'll come in and make sure that our accounting department at this institution has implemented everything appropriately, so that the board can feel comfortable with the financial model that we have. How does that relate to the next step of maybe doing some things more efficiently? We're talking about going to the next step with people that have that expertise and they're not always called auditors but they're some times consultants that can take relationships of dollars to faculty, to students and do the "what is a good quality model." There are probably experts out there already that have quite a bit of practice with that, someone who deals strictly with the financial model. So it's one that I think Dr. Stoble and myself and others would like to look at. There are experts out there and many of them contact us to say that there are some models that are working at other institutions. There are some ways to improve the quality, there are some averages and best practices that are the way we do business and that's going to be part of the action work that we take. And who are these people that we may want to bring in when we talk about

quality and how we deal with the faculty to student ratio, and how does that relate to dollars per student that we spend here? And so there are good means to simple calculation that we do that the auditors oversee but it's something that we want to move toward and this becomes 'let's get some expertise in here'."

Provost Stroble "I guess I think that the process that we're going to be working through is not quite as mechanical as what might be captured in the word audit. I'm thinking of it purely for more of an assessment viewpoint which is that one of your values or principles to assure would be quality and that it may mean decisions that seem a bit counterintuitive to get there."

Senator Lenavitt "I do look at auditing as being half-full in terms of what do we have and where do we need to go? I understand that, but you also said something very central and again on the altruistic side, we're the group who are qualified to look at the available evidence and the research and we're very well prepared. We actually get honored by the fact that we train the people who go out and do the consulting, but we're not good enough to do our own consulting. I think that's central to the issue, that we have to go out and the university has to pay somebody \$50,000-\$250,000 to do consulting when we're the same people who trained them in the first place. So I understand objectivity about doing that. But it's seems kind of odd that the first thing that comes out is that you need go out, find a consultant and spend another \$150,000 to help us with that when I think we're perfectly capable of doing some of that ourselves because of our education."

VP Case: "The fact of the matter is that if we can find the expertise here I'm fine with that. The way I look at the organization on the administrative side, I'm not sure I have the expertise and objectivity to come in and say we're doing things right or wrong. That may be also true in the other standpoint. Maybe if I had hired somebody in the business school to come and look at the finances, I think that'd be great, they have the expertise, they've trained some of the best in the MBA world, maybe they can come do it. But what I want to make sure is that they have the objectivity to make the analysis and the suggestions and the implementation plans, to make sure that we transform to a higher education institution in the future that we want to be, keeping quality and trying to deal with costs. So I took it outside. If we can find the expertise in here that has the objectivity, who can do the analysis and follow through that'd be great."

Chair Fenwick drew the body's attention to the fact that it was four-thirty and that there were still a number of items to cover including committee reports.

Senator Londraville "This is a non-budget comment. I just wanted to thank Provost Stroble because she was part of our defense team for this new PhD and she very effectively shut down one of our harshest critics and gave a very good defense. And also Deans Newkome, Haritos, Kelley and Levant who literally it would not have been possible to do this without administrative support. We thank you and to give you an idea just what a big deal this is for biology, I was ten when we began to talk about a PhD in Biology!"

Chair Fenwick commented "You make me feel old. Older than I am."

Senator Gerlach “I have one observation and then a couple of questions for the Provost perhaps to pass on to the President. I think we all ought to go check our books; how many vice presidents has this university now got? How many and at what cost, what are their salaries? I have no answer, I’m asking the questions. I talked recently with former president Dominic Guzzetta who claims that he only had about a half a dozen vice presidents during his administration with thousands more students enrolled than we have today. Consider that for the budget. As to the questions, they’re based on the recent news in the newspaper which raised issues that have not yet been covered. This is the Plinton case. I’d like to know and you may not be able to answer this today Madam Provost but pass it on to the President if need be. Who exactly was responsible for proposing or arranging that drug surveillance program that resulted in the Plinton case? Is this the campus police, does it involve the office of student affairs, legal office? That’s the first question, who exactly was responsible for setting this thing in motion? Question two: was the President aware of this program when it was instituted and did he approve it? If he was not aware of it, why wasn’t he aware of it? And why wasn’t he asked to approve or disapprove it? I think these are crucial questions the information in due time may be revealed to us but not so far and as I’ve been cogitating about this and talking with other people, these questions have arisen which I thought would be appropriate to ask in this body. I said no answers today, maybe we’ll get them later. Thank you.”

Senator Norfolk “Just for those of us with Sesame Street like memories, this addresses Senator Lenavitt’s concern about outside consulting. This body five years ago unanimously passed a resolution to the effect that we should use in-house consulting when we could. Since that time, brief estimate is we have spent \$12 million or more outside on consulting that could have been done within the university with the talent we have here.”

VP Case responded “Just to make a point, during the budget process, we did the analysis. We currently spend \$4.5 million on consultants. That consulting group involves consultants that are mandatory independent auditors, architects that are mandatory when you get a state building built, and outside legal counsels. Instead of having a group of ten legal counsels, that specialty is brought in, so that is part of the \$4.5 million. About half of that is mandatory. Other than that we’ll have to look into it, but that’s the exact amount for the last fiscal year.”

Provost Stroble agreed that this was the topic that needed to be engaged.

