



2006-2007, No. 6

March 1, 2007

51 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- Passed a motion to request the proposed University Health Insurance and Benefits Committee include one voting member representing Wayne College, one voting member representing retiree dependents, and one voting administrative member. 12
- Approved the proposal for a Nutrition Center, but asked that APC reconsider the name of the center. 20
- Received the written report of the Student Affairs Committee 23
- Continue discussion of the proposal to modify the University governance structure. 23

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle* may be directed to the Secretary, Richard Stratton (x7440).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held March 1, 2007	3
--	---

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of March 1, 2007

A. Executive Committee Report	34
B. Remarks by Senior VP and Provost	35
C. Proposals approved by the Provost	36
D. Wellbeing Committee Report	39
E. Academic Policies Committee Report/Nutrition Center Proposal	47
F. Student Affairs Committee Report	50
G. University Council Exploratory Committee Membership List	51

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 1, 2007

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, March 1, 2007, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-six Senators, forty-two were present for this meeting. Senators Broadway, Goodson-Beal, Halter, Keltyka, Lillie, Ofobike, Plummer, and Vinnedge were absent with notice. Senators Bramlett, Gehani, Hamed, Ida, Riley and Vijayaraman, were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Fenwick welcomed senators. “Greetings this afternoon and welcome to the March meeting of The University of Akron Faculty Senate. The first item of business is approval of today’s agenda; a couple of comments about the agenda. One is that I’m going to incorporate the report from the representative of the Ohio Faculty Council in my opening remarks. And secondly there may or may not be a Student Affairs Committee report. We’ll ask the person who is the new chair of the Student Affairs committee, who is here, at the appropriate time. So with those two minor changes I would ask for a motion to approve today’s agenda.” Senator Lyons moved to approve the agenda and Senator Norfolk provided the second. The agenda was approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes – The minutes of the February meeting were not available.

III. Chairman's Remarks & Special Announcements – Chair Fenwick began his remarks with two obituaries. “Kirk Buckley, a building service worker in Spanton Hall passed away on February 8th, there are no further details provided. And secondly, Dr. Raymond E. Sanders, professor emeritus in the Department of Psychology passed away at the end of February. Dr. Sanders was an active member of the Psychology Department as a teacher, mentor, scholar, friend and colleague for more than thirty years. So if the Senate would please rise for a moment in respect for our past colleagues.” (Senate observed a moment of silence) “Thank you very much.

Later on in today's meeting we will have a report from the Wellbeing Committee and what is potentially a lively discussion of the proposal to have a University Council; a continuation of the discussion from last time.

In February the Ohio Faculty Council met with Speaker of the House Husted. This was the second straight year that we've been able to meet with Speaker Husted. We're very appreciative of his willingness to come and talk to us and to have an open discussion and question and answer period. He still looks incredibly young to me, an undergraduate. He and his wife have a new baby on the way; I believe it's a daughter. He's vitally concerned in the cost of educating that child in about eighteen years. We're very appreciative of his concern with higher education which predates his concern with his upcoming birth. He's very concerned and interested in higher education in the state. And again we're very appreciative of this. However, in thinking about his comments, I think there's a disconnect between his understanding and ours of education issues, not only higher education but education in general in the State of Ohio and our understanding. The first disconnect is that he basically said the problems with K-12 education funding are solved in the state. He gave some numbers [to support this conclusion], such as Ohio now ranks fifteenth nationally in per pupil funding which constitutes a per pupil spending of 3 million dollars per day in the state. We're also above the national means in graduation rates and scores on SAT and ACT entrance exams. What he overlooked, if I remember right, my understanding is of K-12 funding isn't the overall amount but the lack of equity between rich and poor districts in this state. And to our thinking that hasn't been solved. I could be wrong in that, but I have not seen any data to suggest that there's growing equality. And it's kind of like saying that during this decade the average income of American households has increased which is true but so has the inequality again between the richest and poorest households in this country. So that was one disconnect.

He also pointed out as he turns his attention towards higher education that he is doing so because higher education and the number of quality higher education graduates that we turn out are keys to turning Ohio's economy around in the future. But that affordability and access are major problems to increasing graduation rates. Thus affordability of college education and accessibility are problems not only to higher education but to the economy in general. And what he wants is a 33 percent increase in the next ten years in college graduates in this state and a 66 percent increase in graduates in the STEM disciplines. But his discussion neglects, or overlooks, how state funding, or lack thereof, for higher education has played a role in the accessibility and affordability issues. So again, what we say and what we do tend to be different things. To be fair, next Friday in our [OFC] February meeting we will meet with minority leader Chris Redfern.

The other topic that we talked about at Ohio Faculty Council which I think has a great deal of merit for us to think about, is we talked to the legislative liaison from Bowling Green State University. We discussed with him the link that they have between the legislative liaison and Faculty Senate and student bodies at Bowling Green. That Bowling Green State University has what they call a Committee on Professional Affairs. One of the duties of this committee is to have regular reports from the legislative liaison concerning state issues and legislative issues, what is being legislated that affects higher education in the state of Ohio. And vice versa to hear feedback from faculty and students and other members of the Bowling Green community what are their issues, what would they like to see, how can legislators, especially their local representatives, help them in what they need in getting their message across. I think this would be a good model for The University of Akron to think about. To work more closely with our legislative liaison, enter into a dialogue to talk about the state issues and legislation going on that affects us. To start the dialogue I'd like to formally ask for our new legislative liaison, John Allison I believe is his name, to come and talk to us about state legislative issues; hopefully next month, but if not in April then in May. I think this would be very informative and would open up a chance for us to provide input or discussion ideas about what we think are important and how we view higher education.

And finally I want to thank everyone who attended the Hearts for Humanity dinner and dance. And especially I'd like to thank the students who are giving up their spring break to go to the Gulf area to help with the cleanup and repair in that area. I believe they're going to Pass Christian to help this year; I think that's what I read. Their willingness to do that, and the willingness of the students who went last year, again speak to the role of higher education in producing not only better trained workers but better citizens. It's an example of how higher education can generate true civic engagement. And so with that I'll turn the meeting over to Dr. Stratton who will give the EC report."

IV. Reports –

a. Executive Committee – Senator Stratton indicated "The Executive Committee report today will be very short. The Executive Committee met on February 21st to set the agenda for today and also to discuss with Rudy some of the comments that he's already made about the Ohio Faculty Council. Then on Tuesday of this week, February 27th, we met with the President and the Provost. During that meeting Rudy also led a discussion on the comments that he's already mentioned today and asked the Provost for some update on the discussions related to the reorganization of the College of Fine and Applied Arts. One announcement that I would like to make is a reminder to all faculty senators that the election is coming up this spring. Please encourage your fellow faculty members to run for Faculty Senate and get involved in the election process. So keep your eyes open for information on that and encourage your colleagues to participate. That is the end of my report for today."

Senator Gerlach asked "Mr. Chairman, I was reviewing my papers before this meeting and I discovered something that I think we've lost track of a bit. I refer to an action taken by this body last April 6th, when a motion was introduced in the Senate; it was introduced by a number of faculty signing a request for a special consideration. And it goes back to the whole business about student disciplinary procedures. The Senate passed a motion that the Executive Committee have authority to estab-

lish and appoint members to an ad hoc Student Discipline Procedures Committee to undertake the task of evaluating the processes and procedures etcetera etcetera and then another point that was passed in that resolution was that the Executive Committee establish a timeline for this ad hoc committee to at least a preliminary report that is by last October. As far as I know we've lost sight of this all together so I have to ask what is the Executive Committee done or not done, what is it going to do or not going to do about this matter?"

Chair Fenwick indicated that the chair of that committee is Senator Rich. He asked senator Rich to address Senator Gerlach's concern.

Senator Rich asked "What committee are we speaking of?"

Chair Fenwick responded that it was the ad hoc Student Disciplinary Committee, which the EC appointed last April. The committee worked with the commission on student discipline over the summer to locate issues of student discipline.

Senator Gerlach asked if he could clarify. "Mr. Chairman may I read the last part of this to help him prompt his memory? 'That the Executive Committee work with and coordinate with the President's committee and advisory commissions that are investigating matters relating to student discipline. And that the Executive Committee's charge to the ad hoc Student Disciplinary Committee reflect the coordination with the President's commission.' So there was supposed to be some sort of cooperation."

Chair Fenwick corrected himself indicating that Senator Bove was the chair of the ad hoc committee, while Senator Rich was a member of the commission.

Senator Bove indicated the ad hoc committee has not done much recently, but would be willing to "jump back on that ball and get it rolling again."

Senator Gerlach asked if "the Senate [is] to understand then that perhaps within another month we may hear some sort of a report or the progress or lack thereof?"

After some discussion, Senator Bove indicated that the ad hoc committee followed the commission reports and reported to the Senate in September or October.

Chair Fenwick indicated he would consult the Chronicle to determine if the ad hoc committee met its charge or whether further action is needed. There being no further questions, he invited the President to address the Senate.

b. Remarks by the President – “Thank you Professor Fenwick, good afternoon colleagues. Let me just pick up on a couple of the things that Professor Fenwick has already mentioned. The items in Columbus continue to move along and it was nice hearing Rudy speak to us earlier to note that the Speaker of the House certainly is consistent in his remarks, even if those reflect some disconnects that I think all of us do need to address. The disconnect certainly in regard to funding also reflects the fact that funding is not immediately congruent with success in outcomes but it certainly does continue to reflect the discontinuities that exist between regions that have relatively low property tax support and those that have much higher tax support. The disconnects in terms of higher education are many and we’ve chatted about those in the past so we’re happy to certainly reflect on them with you but I think we will need to do a little bit more.

Two other things that need to be reported is that last week the legislature did introduce the legislation that would authorize the Governor to appoint the Chancellor and have the Chancellor report to the Governor and be a member of the cabinet. The legislation also, I am told I haven’t read the details, basically provides the Chancellor with the authority that now resident in the Board of Regents as an entity broadly. So that is likely indeed to move forward very rapidly and we are all I hope excited about the fact that we’ll have a new Chancellor before long who will be working with the Governor very rapidly. One concern about any possible delay is that the Governor is expected to: number one make his state of the state address on the 14th of March and issue his proposed first budget on the 15th of March. At the moment there are no leaks out of the office of management and budget or any other member of the administration about what the Governor will actually propose. Suffice it to say, as I’m sure Steve Brooks would be the first to agree, that the Governor has been talking about priorities but lowering expectations with regard to the budget. So do we have any best guess as to what the new revenues will support Steve?”

Senator Brooks responded that “Everyone’s being very very quiet.”

President Proenza congratulated the Bliss Institute on another very timely survey that was nicely covered and welcomed in Columbus.

President Proenza then continued his remarks. “Okay so that is moving forward and the reason for the urgency obviously is that the Chancellor designee needs to be able to weigh in with the Governor. They have been talking; but clearly they cannot have a kind of formal discussion that would be possible if the Chancellor designee would be in the cabinet meetings as the other members of the cabinet are.

The second thing that has happened in Columbus over the last week or so is that the Northeast Ohio Universities Study Commission has been finalized. The last appointment was that of Jim Trakas former state legislator from Northeast Ohio. Now we have a very unusual situation that has resulted which I think is very favorable and that is that it turns out that three trustees of The University of Akron will be serving on that commission. Mr. Pogue is the appointee from Senate President Bill Harris, our own chairman, William DeMoss is going to be representing the NEOUCOM the medical school board of trustees and our own designee to the commission is of course trustee Phil Kaufmann. So we have an unusually strong representation of people that we are at least in very

close conversation with. The chairman of that commission is Ted Boyd from Canton as I mentioned before and he has indeed now circulated some dates. We learned about two weeks ago that by law the decisions of the legislature do not in fact become formally part of law until 90 days after they've been signed into law. So the commission will have its first meeting approximately 90 days from the signature of that original bill.

