



32 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- Passed curriculum revision number 07-086 25
- Approved final version of University Council bylaws 27

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle*
may be directed to the Secretary, Robert Huff (x5966).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held October 1, 2009 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of October 1, 2009

 A. CRC Resolution and Rationale 30

 B. Bylaw proposed amendment 32

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 1, 2009

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, October 1, 2009 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-nine Senators, 41 were present for this meeting. Senators Clark, Concannon, Ducharme, Gandee, Hamed, Kruse, Marich, Marion, Otis, Roadruck, Sancaktar, Sotnak and Williams were absent with notice. Senators Arter, Gamble, Maringer, Speers and Yi were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Sterns: Welcome everyone to our October 1st meeting. Let me call for an approval of the agenda. I would like to ask your indulgence that after the remarks of the Provost we insert the report of the Curriculum Committee, with an update from Bill Braselton from Frontline. Bill has to make a plane. Is there a motion for the approval of the agenda with that change?

Senator Norfolk: So moved.

Senator Gerlach: I would like to make a point here. I am not going to oppose the approval of the motion, but I wish the Executive Committee would be more explicit in the agenda. We have to remember to keep track of old business. The Student Disciplinary Code for example is still hanging fire. (background noise) Is that to be considered unfinished business or is it to come under the Student Judicial Policy committee? It should be specifically listed so we do not lose track of these items.

Chair Sterns: I believe that is covered under Item U.

Senator Gerlach: It perhaps ought to be specified. I think there are amendments to the bylaws that are matters of old business that have not been otherwise listed on this agenda. In the future such items should be there.

Chair Sterns: Thank you Senator Gerlach. Senator Rich, do we have any pending bylaw changes?

Senator Rich: There are some. Having not been able to attend the last Executive Committee meeting I'm not sure whether there was discussion about whether they would be presented today. I had the impression that they might be and I am prepared to present them.

Chair Sterns: Thank you Senator Rich. I think the amendments are included in the handouts. So Senator Gerlach, what you are telling me is that the agenda as we have been doing it all these years is inadequate?

Senator Gerlach: It is just general.

Chair Sterns: Well it has been like that for a long time but I will be happy to see if we can document further.

Senator Lillie: Would it be helpful to pass the new business proposed amendments to the Faculty Senate bylaws represented in the handouts today. I'd like to recommend that that be part of it. (lots of background noise during this sentence)

Chair Sterns: I think that the last page was called Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, Regarding Inclusion of Full-Time Instructors.

Senator Lillie: What I am saying is to add that to the agenda under unfinished business.

Chair Sterns: Do we have a motion and a second for approval of these revisions? All in favor say aye.
The motion passed

II. Approval of the Minutes – Chair Sterns: We then have the consideration of the September 3rd minutes as they were circulated in the Chronicle. Are there any additions for corrections? Senator Norfolk.

Senator Norfolk: I sent in some corrections. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: We have some corrections that were sent in by Senator Norfolk.

Heather Loughney: Yes, two corrections on page 23.

Chair Sterns: Page 23, two corrections. You want to tell us what those are?

Heather Loughney: Insert "at" before "the same time" in Senator Norfolk's comments. And remove the apostrophe in "its" in the last line of his comments. And on page 24 also Senator Norfolk's comments, "figure" should be "figures" and "generate" should be changed. On page 25 in the adjournment, the first line, Chair Sterns, chair was incorrectly spelled.

Chair Sterns: Okay so for those revisions can we go ahead and approve the minutes?

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman, on page 9 there's an item beginning with my name and it reads "yes Mr. Chairman, this is B" What on earth does that mean? I was drawing to attention and departure of Ronald B. Snyder. And I think I handed in my written remarks so I don't think I know where that B came from, it's Ronald B. Snyder. Then please turn to page 19,

Chair Sterns: Now be gentle, this is Senator Huff's first round.

Senator Gerlach: There are a lot of absences as we say from punctuation. Run on sentences, there's need to be some commas used, periods, semicolons. In the middle of the paragraph there is a sentence that begins "if we are not any long range budget planning". That makes no sense. I think it means if we are not to have any long-range budget planning committee let's get rid of it. Then a few lines down there's a sentence that begins with these words "then that is my seemly, I don't think we need this". It makes absolutely no sense to me. I don't know where that came from. I suggest that those words simply be

stricken that is “this is seemly I don’t think we need this” just begin the sentence “you might consider whether it’s really necessary for us to go through” etc. Except for some other punctuation I will let it go at that.

Chair Sterns: The issue for you new senators is that we have a verbatim transcript, which is done from the tape recording. Speech is not perfect. Verbal speech on occasion does not follow grammatical progressions. It would be nice however if someone would clean up the mistakes. I notice most of the mistakes I make are recorded vividly. Dr. Gerlach is perfectly correct. This is not an experiment in taking random words to make sentences. We accept that. I still however need a vote. A motion to accept the minutes was made by Senator Gerlach and seconded by Senator Norfolk.

All in favor of adoption of the minutes with corrections say aye. **The motion passed**

III. Chairman’s Remarks and Special Announcements - Chair Sterns: I would like to welcome a number of new senators today. Will new senators please stand up? Thank you for being here. We can go around and you can introduce yourselves.

Mike Kimble-SEAC, Nancy Homa-SEAC, Bev McDonald-Summit College Developmental Programs, Lin Chyi-Geology, Robin Pritchard-School of Dance, Theatre and Arts Administration, Vern Friberg-Geology, Jan Carson-Chair of CPAC, David Ritchey-School of Communication, Jon Miller-English, Parizad Dejbord-Sawan-Modern Languages, Jim Steiger-Audiology, Lisa Lazar-University Libraries, Elizabeth Mancke-History, Michele Thornton-School of Social Work.

Chair Sterns: Welcome and thank you very much. (applause) We have a few additional new senators who have not yet adjusted their schedules in order to be able to attend. We welcome the addition of these new senators. I just want to say briefly that a lot is happening that is very important to all of us. One of the things that have been on our plate recently has been the President’s Strategic Planning committee. I am sure President Proenza will mention that we have some forums coming up during October that will provide an opportunity for input and reaction to the plan. A number of people have expressed concern that the focus groups that were done to provide input were done during the summer when many people were not in residence. That is a continuing concern. We want to be sure that they have an opportunity to express their opinions on various issues. There will also be college visitations by the president as part of the process. I think we have a great opportunity here to provide input into the planning process. I want to encourage you to attend these meetings and also the President’s State of the University address. There are a number of opportunities in the coming month for us to participate in those activities.

We will also be considering the new University Council bylaws. They have been circulated to all senators in the most recent version for us to finalize and approve. This process has been a very long and important one and we will hear an official report later in the meeting. I think it is extremely important that we make sure that the Senate’s role is strong and clear. The implementation of the university council is extremely important. Campus-wide participation in decision-making needs to be affirmed by all the groups that are involved. We are in the process of other kinds of discussions that should not deter us from a spirit of moving ahead in a joint shared governance approach.

We are having a visit next week from the National Academic Advising Association. They will be doing and audit visit. We are going to schedule a meeting with that audit group and the Executive Committee on Wednesday, October 7th from 1:15-2:15. For those of you in the Faculty Senate who would like to join with the Executive Committee at that time, please let Heather know that you will be coming. We need to know that we have enough space in our conference room. If any of you have a special interest in advising I would very much appreciate you telling us so that we can have your participation. The purpose of this visit is to have a better understanding of our advising process and to see how well we are meeting our own goals as stated in a document that was developed as a five-year plan dealing with advisement. If you have further questions you are welcome to address them to me after the meeting.

Again, a sincere welcome to all.

We have one piece of business to finish. We have minutes from the Executive Committee meetings from the summer. I will ask for approval of them individually. If you will look in the September, 2009 Chronicle starting on page 27 we have the minutes of an Executive Committee meeting on May 21st. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting May 21st, 2009? (Motion by Senator Erickson, second by Senator Ziegler). All in favor please say aye. (Aye) Any opposed? (None) **The motion was passed.**

Senator Lillie: Why are we asking the Faculty Senate to approve the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting?

Chair Sterns: It has been the tradition in the first fall meeting to have all of the actions taken during the summer presented to the Senate.

Senator Lillie: I recall last spring we received permission to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate from the Senate. I'm unclear as to why were asking for a retroactive approval now.