Chair Fenwick reminded the body again “Time is running short unless we want to hold this meeting over to the September meeting. Are there any other important questions? All questions are important, but they can wait. Thank you Provost Stroble. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee has a written report only so we’ll move to the University Wellbeing Committee.”

d. Well-being Committee - Senator Erickson gave a brief report. The Wellbeing Committee met once in this last month and we had a conversation with Vice President Case. He wanted to learn about the committee and our concerns.” She stated she would not go into great detail but urged everyone to read the report carefully when it was published in the Chronicle. She continued with several other items that were discussed. “We are looking at the potential of doing things ourselves, to see whether the College of Nursing can do a screening program that we would have to budget out at \$50 a person. Then it could be done within the nursing school.

We continued on the framework for the future wellbeing committee. I have met with Dr. Midha and talked to Senator Barrett who is with the AAUP negotiating team. We will meet on the 15th on that issue. Senator Konet mentioned the travel reimbursement issue that had come to our committee. We took it to the Executive Committee as well as VP Case. VP Case said that they are working on this and it should be sorted out and the rate changed by July 1st so that it would be in place for the next fiscal year. We suggested that instead of it being a fixed sum it should be linked to what the IRS and NSF do, and that apparently is going to be so.”

Hearing no questions for the Well-Being Committee, the Chair asked for the Academic Policies Committee report.

e. Academic Policies Committee – Associate Provost Dukes stated that he had two very short reports. “The Academic Policies Committee has considered a variety of center and institute proposals. This work has included inviting the authors of such proposals to meet with the committee and discuss the proposed institutes and centers. A task force/subcommittee of the APC is working on guidelines about issues surrounding attendance at university-sponsored events. Some other issues may be taken up next year as the committee continues carrying out its charge.”

Chair Fenwick “There is a motion handout coming from APC that deals with the establishment of The University of Akron Transportation Center. According to senate bylaws this needs to be presented to the senate a week in advance. However, if no one has an objection, this can come to floor. Are there any objections to this motion coming to the floor?”

Senator Gerlach questioned “Is it vital that we act today on this?”

Chair Fenwick replied that it was and Senator Qammar volunteered to speak to the issue.

Senator Qammar “There are a number of professors from the Civil Engineering department who have already received an award from the US Department of Transportation for a university transportation center. It involves a \$2 million award over the span of four years and USDOT has a great number of guidelines and rules and everything else in how you run one of these UPCs. Last week some time the PI for that particular award received a notice that said, by May 18th you must have a center. You can have the money but you have until May 18 to actually create a structure that is a center.”

Chair Fenwick requested clarification “How big is the award?”

Senator Qammar responded that it was \$2 million dollars in all.

Chair Fenwick again asked if there were any objections to this coming to the floor? Hearing no objections “This is a motion that comes to Faculty Senate from APC so it needs no second. Is there any discussion on the motion other than Senator Qammar’s?” Hearing no further discussion, the Chair asked that all those in favor of establishing a transportation center say aye. The motion carried and Senator Qammar thanked the body.

f. Curriculum Review Commiittee - Assoc. Provost Dukes then presented a brief report for the Curriculum Review Committee. “In addition to its usual work, CRC spent much of the spring considering the implications of the rule change affecting distance learning. It made itself the required subcommittee called the Distance Learning Review Committee and worked on formulating guidelines for considering course proposals for on-line courses and programs. From now on, such proposals will come before the Distance Learning Review Committee for review as required by rule 3359-20-052 B.7+. In the Fall semester, the CRC will continue to work on this and other relevant matters.

Senator Lillie thanked Assoc Provost Dukes for his work on CRC. “I’ve been on the CRC for a couple of years and he’s stepped in and he’s had a great deal of seriousness he’s brought to it and also a great deal of good humor and a great deal of care to it so I just want to thank him.”

Assoc. Provost Dukes “Thank you and bless you.”

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any other comments or compliments.

Senator Qammar wished to also complement the Associate Provost for his job on APC.

Chair Fenwick then moved to the Ad Hoc Committee on Facilities Planning report.

g. Ad Hoc Committee on Facilities Planning - Since Senator Erickson was not sure if she would make it in time to give the report, she had asked Senator Konet to read it.

Senator Konet “The Ad Hoc Facilities Planning Committee met last Thursday, April 30, 2006, in a special meeting to address the plans for the Auburn Science parking deck. The Auburn deck will be closed and construction is to begin on new space for the Department of Biology. This will result in the permanent loss of 231 spaces in the central campus. The committee recommends unanimously that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution: The Faculty Senate recommends that immediate action be taken to accelerate the development of a new parking deck with 300-400 spaces to be placed on the courtyard between the North Parking Deck (Lot 26) and Lot 27 or a similar suitable location.”

Chair Fenwick “This was not presented to the senate a week in advance, so is there any objection to bringing this motion to the floor for discussion? Hearing none, this motion is now on the floor for discussion.”

Wishing to clarify the location, Senator Gerlach asked if the north parking deck was the one over by the new Simmons Hall. This was confirmed.

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any discussion?

Senator Erickson reported that Dr. Sterns expressed his concern about the loss of parking spaces going further than the 231 in Auburn Science Center. There have been other losses on the west side of campus in the neighborhood of 500-600 spaces. Framing this concern around the issue of retention and special events parking for the student union, the committee felt that the issue needed to be a priority for senate to address.