Chairman Fenwick commented to you about the Bowling Green committee that exists and that I did have a chance to talk with Rudy and certainly will make Mr. Allison available. I think you'll find that very beneficial to try to better understand the issues that are facing us not only in the state of Ohio, but I would urge us to have a much broader discussion about what is happening nationally and what is happening globally with regard to higher education. In regard to matters in Columbus, Rudy, I think it's very important for us to recognize that legislators typically don't hear from anybody other than university presidents. I know I've chatted with you about how important it is for us to get students and I know that student government Kyle Bohland and some of his colleagues are increasingly more active in Columbus and it's deeply appreciated. We as a broader constituency need to find a way to appropriately let the legislature hear from us from time to time.

In addition, you've heard me talk, from time to time, about special reports that I think are important for us to be aware of. In keeping with that, though I mentioned this at our last meeting let me just repeat it, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President and at least one member that I know is here today has begun discussing some of these reports with me as a means for me to better understand how you might read some of this material and for me to feed back to you. Rudy suggested we might want to do some of that as part of that body so I will provide Chairman Fenwick with a copy of those things that we'll be discussing. Among them are two reports that I think you can access fairly independently. A very recent one is the report of the new commission on the Skills of the American Workforce entitled "Tough Choices or Tough Times" so putting that choice before us. It makes some very very provocative recommendations about how we might change the progress from high school, and really tenth grade, into colleges and universities as opposed to the way that we are doing it. The other report is entitled "Transforming Higher Education" and it is a report of the National Conference of State Legislatures and so I fully expect that some of the ideas there will begin to be filtering through our own legislature and it's well for us to be familiar with it and several others and I'll make those available to you Mr. Chairman.

Finally, let me just share with you the great news, the results of our university's participation in the United Way campaign. I thank all of you for your participation, and by the way participating doesn't necessarily mean giving. I would remind you of that because one of the things that United Way counts is simply whether you return the card or not. And so in the future, as the representative body here presently of our university I would invite you to please call upon your colleagues in the future to at the very least just return the card. That signifies to United Way general awareness of United Way and that's important. Secondly, obviously if you are prepared to do so and provide a donation that would be great but that's certainly not expected of you of course, but I'm pleased to report that our fall tally was a donation by this university of \$130,000 dollars; a new university record; eighteen percent over our stated goal; and somewhat above last year again. So with that I'm happy to entertain any questions and thank you very much."

There being no questions for the President, Chair Fenwick invited Provost Stroble to address the Senate.

c. Remarks by the Provost - "I'll add my thanks to Chair Fenwick for your co-sponsorship of Hearts for Humanity, I'm sure you saw the final total was \$5100 dollars that was raised as a result of what was really a spectacular evening. Much better than even the spectacular first time we did this. So I'm not aware of what that brings down the student's cost to, do you have that figure?"

Chair Fenwick responded, "I believe it was \$110 per student."

Provost Stroble continued her remarks. "Yeah, \$110 per student for them to use their spring break and provide that great service and what a wonderful thing that is and we had a lot of students in attendance this time too, which was truly wonderful.

Just to give you an update on Student Success and Retention Committee, they have scheduled a March 26 presentation to Deans and Chairs about their recommendations and how they're beginning to process those. If we would also like to schedule a presentation for Faculty Senate I think that's just a matter of us figuring out a schedule and doing that. So we're starting to roll out those recommendations and how they'll be handled.

Several searches - Dean of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering: we anticipate having interviews on campus during March and are very quickly narrowing down a large pool of candidates to a smaller set. School of Law: I think we anticipate having people on campus perhaps in late April or May, we'll see how that goes. Chief Diversity Officer: we have three finalists we're doing reference checks now and hope to have those people on campus for interviews in late March, early April. And Vice President for Student Affairs: we're charging the search committee very soon, invitations are going out, and in the spirit of the ad hoc committee we've asked Frank Bove to serve on that committee and he has agreed to do that. So we are trying to make the links where we can.

To go on then, just a few reflections on national context because I agree understanding what the national conversation is about education certain topics is really valuable to those of us living here in Ohio. So I just finished this past weekend three years of service on the board of AACTE, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. I'm at heart, I think and certainly by training, an educator so being on that board has really been a wonderful experience for me. They're really concerned with issues of preparation of teachers, development of teachers, not just for P-12 schools but what that means for higher education. I heard three women present about very different topics but certainly the overall theme is the importance of using the human voice for good causes and the power of that voice. Erin Gruwell, if you haven't been to the movie "Freedom Writers" that's her story, and 150 students that she taught in a high school in Long Beach California. Very troubled area of the city, lot of crime and most of her students truly had been in juvenile detention at one point or another, had backgrounds that argued against them being successful in high school. She listened to their stories about how they had seen family members and their peers shot down on Long Beach streets. She started to hear in those stories, stories that she was familiar with from the Holocaust, from the Freedom Riders in the South in the Civil War era, in Sarajevo and she started getting

them excited about reading other adolescents' writing about their war zone experiences that they had lived through and got them busy writing their own biographies. As a result of four years of teaching these 150 students they published their autobiographies about their experiences growing up in Long Beach. All 150 graduated from high school and they're all going to college now and they're using the proceeds from the book to pay the tuition. So it's a powerful story about how writing about your life can help you save your life, it's pretty neat.

Diane Ravitch, long-time critic and very well spoken and written critic of higher education and public education in general. It was kind of a great opportunity to get her to speak and to listen to her and I fully expected to be educated a little bit about a different point of view about education: what was working and what wasn't. What was most surprising was that she had read "Tough Choices or Tough Times" and wanted to respond to that. She said that she felt she needed to use her voice to say what she thought that the challenges were for those of us who care about public education. So here were her six points which I thought were interesting. She's talking to the audience, and she says, "Make it your mission to fight for the place of public education in education" and in her words "every neighborhood needs a great public school." Number two "make the case for education as a profession". Number three "use your knowledge of testing and psychometrics to bring sanity to the assessment and accountability conversation". Number four, "make voices heard collectively about the reauthorization of higher education". It's on the docket again this year, it's been on the docket I think for six years now. Number five, "set forth a vision of education" and finally, this is for the teacher/educators in the audience, "prepare teachers who are superb practitioners that they are heavily recruited and sought after". So it was kind of neat speech about how she saw that she needed to use her voice as an advocate for public education but also set the bar pretty high for what it needs to look like.

And then finally, Sheryl Lee Ralph, one of the original Dreamgirls who was on Broadway in '82 when it opened, she now continues to perform but she also writes. She did a one-woman show called "Sometimes I Cry". If you have an opportunity to see this it's powerful. She was deeply affected by the loss of fellow actors in New York City because of HIV and AIDS. As this epidemic began to spread to the African American population she collected stories of thirteen African American women who had been affected by HIV and AIDS. In this one-woman show on any given performance, she selects two of the women's stories and uses song and also her own acting ability to take on the identities of these two women. She creates a very powerful story about how all of us truly need to use our voice to help young people, ourselves and those around us understand what's really necessary to stop the spread of HIV and AIDS. So I had a great weekend and it encouraged me to listen to other people's voices because of what they can teach us and to use my own voice in the ways that I can. I would like to do that today, I encourage you to do the same."

Chair Fenwick asked if there were questions for the Provost.

Senator Gerlach asked "Yes Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Provost could help my failing memory it may be. I hesitate to ask this because I'm not a recipient or sender of e-mails so I may have missed out on something. But a year ago January the Provost spoke to our retirees association and reviewed for us at that time the status of the whole planning of the academic design for the

future. And since that time, I don't know, I've been completely lost, I haven't heard it talked about it since, I've wondered what the status of the design plan might be or whether it's still emerging or is it finished or what?"

Provost Stroble responded "This body recommended to me that we create a joint committee to work together on how to implement the design principles of that plan, that's what the Student Success and Retention Committee was charged with doing, and particularly figuring out how those design principles would inform our work with students. So that's why I think it's important for that group to report back to Faculty Senate."

There being no further questions, Chair Fenwick asked permission for Dr. Liz Erickson to give the Wellbeing Committee report. There were no objections.

d. Wellbeing Committee report (see appendix D) Dr. Erickson reported "You all have a copy of the report of the Wellbeing Committee. I'll just review the major points. It was a short report because a lot of the group's material is attached and I urge you to look at those and as I go through you can have a look if you haven't already. But this last Tuesday, February 27th, Vice President Case sent me the attached e-mail (see appendix E), that you have here on the second page, which described the University Group Insurance Committee that the administration had come up and decided on. And what I had also attached so you could refer to it as we go through the report is the formal input we provided to Vice President Case in mid-December (see appendix F). When I came to you at the beginning December we had not yet had a chance to pull together that input and we were to have till December 15th. We got that report in and I am attaching here because you can compare what has been put out as the University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee and after the administration discussed and deliberated on it, and you can compare it to what we have. You can see the actual committee. The voting composition of the committee you can see on back page of your report. Given that we got this late on Tuesday there wasn't time for the President and the University Wellbeing Committee to meet for a formal response, but I did send them e-mails and ask for feedback. On the basis of that feedback and my review of administration document I would note the following: the administration has included most of the statement of charges proposed by the Wellbeing Committee. You'll see that in our report to Vice President Case we put in the purpose and charges and suggested that they needed to change. Most of those had been included and those charges referred to were significant and feedback system would be appreciated in that process. Secondly, the administration has increased the representation of faculty and staff which is the largest constituencies. In their original proposal it was just one from each of these and we had said that it needed to be representative of the size of the constituencies and employee population. And there is a much greater attempt to do that. Three, the administration has not addressed the three major issues outlined in the December report of the Wellbeing Committee to the Senate and outlined in our last report; a – no separate representation voting or non-voting for Wayne College, b – no voting member of retiree dependents and c – a maintenance of an overrepresentation of administrators on the committee which is meant to provide for employee constituencies. And just to make a note there are three voting administrators in a committee of ten; or eleven if the chair is a voting member which is not quite clear.

Our arguments on those three issues are in this report, and were given at the meeting in December. And there are members of this body who can address them more directly than I can. You have what we said and the written material in what you have. And they still stand. To quote a committee member's e-mail, in response to what we got is they quote, "it appears that a true constituent based representation is not being sought on this part of the plan." It would be, I think, the representation of those certainly on these three issues. So, you in December passed a resolution that supported the ideas that are listed here those three ideas, under three a, b and c. Well actually I think the others as well, but to a certain extent those others have been addressed. I urge you to do so again today though the committee has not had a chance to meet and I cannot bring the resolution to the floor as I understand it a senator will bring a resolution. That is the end of my report."

Chair Fenwick recognized Senator Vierheller for purpose of making a motion.

Senator Vierheller, representing the Wayne College campus, read the following resolution, which was provided in a handout before the meeting.

"WHEREAS, the Senate recommended in September 2005 that a university health insurance committee be set up representing all campus employee groups, and that it be an open and inclusive process as set out in more detail in the September 15, 2005 Chronicle;

WHEREAS, the Senate, in December 2005 directed the Wellbeing Committee to work together with other constituent bargaining and non-bargaining groups to establish a framework for the University-Wide Health Care and Benefits Committee

WHEREAS, the Senate passed a resolution in December 2006 in support of the issues on representation brought to the administration by the Wellbeing committee and outlined in their report to VP Case on December 15th

WHEREAS, the University of Akron Faculty Senate is the body of the University of Akron that has the widest representation from the different constituencies;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate requests the administration to add a voting representative from Wayne campus and a voting representative for retiree dependents to the University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the administration be asked to reduce the number of voting administrators on the Committee to that representing the numbers of non-bargaining unit administrators as insured employees.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if the administration does not meet the request of Senate in these matters, that the administration should report to Senate their reasons for not making these changes."

Senators Gandee and Davis seconded the motion. (see appendix G)

Senator Vierheller began discussion of the motion. “One more point in terms of focusing on the Wayne Campus we have had certain issues that have arisen in the past, healthcare and dental being further removed from the City of Akron, the number of providers available and so forth has been an issue for some on our campus. So that focus in terms of Wayne College representation being behind that part of the resolution. Also as you can see in the documentation provided by the Wellbeing Committee, I think it’s over 700 retiree dependents are still involved in the healthcare system as part of the University of Akron, so again that part of it we believe the importance that there be this fuller representation take place.”

Senator Moritz asked “what does that second to the last paragraph mean?”

