

## University of Akron Faculty Senate Meeting

October 4, 2012 3:00-4:30

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The October meeting of Faculty Senate will please come to order. First item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. There's one item that needs to be added and that is the adoption of the minutes of the September meeting, which were distributed electronically to you. Is there any objection to adding those to the, that to the agenda? Hearing none, are there any other amendments to the agenda? All those in favor of adopting the agenda as just amended, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted.

The second item is the approval of the minutes of the September meeting. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? As was explained in the E mail that accompanied the minutes, we've gone to a different format as, partly as a result of the fact that we now have a professional transcriber. I would encourage you to, in your leisure time, take a look at the full transcript which is available on the Faculty Senate website to see what a wonderful job she does. That really is quite terrific.

Partly as a result of that, the secretary and I really didn't see the same kind of need for as detailed and, you know, almost blow by blow a set of minutes as we've had in the past. And so as you can see from the minutes, they're quite a bit boiled down. They record all the actions that were taken, who made which motions and seconded them and so forth, and they do include the substance of the remarks of the President and the Provost and the short summary of the substance of debate that transpired.

I think this is a better way of doing things for the body, but we would be interested in hearing your comments, not right now of course, but in hearing your comments about it, whether you think it's a good change or not, and you know, we'll certainly listen to them and take those comments into account.

Okay. So where were we? Is there a motion to approve the minutes of the September meeting? Moved by Senator Clark, seconded by Senator Lillie.

Any corrections? Hearing none, all those in favor please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The minutes are adopted.

Next item on the agenda is special announcements. It's my sad duty to report the deaths of four of our colleagues. Dr. George Prough, professor emeritus of marketing, died September 15th after a lengthy illness. He was 67. He earned a bachelor's degree at the University of Akron, a master's at Michigan State University and a Doctorate in Business Administration at Kent State University in 1977. He

joined the faculty of the College of Business Administration in 1968 and retired in 2004. He was the recipient of several honors including the Frank L. Simonetti Distinguished Business Alumni Award, the University of Akron Alumni Association Outstanding Teacher Award and the Distinguished Marketer Award from the Akron Chapter of Sales and Marketing Executives International.

Alan N. Gent, professor emeritus of polymer engineering and polymer physics passed away at his Ravenna home on September 20th. He was 84. Gent's career with the University of Akron spanned 33 years beginning in 1961. He held a variety of administrative and faculty roles, including serving as dean of graduate studies and research from 1978 through 1986. He was the inaugural Harold A. Morton Professor of Polymer Physics and Polymer Engineering.

The recipient of many awards, Gent's most recent honor came in May. The Ohio Research Scholar Professor position at the University of Akron was named the Alan N. Gent Ohio Research Scholar Professor of Polymers in recognition of his noteworthy achievements in education and research and formative contributions to the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering.

Dr. Patricia Parr, a professor and the program coordinator of the Marriage and Family Therapy Program in the Department of Counseling in the College of Education passed away September 27. Dr. Parr earned a master's degree in community counseling and a doctorate in guidance counseling and marriage and family therapy from the University of Akron. She supervised many students on the masters and doctoral levels and provided training for supervisors. She served as the president of the Ohio Association for Marriage and Family Therapy and held numerous other leadership roles at state and national levels. She was especially proud of the collaboration with St. Thomas Hospital which provided an opportunity for the MFT doctoral students to get an enhanced learning experience. She was also an American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy approved supervisor and an Ohio Professional Clinical Counselor Supervisor.

Sharon Butts Hays, a project director in the Department of History for two Teaching American History grants died in Canton on September 27th. She was 63. Hays earned a B.S. in Nursing at the University of Pittsburgh and served for four years as a captain in the United States Army Nurse Corps. She earned an M.A. in History in 2004 and joined the Department of History in 2006. Does anyone else know of any other deaths that we should report? Would you all please rise for a moment of silence? Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the report of the Executive Committee. Senator Bove.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon and welcome. I hope the start of the semester has been smooth and productive for all of you. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on September 14 to certify the senate election results from the College of Business Administration and also to prepare for the meeting with the President and the Provost later that afternoon.