VP Case informed the senate body that “The university is in the process of having a group do an evaluation of all parking across this campus, and with that we’re going to be looking at where parking is needed, where parking is lax, where is the heaviest parking, how should it be monitored, how should permits fees be issued. We want the best university plan to move forward with parking, strategically it’s critical that this institution has a parking plan long term and that’s what this group will be brought in to do. I think it’s critical at this point. As I walked on board I was told by many people where we needed parking. And I can listen to that and I can take it into consideration and I can appreciate it. A couple things I can’t do is say I’m an expert at parking services and that I know where the next parking lot should be. Secondly I can’t tell bond holders and our rating agencies how we’re going to fund this from a long term standpoint. I need experts to do this and that is why I feel it’s appropriate to make sure that that deck is built in the right place and when we have the right financing. I just thought this group should know that since we’re finalizing the process, the process was looked at by a committee. The committee had representation from students and faculty, police, academics and administrators.”

Senator Erickson “The fact that this consultation was going on was presented to the committee. The committee also said that they hoped they would have the opportunity to interact with the consultants on this issue and that certainly we would be involved in input because there has been a long history of facilities planning on this campus that has involved the faculty as well as other folk. It has been very effective but unfortunately it now has only been able to be an ad hoc committee, but these are precisely the people who have worked on this issue for years. The previous parking plan came out of the Sazaki parking plan and many of us were on that facilities planning commission so we understand the issue. When we made this comment it was made realizing that all we can do is recommend but it was a recommendation that came out of the expertise of the committee not in terms of trying to act in their own self-interest. That group had been looking at that whole issue and had been involved in that committee for at least 10 years.”

VP Case responded that he had been told that these plans would involve all constituencies on campus.

Senator Bohland stated that he had to respectfully disagree with this. “We just had a long conversation on the budget and a lot of people are concerned about the academic quality of the university. We built all these buildings, where is the academic quality? And now we’re about to

recommend building a new structure. That would seem a little bit contradictory to me. As a student, yeah I have to walk to class, I'm a commuter. But there are also more innovative ways that may come out of this commission that our chief justice of ASG is working on, such as setting up a system more like Ohio State where they have a better bus system than just our university shuttle. If you ask Jim Stafford, our parking services director, our spots are never utilized, there are always empty spots on campus. So why can't more people park at East Deck and Polsky Deck and get shuttled in for a three minute little shuttle ride? Instead of spending the millions of dollars to build a brand new parking deck after we just talked about how tight the budget's going to be."

Senator Zingale commented "I would agree that this is a question we've been muddling through in our transformation. And so I guess given the route that we may take on this, I want to agree with the idea of the shuttle busses. I think we have to ask ourselves this question, do we want a transformational change to parking or do we want to muddle through?"

Senator Gerlach called the previous question.

Chair Fenwick remarked that the call to question required a two-thirds vote. The body voted 23 to 3 in favor of calling the question. He asked that the resolution be read again.

Senator Konet read the resolution. "The Faculty Senate recommends that immediate action be taken to accelerate the development of a new parking deck with 300-400 spaces to be placed on the courtyard between the North Parking Deck (Lot 26) and Lot 27 or a similar suitable location."

Chair Fenwick called for a vote and the motion failed.

V. Unfinished Business – Included under New Business.

VI. New Business – Chair Fenwick announced that the Reference Committee report, Unfinished Business and New Business were going to be combined together for discussion because it involves a recommended change to the by-laws in the attendance policy. "Senator Rich will address this issue and you should have handouts for this."

Senator Rich "This is procedurally slightly complicated so let me just give you a little bit of background, try to make it comprehensible. In the fall, Senator Gerlach made a motion to amend the by-laws to provide for the senate to declare vacant seats held by senators who had missed four meetings. That motion ultimately was referred to committee. I think it was actually referred to the Executive Committee with the understanding that it would be referred by the Executive Committee in turn to the Reference Committee. The Reference Committee attempted to meet upon two occasions within the last couple of months. The first occasion there was no quorum and on the second occasion there were only three of us, there was still no quorum. And so I am in a position today to report, strictly speaking, that the Reference Committee has not officially met. But the three of us who were at this non-meeting agreed upon a proposed substitute amendment which is what I would like to ultimately offer today under unfinished business. And if I may, let me just describe the procedure that we need to follow here I think.

What I intend to do is move that the senate rescind its motion to refer Senator Gerlach's proposal to committee. If that motion passes, then that will put Senator Gerlach's proposed amendment on the floor. I intend at that point to move to amend Senator Gerlach's proposal by substituting the proposal that the three members of the Reference Committee agreed upon the other day. If that motion passes, then although there could be discussion, given the hour, I don't expect too much, and in any event it needs to lay over for another month which would put us in September, and so I intend to move to postpone consideration of this proposed amendment until September. Those are my intentions."

Chair Fenwick queried if the first motion was to rescind Senator Gerlach's motion?

Senator Rich responded "What we're rescinding is the motion to refer."

This motion was seconded by Senator Norfolk and carried.