Dr. Erickson responded “Oh I’m sorry you want to know for the resolution? I can tell you that if you look at the material that you have in hand, from December the Senate report of the Wellbeing Committee, under numeric representation on the committee, it says that and I will quote you from the report, “Staff, faculty, contract professional and faculty retiree dependents are the largest constituencies with the largest constituencies with which to communicate. It is therefore appropriate to include more than one representative of staff, faculty and contract professionals, and to include a representative of retiree dependents. On the other hand neither Deans nor Department chairs have responsibility for health benefits in their colleges or departments and therefore only represent their own constituencies as employees.” The argument being made here is that this is a committee that is to represent the employee constituencies. Administrators, whether they be Chairs or Deans or higher level administration, should be represented in this committee as employees, not in their administrative roles. Therefore the number that is included for them should represent that. When it says, “given the small numbers in these constituencies and not any particular unique issues, their interests can be met by a representative of a more general constituency of which they are part, non-bargaining unit faculty and administrators.” And you will see on our list that they had one representative. So instead of there being three or four representatives, they should have one.”

Senator Moritz responded “So that’s ok. I’m just not sure that that’s exactly what that paragraph says.”

Dr. Erickson indicated “It doesn’t say one; it just says that they should be used to reflect the number. But if you wanted to change it to say one that’s not a problem.”

Chair Fenwick asked for further questions.

Senator Gerlach said “Mr. Chairman I want to observe that there is, according to my papers here, there was a proposal that retirees might have a representative on an advisory body to this committee, I think that’s not very nice. And not very acceptable because since we have been admitted to membership in this Senate, and have accepted our responsibilities to participate that way. Since we have had membership on the Wellbeing Committee to say now that we are to have no voice there in terms of a voting voice seems to me to be a step backwards, a reversal of the way the administration has been treating the retirees. I think we deserve a little bit more respect than that. I hope that the change will be made in line with the resolutions request and my thought the Wellbeing Committee

has constantly argued for. We stand on the sidelines somewhat as veterans of the university but also to us continuing our interest in the universities' welfare and progress. To this end as our organization is fast approaching its tenth anniversary, various schemes have been proposed for celebrating that and one of them is that retirees should be asked to raise some money for endowing a scholarship. If that's the kind of thing we can do for the university even beginning on a limited basis, not to mention what individual faculty do on their own, never mind the retiree's association, I think that we ought to be given more consideration than this plan would offer us. To say otherwise is to say you retirees don't count for much and therefore we will push you aside. If that happens, it doesn't make me as a professor emeritus at this university very kindly disposed to the university for which I have worked 32 years in various capacities, does not make me kindly disposed to leave them any bequest in my will and so on. You know we expect to be treated fairly, honestly, justly and compassionately. And if we are not dealt with that way don't be surprised if our members will not react accordingly. Thank you for your indulgence."

Chair Fenwick thanked Senator Gerlach and asked permission for Vice President Case to address the body. There was no objection.

Vice President Case thanked the Senate and addressed the motion. "Well thank you. Just to kind of give you an overview of just addressing each of those points and some reasonings and some also some opportunities I think. If you look at the first one, the Wayne Campus, from our perspective both the Wayne and retirees could be looked at in a couple of different ways. One is the Wayne Campus and retirees could be included in either one of the representations where there are elected representatives, either through the AAUP, the SEAC, the CPAC, the CWA. We're more than happy to have representations from it, if those are the elected representatives on the committee. We're more than happy to be participated and even university administration maybe would be an opportunity to put a Wayne person on that. The other idea is that in relationship to the Wayne is that Wayne is very similar to the other colleges. If there are specific issues that we need to address with the Wayne Campus, we'd be more than happy to bring someone in to talk, let them talk to us about the differences. I think our current benefits organizer understands that. That's part of the administration of Human Resources. We do need the current person that oversees that area in there. So I think there are opportunities if there was anything that was going to negatively affect Wayne campus we'd be more than happy to bring the people in.

Remember this is advisory in this section means many ways to bring them in at times when we need their input, when we need their thoughts on this particular process or the responses from the RFP members who are giving us their information or proposals. So advisory will be within this group here and if we need someone in, bring them in that's got a special case we'll be more than happy to bring someone in from the campus if they are not included in one of the representations up here. The retirees are similar, if you think about it for the most part, are probably we are going to be talking about employee benefits so seventy-five to eighty percent of the time this committee will be working with what are the benefits for employees, what are the things we need to address. When the time comes when there are opportunities to look at retiree benefits, if there are one or two or three

people we want to bring in are the retiree-type people and that have been talked to the group or thinking. So there are opportunities. Advisory means they're not shutting anybody out, it means they're more inclusive.

Remember we have a very tight schedule to get a lot of work done. There are eleven members here. We want to make sure we get that group in, working hard and we think this the appropriate representation. Lastly on the administration side, I'll give you the numbers could vary depending on how you look at it. The reason I'm chairing it is because it is a unit, Human Resources is under the Vice President for Finance Administration. If you want to count that as an administration feel free. We look at it as the responsibility that if there is a problem with the benefits I have complete responsibility. If someone doesn't like it, there's a big complaint I will be the one responsible. So that's why I was chosen as the chair. There are two administration reps. There are many parts to this area that are administration, whether it's senior administration, deans, chairs, other people within the institution. We thought that was a fair number in relation to the other eight that are on there from the representative groups. The HR if you want to consider the HR administration, that's fine it is part of the administration as a function but remember we always are going to need administration person represented from HR because they are the ones who have the knowledge and understand the current issues and healthcare benefits and even wellness topics because they are the experts. So that's why they are on the committee. I hope no matter what, there's always an HR representative at the meetings. So that's why they were included. So when you look at the numbers, yes if you included the HR rep as one that would be one, if you included me chairing it that would be two but as we saw it we looked at there's two representatives from all the administration out of a group of ten plus me, so that addresses all three points and I think that's from my perspective the short version of what we wanted to address. Any questions on that?"

Senator Matney asked "It seems to me that the argument that they have advisory abilities is spurious. You could then eliminate anyone, and say well they could eliminate the AAUP and say well they could always come and talk in an advisory capacity. Is there any real reason other than it would be administratively or logistically difficult to have thirteen people as opposed to eleven? I mean do you really feel that adding a retiree benefit would make it that much more difficult to schedule these meetings? It seems to me that specific constituencies like Wayne campus would have specific reasons to be represented on the committee. For example the issue of network coverage: it's a good reason to make sure that they get specific representative as opposed to they can be fit into a category if we happen to elect them. Seems to me that Wayne campus is isolated enough already. And it's unlikely that they're going to be elected as one of three representatives. So is this really that much more work to add two people to the committee?"

VP Case responded: "And I think what we'll do is take it under advice and move forward. I think there are some good points there."

Senator Matney stated "Well we could resolve the issue it seems to me because we're going to vote on this resolution right now."

Vice President Case replied: "This was the short version. I can come back and give you the full presentation at the next meeting. I thought that was how we were thinking. I'm not here to represent any group that made a decision on what the membership should be. Again, our benefits administration understands all the issues and I believe they understand very well. They work very closely with Tammy out there. To be honest with you, Desnay understands the Tammy issues of Wayne campus. I think that's very fair. So as that happens, Desnay's on the phone all the time with Tammy to talk about the specific issues in terms of coverage etcetera. There're issues in terms of vision, there are issues in terms of other things that we need to address. Our benefits person is the closest one to the handle on that. That's really the reason. But we can take it under advice and come back and review your motion and yes or no and then have a true presentation. To be honest with you, as we go through you'll see a parking committee that is now up to about 12-14. Yes, every time you add a person it does become more difficult to get everybody together and to manage that group. That's my own experience."

Dr. Erickson requested some clarification. "It's a question of the information. When we put our representation up, and I speak just as a Chair of the Wellbeing Committee, we certainly had the chair as the Vice President of Finance, but in the exofficio nonvoting or at the very least only voting as in Roberts Rules when there is a tie. It was not clear from what you said whether you would be just chairing the committee and voting in the case of a tie that is one thing I would like to ask. The second one again I'd like you to address the Human Resources as we put it in was there as exofficio nonvoting as she is in the present Wellbeing Committee and she is a very important resource. But she does not vote; she attends every meeting but she doesn't vote, again exofficio nonvoting versus voting is what I ask you to address."

Vice President Case in response: "From my perspective as I look at what this committee has to do, and you look at the part of bringing forward an RFPs which will come from various companies, looking at those, looking at the pros and cons of those, what I intend to do as chair is to get to consensus, is to build the consensus of the group. I don't believe in exofficio title for me or not, Human Resources or not when it comes down to it if we're at well half the group is over on this side and half is on this side, we need to deliberate more, we need to work through the issues. At the end hopefully everybody has benefited from some give here, some give there and you know something that group comes out with as proposal from the university at that time. The voting, from my perspective really is at the end, if you've got a good committee working together, going through the process of deliberating you come out with consensus and that's what we want from this committee. If I was to sit there and take a vote and it became five to five, I don't believe we would be anyplace we'd be going through the process again. If I even sense it's that close we go through the process of deliberating. If there's something that we need to get from a vendor, we will bring them back in there, we have them address it, it is consensus building, that's how we will operate."

Senator Lyons asked "Are we to understand that this means that no recommendations will come from the committee that are not consensus recommendations?"

Vice President Case replied. "Correct. What we're gonna build is consensus, I don't feel comfortable bringing forward any recommendation that's not consensus building. However, that goal is

with the case of everybody giving and arguing and deliberating and also asking whoever it is, whether it's a healthcare vendor, a wellness vendor, whatever it is the group is looking at to come in and give us more detail to compromise, maybe give us a lower price, give us other coverage. So it's everybody it's the people on the group and whoever we're dealing with as vendors etcetera gonna be deliberating. Yes, I'd never feel comfortable if there wasn't, if there was something three quarters of us didn't want it to say it's a done deal. It's gonna be consensus building."

Senator Kriedler: "I'd hear what you're saying. I know I speak for my constituency to say hey we agree with what you're saying. But I think also need to be aware that as my insurance man says "God forbid something happens to you". Do you know what I mean? You are presenting a consensus building, you are presenting hey this is what we're going to do. But I feel and I think that a lot of us feel we need to have it set up in a way that if you're not here, or something changes that we're hearing all that consensus building and we're having people present who can make those kind of recommendations because it is an advisory. The second point would be and I agree with my colleague who said hey what about having the two additional people? I was in a committee today where three of our people couldn't make it and therefore we missed them but they were not able to feed into our discussion and into our recommendations. So I think if we can't you know we're going to have a meeting on such and such and three or four people can't make it, we missed you, but we continue on. So I would just challenge that if we have too many members we can't get together. Thank you."

Vice President Case responded. "I think that no matter what, whether it's a Wayne campus issue, a retiree issue, and those people weren't in the room, we would move on to another topic and bring it back. So in relationship to that I can guarantee that and to the point of changes or you know you hearing it from me versus the next generation, I would hope that this institution would go on towards the idea that we are an institution going towards a goal which is making sure we educate students and to be in that is probably the history of benefits about certain administrative areas; finance administrative areas and the mistrust. And to be honest with you I hear it. I hear it whether it's a parking issue, a finance issue, a benefits issue. What I'd like to do is at least build some sort of trust that we can work through this as an institution. That's what we're here for, and if we don't get past that in some little way shape or form, then I think we're gonna be at odds a long ways. So everybody's got to give a little. We as a group, as a university, should be able to move past these issues. For this group of employees, we have the best healthcare benefits, the best wellness program we can and anything else this group needs to deal with as well as the best consensus group other committees and issues that come before this institution."