With the President and Provost we discussed many items such as the status of the five dean vacancies and plans to fill those vacancies, last year's changes to the undergraduate admissions policies, and the

status of Faculty Senate bylaw amendments with the need for reporting mechanism back to senate or enacted changes.

We also discussed the Summit College Regional Campus issue, inquired about planning for faculty retirements in 2013 and 2015 in light of the recent Ohio Pension System revisions, and also the new UA online initiatives. The EC also inquired about the UA Culture Quest and how that intersects with academics. The Provost will ask Vice President Tressel to speak to the Faculty Senate about the Akron Experience and Culture Quest. We look forward to that presentation.

The Provost informed us about his involvement on the Board of Regents Complete College Ohio Task Force, and the President announced that Olivia DeMoss was recently appointed to the UA Board of Trustees. The EC met again on September 27th and set the agenda for today's meeting. We also made appointments to the ad hoc Committee on Part time Faculty Issues and the UC Student Engagement and Success Committee.

Before I conclude the report of the Executive Committee, the EC has three resolutions to bring forward. They are included in your handouts.

And we'll have to go ahead and ask permission to waive the seven day requirement for the resolutions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Read the first resolution and then we'll do that.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Yes, sir.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there anyone who needs copies of the resolution?

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Resolution number one, whereas faculty participation in decisions about the organization, mission, and naming of academic units is fundamental to the principle of faculty governance and whereas the faculty directly affected by such decisions have the greatest expertise to bring to bear on them, resolve that the Faculty Senate will not approve any proposal to merge, consolidate or reorganize academic units if the faculties of those units have not had an opportunity to deliberate about and vote on the proposal, nor will the Faculty Senate approve any proposal to rename an academic unit or to substantially redefine its mission if the faculty of the unit has not had an opportunity to deliberate about and vote on the proposal.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Just a little bit of background on this one. This is a response in part to some concerns that have been expressed to me and to others. It represents a, what it does is to make explicit what our policy has been in the past. And there have been instances in which reorganizations were proposed and there was some unclarity about whether and when the faculty of the affected units would have an opportunity to deliberate about and to vote on those proposals. The stance that the Senate has taken in the past, and that the Academic Policies Committee has taken in the past has been that the Senate simply will not proceed to consider those proposals if the faculty in the affected units have not had the opportunity to vote. This just makes explicit and formalizes somewhat our past practices, and I hope will provide some reassurance to those who have this concern currently.

There is a one week rule which requires that action items and committee reports be submitted to the Faculty Senate a week in advance of the Faculty Senate meeting. It is explicitly made waivable by the Faculty Senate by majority vote. So if this body wishes to consider and possibly adopt this proposal today, what's required is a majority vote to proceed with the consideration of it. If this body does not wish to proceed today, then it can be put off until the next month.

Is there a motion to proceed to consider this resolution today? Senator Clark. Is there a second? Senator Erickson. All those in favor of proceeding with this, to consider this resolution today, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Debate on the resolution is now in order. Does anyone wish to speak in favor of or against the resolution? Hearing no debate, I take it that you are ready to proceed to vote. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion carries with one dissent.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Resolution number two, whereas under University Regulation 3359 10 2 the bylaws of the Faculty Senate the Faculty Senate is the legislative body of the faculty regarding its academic mission and is empowered to formulate suitable rules, requirements and procedures for the admission, government, management and control of students, courses of study, granting of degrees and certificates, and other internal affairs of the institution necessary to meet the objectives of the university, subject to the approval of the board of trustees, in accordance with the established policies of the board. Resolved that the Faculty Senate welcomes any ideas, suggestions, or proposals that the University Council or its committees may offer, the Faculty Senate has exclusive legislative jurisdiction at the university level over matters of academic policy, including academic advising and intervention with students to promote academic success.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. A little bit of background on this. This is an issue that did come up in the University Council Committee. The University Council Committee Chair did refer the matter to the Faculty Senate, so this is not a disputed matter at this point. But the Executive Committee thought it worthwhile to put the Faculty Senate on record as part of the working out of the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the University Council. I think the Executive Committee believed that there was a need to help to clarify that relationship and what the jurisdictional boundaries are.