Senator Gerlach: When we made that action Mr. Chairman I think you'll recall we said that any actions taken by the Executive Committee on behalf of the Senate should be subject to the Senate's review and approval. The only act I saw that needed the approval was the action recommending on behalf of the Senate the approval of the graduation list. The rest of what is recorded in your minutes does not seem to require any mention one way or the other. It's that one item that needed to be approved by us. Approval is required only when the Executive Committee is has been acting in lieu of us.

Chair Sterns: I belong to other organizations where it is perfectly appropriate to have the body pass on the Executive Committee minutes. It is not contrary to Robert's Rules to do this. Can I have approval for the May 21st Executive Committee meeting with the President and Provost? All in favor please say aye. (Aye) Okay and also for June 8th. Can I have a motion for approval? Senator Ziegler. Second Senator Oswald. All in favor please say aye. (Aye) Thank you. **The motions passed**

I would now like to call upon Secretary Huff to provide reports on the Executive Committee.

IV. Reports –

a. Executive Committee - Secretary Huff: The Executive committee met on September 24th at 3:30. In attendance were Senator Sterns our Chair, Senators Lillie, Bove, Bouchard and Erickson and myself. We had a discussion of the status of shared governance on our campus in response to the update that we had received that day from AAUP. The committee considered several examples of recent successes in the practice of shared governance in the work of the Senate. We also considered how many other issues would be called into question if the concept were abandoned or legally restricted through the contract negotiations. The committee considers this a very significant development that requires our close attention. The committee also recognized the need for improving communications with AAUP's Executive Committee. We also received a resolution from the Buchtel College council concerning the effect of online graduation applications has had on the declaration of majors. This issue will be referred to the Academic Policies Committee for review. Today the Executive Committee will be seeking the ratification of the nominations for the provost search committee members that will represent the faculty senate. The nominees that the Executive Committee will put forward are Senator Sterns, Senator Bouchard and Senator Lillie.

Chair Sterns: We are asking for the Senate to affirm these appointments of the Executive Committee to the Provost search committee. The way this works is that there are three representatives from the Faculty Senate, three faculty representatives from AAUP, and those individuals form a committee of six. This committee then meets with the selection committee as part of the Provost search process. The committee will also meet directly with the Board of Trustees. This group of three senators and three representatives from AAUP are one committee. There is also a committee of community representatives and a committee of alumni. All these groups will be meeting with the search committee.

Senator Hajjfar: What is the procedure. The Executive Committee of the Senate has to nominate or the Faculty Senate nominates?

Chair Sterns: Well the tradition has been that the Executive Committee makes the nominations in this case.

Senator Hajjfar: These three members are members of the Executive Committee?

Chair Sterns: That is correct. The feeling was that these three individuals are elected to represent the Senate and so that would be appropriate in this case. If you feel otherwise please say so.

Senator Hajjfar: I think if the Executive Committee wants to nominate three people it should be in consultation with the Senate or somehow it has to be brought to the Senate floor. The nomination should come from the Senate. That is my opinion.

Chair Sterns: We had considerable discussion about that. If the body feels that that is the procedure that they wish to follow I would certainly be glad to have those deliberations.

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman, it seems possible to me that someone, a member of this body, might be named that is not of the Executive Committee. We have three from the Executive Committee, why not one from other parts of this body? I do not know who that nominee would be, but it might be considered.

Chair Sterns: We really do not have a precedent for this, so we are breaking some new ground here. If the body feels that we would like to do nominations from the floor considering the recommendation of the Executive Committee that is perfectly fine with the Chair. Are there additional nominations? Remember my principle of self-actualization through committee membership. Are there any additional nominations from the floor for the Provost search committee? Senator Hajjafar, would you like to make a formal nomination of those three names as a motion from the floor?

Senator Hajjafar: I am sorry, I do not.

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman, there being no other nominations I move that the Senate approve the Executive Committee's recommendations of the three nominees.

Chair Sterns: Is there a second?

Senator Friberg: Point of Order. I would like to nominate Dr. Hajjafar as a potential candidate.

Chair Sterns: Senator Friberg has a made a motion is there a second?

Senator Chyi: I will second that.

Chair Sterns: Okay, Senator Chyi seconds. A nomination has been made.

Senator Lillie: Let me just ask a question of where we are. My understanding was that the distinguished Senator to my left here had made a motion and someone up here had asked for a second and was interrupted by a point of order. Then you asked for a second to a point of order. I mean that is what I understood to happen. .

Chair Sterns: I was looking for a second to Senator Gerlach's motion. Because a second was not perceived by the Chair I went ahead and accepted Senator Friberg's nomination.

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman, since Senator Hajjafar has been nominated I will move that the Senate now also consider the three nominees from the Executive Committee. (Senator Norfolk seconded)

Chair Sterns: We have four individuals who are nominated; Senator Hajjafar, Senator Bouchard, Senator Lillie and myself. What we will do is ask you to cast a vote for three of those four individuals.

Senator Gerlach: May I further move Mr. Chairman that the Senate will elect those three who get the highest number of votes. (Senator Norfolk seconded)

Chair Sterns: Senator Bouchard is a distinguished professor in the department of History, Senator Lillie is an associate professor in the College of Education, Senator Hajjafar is a professor of Mathematics and I am a professor of Psychology. While the voting is taking place I'm going to call upon the remarks of the President.

Senator Lillie: We had a motion on the floor to approve the top three vote getters, but it has not been acted on.

Chair Sterns: All in favor please say aye. (Aye) Opposed? (None) thank you.

The motion passed

b. Remarks from the President - President Proenza Thank you Mr. Chairman and good afternoon colleagues and welcome to the new senators. I would like to echo the remarks of your Chair, in that it is most important that we proceed as a university with appropriate consultation and with appropriate participation. I certainly support this and I think you know that I would advocate your leadership, and shared governance.

You had mentioned also the strategic plan. I just wanted to echo the need for continued participation. To date 2,223 have participated in a variety of sessions, communications, and visits with the guests that we've had to campus. The report that you will see, I believe next week, is a draft report of all that has transpired, not just during the summer but also back to January. There's still a lot of time for us to move forward. The report is indeed intended to reflect as much as possible the total consensus of the university community. I'm delighted to report some progress in that and to share with you that beginning next week on the 6th or 7th I will start personally moving around the campus to all of our schools inviting participation from staff, our faculty and our contract professionals. We will be visiting with more students, with the community and we'll be visiting with administrative units. I am hopeful that by the end of the year we will have come to some closure and that we can begin then crafting an implementation plan to move us over the next ten years toward those goals that we do select. Let me touch on four other topics today; state budget, the Provost search, the status of our Finance department and matters that may interest to you about the flu and about things that are happening on campus.

Earlier this week the Governor made an important announcement in light of the requirement by the State Supreme Court that anything regarding video lottery terminals be put before all the voters. The state is therefore immediately faced with the very great likelihood that almost 1 billion dollars that was anticipated revenue in each of the two years of the biennium will not be there. Therefore it is faced with a need to make contingency plans in the event that the voters turn that down and that some or all of that revenue is not available. The Governor considered many alternatives and finally concluded that he will recommend to the legislature that the phasing in of the reduction in the state's income tax will be postponed. I believe this reduction is now in its second or third year. Forgive me I don't know the exact detail on that. The phase in of those continued reductions will be put in moth balls so to speak and rest for two years to allow for the state's budget to come more closely into balance by not losing that revenue as well. It's important that you recognize that this is a bold initiative on the part of the Governor and that inherent in his remarks was also a very strong defense in the continued and very vital role that higher education plays. No comments were made about possible reductions in higher education for which I think we should all be very, very thankful.

I was visiting this morning with one of the editors of our newspaper. We looked at each other and said that if any of this economic downturn had been happening four years ago we knew with great certainty that it would have been higher education that would have been taking a great deal of the burden of this difficult economic situation. Times have changed, we should be grateful and communicate our appreciation both to the Governor and the Chancellor. They have made a very strong team. I was with the Chancellor yesterday in Washington at a meeting with speakers in different panels. He continues to be one of the greatest champions for higher education and I hope you feel that.