Dr. Erickson stated: "What I found and this is one of the reasons that the committee felt so strongly about this after all it might have been the colleges that could have came up with our suggestions but the number of times over the years where we didn't know there was a Wayne College issue. I mean we would have certainly thought of some of them and Desnay would bring up well you know we've got them for the doctors and the this and the that when we were actually doing our RFPs and coming up with looking at alternative people. Senator Davis you were at some of the meetings. We managed in that particular case to miss out on dental which we looked at everything else but if there had been somebody there from Wayne we wouldn't have done it. And other ones, when they're

talking about recreation and many others of these things where we think oh yes, everybody's involved. Oh my gosh, then Colleen would say well you know there's Wayne and you know if that's what you're going to suggest then you have to be something different for Wayne. So it would be nice to think that all of us knew when to bring them in, but we don't and that what a group or committee would mostly with one Wayne rep and all the rest of the committee said we feel Wayne is different and it really needs representation and out of our experience of what we've learned of the differences of that apply. If we hadn't had Linda among other things because Linda provides a huge input from a long period on this issue but she also is a person who knows where all the retiree dependents are. And that makes a huge difference. And there's a lot of them. And certainly on the Wayne issue I can only say we say that out of experience: 'cause we didn't know the issues that Wayne had."

Vice President Case indicated "I think it not only goes with Wayne but when you think about it we talked about Wayne as a separate part of this, there are probably some other issues that a few other colleges could argue in some way shape or form the benefits or other issues and I think from my perspective if there's gonna be the RFP going out on the street just take healthcare, just take that as an example, well I'll be honest with you I think Steve and Desnay should reach out to Wayne and say are there any special things that we've been, that this group hasn't looked at. I have no problem with that. From our perspective it's being proactive, it is not being exclusive it's just being proactive in making sure that we can address the issues and be proactive in terms of getting input from them. Whether we're dealing with the healthcare issue or putting in a wellness program there and how are we gonna relate to maybe the athletic facilities and the wellness at here and at Wayne are they gonna be inclusive, I think that the discussion in wellness is that in this meeting I do think we do need to bring in a Tammy or Wayne representative to talk a little bit about the difference between their rec and our rec and all that kind of thing. So that's just a longer answer than it probably needed."

Senator Matney continued the discussion. "First of all I'd like to say that I appreciate and agree with the consensus model I think that it's very important that we do work towards as much as we can a consensus for everyone; which makes it even more difficult for me to understand why insuring that you have 100% representation or as close to it by including Wayne and retirees into this model is objectionable. I don't see why we wouldn't want to make sure that their voices are heard. That way when you're making a consensus decision we know that everyone is represented and I think that it's a strong model. So I guess I would like to urge my fellow senators to vote for the resolution that's before us from wellbeing in order to insure that those voices are also heard in this process."

Senator Vierheller: "I just wanted to assure that we appreciate the work that Human Resources has done for Wayne college and their interaction with Tammy and so forth. It wasn't a question of that. It's just in assuring we get the representation. We see as a model. I mean I'm here in the Faculty Senate representatives to the Provost advisory group, the President's advisory group so in general it is a model that we would have separate representation in such a way."

Senator Kushner-Benson observed: "Just to clarify the math involved here. The resolution does recommend that the number of administrators be reduced on the committee by adding two mem-

bers, one from Wayne one to represent the retirees, it may be a washout depending on the number of administrators that are actually removed from the committee so some organizational issues may be a moot point.”

Senator Matney asked if the language in the next to last paragraph needs modification. Are people still confused about it? He had trouble reading it. He wondered if Senator Moritz wanted to suggest specific language in a motion to amend.

Senator Moritz responded the paragraph is trying to say that the administration representation on the committee be reduced to one. He did not think it was a great way to start out, if we are really seeking consensus. When asked by Chair Fenwick if he wished to make a motion to that end, he declined. He was against the motion as is stood and would be voting against it. He therefore had no need to amend it.

After some discussion, Senator Kushner-Benson made the following motion to amend the next to last resolution. **“Be it further resolved that there be one voting administrator on the committee.”**

Senator Volmer seconded the motion to amend. Chair Fenwick recognized Vice President Case for further comment.

Vice President Case: “I wanted to speak to the amendment, but there is one comment I would like to make, because I think it’s important and relevant. I know in terms of this we did do one thing; we reached out to five areas to make sure we got input from everybody across the campus. We did, I had meetings with AAUP a very long meeting a good discussion on this proposal. They gave us very good feedback. We met with the wellbeing, those two groups, CPAC, SEAC, CWA. We met with a lot of groups, remember we got a lot of feedback. We compromised. Remember at least there was recognition of points we took into consideration and changed. The wellbeing got some of their stuff put in, the AAUP also, CWA had input, SEAC, CPAC. That was the process. So yes we may have changed some of the information from the wellbeing but remember the group looked at the information as all separate documents how can we do what’s best for the university pulling in the opinions of everybody? And so I do just want to make that point, and I know it’s not to the amendment but it’s important in terms of any presentation I may make on this that we took in input from almost six groups. And that was how we had to go through it and I think everyone in this room would realize that when you get input from so many various groups, everybody has to compromise. And I believe in that, I do believe in that as we go forward and I believe it’s a trust issue that we need to push forward, we have a good committee let’s make sure we get this moving as quickly as possible. Thank you.”

Senator Gerlach rose to ask “Mr. Chairman, a point of clarification. Is this to be an amendment which simply removes all the language there except to say that the administration have one voting member on the committee and that’s all it’s going to say? Because I couldn’t make out any sense of representing numbers of nonbargaining unit administrators as insured employees, that’s all garbled. I wonder if this is simplifying simply to have a one administrative member.”

Chair Fenwick stated “As I understand it, the amendment makes that clause read: “Be it resolved that there be one voting administrator on the committee”, period.”

There being no further discussion, the question was called. **The amendment passed.**

There was no further discussion on the main question, as amended, so that question was called. **The main motion passed.** (see Appendix H)

That concluded the report from the Wellbeing Committee. Chair Fenwick then called on Dr. Dukes to submit the Academic Policies Committee Report.

f. Academic Policies Committee report Dr. Dukes: “Hello. The Academic Policies Committee met and unanimously supported the establishment of The University of Akron Nutrition Center of Excellence.

‘Be it resolved that The University of Akron Nutrition Center of Excellence will bring together the university and community into one comprehensive regional center for the study and delivery of effective nutrition interventions. It will provide the needed link between UA nutrition expertise and the extensive preventative health care needs of our campus and our surrounding community. The physical space would include a nutrition assessment laboratory with contiguous community nutrition education room, information technology lab, private examination and nutrition counseling areas, reception area and office areas.’ (See Appendix I)

Chair Fenwick indicated since the motion comes from committee it needs no second. He called for discussion.

Senator Vollmer asked “Can you tell me what the word excellence means?”

Chair Fenwick asked if the Senate would allow Deborah Marino and Evelyne Taylor to respond to any questions on the center. There were no objections and they were invited to address the body from the front of the room.

Deborah Marino replied “Hi, our Nutrition Center for Excellence I guess we chose the title because we wanted to bring in comprehensive services and we wanted to draw on the expertise that we have within our department and with our colleagues that we work with out in the community. And we felt that by having that title that that would convince others that we have services that were worthy to participate in.”

Senator Gerlach stated “That does not satisfy me. This is a mishmash of terminology if ever I heard it. Have we not learned how to use English? Center of Excellence, excellence has to be applied to something. I assume that they’re driving at doing something about a nutrition program that is excellent in some way. But Center of Excellence just modified by the previous word nutrition is a jumble. I think it ought to be reworked somehow. Everything is the center of excellence, the

History Department is the Center of Excellence in Historical Study I guess. Where there is excellence in nutritional programs that's to be understood, put it in a particular context, why can't we say it in a more succinct but direct and correct way. Excellence hanging out there by itself in that way does not seem to fit to me that's all I'm saying. I move that we send this back to committee for further consideration on that point."

Senator Vollmer seconded the motion to return it to committee and Chair Fenwick asked for discussion.

Senator Kushner-Benson observed that "Having served on the Academic Policies Committee the past two years in which this proposal has been I think it's been two years (it has) I believe it started last spring I believe that the group from Fine and Applied Arts who developed this proposal has worked diligently to address the questions that we've had. I'm strongly in support of this center. I do agree perhaps that the title of the center could be reworked but I don't see a need to send it back to committee simply to rework the title."

There being no further discussion, the question was called. The **motion to return the proposal to committee failed**. Discussion returned to the motion.

Senator Norfolk asked "What's it going to cost us?"

Evelyne Taylor responded: "We've done substantial prework with this where we are getting some money both from our deans to support this center and we are providing some services to other units on campus and off campus that are providing monies to us. So our hope is that this would be selfsustaining in three to five years."

Senator K. Clark asked where the center would be physically located.

Evelyne Taylor responded "We're doing what we're doing now in Schrank Hall South, but we have had discussions with Jim Haskell in Facilities. We've looked at temporary space in the Broadway Building. That building is slated to be taken down eventually but at least it will get us started."

Senator Lyons asked "Is this strictly a Fine and Applied Arts initiative or does it include other units on campus? Especially those that work in areas that would be related to nutrition."

Evelyne Taylor replied "The center would be just us but we have collaborative partnerships with several other units on campus."

Senator Moritz: "I would like to say that the center of excellence kind of sticks with me too and I was wondering.... In the description it sounded like Ms. Taylor was describing a comprehensive nutrition center. I was wondering if that's what the term excellence meant, maybe it's a term I'm not familiar with and it needs to be there, but if it's just a comprehensive nutrition center which is wonderful and it sounds like a great idea, why not just call it a comprehensive nutrition center. Excellence does not describe comprehensiveness to me, and it does kind of stick in my mouth when

I try to read it too. It's interesting throughout the whole thing it's just referred to as nutrition center mostly, which sounds really good. It's hard not to send it back to committee, you have worked on this and the title is so minor. But its just a thought."

Evelyne Taylor and Deborah Marino inddicated they were open to modifying the title of the center. However it is important the "nutrition" stay in the title.

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman, the reason I made a motion to send it back to committee was to play around with the phraseology. It's always difficult for a larger body to tinker with that. But that having failed and other people having said what they said, let me make another try at it. And that is I move that the title be changed to read "The University of Akron Center of Excellence in Nutrition" how would that do?"

The motion to amend died for a lack of a second and discussion on the main motion continued.

Senator Rich indicated "the problem I have with even the latest formulation is designating one's self excellent. That's an honor that should be bestowed by some higher authority and besides it hasn't had a chance to become excellent yet. I think my colleagues suggestion of comprehensive nutrition center makes sense if it makes sense to the folks directly involved then I would if it makes sense to those it be changed to that.

Discussion followed to understand if "Comprehensive Nutition Center" is an accurate representation of what the proposal intended. However, no conclusion was reached.

Senator Kreidler then suggested "that we as a body support totally the nutrition center and that we send back to them the idea of naming that center. And I think that would be what we can do instead of spending time that we dearly need on which one is best. So is there a way that that can be amended to whatever we've got on the floor?"

Chair Fenwick suggested that, if it plesed the Senate, the motion to aprove the center could be supported and then a second motion to have APC reconsider the name could be entertained. It did please the Senate, so a vote was called on the main **motion to approve the nutirition center. Motion passed.**

Senator Gerlach then **moved that APC be requested to reconsider the name of the center.** It was seconded by Senator Vollmer. There being no discssuion the question was called and the **motion passed.**

There being no further business from APC, Chair Fenwick thanked Dr. Dukes and asked if the Student Affairs Committee had a report?

Senator Shantz reported: "A brief one, immediately prior to our meeting today I did receive a written report from the chair, Sherry Gamble. It looks to me that it's about three pages long and I did

not have time to summarize it for the group. I would not particularly be interested in reading the entire text. I would ask if there is anyone else here from the committee who might be able to give a brief summary?"

Chair Fenwick ascertained that no one from Student Affairs Committee was present and that the written report contained no motions. Therefore, Senator Gerlach made a **motion to to receive the report of the Student Affairs Committee and put it in The Chronicle**. The motion was seconded by Senator Norfolk and **passed** without discussion. (see Appendix J)

There being no further committee reports, the Senate turned to old business and discussion on the proposed University Council.