We have the same procedural question that came up in connection with the last resolution, and that is whether you wish to waive the one week rule. If you would like to waive it, we can do that. If you

would prefer not to, we can consider it in the next meeting. Is there a motion to waive the one week rule? Senator Steers, and Senator Witt seconded. All those in favor of waiving the one week rule in connection with the second resolution, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion carries with, I think I heard one dissent. Motion carries with one dissent. Debate on the resolution is now in order. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I wanted to rise to endorse as the elected co chair of the University Council the intent of this resolution, which is to help us figure out where the appropriate boundaries are for consideration. So I think this is a step forward. It's welcome, and I would encourage all of you to consider it in that light. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Further debate? Hearing none, I take it that you are ready to vote on the resolution. All those in favor of the resolution please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Resolution number three, whereas the University of Akron would like to explore more cost effective measures to provide classroom clicker technology and whereas the faculty and students directly affected by such decision have the greatest expertise to bring to bear on them, resolved that the Faculty Senate create an ad hoc committee composed of faculty and student users of classroom clicker technology, to be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in order to craft an RFP to vet vendor responses with open demonstrations for all faculty and students to attend and provide written feedback on, and to bring forward a recommendation to Faculty Senate for approval.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. The background of this is that an RFP, a request for proposals, was put out some weeks ago, and proposals have been received. This was done without consultation of faculty body, and the Executive Committee believes that that is necessary, and that in particular that the faculty consulted those who actually use the student response pad or clicker technology.

So this proposal would create a special committee to first review the RFP to make sure that it is adequate. If it is, then to proceed to review the proposals that were received.

One of the concerns is that there are, there's a substantial number of faculty who use the clicker technology who have invested a good deal of time in creating questions using the software that is, that is used in connection with the current technology, and I think there's a need to ensure that the faculty time that would be required to re do questions to make use of other software is taken adequately into

account as well as simply the needs for pedagogical purposes. And the view of the Executive Committee is that's something about which faculty members should have something important to say.

We have the same question here concerning the process. Is there a motion to waive the one week rule? Senator Clark. Seconded by Senator, help me please with your name.

SENATOR WESEMIOTIS: Wesdemiotis.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Wesdemiotis?

SENATOR WESEMIOTIS: Very good.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: All those in favor of waiving the one week rule, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries. Is there a debate on the resolution? Hearing none, Senator Clark.

SENATOR KATHLEEN CLARK: I appreciate the explanation that you did provide regarding the background of this resolution, however, upon my first read the word in order to craft an RFP is my, the connotation of the word craft is different from what you described, which was to review an RFP.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The senator is quite right. And the chair would certainly entertain a motion to amend the resolution.

SENATOR SUSAN CLARK: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So that it says to review the RFP. And I would simply note that the implication there is that if it is found wanting that there would be a need to re do it. If it's not found wanting

SENATOR SUSAN CLARK: As a part of the vetting process.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I thank the senator. Is there a second to the motion to amend? Senator Elliott. Debate on the motion to amend? We're not debating the main motion, which is the creation of the committee, it's just this change in the wording of the motion. Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion to amend, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent.

Is there debate on the main motion? Hearing none, I take it that you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries without dissent.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you very much senators, appreciate it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I somehow managed to skip myself in the agenda. The chairman's remarks. I will keep them brief. Just a couple of points I wanted to make. The first is that I think that it is time for the Faculty Senate to reassert its primacy as the academic policy making body at the University level partly because of the changes that have occurred in change in governance structures and partly because I think it's something that needs to be done from time to time. And the resolutions that were just reported out of the Executive Committee and adopted by this body are consistent with that.