Senator Rich "The second motion is to amend Senator Gerlach's proposal by substituting the proposed by-law amendments that are indicated in the handout, which I hope you all picked up at the beginning of the meeting. There are really two amendments of any substance; the first is the insertion of what would be a new paragraph called "G" in the article on terms of office. This new paragraph would say "the Senate may expel any senator who is absent without notice from more than three meetings during an academic year. In such event, the Senator's seat shall be deemed vacant." Because this paragraph would be inserted before what used to be paragraph "G" the proposal is to re-letter the former paragraph "G" to paragraph "H". That's the part that directly responds to the original proposal but while the three of us were meeting, we noticed that there was another problem in this article in paragraph "F".

The last two sentences of paragraph "F" provide that "senators who become unable to regularly attend meetings due to conflicting professional duties, imperative personal affairs, or illness will retain their seats if approved by a simple majority of those voting in the constituency. If not approved, the seat shall be considered vacant." We observed there was no mechanism for actually implementing this. So the second part of the proposal is that that paragraph be modified as indicated on the handout so that what used to be the second to last sentence would now read "the Senate may declare vacant the seat of any senator who becomes unable to regularly attend meetings due to conflicting professional duties, imperative personal affairs, or illness." And then the last sentence would be deleted. That is the proposed amendment to Senator Gerlach's November proposal."

Senator Gerlach seconded that motion.

Chair Fenwick asked if there was any discussion on this motion?

Senator Lillie “It appears to me from reading the motion that, probably deliberately, they have said the Senate “may” instead of the Senate “shall” so that means at this point there would have to be a particular instance brought to the attention of the Senate before we even consider whether or not this would be something we’d want to do. So there wouldn’t be some kind of committee out there counting up absences?”

Senator Rich responded that there was no provision for that in this proposal. “Even if we were to use the mandatory word “shall” there would still need to be something to initiate that process and if we use the word shall we’d be trying to bind ourselves to do something that we really don’t have the power to bind ourselves to do. So it seems that’s why the word “may” is there, not “shall.”

Chair Fenwick asked for further discussion. Hearing no discussion, a vote was conducted and the motion carried.

Senator Rich then moved to postpone consideration of the motion until the September meeting. Senator Gerlach seconded

Senator Lillie raised a point of order. “We just passed a motion, what are we moving to postpone consideration of?”

Chair Fenwick replied that “Technically, since it is a by-law change, we have to” The Chair did not complete this thought.

Senator Lillie interjected that “If it has to lay over a month it would not need a motion to say we’re going to postpone it would we? Because that’s in the by-laws already, to layover a month after it passes. If we want to pass this motion to get it out of here, that’s fine.”

Senator Gerlach clarified “Technically, I think parliamentarily, we could have tried to insist on a vote today because this has already been considered before and it’s laid over and laid over. But given the nature of the whole thing we thought it would be better to lay it over once more rather than to raise this question. So this makes it perfectly clear that this is what I propose we do.”

Senator Lillie withdrew his objection.

Chair Fenwick stated that he would defer to the former parliamentarian’s suggestion and asked that all those in favor of the motion laying over until September on this by-law change to say aye. There was one opposition. The motion to postpone consideration until September carried.

VII. Good of the Order - Chair Fenwick asked if there was any other business to come before the body, any good of the order?

Senator Gerlach “At the risk of us spending another minute here, for the good of the order, I would like to observe two things just briefly. I looked at the proposals approved by the Provost to the Faculty Senate in May, Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences at the top of the list, “delete the foreign language requirement for Master’s Degree in Chemistry.” I think that’s a scandal, a shame, out of the college of Arts and Sciences, no languages? It’s the old attack all over again.

The other thing is I didn’t get a chance to observe on the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, their report. This thing has been going on ever since that body was created, but I think we would be best served if, when they say grievances were received by the committee and assigned such a number, that they would also report to us in a very general way, what the nature of these grievances are. Can this be done without identifying people, particular cases? I think it could, but I ask the question.”

Senator Stachowiak “For the good of the order, I heard Senator Gerlach’s questioning of the President as to how the Plinton case transpired and I’d just like to make comment that a lot of what you might read in the paper is biased, and I know that that just stuns all of you. But I suggest that if you found a university police officer, got them aside and talked to them, that there’s reason for why things happened, there’s a reason why that exact event occurred and it may not be exactly what you read in the paper. A lot of what I read in the paper I am still trying to figure out where it came from. I have a good idea. But just for the good of this order, especially in consideration of the investigatory type of commissions going on, there are two sides to every story and I just ask that you look at the second side.”

Chair Fenwick asked if there were other comments for the good of the order? “Once again, thank you for your work this year, and have a good relaxing but productive summer. Once again my appreciation Linda for all the hard work. Goodbye, see you in the fall!”

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Heather Loughney
Transcript edited by Rose Marie Konet,
Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MAY 4, 2006

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

Executive Committee Report May 4, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Executive Committee met with the President and Provost on April 19 and again on April 27 to set the agenda for the May faculty meeting.

In the meeting with the President and Provost, the following issues were discussed:

The current mileage rate for travel reimbursement has been 30¢ per mile for a number of years. EC has asked the administration to consider raising the rate to meet either the standard used by the IRS (between 44 – 47¢) or the National Science Foundation of 47¢ per mile. The Provost stated that VP Case was already looking into those possibilities.

We also engaged in discussion about a potential controversy surrounding Suarez donation for the marketing school. The University is carefully checking into this before proceeding any further.