VIII. Old Business

Chair Fenwick: "Dr. Erickson is going to come down. If you remember, Dr. Erickson and Senator Lillie were elected last spring by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate as decided upon by this body to represent faculty on the Exploratory Committee for the University Council. Senator Lillie is on sabbatical, the Executive Committee in January elected me as his alternate. So this discussion comes to this body from Dr. Erickson and myself. And what we had talked about in February was to electronically send out this survey evaluating the various components and various committees of this structure to all faculty. And then to report back to this body those results. Well in developing the questionnaire and developing a mechanism for sending it out to Faculty Senate both Dr. Erickson and myself independently came to the conclusion that 95% or more of the faculty had never heard of this proposal. So it would make no sense to send this to them first or directly. But we decided to come to you as representatives of colleges and various constituencies, especially those who represent faculty, to discuss how we get this discussion started with your colleagues. You're in the best position to know how to do this. You're closer to the ground. In many colleges this is simply having a college meeting, in some colleges it's not. So we sent out this FAQ last week trying to answer questions that we had heard in the past. In the process we received several other questions on the listserv discussion. And so I will simply proceed at this point to open this up to questions about the proposal. That's where we stand."

Senator Gerlach asked that a list of all who served on this committee be included in today's minutes. (see Appendix K)

Chair Fenwick indicated that could be done. "In fact there are several others in this body: representatives of other groups include, Senator Bohland represents ASG, Senator Stachowiak represents SEAC, and Dr. Dukes is co-chair representing the deans."

Senator Norfolk volunteered "I believe I can answer your question for my department. The people in there don't care about university politics at all. They have no interest in any of this."

Senator Bohland stated: "Just a couple of points, one, as a student and a student leader, I wouldn't really consider the University Council I hope not, to consider it politics, more as shared governance. And so I think that's what we're looking for or that's what our aim is. One thing I want to

comment on is the comments that I've heard so far seem to center around the numbers of representation. Especially with faculty because faculty, I don't know how many faculty in this body [about 56] but on the proposed structure there's significant less. The idea is not to just decrease numbers and we decrease representation for some group but to bring everyone together and give everyone an equal say and enhance that say. So though ASG has 17 senators and then an executive branch, but then I support this I don't support us going from 17 senators to a few representatives. We keep our senate intact and still work as a senate but we're sending a few representatives to this University Council that's going to actually enhance our say. And I think the faculty although the numbers from Faculty Senate we're going to go down to University Council just because there's less people does not mean their say is going to be diminished. I think that the input if I may use the term, is going to be greatly enhanced even though there's going to be a few faculty members, because it will be shared governance and not a body largely of faculty but we're getting consensus just like Vice President Case said we're trying to reach consensus in the University Council. And get everybody to weigh in on their matters. Thank you."

Chair Fenwick continued with a similar theme. "I just want to make it clear that this is not a replacement for this body, this body and its committees will continue. We will elect from this body the representatives to go to council. This body as envisioned in this proposal, Faculty Senate will become a pure Faculty Senate. That is only faculty will be represented on this body. Other groups will have their own representative bodies. So I just want to clarify that. The committees that are proposed for University Council are going to be committees except in ad hoc form in this body."

Dr. Erickson added "And if I could make an additional statement that goes on from there. With respect to how to see whether this has any relevance to your constituents, 'cause I don't doubt that people are what Senator Norfolk is saying is true. When we discussed this before in shared governance group, anyway, and not just for that group why would I put all this time and effort into this so it just wouldn't matter, but why would go on from the decision making task force to the ad hoc decision making group that worked for a whole summer meeting once a week. Basically because the issues that we want addressed are not peripheral issues. We want the kinds of issues addressed that all of us do have interest in. We do want to know happens with facilities. We used to also have a facilities committee, that committee reported to this Senate, consisted of and it was appointed by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee didn't sort of say in this committee only we put faculty we also put other people and why? Because the people who appointed us were the elected representatives of the faculty Senate. Now this senate is not this is one of those times when words make no sense. Before August 2003 we were not a Faculty Senate, we were the University Senate. We had faculty, we had students, we had staff, we had contract professionals, we had retirees, part-timers, chairs, the whole thing. That's why after 2003 when they took away all these things and said see it isn't faculty it's management. We said no, this is really an institution that has all these representatives. Now what did the August 2003 do, it took away from this group all but it's purely academic functions. That's what we lost. We kept that, that's what the Faculty Senate has, the only one that sort of was left there in these was somewhat of a limbo was wellbeing but the rest was not. We are saying that there needs to be a format. A way of bringing back that shared input, not from people who decided by administrators who are at the top, and are appointing people, but we are from our own elected representatives those are the people who do the electing on committees.

It's the committee structure of this that I think is relevant. We have a Facilities Planning Committee which would indeed be involved in having a subcommittee on parking. For example, back before 2003 when we last had a really bad parking situation, Harvey Sterns as chair of ad hoc Facilities Planning and the faculty were a minority on that committee. But we all brought things to the Senate and we all said oh yes, that's Senate business. But that subcommittee on parking was jointly set up by Harvey Sterns that made it much much more of a buy in to everybody. That's why we need that kind of a structure. Instead of ones that are just top down in ad hoc way which all we've had since, on these kinds of issues. Well either we have not been included at all or it's been done by where the administrators make the choice. This is what we want to do away with; this is why there is a planning committee, which we haven't had any input into, since 2003; budgeting, ditto until we lost one member on the OAC just this year. Facilities planning, which there are umpteen issues. Where as I've said we've had the experience of it really is possible for everybody to work together but there needs to be a sort of a basic, as Senator Matney brought up in a different issue, there needs to be that sense of real inclusion. Once you do when we work together we work together well, I can say that for the shared governance committee, it has been terrific. Did we trust each other at the beginning, no, but we do now. It matters that we have input into the budget, it matters that we have input into planning, it matters that we have, and it matters that we have are in facilities and in the rest of those committees. Each of them is in fact the issues that we need to look at. Now if you faculty want to consider that this faculty we should have a minimum number on those committees by all means. If the council that may make some decisions on these kind of issues in terms of description might want numbers that are different from the list that we came up with please get your faculty to say the idea is not impossible but we want more faculty on them well then please put those in. But that's as I see it, I think it's the committees are on things that really matter."

Senator Gerlach: "We began with some questions to the Chairman and I'm trying to keep track of them. Did you not ask the members of this body how to proceed? How to get the faculty at large to be informed to this and respond to us?"

Chair Fenwick: "Yes."

Senator Gerlach continued: "Well I haven't heard anything about that yet. All I can tell you is, that I have reported these doings so far to our association through the Akron retirees' executive board, which is a sizeable group. It would be larger than this University Council. We get along very well too. And they sort of shook their heads and Senator Gandee gave them your written statement to look at I don't know how far...well that's how far we've gone. I don't know whether we're going to poll the whole list of members of the retirees association but we've gotten some idea, some of our own. You know I'm still not sold on this. But let me ask you a couple of other questions too. I think I heard something said that if this council were to be formed the Senate would of course would continue except that do I hear this right, it would made up only of faculty? No more students, no more SEAC, no more anyone that's, strictly faculty. The point is this, who's going to arrange that? How are we going to purge the Senate? Are we going to do like Oliver Cromwell and march into the house and throw them out? Or are we going to...this is going to have to be submitted to the Trustees."

Chair Fenwick agreed “It is. One does evolve, it has to be approved by this body, there’re bylaw changes will be approved by it.”

Senator Gerlach continued: “So you’re going to have to submit this whole idea of the revised bylaws of the Faculty Senate which will be true Faculty Senate? There will evidently be then committees, similar committees in both the Senate and the Council? We’ll have a facilities planning committee in the Senate?”

There followed an exchange among Dr. Erickson, Dr. Gerlach, and Chair Fenwick on the committee structure of the Faculty Senate, if the University Council is approved. The conclusion was that it would depend on the new bylaws, but presumably they would be the same standing committees (not the ad hoc committees) the Senate currently has.

Senator Gerlach continued “A library committee? Academic policies committee? Whatever else there were. Well as I said now that you said that, I was interested in how we were going to accomplish it all because with this approval if it’s gets approval, has to go then the other set of adjustments to the existing bylaws of this body. You better start drawing out a paper that indicates what the revised bylaws of the Faculty Senate will look like, so we can look at it. If that passes muster, we may just let you get away with this University Council. But I sense here that the wheels are in motion, and things become inexorable after awhile. Yet if for no other reason than people get tired to us and go well go on have it. And so on, and so I will wonder myself how this is going to proceed but I would be much appreciative to have this cleared up as to how the Senate will remain because that’s the only place that I’ll be able to remain I’m sure I’ll never sit on University Council.”

Chair Fenwick responded “Well don’t be sure, we may want to curse the council at some time. This is not a final proposal; this is a starting point for discussion. Before we get to the nitty gritty of bylaw changes we need to have, as Vice President Case talked about, a consensus on principles. And I think it’s very important that we talk to our colleagues back in our colleges, the people that we represent and see whether they want this; whether they understand it. An old saying, all politics is local. If this is going to work it has to be addressing the issues of everybody in this university community. It has to be addressing wellbeing benefits issues, it has to be addressing parking issues, it has to be addressing facilities use, it has to addressing computer issues, so that’s where I would start the conversation. How best can some other governance body, starting with this proposal, how best can it serve you? Because we serve at the behest of our colleagues, so that’s how I’d couch this.”

Senator Norfolk responded “I will reiterate the comments in the last meeting, if we create this body, and people to the handful of the faculty there, we are better off than we are now. But if we do so, then we’re wasting the time of fifty-some people here. There will be so little to do on Faculty Senate here we’ll just have another thing for people to do and I would suggest that part of this proposal be to shrink down this body down to maybe just one representative per college. Plus I would suggest the Provost because that’s an appropriate person to have, or maybe a dean and leave it at that just to discuss the academic issues.”

Senator Lyons continued the discussion. “I find myself in the unfamiliar position of I think agreeing with Senator Gerlach. I’ve had several conversations with colleagues the last couple of weeks and I have to say that I’ve been persuaded that my initial position was perhaps,... well I’ve been persuaded that my initial position is no longer my current position. However, I do just want to put the concern out there for all senators to think about, because I think as a faculty member only, we have to be cautious about endorsing a move where we have a current highest legislative body where we call ourselves the highest advisory body on campus where faculty that are about 95% of the body and it is widely represented, we have students, we have all the constituencies that would be on the council, to a new body that would be at best 25% faculty and that’s not simply because I’m counting votes. And that I think we need more faculty. It’s because I’m concerned that there’s a battle on campus over how seriously we will take scholarly work; there’s a battle on campus about the degree to which scholarship is the top priority of what we do. And if we have a diluted faculty voice, which I think it manifestly will be, a diluted faculty voice, then we need to be cautious before we vote to endorse that. And I think we need to ask ourselves will that new body as the senator just pointed out, will that new body be any more likely to share information with us in a timely manner. If it isn’t, if we have the same ad hoc status that we had just take off the ad hoc label, we will be in a worse position than we’re in now. So I guess my question is did the committee get a promise of a commitment or (I’m not sure what the word would be) a commitment from the university to treat these new committees as the official committees, rather than to treat them the way the PBC used to be treated or the current ad hoc committees are treated, which would be to ignore them.”

Senator Stachowiak: “I think that what some people are forgetting here is the fact that the whole idea of this is to bring global issues into the light and to discuss them in a consensus forum as VP Case mentioned earlier. What I hear is oh we’re gonna lose power, we’re gonna lose this, we’re gonna lose our voice, you’re not gonna lose your voice you’re gonna just go into a room with other people, administrators, staff members, contract professionals and we’re all gonna agree on something and make a decision as a task force, a decision making task force recommended a long time ago, that we need to make decisions globally using all the resources on campus just not having the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. So on top of which, no promises have been made because this is a draft proposal. The idea is how do we work together to get the answers across and what needs to be remembered as well is part of the construct of this is to there’s going to be administrators. There’s going to be deans, there’s going to be vice presidents, there’s going to be people from all areas. They’re agreeing what sense would it make for the administration to say no they don’t know what the hell they’re talking about, we’re just gonna do it our own way. That won’t go because hopefully we’ll have enough people in there of weight and authority that everybody’s ideas will be listened to the consensus building will make a model that can be shared leadership at its best. That’s the way I look at it.”