I also wanted to mention that I have been giving some thought to the general subject of interdisciplinarity and the existence of disciplines within the university. What's prompted me to think about this has been the work that I have been doing with the members of the committee and members of the faculty and the Departments of Political Science and Sociology and Public Service Technology in Summit College on the Criminal Justice baccalaureate proposal.

I think this is an issue that needs some attention by this body. Not today but we're going to need to have discussion about some significant and fairly deep questions about the role of disciplines in a university and the role of interdisciplinary studies. I only want to say at this point that my own somewhat tentative view is that you can't really have interdisciplinary studies without disciplines. There's nothing to be inter, between, if you don't have disciplines. And so although there are important initiatives that need to be undertaken, and we will be discussing and potentially approving, by way of interdisciplinary studies, we will need to pay some attention to what becomes of disciplines within the University and what their role is.

So I mention this really mainly just in the hopes that you will start thinking about it as well, and we'll have occasion to talk about it a little later in the academic year. That concludes my remarks.

Next item on the agenda are the remarks of the President. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And if I may just comment on your last recommendation to the Senate, I concur. It's a very worthwhile topic. It's also one that has been around for a while and so I would first recommend that you have a chance to look at Stan Eikenberry's book, Beyond Academic Departments, which was written some 30 years ago, and its message is still timely.

And secondly, obviously that you altogether review the history of disciplines and understand that some evolved from other disciplines, some evolved from interdisciplinary thinking, and they will so continue into the future. So it continues to be something that needs to be understood as fluid yet always remain remains a valid topic for examination at any one time in history. So congratulations on bringing that out.

Senator Bove also mentioned earlier the ongoing discussion, as did you Mr. Chairman, on Summit College, and the programs in relationship to criminal justice. And it is with some measure of interest that I have paid attention to the work of the Senate's ad hoc committee to review that criminal justice program and the role of Summit College. And I am aware from my meetings with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as Senator Bove commented that this committee will be working with the faculty of Summit College to explore options for the future of the college.

And in this context, I think it is appropriate that I provide you some background information about Summit College, which I hope will be useful to you in terms of creating some context.

Some of you who are senior members of the faculty at the University of Akron will recall that the name, Summit College, is relatively new. In fact, the former Municipal University of Akron Board of Directors created the University of Akron Community and Technical College in 1964. And for the next 40 years that unit included Community and Technical College in its name. And then in 2004, just six years ago, the board of trustees changed the name of that unit to Summit College.

This past spring at the request of our current board of trustees we briefly discussed with them the current status of Summit College with a view to explore options for its future, and these included among several options, the possibility of converting Summit College into a branch campus.

Last month we hosted a visit to our campus by the Ohio Board of Regents and the Chancellor who held their regular board meetings at our Student Union. And I will come back to that in just a moment. During their meeting, the Chancellor once again expressed a view that he has made in previous public comments, as have the previous Chancellor and many before them and others, of the need and desire to have low cost community college options in Summit County.

I mentioned this to further emphasize the importance of your deliberations in the context of matters that are being discussed state wide.

I encourage the faculty to consider options that are responsive to the Chancellor's request and indeed to the needs of students in Summit College.

Meanwhile, I as well as other members of the University's leadership and the board, will follow through with those in Columbus to gain their perspective from a legislative and financial angles on possible options that we may wish to consider and certainly make those known to you.

Now, this is a matter of significant importance for all of us and deserves our best efforts to identify the optimal choice or action. You may have read recently that the governor has for a second time in his administration, assigned to President Gordon Gee and a small committee the task of addressing higher education funding issues. At this time Gordon Gee and his team are constructing the SSI formula that will determine our respective funding levels for the next biennium.