The Chairman and all of you remarked about the Provost search to which we will shortly have your three nominees. The process calls indeed for the you the Senate to nominate three individuals, the AAUP to nominate three individuals and for us then to constitute a group of faculty to serve as one of the review bodies for those candidates that are invited to campus by the Provost's search committee. In addition to all of those other groups, students will be involved in a variety of those elements and I expect both of you in particular will so participate. I expect that we will shortly have some indication of the timing. We retained the firm of Baker and Associates. Some of you may recall Mr. Jerry Baker who's helped us with several searches in the past. They have been in several months in what referred to in the trade as the "quiet phase" where their firm reaches out to leaders in higher education throughout the country, solicits nominations, solicits expression of interest, tries to reach out to those particularly outstanding candidates indeed secure their interest. The position is now formally posted publicly. Following up on this quiet phase, I expect a few other expressions of interest to come forward. Typically, regrettably, for better or for worse, in higher education at this level the public advertisement yields the least desirable candidates most of the time. We will search through any of those expressions of interest before we go forward. I expect that within certainly the next 30 days we'll be able to announce the timing of the subsequent steps in the Provost search. We hope to have this concluded by the end of the calendar year. I will be sending a letter out to campus effectively advising the whole campus of what I shared with you concerning the provost search.

As you know we had a vacancy in the position of our Chief Financial Officer. Last week in consultation with the finance leadership team and the senior leadership team of the university, I appointed as acting Chief Financial Officer and Vice President for Finance, Mr. Scott Borgemenke. He is already working very aptly. Mr. Borgemenke is very close to the Chancellor and he served as a trustee of Ohio University. He has a deep experience in aspects of state finance having served in several positions at the state level. I think he will be very very helpful particularly as he deals with our need to interface with the state and with the Chancellor's office in particular.

Let me turn to the flu. All of you of course know that there's some concern about H1N1, swine flu. There's also regular flu and it's not easy to tell the difference at times so don't get spooked unnecessarily. Suffice it to say that this past summer as a result of the global concern over swine flu, our emergency management team assembled itself for considerable discussion and exercise in which they reviewed various scenarios related to the swine flu. We presently do not have any confirmed cases on our campus, but we are certainly taking this seriously and preparing appropriately. Most of the cases that have been reported on other campuses have turned out not to be expressions of swine flu. Most of the cases that have been reported have turned out to be mild cases. Resident students have received information about this infectious disease and good practices that can help minimize its spread. I certainly hope all of you are appropriately informed and keep some nice hand sanitizer nearby or wash your hands as often as possible.

Guard yourself in terms of contact with anyone that you see as potentially infected. If you do feel like you have the flu the best advice that is being given by the Centers for Disease Control is stay home until you feel better. Don't get in the crowd. So in keeping with the CDC recommendations for colleges and universities, our University Health Services department will advise students who report flu symptoms to isolate themselves or to go home. If employees begin to experience flu-like symptoms I hope you will notify your supervisors and remain home for at least 24 hours after the fever is concluded. So please take that seriously so that we can minimize any flu outbreaks whether swine flu or the seasonal flu.

Let me share a few university achievements of the last few weeks. There certainly have been a lot of things to be excited about. You saw my letter reporting some things that were already what I call "wow" moments and those continue. You're aware of our 14-day enrollment count that puts us at 7.6 percent increase in enrollment over last year. Our total student enrollment that is almost at 28,000 students, 27,911 to be exact. This is the highest full-time equivalent in the university's history. On September 12th I'm sure you didn't fail to notice that we inaugurated Infocision Stadium and Summa Field before a capacity crowd of 30,000 fans and won that game, only to be confronted by some challenging situations of rule violations in which the team and the staff felt our quarterback had to be suspended from the team, not from school I might add. That's unfortunate because obviously you know the result of the next game. We recently also broke ground on our National Polymer Innovation Center which will open in June. We will benefit from a wonderfully accelerated construction path as a result of employing the construction management concept. Construction on the East Exchange parking deck is proceeding. It will provide an additional 1324 parking spaces available by next fall. I'm sure you have seen the ongoing construction of the new residence hall on the northeast corner of the stadium footprint. Last night our soccer team continued to gain national exposure and accolades beating Ohio State 3-0 for a record of eight wins and no losses. It is nice that not only did they beat Ohio State, but the evening before that game, Indiana oval football, - you understand those of you who have come from where football is soccer, you understand why I have to translate, you know that other football - trying to throw one of these caused me to have my first and hopefully my final football injury. My knee kind of went out of joint. It's not a sport I practiced as a college student. Most of you may know that our soccer coach, Caleb Porter, came to us from Bloomington, Indiana. Anyone here who went to Indiana? I was at Perdue, and we used to say that in Bloomington all the intelligent signs pointed to West Lafayette, now they point to Akron. Sorry. Standard collegiate rivalry thing.

Finally we received recognition for our commitment to diversity and inclusive excellence. The nonprofit Minority Access Inc. named The University of Akron as among an elite group of only 43 colleges and universities nationwide that serves as a role model institution promoting diverse academic environments.

There are probably a number of other things that I could share with you, but I think that is more than I had already planned to share with you. I will shut up and ask if there are any questions.

Chair Sterns: Are there questions for the president?

Senator Bouchard: I apologize first Luis; this is kind of a long question. I'll give you the short version first and then you can think about it while I do the long version. The short version is, will you provide the same sort of excellence leadership to increase the number and quality of our faculty that you've already provided to improve the campus? Let me just sort of talk about this.

President Proenza: The short answer is yes, and I'll give you the long answer after I hear your long question.

Senator Bouchard: I like this answer so far. You were just saying we've got more students than we've ever had which is wonderful, but we don't have more faculty than we've ever had. Ten years ago, before the early retirement buyouts, I know we had a lot more. I was looking at some figures for Arts and Sciences because that's my college and I know it. We are a college that gets all of the freshmen and all of the sophomores first because most of their general education courses are through Arts and Sciences. As of last spring student credit hours were up almost 30 percent in the last five years. This is even before this fall's seven percent increase. Yet in the number of faculty we have only gained 6 positions. This is something like 2.6 percent in the same five years. So in terms of faculty to students we're falling further and further behind every year. Right now we've got roughly 45 to 1 student/faculty ratio for tenure track faculty. This is pathetic. I'm sorry. As we all know, the "excellent" liberal arts colleges like a 10 to 1 ratio. We are never going to be an excellent liberal arts college, but I think we have the potential to be an excellent regional, state-funded, or state 'imagined' funded university. It would be kind of nice to be one. A couple of things have bothered me over the last few years and now that I'm on the Senate and I can say them all.

President Proenza: Connie's never been shy about sending very thoughtful letters, very thoughtfully constructed.

Senator Bouchard: One of the things that keep bothering me is that a tenured or tenure-track professor retires or leaves and they're not replaced with another one. They are replaced with a term instructor or a lecturer or college lecturer. The names keep changing. These replacements normally have a Master's which means that you can't put them in the upper level courses for our majors. We certainly can't put them in our graduate programs. All the studies show that the best way to retain students is to have them taught in small classes by tenured, tenure-track faculty who are committed to this place. Not by people with Masters degrees who won't be able to teach them as they progress through their major or certainly not by part-timers. We do want to retain them. We don't want to just admit them and then forget them. We have a lot of really dedicated part-timers but our dedicated part-timers are teaching one course for us, one course at Lorain Community, one course at Kent. They can't be the kind of mentor/guide that the student's want. So this has been a concern for me.

Another concern is that we want to be a research university. We can't be a research university with term lecturers. We've got to be a research university with real faculty. There were some issues last spring which I hope have been resolved where faculty actually got outside research grants and were denied the ability to take them even when they volunteered to give up their salary to take them. This is terrible. This is a bad sign.

I think it was about six years ago you had a plan that would draw us up into the middle of the state's salary scale. We are now at the bottom and we are sinking further. In History, which again is just the department I know so I'm doing some special pleading, we're below Youngstown State. This is not the sign of the premiere research university of Northern Ohio. To give you an example that I know, if I was at OSU, a distinguished professor who's had her degree for over thirty years, I'd be making 70,000 dollars more than I am at Akron. I'm not saying I deserve a 70,000 raise. I wouldn't object. It would be nice if there wasn't such an enormous gap. Four years ago you said you couldn't do anything because of the union. I

think if you went to the union and said, “Is it okay if we give everybody a nice raise?” they wouldn’t take you to the state labor board. Finally and again just a comment coming out of the contract negotiations, the opening salvo coming out of the administrations lawyer representatives was to drastically reduce faculty governance, weaken the protections of tenure and drastically reduce and restrict the ability of faculty to take research leaves every eight years. Although this was explained to me as “oh yes everybody always starts with negotiation by saying horrible things”. This isn’t the way to talk to us. We’re not peons, and you and I, we can talk to each other, and I think the faculty as a whole need to hear from you that faculty are respected and are going to be increased. Please don’t say in these difficult times we have to wait and do it later because...