The EC also informed the President and Provost of the creation of two senate ad hoc committees:

1. Senate ad hoc committee on student disciplinary proceedings. The members of that committee are: Tim Lillie and Bill Rich (co-facilitators); John Boal, Frank Bove, Kyle Bohland, representing ASG, and Jesse Mann, representing Graduate Students.

The EC would like 2 or 3 more members for this committee, so volunteers are welcome. If interested, please email Rudy at fenwick@uakron.edu.

2. Senate ad hoc Exploratory Committee on the University Senate. Members of the committee recommended for senate approval are:

Elizabeth Erickson
Tim Lillie
Robert Huff
?????

APPENDIX C

Report of the Senior Vice President and Provost Faculty Senate May 4, 2006

- Thank-you for your leadership and partnership with Office of the Provost in 2005-06
- Updates about Searches/Appointments

Office of Multicultural Development: Ms. Coleen Curry, Interim Director
UA Medina County University Center: Ms. Susan Louscher, Director
Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development and Director of
Institute for Teaching and Learning: Candidates on campus next week
Deans searches in progress

- Joint appointment: *Design for our Future* Student Retention Planning Committee
(see attached charge)
- Budget update: John Case, Vice President for Finance and Administration,
Chief Financial Officer (see attached summary statement)

APPENDIX D

Choices for Facing Institutional Budget Challenges The University of Akron

April 2006

*“As campuses face budget reductions, they have a series of choices about how to respond. A short term vision, what we call ‘**muddling through**,’ may allow an institution to muddle through for a brief period, but has damaging long-term consequences for the campus. A long-term vision, which we believe involves **transformation**, may mean a more difficult immediate conversation, but ultimately offers a more hopeful future for student learning and faculty vitality.”*

Guskin & Marcy, “Dealing with the Future Now: Principles For Creating a Vital Campus in a Climate of Restricted Resources,” Change 35, (July/August 2003).

“A great organization is one that delivers superior performance and makes a distinctive impact over a long period of time.”

Collins, Good to Great and the Social Sectors, 2005, p. 5.

Muddling Through

- Assumes that the challenges are short-term and cyclical, with no permanent consequences
- Assumes that the only needed changes are incremental
- Actions taken only address short-term needs without challenging fundamental structures and processes

Transforming the Institution

- Assumes that long-term problems require long-term solutions
- Assumes that fundamental changes are needed to assure not only survival of the institution but to assure quality
- Actions taken create a clear and coherent vision of the future, transform the educational delivery system, and transform organizational systems

Implications

- Short-term strategies that close the gaps between revenues and expenditures are necessary but not sufficient to help institutions survive these challenges while also assuring continued quality. We will need to make permanent reductions in expenditures and reallocations of other resources.
- Organizations aspiring to greatness must continue to invest in components that can deliver superior performance even in times of constrained resources.
- The most strategic reductions, reallocations, and investments are those that transform our systems consistent with a clear and coherent vision of the future.

APPENDIX E

Design for Our Future Student Retention Planning Committee

Jointly appointed by Office of the Provost and Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Members:

Co-Chairs: Rudy Fenwick and Karla Mugler
Bill Lyons
Jeff Schantz
Maryhelen Kreidler
Dick Steiner
Helen Qammar
Bill Kraus
Jim Sage
Sabrina Andrews
Victor Pinheiro
Coleen Curry

Purpose:

To effect the study and planning necessary to begin campuswide implementation of the five design principles of leadership, innovation, engagement, inclusion, and assessment with a focus on student retention

Operating Procedures:

The expectation is that the work of this committee will be completed during Summer 2006 and is likely to require time and effort outside current summer work assignments.

The Office of the Provost will provide an operating budget of \$3500 that will support the committee's summer work for expenses such as meetings, copying, supplies, and report writing. The committee may need to engage others in this work and should confer with others on campus as necessary.

Upon successful completion of the planning and submission to the Provost of a written report that addresses the questions according to the specified criteria below, an additional sum of \$12,000 will be provided for use by committee members for approved professional expenses, such as conference attendance or technology purchases.

Questions to be considered:

1. What do current data indicate about trends in retention for UA students? Data should be disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, admission category, college, program, and other subpopulations of interest. Examine data for undergrads and graduate students.
2. How do UA trends compare with other comparable institutions in the state and country?
3. What do self-studies and research completed at UA indicate are the most effective means of increasing retention? For which populations? What are the financial and human costs of these interventions? What is currently working/not working? How could we have better impact to create success for students? Which interventions achieve the best return?

4. What do state and federal policy reports recommend as effective retention interventions?
5. What can be learned from our own students, faculty, staff, contract professionals, and community members that would guide our retention efforts? Examine every aspect of the campus: financial aid, student life, advising, instructional support, curricular offerings, facilities, technology, student employment, etc.
6. What can be learned from very different approaches to student success, such as Berea in Kentucky, where the institution employs every student?
7. What specific actions do you recommend for UA, noting individuals and entities responsible as well as timelines for implementing and the metrics for success?