Chair Fenwick: “I just want to add a couple of things, cause I was going to answer Senator Lyons question in a different way and that’s to say at this point there’s no promises or agreements been made and I can’t imagine that they would. On the other hand, the Provost’s office has provided support for the committee in the form of Associate Provost Dukes serving on the committee, a staff person who arranges and coordinates schedules and does the minutes of the meeting and also say that whatever. If anything comes out of this again I want to emphasize again that this is not a final

set deal, this is the beginning of the discussion and not the end of it. But whatever comes out of this if something comes out of it, such as bylaw changes has to go through us; it has to go through the President; it has to go through the Board of Trustees. At that time it becomes rules of the university. So if they approve those rules then they have made a commitment. These are the governing committees of the university. As recommendation and that's all they've ever been. We can make recommendations to the Board of Trustees."

Dr. Erickson continued. "I could add just a little to that in terms of if it is not going to, I was on the subcommittee that set up the committee structures and the committee charges. I worked with Joe Wilder who is the chair of the math department. He is somebody from the outside who has come in he's been a very valuable voice on our committee. Very valuable voice. And I see him as a faculty voice and also as a "I want to get this system working voice". Just as the Vice President (Sage) who is on our committee is a strong supporter of a committee structure that has real input from the people who really know. It's not top down, it's what we want. He is very supportive of this kind of system. But you're not going to get real trust without giving people real responsibility and real input and that those people need to be representatives of the collective representatives of the bodies. I can say that.

As far as a committee structure, I came into this after reading the Decision Making Task Force that said across campus there are huge, to say it's a web would say that it sort of ties together but they don't, all these ad hoc committees doing this and that and some of them haven't met forever but nobody's sort of stopped them and others do but nobody knows what's going on it was a mess. And if we don't end up with an official set of committees as you said which replace that system of ad hoc committees set up by us, by the administration, by whoever, then personally I'm not going to vote for it. I think that's exactly what we're trying to get is that kind of system whereby everybody has input, you come up with results. Will it work perfectly? No? But at least it could be better than nonfunctioning stuff we have now. That would be my answer. But as far as whether the administration is really going to buy into yet, they are discussing it. This afternoon the vice presidents are discussing it, the deans are discussing it, at the moment nobody is doing more than discussing at the moment."

Senator Gerlach suggested "Yes, a passing observation along those lines, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps you ought to ask the Trustees to start discussing it. You are going to ask the faculty or at least faculty representatives to go to work, let them put out a feeler. See whether they might be interested or just throw up their hands and say we'll wait and see what you come up with for the end. But there it is. As to this ad hoc committee thing, let me say one thing in advance of the good of the order, the reason I raised that question about that Student Disciplinary Procedures Committee is we lost track of that. We decided that the administration was going to go forward with revising the student disciplinary code. At that time we said wait just a minute this is a clear, I don't know, business of this Senate according to its existing bylaws. We have jurisdiction and we made the case there I think that we ought to be involved in this. Now what the administration is doing since they set their commission and committee I don't know, but our ad hoc committee ought to have gotten busy and found out what they're up to or anything. Are they going to come forward with some revision of the student disciplinary code and are they going to ask us to approve it or whatever? There is a case of maybe the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing or vice versa. Well we've got to keep

track of these things. And if we don't the Senate is showing it's own incapacity to govern. So I thank you for your consideration of this, but let us not drop the ball on this little point of the student disciplinary committee."

Senator Gandee requested some information. "Who took away all these committees that you just listed? In the beginning who took those away?"

Dr. Erickson responded "You know who that is, it was the Trustees."

Senator Gandee then asked "At their advisement from the administration. Right?"

Dr. Erickson: "We don't know who gave them the advice on that, all we have when we looked at the material on what the meeting of the September meeting of the Senate of 2003, which is when we had just heard about it. It was in fact just handed to us at the end of a board meeting. That's all we know and we've ever really known about what happened. Now the administration afterwards asked by AAUP said that they were doing it because of the collective bargaining discussions that were going on, but that's when they did it. And they did not give us a detailed explanation of why they took away each of them because a number of those don't fit within any kind of way that you could say they fit in a management versus labor decision. But certainly the administrations position which was that is was separate. But also AAUP has said that many many universities a collective bargaining and senates that have input into precisely the issues that we are talking about."

Senator Gandee then asked. "Okay, why would the administration or the Board of Trustees want to relinquish the powers now?"

Dr. Erickson responded: "One issue that comes up here is that this whole issue took place when NCA arrived. When NCA was really concerned about the issues of shared governance on the campus and it's coming back in April 2008 to look to see whether or not there's been some there's been improvement in shared governance on campus. That is an important issue for us, why we're doing it at the moment. We saw it as an opportunity at this point."

Senator Lyons: "I had a question; the comment is in your response to your previous question. You noted that we'll be in better position than the current non-functioning Faculty Senate and I just want to point out that's an empirical question. My concern is that we won't be in a better position. However, the question is on your NCA comment. To what degree is this linked to NCA pressure and if we failed to act and failed to proactively dilute faculty input on decision making, if we did nothing, would this force the university's hand? Force the Board to address the fact that they took away all the powers of Faculty Senate?"

Chair Fenwick responded "While I can't speculate on that at this time, on the one hand there is concern about this focused visit, they are coming back soon to look at our governance structure. On the other hand there's real concern that it doesn't matter. That the accreditation is so proforma that it doesn't matter. Those are two ends of the speculation and depending on what side of the bed I get up in the morning I'm on one or other. So I'm sorry I can't really address that issue."

Dr. Erickson interjected “But the issue also is if you look at the material Dave Witt was kind enough to get us the link to when we started on the ad hoc Decision Making Task Force, the AAUP shared governance statement and a whole series of other ones on what is a good campus.... You can’t come up with the exact specifics of what will make effect shared governance because each campus is different; they have given awards to campuses with very different situations. But when we looked at them they all had some of the structures that we’re talking about. We have that kind of an input from the rest of a world that used to not exist. Contract professionals were relatively small and stark. While important they didn’t have the kind of really important roles that they do have now. In a world where a lot of very simple things have been taken over by machines so the rest of everybody has some input. Those universities that have good shared governance are ones that involve all those folk there; they have the faculty and staff and contract professionals and administrators in looking at important issues. If we can’t manage that, well we have failed on share governance anyway. Our attempt was to come up with a structure to replace what was there before because we, our judgment, our judgment as a executive committee of the Faculty Senate back in 2004 was that no they wouldn’t. You could not try to do it directly now. We had to look at trying to deal with those functions that we had taken away from us in a different kind of way. But we needed to have real input and this was the method; ... well that’s what this that group came up with. It was their judgment that this might work. But it’s exploratory; we haven’t gone further than that. We said let’s see and it does require that you guys think it’s worth at least trying.”

Senator Hallett: “I just have one question. I want to make one point. This is my first year in the Faculty Senate and I’ve always wanted to be in the Faculty Senate, I was really happy to be elected so that I could a voice in the issues that impact on the faculty. And I have to say that it really concerns me that now I finally run for Senate and get on the Senate and now your telling us that guess what, we’re coming up with a different body it’s going to be the University Council and guess what else, we’ve decided that we’re not going to have a lot of issues that affect Faculty Senate so we’re going to shrink down the Senate. That I have to tell you really concerns me because I feel that we were elected to represent our constituents and have a voice in the university issues that impact the faculty and now we’re finding that this is all changed and so I have to say that I think it dilutes the faculty voice and I think that those of us elected here should also be on the faculty council then.”

Chair Fenwick observed “I think we’re losing our quorum, that while nothing has been decided, and this is not right now we have to start discussion somewhere, something concrete. This is what is concrete to discuss. All of us who have been involved in this exploratory committee are now at the stages of going back to our respective constituencies and asking their opinions about this. And asking for their contributions you understand, contributions improve governance. So that’s where it’s at, nothing has been decided, there has been discussion of shrinking the body here, that’s one idea. That is not part of this proposal; it has never been a part of the proposal. Ultimately the goal of this is not to shrink the importance or voice of the Faculty Senate, or the faculty. I think for one thing that we’ve kind of missed is also the need to communicate, to talk to each other, there is no body, no formal body on this campus now where every constituency can talk to each other in the same room.”

Senator Lyons: "I'm going to speak on the other side of the issue which is to say if this new body did have better communication and timely sharing of information we would in a better situation, so I'd like to ask the EC the next time they speak with the President and the Provost if they would ask the President if he would be willing to address that question the next time he speaks to the Faculty Senate. To what degree is he willing to say these committees which will be overloaded with administrators will be the official committees? We will treat them as the official committees and share information in a timely manner and make them the official advisory bodies."

Dr. Erickson: "Let me just take one thing out of what you just said, because it's what I asked people to take back to their, to get from their constituents. It is really, I said it is really important to consider the makeup of the committees and this is really important. There is nothing in this document that addresses the "who should be on those committees". It is perfectly legitimate for you to ask as us as your representatives, we haven't got to that level yet, but for you to say we want that certainly on committees a, b, c and d that at least x percent be faculty. There is nothing and in some universities that is part of bylaws of such a council. That a minimum x percent is from certain group. The council suggestions are the five suggestions are only suggestions, that is another one where if you feel that you need that we need to have a higher order then at least put that in, then of course if it's going to end up being there's going to be some to and fro on it but yea, say that. We need more input into the council and reason. And the for the committees we did not define how we get the membership of the committees. There are no bylaws involved with this; it's just a general idea. So that's one where your input is really important. The input of your constituents, what would you see as the appropriate the appropriate membership in terms of different types of people if you like, of each of the committees. That's definitely an input we're asking for. There's no at this point no way of saying that it is administrators because we haven't put it in there at all in this case."

Senator Gerlach requested one parting shot. "The one thing you see that somewhat mislead me when I read this draft proposal in the very beginning it was not made clear there in so many words that the proposal was to retain the Senate but to change its composition. You better make that clear as you go about telling these other people. And secondly if it was to continue as before, it struck me as duplicating too many things because the Senate has had committees, ad hoc recently among other committees and this council's going to have the same committees. Now what's the purpose of that? That needs to be clarified too. You've not been completely forthright about what the Senate would look like if this plan were to be completed. You've got to clarify that for everybody or they won't know what's going on."

Chair Fenwick: "That's exactly the kind of feedback or comments that we need. What's not clear, what could be improved and needs to be thrown out and again it's getting late."

Senator Matney: "I know it's getting late and one of my points that I'd like to say is that it's a shame we always wait until the very end to start discussing important issues, it would be nice to push forward the discussions of important issues of governance to the beginning of the meeting so I'd like to go back to Professor Lyons' suggestion and ask either that the President address these issues which are really important leaving aside the inflammatory and potentially inflammatory word of overloaded and either that or move the President and the Provost's comments to the end of the meeting so we can address the issues that the body really needs to talk about at the front."

Chair Fenwick: “Okay, we certainly will bring that up and make that suggestion.”

VIII. Adjournment Senator Moritz made a motion to adjourn; Senator Matney seconded the motion. Chair Fenwick thanked the senators and adjourned the body.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

*Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,
Secretary of the Senate*

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MARCH 1, 2007

APPENDIX A

Secretary Report for Faculty Senate Meeting
March 1, 2007

The Executive Committee met on **February 21, 2007** to set the agenda for today's meeting. Chair Fenwick also shared highlights from the Ohio Faculty Council meeting.

One highlight was Speaker Husted's views on higher education, including proposals to modify the role of the Ohio Board of Regents and the Chancellor.

Another was how some sister state universities promote higher education and their role in it. For example, BGSU has a Professional Affairs Committee to inform the Senate about professional issues and assist the Senate with media and governmental affairs relationships.

On **February 27, 2007** the Executive Committee met with the President and Provost. The following issues were discussed.

Speaker Husted's comments: Chair Fenwick shared comments made by Speaker Husted at the Ohio Faculty Council meeting and the President indicated that these comments seem to be consistent with comments the Speaker has shared in other forums. The president also indicated that a bill has been introduced to make the Chancellor a cabinet level appointment, with the OBR serving as an advisory board to the Chancellor.

Professional Affairs Committee: The EC suggested that UA explore the possibility of creating a committee similar to BGSU's Professional Affairs Committee. The President was receptive and wants to pursue the issue further.