President Proenza: I’m not going to say that.

Senator Bouchard: I’m so glad.

President Proenza: I can’t possibly address everything. The general answer to your question is yes and let me tell you how we’re approaching it and offer some other perspectives that are important to your cause. We are very much beginning to see the benefits of having improved the campus, now we’re seeing those and at the same time that we are seeing some cuts in state funding, that we’re seeing some other costs increase. I see Elizabeth Erickson over there and she’s of course very familiar with how our healthcare costs are increasing and how they expect to continually increase in the foreseeable future and I’m sure you haven’t missed all the national dialogue about that. At the same time that we are surely succeeding we are being faced with some other pressures. Nevertheless I have already asked the Provost and certain other colleagues and Deans in the Vice President’s office to begin working with me on a plan to increase the size of our faculty by no less than 100 and hopefully by as much as 200 new faculty. Now where are we going to get that money? At the moment frankly I haven’t a clue but I have a lot of good ideas about how that might happen. But it’s not going to happen tomorrow. If this was Georgia in 1967 the Governor in one day authorized and committed and got the legislature to appropriate the resources for 400 new faculty positions at the University of Georgia alone and comparable level at the Georgia Institute of Technology. I don’t see that happening in Ohio but there might be some other ways. As early as last year we talked with the Chancellor as he began to develop this concept of Centers of Excellence. We outlined for him how the university of Akron had begun to actually speak the language that he was now speaking, not in response to what he was speaking but as early as 1999-2000 we had developed the Charting the Course document that talked about clusters of excellence and focus differentiation. We presented him at that time with a draft which our trustees had seen of a plan that would have us redirect some of our resources to effectively concentrate and differentiate in select areas. We were prepared to do that, to reach the kind of high aspirations that he’s trying to set for all of the universities. We let him know that we felt we needed his help, to which he made the total goal that we were setting for ourselves. So that is in motion. Obviously I can’t address all of the points you raised cause I can only remember a few Connie, but let me just share some things. Colleagues I sent to you a letter not so long ago in which I cited the best of times/ worst of times and reviewed it with you here. Cited in that letter was some of the work that’s being done nationally, I cited a major speech by Gordon Gee at the American Council on Education. All of which says that we cannot possibly expect to be able to succeed if we do business the way that we’ve always done business okay? Now exactly what should that mean to us at The University of Akron. We are in the midst of examining that through the Strategic Planning process. We can’t expect to have only small classes. We will have some small classes and we will have to have some large classes. Or maybe we’ll have to have dozens of small

classes and all of us will have to find a new way to deal with dozens of small classes rather than one. We are going to have to accept the fact that at The University of Akron we have units that are effectively functioning as a community college and units that are effectively functioning as if they were at MIT or Cal-Tech or you name the very best institutions in your mind if it's Peking University or the University of Tokyo at the global scale. That means that we all have to be a little more understanding of each other because those that are functioning at this level obviously are not going to get paid what those that are functioning at this level. The market doesn't support that. It would be nice but the world doesn't work that way and yes I would like to be paid what Gordon Gee does too but I'm not likely to and I have no illusions or aspirations. Aspirations maybe, but illusions, I have none of that sort. Finally colleagues, I am bound regrettably, by labor laws from not commenting on what some of your colleagues are saying. I can only tell you that I do not support what they are alleging. I will not support that because I did not support it. If that's not enough of an indication of where I'm coming from I don't know what else I can give you.

I will tell you my favorite story about the fourth estate. In roughly 1985, my mother had just come to live with my wife and I in Georgia. She was about 85 at the time and she speaks very little English. We go out and buy a satellite antenna. In those days you couldn't get direct TV. You had to have the big 12-foot dishes so we could tune into the two satellites that the country of Mexico had put up so she could watch her favorite telenovelas. They are the same thing as soap operas except thankfully they go on for a little shorter period of time. They start in one month and end in about six months or less. They tell a wonderful story and then another one begins. She was just excited about it. We were watching the transmission and there was a huge great earthquake in Mexico City. I could see that in Mexico City there were maybe three buildings that were damaged. About that time the phone rings and it's somebody from the local newspaper in Athens. They say we understand you have connections to Mexico. Can you tell us anything about what happening there? I said we have the satellite and we have been watching. There are only three damaged buildings that they keep showing. The next day I'm quoted in the newspaper, as having talked to my family through a ham radio operator and the devastation is everywhere! Okay, do I make my point clear? Let's take another question.

Senator Elliott: I have two questions. My first is you mentioned that there is a new sheriff in town in Columbus and how you're perception of that is mostly favorable. I'm wondering if you have an inkling about when that new political composition in Columbus might have any impact on our Board of Trustees?

President Proenza: It had three. There have been three appointments by the Governor, Kevin Thompson, Jane Bond and Gordon Wolf.

Senator Elliott: There was one trustee who over the summer there was some legal action going on?

President Proenza: I am happy to report to you on that. This is just the facts. Over a year ago, maybe even more than that, there was a property that was being offered for sale that the university wanted to buy and the son of that Trustee owned it. The Trustee disclosed that before the Board of Trustees, abstained from voting and nevertheless both university and the Trustee approached the Ethics Commission of the State of Ohio for an opinion. The Ethics commission took a huge amount of time, much more than I've ever seen them take on anything, and came back alleging that this person had committed eleven ethical violations, okay. If I'm not mistaken Bill you might be able to remind me, I think all of those are listed as

misdemeanors, maybe there was one that might have had something else but in any case I believe seven of the nine were dismissed and the two remaining are of such a nature that normally had the Ethics commission done what they'd been asked to do would have been resolved by that person filing and amended disclosure statement okay. It is complicated further and again perhaps professor Rich or others can tell you that in that if a Trustee has an interest which again the court ruled he did not actually have a business interest in this case, there is probably presently not statutory basis by which the university can resolve the matter and so will probably lead to some new revisions of state law or creating some new processes in moving forward. Does that generally answer your question?

Senator Elliott: I guess so. So second question.

President Proenza: Sure.

Senator Elliott: You said that 1372 spaces would be added in the new Exchange deck. I've seen work going on in the old Exchange deck and have heard rumors that maybe they're going to close that one?

President Proenza: No. We're constantly cleaning, repairing, fixing, etc.

Senator Elliott: So the old Exchange deck is going to stay online?

President Proenza: For the foreseeable future yes. There might come some time when it needs to be repaired in a larger fashion or torn down and replaced. If I'm recalling correctly and maybe somebody knows here before we started the work on the Exchange deck we had approximately 10,500 spaces on campus. During the summer we added about 600 surface parking spaces in the area of the stadium and in the area of the old Urban League building. Those will remain until buildings are constructed. There are plans for three other parking decks as soon as we can raise the money to build them.

Chair Sterns: You will note that in this last Chronicle there was the report on parking issues that has some of that information.

Senator Elliott: Did you raise the issue last time that an analysis of timing and when each parking lot fills up would be helpful. I haven't noticed anything like that. Did it come out or was it in the Chronicle?

Chair Sterns: No. The Chronicle gives you a report of parking as of July 22nd in anticipation of the fall term. It does delineate in the current Chronicle the spaces that were added. Senator Elliott is bringing up another point that was discussed, that we would be monitoring in the last month, the usage of spaces and so forth.

Senator Lillie: I just wanted to say that I had seen a report that recently came out monitoring the use of the parking spaces. I think Associate Provost Ramsier knows more about it, but that has been done recently.

President Proenza: Jim Stafford, who oversees parking has a very good regular observation on which lots are available at what times. If for some reason you need to go away and come back to campus and you know your favorite spot is gone as often happens of course, he can tell you where you will surely find a space.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Permission to speak?

Chair Sterns: Permission to speak, Senate gives approval, please speak.

Associate Provost Ramsier: We did send the last two weeks worth of data from Jim Stafford's parking office staff and a website link where they show the kind of available spots during the day. That was sent to the Academic Policies Committee, who is looking at this issue with respect to course scheduling. It was sent to all the Deans to distribute to everyone in their colleges. It was also sent I think to Chair Sterns to disseminate to the Senate and the Executive Committee just this week.