Criteria:

- Recommendations are clearly derived from trends discovered in the examination of data, self-studies, policy reports, benchmarking, and constituencies.
- Each report component has been completed in a thorough manner and concisely described in the report with appropriate appendices provided. An executive summary and powerpoint presentation should be provided.
- Recommendations provide clear, specific, and implementable steps which can be undertaken as early as fall 2006.
- Recommendations compel action by entire campus community for a unified, coherent focus on student retention.
- The recommendations reflect the 5 design principles.
- The metrics provided include appropriate measures and language for balanced scorecard and innovation configuration map as well as dashboard indicators.

APPENDIX F

REPORT OF UNIVERSITY WELLBEING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY SENATE MAY 4TH, 2006

The Wellbeing Committee met on March 20th with the following items of business:-

Conversation with Vice President Case

Vice President Case attended the Wellbeing Committee meeting. He said that he wished to learn more about the Committee and to listen to our concerns. We brought up with him the on-going discussion of the future Wellbeing Committee structure as expressed in the Senate resolutions of September 2005 and December 2005. We also explained the role Wellbeing has played in the past in health insurance planning and the role of a representative elected body (like PBC) in evaluating the basic tradeoffs of health care insurance absorption v other costs.

The Committee expressed its continued interest in a more adequate system of accounting relating to health care spending, as advocated by the Senate in 2003.

The Chair shared the information related to health screening (see below) and its likely costs.

Finally, VP Case was able to tell us that the issue of travel reimbursement was being addressed with a new policy to be in place by July 1st.(see below)

Update from Wellness Subcommittee

The Chair reported information from Desnay Lohrum of Benefits on the potential for a screening program like that conducted at Kent State for its employees as a wellness initiative. Medical Mutual of Ohio, our present PPO, would arrange such a screening for those in the PPO, at a cost of \$50 per person. The Wellbeing representative for Nursing is exploring the possibility of reinstating the screening program carried out some years ago by Nursing faculty and students..

Framework for future Wellbeing Committee

The Chair reported that she had met with Dr. Midha, who will be representing the administration on this issue. She also spoke again with Senator Linda Barrett of the AAUP negotiating team. The ideas of the Wellbeing Committee on the structure of a new Wellbeing Committee have been shared with both groups as a starting point for discussion. It was agreed that there should be meetings on the issue during the summer.

Travel Reimbursement

It had been brought to the attention of the Committee that travel reimbursement of employees who use their own cars for university business had not been changed for a number of years. It remained 30 cents per mile, although the state rate was 40 cents and the Federal rate, based on a continually updated IRS study is 44 cents. The Committee members expressed their support for a system like other universities in Ohio: a rate equivalent to that estimated by the IRS. No further updating would then be necessary. Vice President Chase, as reported above, said that the problem should be solved by July 1st.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Erickson
Chair, Wellbeing Committee

APPENDIX G

To: Faculty Senate
From: Susan G. Clark
Chair, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee
Date: 4/17/06
Re: Grievances

Three grievances were received by the Committee and assigned file numbers, 06-01, 06-02, and 06-03.

The Committee has completed its consideration of grievances 06-01 and 06-02 and has rejected the complaints. Grievance 06-03 is still under consideration.

APPENDIX H

Academic Policies Committee Report for Faculty Senate Meeting May 4, 2006

The Academic Policies Committee has considered a variety of center and institute proposals. This work has included inviting the authors of such proposals to meet with the committee and discussing the proposed institutes and centers.

A task force/subcommittee of the APC is working on guidelines about issues surrounding attendance at university-sponsored events. Some other issues may be taken up next year as the committee continues carrying out its charge.

APPENDIX I

The University of Akron University Transportation Center

Executive Summary

On July 29, 2005, the 109th Congress of the United States passed the TEA-LU legislation which authorizes the U.S. Department of Transportation to fund 22 Tier II university transportation centers (UTC) throughout the nation. The University of Akron is one of the Tier II recipients.

With the support of the Ohio Department of Transportation, The University of Akron submitted a proposal to the U.S. Congress in the spring of 2003 seeking funding from the upcoming TEA-LU legislation. This proposal was eventually selected for funding with The University of Akron ultimately becoming one of four Tier II UTC in Ohio—Akron, Cleveland State, Youngstown State, and University of Toledo. Each awarded UTC is to receive \$500,000 dollars annually for the next four years.

Ohio's modern transportation systems have been instrumental in promoting and supporting the economic development of Ohio and US for more than four decades. However, with the increasing travel demand in trip length, trip time, and freight tonnage, our roadway system is experiencing worsening traffic congestion and accidents, and the infrastructure has fast deteriorated to the point where it requires immediate rehabilitation.

Its large population base and roadway network require Ohio to be a major player in education and technology innovation for the improvement of our transportation systems. Ohio has the fifth largest interstate roadway system carrying the fifth largest traffic volume in the nation, and has the second largest inventory of bridges supporting the fourth largest total number of motor vehicles. In the three major metropolitan areas with population over one million (Cleveland, Columbus, and Cincinnati), sustainable economic development and improved quality of life rely largely on the safe and efficient operation of the statewide transportation systems.

The Akron UTC was established in recognition of its potential to provide strong leadership in research and education to address transportation problems in Ohio.

The Akron UTC will focus on Transportation Mobility and Asset Management. These will include traffic safety, system control and management, pavement and highway material testing, foundation stability of highway infrastructure, etc. The Center will be hosted in the College of Engineering and its membership will consist of faculty members in transportation engineering and other related engineering fields at The University of Akron.