Update on FAA discussions: The Provost indicated that discussions are continuing on the possible reorganization of FAA. The concern is how to best promote program success in an environment that includes continuing discussions with outside partners on the creation of a Health Center.

That concludes my report.

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST MARCH 1, 2007

- Thank-you for co-sponsorship of Hearts for Humanity, resulting in \$5,100 for students' alternative spring break trip to Pass Christian, MS
- Progress: Student Success and Retention Committee: March 26th presentation for Deans and Chairs
- Update on Searches: Dean of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering, Dean of School of Law, Chief Diversity Officer, Vice President for Student Affairs
- Highlights of AACTE Board Meeting: The Power of the Human Voice
 - Erin Gruwell
 - Diane Ravitch
 - Sheryl Lee Ralph
- Your Questions?

APPENDIX C

Proposals Approved By Provost To Faculty Senate March 2007

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-07-008	Biology	Delete course 3100:366
AS-07-029	Geography	Change certificate title to Undergraduate Certificate in Urban and Regional Planning. Change required and elective courses.
AS-07-030	CSAA	Add new course 3240:105 The Incas
AS-07-033	Biology	Change required courses for BS Biology Botany Specialization
AS-07-037	Arts & Sciences	Decrease elective credits for BS/M.D. degree
AS-07-041	Biology	Add course 3100:663 Advanced Exercise Physiology
AS-07-042	CSAA	Add new course 3240:106 The Maya
AS-07-043	Philosophy	Add course 3600:421 Philosophy of Law
AS-07-050	Geology	Change course title and prerequisites 3370:231
AS-07-051	Geology	Split BA Geology into two tracks: Earth Science and Environmental Science
AS-07-052	Geology	Change bulletin description to add "field trip" to various courses
AS-07-065	English	Assign permanent course number 3300:440
AS-07-066	English	Assign permanent course number 3300:379
AS-07-067	English	Assign permanent course number 3300:364
AS-07-073	English	Add senior seminar to major

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-07-07	Ed Found	Change requirements and electives for Higher Education certificate program

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
EN-07-66	Mech Eng	Add new course 4600:694 Deformation and Failure of Polymers and Soft Materials

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-07-09	Dance	Add new course 7910:113 Dance Ensembles:Workshop
FAA-07-18	Dance	Change requirements for Dance minor
FAA-07-20	Music	New course 7510:630 Summer Concert Band

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
PS-07-04	Poly Eng	Add course 9841:777 Modeling of Nanoscale Materials
PS-07-10	Poly Eng	Combine two courses into one new course 9841:749 Phase Transitions in Polymer Blends and Alloys

Provost Office

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
WC-07-08	Wayne	Change bulletin description of 2260:172 and 2260:273

Proposals Approved By Provost
New Programs to Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees
March 2007

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-07-044	Philosophy	Create Pre-Law Philosophy minor

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF UNIVERSITY WELLBEING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY SENATE MARCH 1ST, 2007

On Tuesday, February 27th, 2007 VP Case sent me the attached e-mail and document describing the University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee as decided by the administration. I have also attached the formal input we provided to VP Case in mid December.

There was not time for the present University Wellbeing Committee to meet for any formal response to the administration, but I asked members of the committee for feedback.

On the basis of that feedback and my reading of the administration document I would note the following:-

1. the administration has included most of the statement of charges proposed by the Wellbeing Committee and developed in the draft of the University Council document. Those charges referred to a significant feedback system and we appreciate their agreement to that process.
2. the administration has increased the representation of faculty and staff which are the largest constituencies. We suggested more in our proposal, but the original version of the document had less than the present proposal.
3. the administration has not addressed the three major issues outlined in the December report of Wellbeing to the Senate and outlined in our attached report
 - a. no separate representation (voting or non-voting) for Wayne campus
 - b. no voting member of retiree dependents
 - c. an over-representation of administrators on a committee which is meant to provide advice from employee constituencies. There are 3 voting administrators in a committee of 10 (4 of 11 if the Chair is a voting member)

Our arguments on these three issues are set out in the attached report. They still stand. To quote a committee member's e-mail "it appears that a true constituent representation has not been sought in this final plan".

In December the Senate passed a resolution in support of these ideas. I urge you to do so again today, although as the committee has not had a chance to meet, I cannot bring a resolution from them to the floor.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Erickson
Chair, Wellbeing Committee

The University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee

Mission of Committee:

To assist The University of Akron in securing a group insurance benefits program that provides insurance benefits to all University employees on a fair and consistent basis, in a manner that minimizes the need to seek the input separately of representatives of the many employee constituencies that comprise the University of Akron community, and that includes health wellness initiatives that are not historically part of insurance benefits programs but that maximize the opportunity of all employees to pursue healthy lifestyles.

Charge of Committee:

The University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee shall:

- Review current level of university health benefits provided, including medical, dental, vision, prescription drug, life insurance, Employee Assistance Program and disability insurance.
- Collect and analyze information on health wellness initiatives.
- Collect and analyze information on new models or options for such coverage as become available.
- Review cost and usage data and trends, employee opinions and preferences and potential changes to current coverages.
- Seek input from constituency groups concerning preferences relevant to the available options.
- Develop a consensus draft recommendation on the group insurance plan.
- Provide opportunity for feedback from employee constituency groups on the Committee's proposed recommendation.
- Make a final recommendation to the President of the University, including a summary of constituency feedback. Such recommendation shall be shared with each constituent group that is represented on the Committee.
- Responsibility to work with HR and Purchasing to draft and complete a timely RFP process for university group health and wellness benefits

The Board of Trustees shall make the ultimate decisions regarding the group insurance benefit programs, taking into account the recommendations of the University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee and any outside consultants that are retained to assist with this process. Upon approval of the insurance benefits program by the Board of Trustees, the University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee shall continue to be available for consultation.

University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee Page 2

Composition of Committee:

VP for Finance & Administration/CFO, Chair
The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) - 2
Staff Employee Advisory Committee (SEAC) – 2
Contract Professional Advisory Committee (CPAC) – 1
Communications Workers of America (CWA) – 1
Law School Faculty Member – 1
University Administration - 2
Human Resource Office – 1

Representatives are elected or appointed by constituent groups.

Advisory to the Committee: Office of Employee and Labor Relations, Human Resource/Benefits, Part-Time Employee Representative, Retirees Representative, Institutional Research Representative, Budget Representative, and Purchasing Representative.

Important for Members to Have: Knowledge, interest, experience, commitment, willingness to digest and analyze information, willingness to participate in timely data gathering/analysis for the committee (all members will participate in the workload of the committee).

TO: Vice President John Case

FROM: University Wellbeing Committee (see below for names)

SUBJECT: Committee response to draft document on “University Group Insurance Benefits Committee”

The Wellbeing Committee wishes to thank Vice-President Case for meeting with us on December 5th, 2006 to present the draft proposal for a University Group Insurance Benefits Committee. The Committee began discussion of the draft that day, sought feedback to it from their constituencies and met on December 12th for further discussion. One such constituency was the Faculty Senate, which voted overwhelmingly in favor of the major concerns we have outlined below. The following response was developed and accepted by the members of the Committee.

The Committee, while appreciative of the effort to develop a committee to provide input into the health insurance benefit program in a fair and consistent manner, has several concerns with the draft proposal and has developed an alternative version of the purpose, charges and committee membership.

A. Noted Issues

1. Purposes and Charges of the Committee

The proposal for a University Group Insurance Benefits Committee presented to us by Dr. Case does not seem to be an adequate replacement for the University Wellbeing Committee, nor does it appear to represent the vision the Faculty Senate had when it asked the Wellbeing Committee to draw up a draft for a “University Wide Benefits Committee”. First, the present description of the Wellbeing Committee in University rules (I’ll put in the numbering) states: “the committee shall concern itself with matters relating to health and wellbeing, such as fringe benefits, insurance, pensions and leaves”. The role of Wellbeing is greater than just insurance. In discussions by the University Council Exploratory Committee of shared governance in areas applying to multiple constituencies in the university, Wellbeing and Benefits has been included as a committee of the proposed University Council. Of course it would be possible to have a separate Committee with this wider purpose, but in the interests of efficiency and non-duplication a single Committee would seem to be more reasonable, one which reports to the President and also to University Council.

Second, the vision of Faculty Senate (representing the non-bargaining units of CPAC, SEAC, Law School and retirees as well as bargaining unit employees) is as stated below:

For the future, we recommend that a University Committee be set up consisting of elected bargaining unit representatives from the American Association of University Professors and Communication Workers of America, elected non-bargaining unit employees and an elected retiree representative to develop the structure of health insurance in a fair and timely manner, based on the same type of process that had been used with the Wellbeing Committee. That process should be fair, efficient, open and inclusive as part of shared governance, to evaluate the level of cost absorption by employees based on the budget tradeoffs for the university and in which the Committee then reviews possible changes in the present plan in a fair, responsible and timely way.

We note that the draft presented by VP Case did indeed state that the committee should develop insurance proposals “on a fair and consistent basis”, which we applaud. However it is not clear whether the statement in the charge “it shall not be the Committee’s responsibility to make recommendations regarding employee cost sharing” reflects the process outlined by the Senate. It has not been the role of the Wellbeing Committee to make recommendations on the proportion of health care costs to be allocated to employees versus absorbed by the university. In the past that was the role of the Planning and Budget Committee and now is involved in the present budget decision-making process. However, the Wellbeing Committee considers the mandate to make sure that insurance benefits are “fair” to include consideration of the equitable distribution of the aggregate employee cost across all employees. That includes deductibles, co-pays, co-insurance percentages, out-of-pocket maxima but also any monthly payments.

2. Numeric Representation on the Committee

Given the agreed upon purpose to provide “insurance benefits to all University employees on a fair and consistent basis” and the role of the committee members to provide input from the “many employee constituencies”, then a reasonable assumption is that the number of representatives should reflect the size of the constituencies they represent.¹ Staff, faculty, contract professional and retiree dependents are the largest constituencies with the largest constituencies with which to communicate. It is therefore appropriate to include more than one representative of staff, faculty and contract professionals, and to include a representative of retiree dependents. On the other hand neither Deans nor Department chairs have responsibilities for health benefits in their colleges or departments and therefore only represent their own constituencies as employees. Given the small numbers in these constituencies and no particular unique issues, their interests can be met by a representative of a more general constituency of which they are part (non-bargaining unit faculty and administrators).

Further, it does not seem appropriate that the Chair, the Provost and the Human Resource Officer should be voting members of the Committee, although we consider that they should be active in the discussion. Their interests as employees are already covered, the VP for Finance has already had input at the overall cost absorption stage, and the Human Resource representative is there to provide technical input. Also, the Committee recommends to the President and the administration and these members have input at that stage.

As it stands, the makeup of the committee is 45% administration, with one representative each from the AAUP, SEAC, CPAC, CWA, FOP, and the Law School. The University Group Insurance Benefits Committee could therefore be construed to be an administration committee with minimal faculty, staff and contract professional representation and no retiree representation.

3. Lack of Wayne College Representation

In the administration’s charge to secure a “group insurance benefits program that provides insurance benefits to all University employees on a fair and consistent basis,” it is vitally important that Wayne College has a voice through representation on the University Group Insurance Benefits Committee. Wayne College, the only branch campus of The University of Akron, is located in Wayne County in Orrville, Ohio. This campus is at a considerable distance from Akron and the majority of its employees live in areas that are different from those of employees at the main campus. There are 75 full-time and 120 part-time employees involved. Historically, Wayne College has had its own representative on Akron Campus committees including Faculty Senate, Wellbeing, Rights & Responsibilities, Advisory to the Provost, and Advisory to the President. It has long been recognized that the branch campus, which has its own budget and is separately accredited by The Higher Learning Commission, has unique circumstances which must be taken in account when decisions are made that affect its employees.

This constituency needs a separate representative to assure availability of comparable group benefits to those of employees at the Akron campus and a voice to express their concerns. For example, vendor networks need to include sufficient effective providers in the appropriate geographical areas. In the past, Wayne College has experienced decisions that affected their level of benefits, most notably concerning participating providers that are considered in network. For example, the last time a major change occurred in the dental plan, the Orrville campus community was faced with the availability of only one part-time, semi-retired dentist practicing in a remote location of the county.