Senator Elliott: Did you send it to the Buchtellite?

Associate Provost Ramsier: No.

Senator Elliott: Students need to know.

Associate Provost Ramsier: We have student senators here and they will be receiving that but it's on the Parking Office's website, you just have to go and look at it.

Senator Erickson: I had two questions for the President that did not have too much to do with each other. The first thing related to the your first issue of the strategic planning. As you say there are going to be a lot of meetings this month and you want to get input. I have had people come to me with concerns about not having enough input from faculty. I've been at some of the meetings in the summer, I've been one of a definite minority. It was a matter of time in the summer but it was also the timing of a lot of these activities. I understand that when speakers are coming onto campus that has to be taken into consideration. Their time has to be taken into account. Could it be made clear to whoever is organizing the meetings this next month that they take in account the kind of schedules that faculty have? Schedule them at times, many different times, so that faculty can have a significant input. Also that it be in a format that allows people to have significant input. A college meeting is a very difficult place to get interaction with the faculty because of again timing.

President Proenza: Let me tell you what we've done and I'm open to further suggestions. The meetings now on campus will go through into December. I'll be coming to every college. There will also be at least three if not four open meetings where anybody can come, scheduled at different times of the day so that you now hopefully have that opportunity. If there is a group that feels like they've been left out, I'm hoping to have a separate special meeting with them. Finally the website that the steering committee for the strategic plan has been maintaining and keeping also allows for input directly through the web.

Elizabeth Erickson: I wasn't there for the focus groups because those were during exam week. I'm sure faculty were not very much involved then. When you had speakers and you had the ability to for small groups to interact, that's very different from someone standing up in a meeting and saying I want to talk about this and that.

President Proenza: If I'm hearing you correctly you would have something independent of the strategic plan for people to talk about anything they want?

Senator Erickson: No. This is for the whole notion of the strategic plan. It's much harder to get up at a large meeting and launch into some specific item in the strategic plan than it is for a small group of people together to come up with a set of inputs as you have done, and very effectively done so far. I'd like to make sure that faculty had that possibility also.

President Proenza: I appreciate that and I'm trying to be as responsive to the report that you made. Here are a couple of suggestions. If any group of faculty wants me to come back because they could not be there at a particular time and can't be at one of their open meetings, let me know, I'll come back.

Senator Erickson: That would be excellent.

President Proenza: They'll have to take the initiative cause I won't know. Secondly, please tell all of your colleagues that the web has created a wonderful tool for individual input if you want to be totally private. Some of you have written me personally. Those of you who've taken advantage of this know that I'll read what you send me. The opportunity is there and more will be made available if you ask for it. Okay, I am now scheduled to the 2nd I think through December I don't know what the day is that I get off.

Senator Erickson: Thank you very much.

President Proenza: You had a second question.

Senator Erickson: You brought my second question up by mentioning healthcare costs. As you know there is no functioning Faculty Wellbeing Committee anymore. The issue has been taken over by quite a different group. I have had numerous people come to me to say they haven't heard anything about healthcare costs. As you know when we did have a Faculty Wellbeing Committee we used to report on a regular basis to the senate so people would know what was going on. It is coming up toward the end of the year. I was asking because people have asked me, whether you could report on it or on that whole negotiation.

President Proenza: Should we perhaps plan to make a report on the status of what our consultants are telling us that healthcare costs will be at the next meeting, I don't have the information in front of me Elizabeth, but I am happy to make that available.

Senator Erickson: And the committee that's involved has been meeting is that correct?

Chand Midha: The committee has been meeting and they've got some recommendations that are being discussed at this stage. They are on the negotiating table as well as other groups also.

Senator Erickson: As you know it did not just consist of those in the bargaining unit. It consisted of others. That's why I had questions. For those folks there had been nothing said about where the healthcare costs are.

Chand Midha: I think we need to ask some of our colleagues. There is a faculty representation to the best of my knowledge.

Senator Erickson: That is right, but there hasn't been any report.

President Proenza: Let's just be sure that that happens.

Senator Gerlach: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to follow up on the theme of my colleague in History, Professor Bouchard. History is my background too. I would suggest to the President that you just might consider the means whereby more faculty, full-time, tenured faculty might be supplied. I would refer you to one of President Proenza's predecessors. I think it was the 11th President of the university. He had an enrollment of about what it is today but by comparison the number of administrative officers in this university has doubled. We all know that administrative officers tend to get paid far in advance of what faculty do. My ideal of a university is that no administrative officer gets paid more than the faculty. That's a dream world too.

President Proenza: I think the Governor has that illusion too.

Senator Gerlach: That would be an ideal situation. Is it not possible to combine administrative work to the point of not having so many administrators to pay for? This is one of the things I objected to in dividing up a college. We got more administration, more administrative costs, two deans instead of one, assistant deans instead of one assistant dean. Can we not ever save some money that way?

President Proenza: I think your colleagues in the Executive Committee have heard me talk about this. Perhaps they can inform you. I have several ideas in that regard that are very much in the direction that you are hoping that we go.

Senator Gerlach: Thank you.

Senator Lazar: Thank you very much for your work on getting our input for the strategic plan. I did attend one of the faculty discussion sessions. I found it to be very helpful. The comment that I had to the facilitators, one that I'm asking you, is that I see a very broad level of input at the opening level, and I appreciate the opportunity to give all this feedback. But then what happens? I noticed in your opening remarks you said something about presenting a draft. Being on the strategic planning committee at the library, one thing that we tried to do is not just take everyone's opinion and say "here's our finished product", but to continue to have input at the various levels. For example I might say I want more space and then have it in the end product be nothing near what was the initial intent was.

President Proenza: First of all the report that will be distributed shortly is going to be marked very clearly *Draft*. The consultants have been helping us with this at the strategic planning steering committee. They got further input from the committee to add to what they had heard and other inputs. So this continues to evolve. I expect that should indeed be the process for at least the next several months. The outlines of the strategic plan should continue to evolve now following some degree of consensus. No plan of an organization as large as this is going to reflect everybody's wishes, or major complaints or major issues. But this is certainly much more involvement than we had when we did *Charting the Course* ten years ago. We have already had a great amount of that. I think all of you have identified five or six major, broadly defined goals. Those will need to be, assuming those are the final ones that are approved at the end of this next several month period, we will then need to decide how we going to implement them. That's when all of you at your

individual units will need to begin to focus on how your unit will participate. Dr. Gerlach's point is one of the questions that I've been raising. Are there times when this unit and this unit and that unit and that unit may need to come together and work out a plan collectively, because one alone can't accomplish the goal? I tend to have about a 40,000-foot view. I do tend to look at the big picture. You guys have to let me know what the details are.

Chair Sterns: Thank you very much Mr. President. Thank you for your indulgence today and thank you for staying with us to answer all these questions. I would like to have the Secretary report on the vote.

Senator Huff: For Senator Sterns there are 29 votes, for Senator Lillie 23, for Senator Bouchard 21 and for Senator Hajjafar 27. So our three representatives will be senators Sterns, Lillie and Hajjafar.

Chair Sterns: Thank you. Provost Baker.

c. Remarks from the Provost - Provost Baker Thank you. I appreciate this the second opportunity to address you as your interim Provost. I am reminded of the conversation that we just had with the President how important the work of this unit is. I'm glad also to know that solid progress continues to be made in advancing the university council model of shared governance. It's good to know that it is continuing to move forward. I understand there will be a committee report later.

I want to extend my appreciation to those members of the faculty who've been participating in the Ohio Board of Regents initiatives that help students transfer from one college or university to another. I know that many of you have spent time responding to OBR about potential TAGs those are *Transfer Assurance Guides* and learning objectives for courses within the TAGs. Many of you have also served on TAG committees review courses submitted by colleges and universities as a match for courses within the TAG and faculty members have also served on committees to explore whether establishing a TAG would be advisable. UA is also the host site for two validation centers for the career and technical disciplines of Medical Assisting and EMT, so thanks to all of you who have helped to make the University of Akron a transfer-friendly institution. Many of my comments have already been covered so I can make this briefer. Following up, the National Academy of Advising NACADA visit that professor Sterns mentioned is upcoming. That stems in part from the work of the First Year Experience Retention committees that are supported by the Faculty Senate. The audit will help us to further improve our student advising. In addition to the session that professor Sterns mentioned there will also be an open forum with the site visitors and I would encourage you to attend if possible. An agenda for that meeting will be forthcoming.