This document includes a mission statement for the Akron UTC, followed by the description of organizational structure, the physical facilities required, and the budget estimate and funding sources. The last section discusses the operation and the expected outcomes of the Akron UTC.

MISSION

The mission of the Akron UTC is to promote transportation systems research and education by pooling the excellence of knowledge and expertise currently existing in the University of Akron and other parts of Ohio. This mission aligns with the mission of the University of Akron in its effort to provide quality higher education and promote advanced research and technological innovations in Northern Ohio.

The exacerbating problems of roadway congestion, traffic safety, and infrastructure deterioration require comprehensive and continuing efforts from many technical areas to work cooperatively. The advantage of having a UTC at the University of Akron is to be able to put together knowledge and expertise from different areas in an interdisciplinary approach to identifying solution strategies. The Center will also help promote collaborations with federal and state transportation agencies, and with other research centers/institutes to increase competitiveness in funding applications.

The Akron UTC will conduct the following activities:

Research

The Center will work with other university research programs in Ohio and collaborate closely with the Ohio Department of Transportation to address problems in areas covering:

- 1) traffic operations and system optimization
- 2) traffic safety, including work zone and older driver safety
- 3) monitoring, assessment and modeling of pavements and highway materials
- 4) health monitoring and testing of bridge systems
- 5) transportation and homeland security

Education and Technology Transfer

In addition to research activities, the Center will collaborate with other excellent education programs in Ohio in a number of activities including:

For education –

- 1) Offer new multidisciplinary transportation engineering courses which can be offered to other institutions by means of distance learning.
- 2) Develop mechanisms for liberal sharing of lab facilities and equipment.
- 3) Foster student organization activities in transportation, organize student paper/project competitions, and sponsor students to attend regional and national transportation conferences.

For technology transfer –

- 4) Provide continuing education opportunities (workshops, seminars, and special training courses) for local industry.
- 5) Develop web-based delivery of transportation news.
- 6) Sponsor and/or jointly host transportation conference to showcase the work done within the Center.

Nationally, more than fifty UTCs are now working closely with the local state Department of Transportation, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, etc. Many of these UTCs have been in operation since 1991 with financial support from the special transportation legislations similar to TEA-LU. While the funding application process will remain competitive in the future, the U.S. Department of Transportation is required by the law to provide continued funding after the four-year cycle to support transportation research and technological innovations through the UTC and other national programs.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

As a recipient of the Tier II allocation, the Akron UTC will carry out activities in research, education, and technology transfer through its members and supporting staff in various areas of expertise. The Akron UTC will be hosted in the College of Engineering and will consist of the following members at the time of establishment:

Dr. Ping Yi will serve as the Director of the Akron UTC. Dr. Yi has been involved in transportation education and research for more than twenty years. His experiences include serving in the public, private, and academic sectors and dealing extensively with government officials in transportation at federal, state, and local levels. While working as a Principle Senior Scientist in charge of multimillion-dollar projects in the Minnesota Department of Transportation, he has since 1991 been involved in a number of UTC committee activities in Minnesota, Tennessee, and Ohio. Dr. Yi conducts research on traffic system analysis and control, traffic safety, intelligent transportation systems, and application of advanced information technologies, and has won and completed numerous research projects funded by the Federal Highway Administration, MnDOT, and ODOT.

In addition to managing the Center's day to day operation and participation in the research and education activities, the Director's responsibility also include reporting to the federal UTC program, preparing progress and annual work reports, interacting with ODOT and other state agencies for collaboration and funding support, attending national UTC meetings and other necessary regional conferences and local professional activities for the outreaching and future development of the Akron UTC.

Dr. Robert Liang specializes in geotechnical assets and risk management, bridge testing and monitoring, construction innovation, natural (mineral) resource utilization, large-scale transportation facilities monitoring, infrastructure data collection, modeling, and assessment, pavement design and highway materials, structural health monitoring technologies. Dr. Liang has been very active in ODOT sponsored, federal funds based, research.

Dr. Wieslaw K. Binienda specializes in advanced composite materials for bridge and highway structures, crashworthiness and impact behavior, ballistic and explosive behavior, modeling of strain

rate dependent materials, material model development and implementation into nonlinear-based systems. Dr. Binienda has been very active in research sponsored by NASA and other government agencies.

Dr. Pizhong Qiao has expertise in structural health monitoring and wireless communication using smart materials and MEMS sensors, advanced composite materials for highway structures, new construction, rehabilitation, retrofitting, and repair methods, highway security and safety through development of highway protection systems, development of new highway guardrail/roadside barrier using advanced materials. Dr. Qiao has been very active in research sponsored by NASA, FHWA/ODOT, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, and OAI.

Dr. Daren Zywicki focuses his research on sensor and information systems applied to transportation and civil infrastructure material characterization and monitoring. His research interests include geomaterial characterization, nondestructive testing and data-sensor fusion. A specific problem of interest is the exploitation of sensor arrays for nondestructive testing and evaluation of pavement systems. He also works with fusion of geographic information systems with sensed data for improving civil engineering and transportation management decisions.

Dr. Ala Abbas focuses his research on pavement materials, design, and performance modeling; micromechanical modeling of geomaterials; dynamic response of asphaltic materials such as asphalt mastics and asphalt concretes; rheological behavior of asphalt binders with emphasis on the role of binder modification on pavement performance; thermal expansion of concrete in rigid pavement design, and the characterization of pavement surface texture using image analysis techniques.