4. Lack of Retiree Dependent Representation

At the present time over 700 retiree dependents are *provided* health insurance by the University of Akron. They form a significant number of those provided insurance and need a Committee member who will represent their interests with regard to benefits, rather than an advisory position. Part-timers on the other hand are *allowed to purchase* university health insurance, under certain circumstances.

To provide some background: health insurance coverage for dependents of retirees is provided if the retiree's original appointment date was prior to January 1, 1992 and the retiree has or had 10 consecutive academic years of full-time service with the University prior to retirement. This coverage has been provided since the University became a State institution. This coverage is provided at no cost to most retiree dependents. This benefit has been reaffirmed in University Documents since the University became a State institution.

The needs of retiree dependents are not always evident to the larger university community. Like employees at Wayne College, they have different geographic requirements and different potential options for coverage. They form a constituency with special communication requirements. When the Faculty Senate and the University Board of Trustees added a retiree representative to the Wellbeing Committee they did so because they recognized that retirees and their dependents represent a constituency whose well-being is directly affected by decisions made about university health plans.

B. Proposed Committee

Taking into account the concerns outlined above, the Wellbeing Committee recommends the following Committee as part of the shared governance structure of the university. The Committee would report to the President and to the Faculty Senate (or if adopted, a new University Council).

University Benefits and Wellbeing Committee

Overall Purpose: To study, monitor and make recommendations to the President and University Council (at moment Faculty Senate) on matters relating to health and wellbeing of employees. These include, but are not limited to such items as fringe benefits, insurance, pensions and leaves.

Purpose with respect to insurance: to assist the University of Akron in securing a group insurance benefits program that provides insurance benefits to all University employees on a fair and consistent basis, utilizing a process that efficiently obtains input of the employee constituencies and that includes health benefits programs that maximize the opportunity of all employees to pursue healthy life styles.

Charge related to insurance:

1. Review current level of university health benefits provided, including medical, dental, vision, prescription drug, life insurance, Employee Assistance Program and disability insurance.
2. Review cost and usage data and trends in health insurance and health care costs to provide input to the Budget and Finance Committee (at present OAC)
3. Collect and analyze information on new models or options for such coverage as become available

4. Using the cost absorption requirement provided by the Budget and Finance Committee (or its equivalent), develop alternatives for allocation of premiums across employees with differing characteristics and for deductibles, co-payments, co-insurance percentages, out-of-pocket maxima and extra services
5. Seek input from constituency groups concerning preferences relevant to the available options
6. Develop a consensus draft recommendation on the group insurance plan
7. Provide opportunity for feedback from employee constituency groups on the Committee's proposed recommendation
8. Make a final recommendation to the President and administration, including a summary of constituency feedback.
9. Provide members to the sub-committee that sends out the RFP and reviews and interviews vendors.

Membership

Voting members of the Committee shall be elected by their constituencies.

Chair: VP for Finance (ex-officio, non-voting).

3 representatives from SEAC

2 representatives from CPAC

3 representatives from AAUP

1 representative from Law School

1 representative for CWA and FOP

1 non-bargaining faculty & administrators

1 retiree dependent representative

1 Wayne college representative

1 Human Resources (ex-officio non-voting)

1 representative of the Provost (ex-officio and non-voting)

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Erickson, Chair
for University Wellbeing Committee

Footnotes

1 We note that this assumption is premised, in part, on our understanding of the role of the new committee in the collective bargaining process. Increasing the representation of the bargaining unit personnel makes sense as long as the subject matter of the committee is *not* also subject to a separate level of review as part of the bargaining unit contract negotiations. From the terms of the proposed committee we have inferred that the bargaining unit would not attempt to review healthcare issues outside of the new committee, with the exception of employee cost sharing matters which are specifically removed from the committee's purview. Obviously, we have not had the benefit of seeing the comments of the bargaining unit regarding the proposed committee. If the new committee is merely advisory and these matters will also be addressed as part of the periodic contract negotiations with the bargaining unit, then there is no need for AAUP and CWA to have proportionate representation on the new committee. Indeed, providing fair and appropriate representation to the views of non-union employees in this situation would seem to require that the bargaining unit's representation on the new committee not be increased despite increases in the representation of the other groups to reflect their proportionate stakes in these matters.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO WELLBEING COMMITTEE - amended during the 3/1 Senate meeting

WHEREAS, the Senate recommended in September 2005 that a university health insurance committee be set up representing all campus employee groups, and that it be an open and inclusive process as set out in more detail in the September 15, 2005 Chronicle;

WHEREAS, the Senate, in December 2005 directed the Wellbeing Committee to work together with other constituent bargaining and non-bargaining groups to establish a framework for the university-wide health care and benefits committee

WHEREAS the Senate passed a resolution in December 2006 in support of the issues on representation brought to the administration by the Wellbeing committee and outlined in their report to VP Case on December 15th

WHEREAS, the University of Akron Faculty Senate is the body of the University of Akron that has the widest representation from the different constituencies;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate requests the administration to add a voting representative from Wayne campus and a voting representative for retiree dependents to the University Group Insurance and Benefits Committee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that **there be one voting administrator on the Committee.** ~~the administration be asked to reduce the number of voting administrators on the Committee to that representing the numbers of non-bargaining unit administrators as insured employees.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if the administration does not meet the request of Senate in these matters, that the administration should report to Senate their reasons for not making these changes.

APPENDIX E

MOTION IN REGARD TO ESTABLISHING THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

NUTRITION CENTER OF EXCELLENCE

The Academic Policies Committee met and unanimously supported the establishment of The University of Akron Nutrition Center of Excellence.

Be it resolved that The University of Akron Nutrition Center of Excellence be established.

The University of Akron Nutrition Center of Excellence will bring together the University and community into one comprehensive regional center for the study and delivery of effective nutrition interventions. It will provide the needed link between UA nutrition expertise and the extensive preventative health care needs of campus and our surrounding community. The physical space would include a nutrition assessment laboratory with contiguous community nutrition education room, information technology lab, private examination and nutrition counseling areas, reception area and office areas.

Purpose:

The goal is to develop a Nutrition Center of Excellence integrating nutrition service and research at the University of Akron, while expanding opportunities for revenue generation and multi-institutional collaborative research and service.

Further Goals and Objectives:

- Meet emerging health care and marketplace needs of the community and offer innovative and competitive services
- Enhance revenue diversification and income from external funding sources and fee-for-service
- Enhance the visibility of the University through public engagement and recruiting opportunities.
- Expand nutrition research opportunities and competitiveness at the local, state and national level
- Serve as an educational resource for students and the community for the most up-to-date nutrition interventions
- Partner with local hospital systems, governments, business and community organizations to foster collaborative research and service projects.

The Center will serve as an educational resource for students and the community for the delivery of nutrition interventions. Nutrition services and expertise are in high demand today. Research is required and funding is available. The Nutrition Center of Excellence would strengthen research in the following areas:

- Obesity and obesity related disease and the nation's aging population are important drivers of spiraling health care costs which greatly impact the economies of our businesses and governments at all levels. The Center would support our work with healthcare improvement initiatives in the treatment of chronic disease, including obesity and diabetes.

- Athletes are demanding nutrition and recovery services along with strength training and athletic training support. The Center would enhance our research efforts in sports nutrition. Also, these demands offer student athlete recruiting opportunities for UA and engagement with the northeast Ohio public.
- USDA has approached us to partner with them on projects to merge information technology and nutrition practice that will meet the growing need for internet-based consumer education. This collaboration would translate into ongoing research dollars from the USDA and would position us favorably to compete for emerging federal grant opportunities.

In summary, the availability of a Nutrition Center of Excellence is essential for us to expand research and revenue opportunities in sports nutrition, chronic disease treatment, wellness and disease prevention, nutrition information technology, food safety and sanitation and community nutrition initiatives.

The Nutrition Center will engage the university and surrounding community to meet emerging health care and nutrition marketplace needs by offering innovative and competitive nutrition services and serving as an educational and research resource.

We have done the groundwork to begin the services described below, but cannot reach full potential without the university's support and additional resources.

- Athletics Services: For performance, health and safety reasons, the athletic Department at the university has contracted with our department for Sports Nutrition assessment and intervention services. We have acquired assessment equipment through OBR to support this effort including a bicycle ergometer and EKG with computer support. Facilities for equipment and for assessing, interviewing and counseling athletes would allow us to provide sports nutrition services and meet the growing demand.
- Health Care Delivery Initiatives: We have collaborated with the Family Practice and Internal Medicine departments of the Summa Health System in a number of national and local research and service initiatives. Establishment of a high-profile Nutrition Center would bring the public and providers onto The University of Akron campus, showcase our services and dramatically expand our potential for grant funding.
- Food Safety and Sanitation Training Initiatives: Currently our department contracts for training services to provide ServSafe Certification Training to Campus Auxiliary Services employees. With additional resources, these services could be expanded to the business community.

Nutrition services that will be provided in the Nutrition Center include:

- Nutrition risk assessments utilizing anthropometric equipment in a private counseling setting*
- Laboratory analysis of blood, urine, and other samples to support nutrition therapy and research*
- Nutrient analysis systems to support tailored nutrition counseling and risk assessment for practice and research purposes*
- Providing on-site private nutrition counseling for meeting the needs of campus and community*

- Food systems management and sanitation consultation and education services

*For legal and safety reasons, these tasks require dedicated space.

The health issues of greatest concern today such as obesity and diabetes require nutrition services utilizing the latest practice technologies. Health care delivery systems are changing and the demand for nutrition expertise is growing. The Nutrition Center holds tremendous potential for meeting the growing public health needs of our community and nation. The Center will enhance the visibility of the University of Akron through engagement for the public good and through nutrition research recognized at the state and national levels.

APPENDIX F

To: Faculty Senate

From: Student Affairs Committee

The Student Affairs Committee was charged with following up on a question from Academic Advising and Faculty Advisor Lone Star Fraternity, Don Canary. The question was “Recently Greek Life passed a resolution that enables them to fine organizations for turning in late rosters, e-mail addresses, etc. I would think a fine paid by students (or a student organization) would need to pass through the Faculty Senate and maybe even the Board of Trustees”.

A meeting on February 15, 2007 was scheduled with the Student Affairs Committee with regard to the above issue. The committee agreed a meeting with Thad Doyle, Assistant Director of Greek Life to discuss this issue would be beneficial. Sherry Gamble, Chair of Student Affairs Committee would meet with Mr. Doyle and report back to the committee on March 8, 2007. Mr. Doyle shared a report addressing the problem of late paperwork, the steps taken in planning and implementing this resolution and an e-mail from the Greek Life Programs Staff notifying all chapter presidents, campus and chapter advisors. A copy of this report is enclosed.

Mr. Doyle welcomed the meeting to discuss this issue and hoped this opened the door to a positive and active relationship between both the Office of Greek Life Programs and Faculty Senate.

The following is the official charge for the Student Affairs Committee as stated in the senate bylaws.
Student affairs committee.

- (a) Recommends policy, subject to approval of faculty senate, regarding the granting of scholarships, awards, grants, and loans to university students.
- (b) Proposes regulations concerning all extracurricular activities (except athletics) to faculty senate. Recommends to the senate the extension of official recognition of student organizations.

The committee will be meeting to address the findings.

Sherry Gamble,
Chair Student Affairs Committee

APPENDIX G

University Council Exploratory Committee

Members:

Bohland, Kyle – ASG
Calabretta, Eric – ASG
Dukes, J. Thomas – VPs (co-Chair)
Erickson, Elizabeth B – Faculty
Fenwick, Rudy – Faculty (ex-officio)
Gunn, Virginia L – Faculty (ex-officio)
Hayes, Debra L – CPAC
Kern-Simirenko, Cheryl – Council of Deans
LiCause, Joy A – SEAC
Lillie, Timothy H – Faculty (co-Chair)
Marsden, R. Kent –CPAC
Sage, James L – VPs
Sheffer, Daniel B – Chairs
Stachowiak Jr, Robert – SEAC
Wilder, Joseph W – Chairs