I probably don't need to mention anything more about Strategic Planning that hasn't already been covered except to remind you and encourage you to attend the open sessions as we move forward.

Next week beginning Monday there are some activities that will be happening through the weekend. October 5-9 is China Week, a campus and community week that explores Chinese culture and Sino-US relations politically, economically and culturally. There are a wide variety of activities planned and I know many of you are participating. The majority of our colleges and faculty will be engaged in a variety of the activities that are planned. The program and engagement model for China Week by the way was our successful Race Relations Week that was in the winter. In addition as part of the Confucius Institute grant the Chinese ministry of education has sent the last portion of some 3,000 Chinese books and instructional materials received by university libraries.

October 29 and 30th The University of Akron will host the second annual *Engage to Learn, Learn to Engage* Service Learning and Community Engagement Institute at Quaker Square. This will be a little different in scope from our first event. The goal for this institute is to help faculty start the process of partnering with the community to imbed real world educational experiences into their coursework. In addition to nationally and internationally known speakers, the institute will spotlight The University of Akron's expertise, showcasing the work of a number of faculty involved with service learning and curricular engagement. These examples of outstanding faculty/community partnerships will just be a part of what is planned to be an energetic institute with multiple opportunities for faculty to interact directly with community members as well as agencies. I hope you'll find time to participate and learn from our own experts and engage with community members to enhance learning opportunities for all of our students. In addition mini-grants will be available for those who initiate a service-learning project. More information about this is available on the ITL website.

Finally I'd add some points of cultural interest. If you haven't had a chance yet to see *From an Afro-Centric Point of View*, the Myers School of Art has done an outstanding job staging this in the Honors Gallery, Many of you traveling on Buchtel Avenue can see that it is both beautiful during the day and in the evening. There was a reception yesterday with some speakers and with the artists John Walker and Woodrow Nash, who is from Akron. I strongly encourage you to visit the exhibition. I would also like to mention that there was a luncheon today for members of the Paul Taylor Dance Company. They are in residence here, working the whole week with our students in dance as well as area high school students. I think many of us are aware of the growing national and international reputation to our dance program and it's programming. The highlight will be Saturday evening when the Paul Taylor Dance Company will give their performance at EJ Thomas. It really is fantastic to see such world-class dance here in Akron.

In closing let me say I hope everyone's semester is going well. I'm really grateful for your support and your efforts to promote student success. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I do need to be Cleveland at 5:30 so if there are no questions, you'll excuse me if I dash out the door.

d. Committee Reports - Chair Sterns I had asked Bill Braselton from Frontline to give us an update on the ad hoc Computer Software Review Committee. Unfortunately he had to leave. Let me just report by saying that Senator Norfolk had asked for a contract price at the last meeting. The amount of that contract was \$138,000. What Mr. Braselton was going to present is a written document that we can share with the Senate. It outlines the accomplishments of the project. I can tell you that the first phase is now just about complete and in a conversation that I had with Vice President Sage, it looks like we will be moving ahead with the next phase. This will accelerate the process dramatically. It is unfortunate that he did have to leave, but he did inform me that he had to catch a plane and we had an unusually long early part of the meeting. Are there any questions that I can deal with? Senator Elliott?

Senator Elliott: As I recall the issue was whether those kinds of consulting or contract agreements would be able to be performed by units internal to this campus?

Chair Sterns: Well actually this project is a combination of both in terms of internal and external staff.

Senator Elliott: It is interesting but I don't know what proportion is the external component. Would internal units be able to make a bid on that? In other words, if this is never publicized to internal units on campus so they can submit a bid on it then it's basically undermining any ability for internal units to achieve what Professor Norfolk suggested.

Chair Sterns: I think you have very specific concerns I would like to invite you to come join the ad hoc Curriculum Software Review Committee. Attend the meeting and we'll have that discussion there so you can have a full briefing and understanding of the process. This entire process was fully transparent. The bidding process was shared with the Senate. All the steps have been reported on the website that follows this activity. Before they came to The University of Akron, Frontline had done an earlier version of the project at Ohio State. That kind of task analysis is part of this process and all the meetings that were involved take great deal of time. I think there were over 30 different meetings that were part of capturing the *as-is* process. I don't know if anyone who was on the faculty would have the time to do that. However, the idea of making bids certainly makes sense to me. The way that this came about was Vice President Sage first decided that they were going to adopt a new software platform. The next step was that he contacted the Senate and said that he was going to do this and that it would provide the opportunity to redo the existing curriculum program. As many of you know, the existing program has lots of clunkiness. It was my suggestion in the Senate around February that we have a committee that would not only deal with the software issue but would also completely examine the process. So what's interesting about this is that the whole project basically emerged as a Faculty Senate project. In that sense it was fully discussed and launched here.

Senator Gerlach: I don't remember any such thing.

Chair Sterns: Well then you go back and read the minutes of the February meeting.

Senator Gerlach: Neither do I remember ever having reported what this was going to cost. That was never revealed to the Senate.

Chair Sterns: The funding for this came out of the IT budget. I don't think that the contracting needed to necessarily be approved by the Senate since it was part of the plan of the IT unit of the university. However this was fully discussed, a committee was formed; I went to the committee meeting to select a chair. No one on that committee was willing to serve as Chair and then I decided to function as chair. The fact of the matter is and we have been reporting about that. I'm afraid Dr. Gerlach, that this may have been one of the meetings that you were absent; rare though that is. This is not something that has been done in any way under the table. It has been fully disclosed, fully discussed, and as far as I'm concerned is one of the best things I've seen happen out of this Senate in a long time. You know what I love about this group is that if we don't do anything, we criticize ourselves. If we do something we criticize ourselves. So I'm perfectly glad to hear what you are saying, except that I see something very good coming out of this. I don't see why there are times when using top-notch consultants are not perfectly appropriate. We didn't ask the Senate for the funding. If the IT department and the Provost office is willing to provide it then it seems to me to make sense. Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie: I just want to rise to say that we did discuss this. I can't recall precisely when. I'm fairly certain we didn't discuss the financial part of it, so the Chair Sterns is correct there. The issue of concern to me and of most concern to the Senate is to keep our eyes on not the software package, but to ensure that the faculty retain control and approval over the entire curriculum proposal process from beginning to end. The advice and input of administrators is purely that, administrative, not substantive. One of the things that I think is good about some of the questions that are arising here is that it shows that the faculty are concerned about the process. I would encourage those who are interested to keep an eye on the process in your department and college. Insist that within any committee or other process in your college that curriculum proposals and approvals be made by faculty and not by administrators. One of the things we had seen from time to time and place to place was that there were efforts by some administrators to insert themselves into the process and hold up proposals because they had administrative concerns. I think that's inappropriate. Faculty needs to be the group that decides that. It is certainly important for us to receive input from the people in the administration about why perhaps were going too fast and where we might find some help for them in the process. I would say that it would most helpful to us, to Chair Sterns and to this process for those faculty here to keep track of those kinds of issues and keep us alert to them so that we can insure that the faculty maintain in control of the process. The software method that is used is in my mind at least for our purposes secondary, provided that the faculty maintain the approval. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Thank you. Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson: Just following on from Senator Lillie. I am the acting representative from my department on the Buchtel College Council, which is the group that deals with curriculum in our college. We have just formed a subcommittee to deal with that second issue. I have had to use that software over the years that we have had it in place. I think Senator Sterns called it clunky. It has been absolutely abominable and now it is up to being awful. It really needs some work. I was one of the people who said it to Vice President Sage that the curriculum stuff really needs work! He looked at it and agreed with me. I am very grateful for that. When we did this in the Senate last February, it seemed to be a very good chance to do something that the members of the Senate had been talking about at various points some years. Helen Qammar, who is now with ITL, said some years ago that the one thing that we need to do as a Senate is to deal with that whole issue of having an effective curriculum process; not just the technical chunkiness being solved, but what do we want in terms of how that curriculum is reviewed. What goes into the curriculum process at each level. Buchtel College Council has formed a subcommittee to look at the whole issue of what we need to have going into the curriculum process as well as the technical issues and I would urge everyone to do the same in their own colleges.