Dr. Richard E. Klosterman specializes in geography and planning. He has expertise in the areas of planning theory, planning methods, geographical information system (GIS) and computer applications, computer-based planning support systems (PSS), integrated GIS and other software tools and custom-written modules, land use planning, and urban modeling and emerging modes of collaborative planning.

Dr. Kevin Kreider specializes in mathematics applications in engineering. His research interest includes simulation of nanowire processing, inverse problems in nonlinear viscoelastic materials numerical methods in computational aeroacoustics, numerical methods in engineering, inverse problems in electromagnetic wave propagation.

Faculty/Researchers in other Ohioan Universities can also contribute to the Akron UTC through participating in its research and education activities. Those include at least the following institutions and focus areas:

Case Western Reserve University – Highway structure and foundation

Kent State University – remote sensing and GIS

Ohio University – pavement testing

Ohio State University – remote sensing and traffic control

University of Cincinnati – traffic operation and management, bridge structure monitoring

University of Dayton – traffic operation and analysis

Central State University – transportation environmental impact

Administrative Support will also be needed to assist in the Center’s operations. This will include helping organize activities in education, technology transfer, and research programs in the Center, and taking care of the daily correspondences with government agencies and other UTCs. The assistant will be hired using the UTC funding after the program commences.

The existing expertise in transportation and related areas at The University of Akron have attracted more than \$6 M in federal, state, and local funding over the past 5 years as shown below:

	Funding Source	Amount (\$)
	Federal Sources – NASA, NSF, Air Force, etc.	1,150K
	State Source – ODOT, OAI, OBR	4,800K
	Industry – Cities, Corporations, Consulting firms, and Others	200K
	Total Funding	6,150K

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

A number of existing engineering laboratories and computer facilities, including the Transportation Lab, the Pavement and Geotechnical Testing Lab, the Materials Lab, and the Structures Lab, and the GIS Lab, will be utilized for the Center’s research and education activities. In addition, the distance learning and the video conferencing facilities can also be used for workshops and technical seminars.

Space for the Center has been allocated by The College of Engineering in support of its operations. The Center will be located in Schrank Hall South, Room 9, which is suitable for hosting visits from other UTCs and the federal and state transportation agencies and providing meeting space for discussions on the Center’s activities. Official documents from the national UTC program and research reports created by the Center will also be collected and stored in the Center for review and study.

BUDGET AND FUNDING SOURCES

The Tier II funding implements a 50/50 matching formula for the recipient UTC to use the federal funds. Additional funding sources include ODOT, ODPS, ODOD, and other national research programs. While matching funds solicitation is one of the key efforts to be undertaken, the Akron UTC members have been very successful every year in securing research funding from these organizations.

It is expected that the operation of the Center will be fully funded by the federal dollars and matching funds for the first four years. This includes communications, technology, supplies, travel,

conferences, and staff support and other necessary compensations. The Center will continue to seek funding looking beyond the next four years, by participating in competitions of research, education, and technology transfer activities by many federal and state programs.

IMPLEMENTATION

Once the Akron UTC is approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees, several working committees will be formed to address issues on the development and operation of different programs in the Center. The following timeline will be used as a reference:

- development of the strategic plan in two months
- forming working committees on research, education, technology transfer, and additional funding and outreaching in the next three months
- setting up advisory council to include representatives from federal, state, and industry officials in the next two months of the Center's operation
- starting full operation within six months

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The program outcomes of the Akron UTC include increased sponsored research projects leading to increased research opportunities and the number of quality graduate students in transportation engineering. The education and technology transfer components in the program will also result in improved undergraduate and graduate courses, and diversified workshops and technical seminars for the local and regional transportation industry.

The outcomes collectively will benefit the economy of Ohio and quality of life of its citizens from improved transportation system. These improvements lead to travel time savings, fewer accidents, and energy savings and less air pollution.

APPENDIX J

In addition to its usual work, the Curriculum Review Committee spent much of the spring considering the implications the rule change affecting distance learning. It made itself the required subcommittee called the Distance Learning Review Committee and worked on formulating guidelines for considering course proposals for on-line courses and programs. From now on, such proposals will come before the Distance Learning Review Committee for review as required by rule 3359-20-052 B.7+. In the fall semester, the CRC will continue to work on this and other relevant matters.

APPENDIX K

**Resolution from the
Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee
for presentation to the Faculty Senate
May 4, 2006**

The Ad hoc Campus Facilities Planning Committee met last Thursday April 30, 2006 in a special meeting to address plans for the Auburn Science Parking Deck. The Auburn Deck will be closed and construction is to begin on new space for the Department of Biology. This will result in the permanent loss of 231 spaces in the central campus. The committee recommends unanimously that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

Resolution: The Faculty Senate recommends that immediate action be taken to accelerate the development of a new parking deck with 300-400 spaces to be placed on the courtyard between the North Parking Deck (Lot 26) and Lot 27 or a similar suitable location.

Respectfully submitted by
Harvey L. Sterns, Ph.D.
Chair, *Ad hoc* Facilities Planning Committee
e-mail: hsterns@uakron.edu