Senator Elliott: I think my comments were associated with the curriculum review process, but that's not what they were directed at. They were directed at this contracting process and the idea that Senator Norfolk suggested that we ought to have an opportunity at least to bid on these things. There ought to be injected into this process of outsourcing things a stage where it says "here is the description of work, does anybody want to bid on it internally". You are probably right. Nobody will say, "Give me more work".

Chair Sterns: I certainly could see the great virtue in the point you are making. This group however has moved extremely fast, extremely effectively. In the future I certainly could raise that idea with Vice President Sage. I think that is a very fair idea that should be considered. Senator Gerlach.

Senator Gerlach: I just want to reinforce a couple of things suggested by Senator Lillie and Senator Norfolk. In some 30 years of my experience as a faculty member we have gone through various changes in this curriculum review process. I do not see why we could not do it again on our own and save this money.

Chair Sterns: You're forgetting that it is not just a process. It is also all the programming that goes with it.

Senator Gerlach: I understand that now but perhaps I didn't grasp it in February. If the faculty is to be in control, they ought to do it entirely by themselves as far as I am concerned. Do not use any outside consultant. We never used to have that done when we reviewed the curriculum process. We just went ahead and did it as we saw best. That is what we have an Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee for.

Chair Sterns: Heather was kind enough to look up for me that the ad hoc Curriculum Software Review Committee was created at the October 2008 meeting on a resolution from Senator Lillie. It was almost a year ago that this process began. You know we have a number of other pieces of business today. Thank you for the discussion. I hear what you are saying. I will certainly be glad to bring that forward. I do not think in any of our discussions as a committee we ever discussed the possibility of internal bidding. Let's move to the curriculum review committee. Please Associate Provost Ramsier.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Thank you Chair Sterns. Academic Policies Committee has an informal report. We have begun our bi-weekly meetings. We are working on the issue of the scheduling policy as you heard me mention before the charge from the Faculty Senate. We invited the enrollment manager to come to our meeting next week to talk about issues that relate to scheduling that also includes parking and many other things.

The Curriculum Review Committee, which I also Chair, and GEAC, are all meeting bi-weekly. Curriculum Review Committee does bring forward a formal resolution to the Senate today to approve a curriculum proposal for Arts and Sciences College proposal 07-086 from Public Administration and Urban Studies to create a web based versions of courses for an existing certificate program. The Curriculum Review Committee asks that you approve this outstanding curriculum proposal.

Chair Sterns: The Senate has a handout on that as well.

Senator Lillie: I really do not have any objection to what the Public Administration and Urban Studies faculty think that is right for them. What I am looking at in this particular proposal 07-086 is that it refers to an existing certificate program, it refers to courses, but it does not name either one of them. So I intend to vote in opposition to this because of the fact that it does not include specifically what it refers to.

Chair Sterns: Your reading of this is that it asks for a blank check.

Senator Lillie: In response to the Chairman, there is nothing specific. It is a very general kind of thing. If they are asking for permission to go ahead and do the paperwork, then bring the specific changes through

the line, I am fine with that. This does not say anything except that the recommendations for the curriculum proposal are actually approved, creating web-based versions for certificate program. There is no specificity there. What certificate program is it? What are the courses? Is it all the courses or some?

Senator Hajjafar: What you see you here is a proposal summary. If we go into the curriculum proposal website, over there you see in detail all the courses, everything that has been added, what has been taken out. This is just a summary of it.

Senator Lillie: Has the curriculum review process been gone through?

Senator Hajjafar: This is just a summary.

Senator Lillie: Thank you and I withdraw my concerns.

Senator Mancke: I was just going to say the same thing. It is all on the web.

Senator Hajjafar: I have a point of order here. The process of the approval of courses is that the final decision is made in the Curriculum Review Committee. But if CRC is a Senate committee, as I remember it, any proposal that receives two negative votes must come to the Senate. If it is unanimous I do not think we should bring it to the Senate floor. That is my understanding. I want to save paper. In the future if any proposal has two negative votes in CRC, according to procedures it has to come to the Senate floor.

Associate Provost Ramsier: Well this was the only one, so that is why there was a little more paper-work.

Chair Sterns: We have been reviewing this. You are correct. That is the procedure as outlined. I think what has happened in the last year or two years is we have been reviewing these. The reason we know that is because the Curriculum Review process has been carefully looked at all the steps and so forth.

Senator Gerlach: If Senator Hajjafar is correct, the Senate then does not have any effective power over the last step. I don't care if the committee votes it out double unanimously. The final step ought to be the Senate's. Just in case someone in the Senate has questions to ask and raises some sort of reasonable objection. You are going to destroy the Senate by surrendering powers to the committee. That is wrong.

Associate Provost Ramsier: I think you will notice that since I've been the Chair of this committee reports have come here.

Senator Erickson: In the past the Faculty Senate asked the Executive Committee to sign off on this and for ages and ages I got lists and lists of these things. I felt I was being forced to make that final decision. I'm very glad in actual fact it came back to the Senate. It has always been the Senate that had to make that final step. It has been done differently at different times, but it has never been just the committee.

Senator Lillie: I think we have particular rules for how this is supposed to be done. We ought to be doing it that way. If we do not like the rules we should change them. It might be helpful for this process if we could determine exactly what the rules are. So perhaps one of our standing committees might be tapped to clarify this for us.

Chair Sterns: The reason that Senator Hajjafar is saying this is that as part of the curriculum review process, we uncovered that this indeed was what was on paper. However we are operating differently from what is there. We really need to revise it. This is an inconsistency.

Senator Rich: The Faculty Senate bylaws provide the Curriculum Review Committee reviews curricula and course recommendations of the several colleges and divisions and when necessary submits them to the Senate for action. I think “when necessary” means when action is required and so I think the recent practices of Chairman Ramsier have been exactly correct. If the committee has anything that it regards as an internal rule that is contrary to this, it seems to me that rule is inoperative. It is contradicted by the bylaws of Faculty Senate that were put into force by the Board of Trustees. I don’t see how there could be really much question about how this is supposed to work. If we wish it to work differently from that, then we could consider proposing a bylaw amendment that would have to be approved by the Board of Trustees.

Senator Lillie: To answer Senator Rich, to the best of my knowledge, there is a Board approved curriculum process, a rule. That may be what Senator Hajjafar is referring to. That is one of the reasons why it might be helpful for us to make sure that that Board approved rule might be in conflict with our bylaws in some way that we haven’t been aware of up until now.

Chair Sterns: What has happened in the exploratory committee is that we looked at each of the steps very carefully. I will ask the committee to uncover any of these discrepancies and then we will bring them forward. Senator Rich has told us that according to the bylaws we are behaving exactly correctly.

Senator Lillie: Point of order. I just told you that there is another rule that is also a Board of Trustees rule. I am not suggesting that there is anything wrong with what Senator Rich said. I am just suggesting that there may be two ways of looking at the same thing.

Chair Sterns: I am going to ask that the curriculum review committee take up this issue.

Senator Hajjafar: I disagree senator, because it says explicitly “if necessary”. I have been serving on the Curriculum Review Committee and the Senate for about 12 years. The practice of the committee has been if there are more than two negative votes that is “the necessity”. That has been the practice.

Chair Sterns: I think we have a disparity here that needs to be resolved and so as I said I am going to suggest that we take it to the Curriculum Review Committee. We will look at what has been happening. We will look at what the discrepancies are and we will report back.

Senator Rich: I just quickly looked at the University regulation concerning curriculum changes. It says that the Faculty Senate shall approve or reject a proposal.

Chair Sterns: Let the committee do the work in committee, not in the Senate.

Chair Sterns: I think that this is a practice in compliance.

Senator Mancke: This is an important point that cannot be resolved at this time. It should be taken up at the next meeting.

Senator Gerlach: I call for the previous question. None of this is now germane to the motion to adopt this proposal.

Chair Sterns: We are being asked to vote on the approval of the curriculum revision number 07-086. Any further discussion, if not all in favor please say aye. (Aye) Any opposed? (None) **The motion passed**

Why don't we go right ahead to the University Council Exploratory Committee?

Associate Provost Ramiser: The University Council Exploratory Committee has received all the feedback on the previous version of our bylaws. We have discussed every comment and suggestion. We have modified the final document that you now hold. Some of the technical editing we just did where it made sense. We have highlighted if you have a color version. There are areas in the proposed bylaws that are different and so we highlighted them in a different color. I would draw your attention to what I consider to be the substantive difference. It is on page 9 and following onto page 10 on my printout. The standing Committee for Student Success that is proposed to the new university council. We have specifically gone back and added language to make it very clear that the University Council Student Success Committee will not cross and overlap with the work of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate's concern is success on the academic side. We have added language to clarify that the UC's concern for student success is with respect to administrative and logistical issues, not academic issues. We have also added three charges to the members of what we now call the Oversight Committees for that Student Success Committee. That will be working with the VPs to do implementation on administrative policy, practices, logistical issues such as we heard earlier of a problem with online registration and the declaration of majors. That is a technical detail that is not an academic detail. There could be things like that the University Council will take on itself, not the academic and particularly not the curricular issues which belong in the Faculty Senate. If you had a chance to look at the language and I hope you have, the committee brings this forward for your ratification as it has to all the other constituency groups. The plan is to have it formally acknowledged by all the eight groups before the deadline to submit to the Senate for the November meeting. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: This was sent to all senators. Are we prepared to vote on this issue?

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I see you did make an addition as we recommended, adding an amendment section. Is there anything else that you might want to point out about changes that have been made?

Associate Provost Ramsier: I will ask Senators Lillie and Erickson to comment. I think the most substantive changes besides adding the amendment section is the extra language to declare the distinction between the student success parts. That had a lot to do with academics when the academics belong to the Senate.

Senator Gerlach: Mr. Chairman may we know if any other of the constituent groups have made a final pass on this, or are we the first?

Associate Provost Ramsier: You are the first. It came out just in time to get to this body one week ago.

Chair Sterns: I ask Senator Lillie and Senator Erickson, who are both participants in this committee, if they have any comments before we vote.

Senator Lillie: This is a process that has taken almost three years. I was co-chair for two and a half years. We spent a lot of time trying to hammer out and understand the points of view of the various eight constituency groups that make up the proposed University Council. In some ways it was an exasperating process for all present. It was also highly educational. What we tried to do was to make it clear that University Council is not designed nor is it intended to be a superior body to Faculty Senate. It has different responsibilities than Faculty Senate; it has no oversight in terms of supervision of the Senate. We worked very hard to make sure that we preserved the primary role of the Senate in terms of academic issues, that is what remains perhaps less specifically defined than we liked. We made it very clear through many arguments and a lot of discussions that that is something the Senate needs to maintain and will maintain. So I would say that given the charge we had and the process we went through, this is a recommendation that embodies the best we could do under the circumstances. It does maintain the primacy of the academic role of the Senate.

Senator Erickson: I agree with Senator Lillie. In May we passed the previous draft of these bylaws with the notion that they still needed one more round which hopefully would not be substantive. I think that it is now a better document. That whole issue of the student success is more clearly delineated. There is a role for a student success committee of the council, but that it is not the academic role. I think that it now makes this document a better document. I would urge that you pass it.

Chair Sterns: Any further discussion? Senator Mancke.

Senator Mancke: I am a little puzzled by the amendment section. The third stage in amending is approval of the council. Is there no requirement that the council has to ask anybody else for approval? This whole document can be amended, whole sections deleted without anybody beyond the council approving it?

Chair Sterns: Same as the way the Faculty Senate operates. That is the model. Are we ready for a vote on this?

Senator Gerlach: One question Mr. Chairman. This being passed, when is it contemplated that this body will elect its members to the council? Is that clear yet? Are we going to wait until all the constituency members have given their approval or are we going to schedule our own elections at a certain time? I would like to know.

Associate Provost Ramsier: I think it was the committees understanding that this is a version for ratification by the eight groups. We are to bring back the results of the ratification votes to the Senate in the November meeting and let the Senate decide on the action to send this forward to the President, because this was the originating body.

Senator Gerlach: In other words we would wait until the President and the Board of Trustees dispose of it before we risk putting any of our necks on the line. Thank you.

Chair Sterns: Are we ready for a vote? All in favor please say aye. (Aye)

Senator Mancke: I did not hear a call for opposing votes. I vote against the motion.

Chair Sterns: : Duly noted.

The Motion Passed

We also have a bylaws revision to take care of today. Call upon Senator Rich.

Senator Rich: I regret to inform the Chairman that the time is after 5:00 and I have to meet a class tonight. I can't stay. If someone else wishes to present the amendment I suppose that could be done. My own preference would be for it to be postponed until the next meeting.

Senator Lillie: Then I would move to postpone the consideration of this until the next meeting. (second by Senator Norfolk)

Chair Sterns: All in favor. (aye) Any opposed? (none) Okay. That being the case, I think we have had a rather long meeting today, any Good of the Order? (none)

V. Adjournment - Chair Sterns: Can I have a motion for adjournment? (motion by Norfolk, second by Ziegler) All in favor please say aye. (aye) Thank you all very much.

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 pm

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

Transcript edited by Robert Huff,
Secretary of the Senate

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF OCTOBER 1, 2009

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

RESOLUTION 10-01-09

Pertaining to the Approval of the Following Curricular Changes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the recommendation presented by the Curriculum Review Committee concerning the curricular proposal approval listed below, be approved.

AS-07-086 PAUS - Creating web-based versions of courses for existing certificate program

September 28, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
 FROM: Curriculum Review Committee
 RE: Curriculum Proposal Approval Recommendations

Below is a course proposal that need Faculty Senate review and approval.

<p><u>AS-</u> <u>07-</u> <u>086</u></p>	<p>Creating web-based versions of courses for existing certificate program PAUS</p>
<p>Proposal Summary:</p>	<p>In 2003 the certificate program for the Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies was revised. The change in the certificate program was premised on the use of a combination of web-based and secondarily weekend courses as a way to reach a wider audience of public and non-profit sector managers. Without approval to offer course as web-based courses we cannot offer the certificate, or at least not offer it in the way it was intended. It is the intention of the department to offer both classroom based and web-based versions of these courses in the future. Based upon the experience with web-enhanced courses we anticipate few changes in the format and structure of the courses. In those courses that have already been offered in the web-enhanced medium little more than a shift of the delivery of assignments and an expansion of the number of electronic interactions (chat rooms, etc.) will be required to convert the course from web-enhanced to web-based. For the courses which have not yet been offered in even the web-enhanced format then the change to the instructional approach is more extensive. The changes to be made will focus on two elements: first, a more aggressive stance on issues concerning plagiarism, with the University web information being linked to each syllabus; and, second, a restructuring of the delivery of lectures and assignments. To reflect the expectation of the Buchtel College Council each course will require a minimum of weekly interaction with the instructor either in a chat room or in assignments submitted via e-mail. With the obvious exception of in-class presentations, the web-based classes will be quite similar in content, structure and assessment methods as the web-enhanced and land-based courses.</p> <p>The syllabi for the web-based courses proposed here are modified versions of the current classroom based courses. For reasons of accreditation and good pedagogy the web-based courses proposed herein will have the same learning outcomes and readings as the parallel traditional formatted courses.</p>

APPENDIX B

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws

Regarding Inclusion of Full-time Instructors and College Lecturers

(H) Membership

(1) Eligibility. Members of the faculty senate shall be elected from the full-time faculty of the university of Akron, excluding deans, department chairs, and other primarily administrative officers with faculty rank; from the part-time faculty; from contract professionals, excluding those with decanal rank or higher; from the non-bargaining unit staff; and from students. For purposes of these bylaws, members of the full-time faculty include full-time regular faculty, instructors, and college lecturers.

Deleted: regular

(2) Apportionment.

(a) The full-time faculty of the individual degree-granting colleges and the university libraries shall elect representatives from their membership, excluding deans and other primarily administrative officers with faculty rank, apportioned on the basis of the number of full-time faculty within the electorate and appointed to the units during the semester of the election; one senator for each fifteen full-time faculty members or fraction thereof.

Deleted: regular

Deleted: regular

Deleted: regular

(4) Electorate.

(a) The eligible electorate, for the full-time faculty membership on the faculty senate, consists of all full-time faculty of the university of Akron. For the purposes of election to the faculty senate, academic deans, department and division chairs, directors of schools, and administrative officers holding regular faculty rank will be considered part of the electorate.

Deleted: regular

Deleted: regular