It is expected that the governor will receive that committee's report around Thanksgiving at approximately the same time, by the way, that the governor will be preparing the executive budget proposal which is normally delivered to the legislature after the first of the year.



I mention both of these because the timing of these events may affect some of the opportunities and options that we might consider related to the future of Summit College as well as revenue considerations related to providing low cost community college options in Summit County. So I ask you to please keep that in mind and certainly avail yourself of any information that either I, the Provost, Mr. LaGuardia and others may have and certainly consult with others on the issue.

I mentioned that I would return to the Board of Regents visit, and indeed they held the regular meeting of the Board of Regents here on our campus on September 13. They invited presentations from Dr. Sherman and myself about our institutions to be made to the full board.

Dr. Sherman and I touched upon our university's progress over the last decade and discussed our current plans for our future such as Vision 2020.

Some of you may recall that the last time that we had occasion to address the Board of Regents on behalf of the university was when we launched the New Landscape for Learning. Subsequent to that, the Board of Regents did visit our campus in the midst of the early implementation of the New Landscape for Learning, but this is probably about 10 years since they were last on our campus. It also happened to be the time that several members of the Board of Regents were retiring and we were privileged to witness some of the accolades and reminiscences that went along with that ceremony as well as welcoming back to the Board of Regents two members that were very instrumental in the last decade Donna Alvarado and Bruce Bigley from the Youngstown hearing.

The day after the 13th the Regents, Ohio Higher Education Technology Transfer and Commercialization Task Force met at Quaker Square for its fifth report on higher education. As you may know, the Provost served on that task force. It was a meeting that was very well attended by well in excess of 100 representatives from industry, government, the community and higher education.

Dr. Sherman and I shared some information on the success that we've had in our own efforts, and I joked are the Chancellor and with the chairman of that task force that they've gotten it 98 percent right, because from my experience these task forces always leave out the primary driving force behind these opportunities, namely the need of the state and our larger community in northeast Ohio to attract the talent that's responsible to generate the knowledge that can then become the technologies that can be licensed or transferred.

We had several very complimentary reports and comments from the Chancellor, other members of the task force and panelists, particularly about the work that we've been doing in some of our colleges. The specific comments focused on engineering and our partnership with the Timken Company.

A few days later, this was Thursday and Friday the 13th and 14th. And then on Tuesday the Board of Regents once again in this case at its meeting on our campus of the board's Complete College Task Force on which Dr. Sherman also serves, and Dr. Sherman and I had a few moments to highlight for them the Pathways to Success approach that we've been taking.

And as you might well expect, I took the opportunity to sort of remind them of some basic realities that need to be observed, such as not rewarding those that simply accept those that will graduate no matter

where they go, or those that claim to be better simply because they spend more money and other such idiosyncrasies in higher education.

I did mention to your Executive Committee the appointment of our new trustee Mrs. Olivia DeMoss. She's a two time alumnus of the University of Akron holding an undergraduate degree in chemistry and a professional degree in law. She's been very actively engaged on various committees of the university and the Foundation on the National Alumni Board of Trustees and as a member of an advisory committee for the School of Law. She's also quite engaged in the community in arts and charitable organizations, and we have no doubt that she will be a very capable and contributing member of the board of trustees.

Since then we've also been advised that a new student trustee has been appointed, so I hope you will please welcome Ryan Thompson as our new student trustee. He's majoring in political science and minoring in financial planning and we certainly welcome him to his new role in the meeting. He participated with his fellow student trustee Allen Voeller in a splendid program which is now becoming an exceptional opportunity for students to be featured before the board. So please do welcome him.

Two weeks from tomorrow on October 19th we'll have a formal dedication and ribbon cutting ceremony for the Timken Engineered Services Laboratory in the new Engineering and Research Center. We welcome any of you who wish to attend.

We've had two awards for the University. For the fourth consecutive year the University of Akron has been designated one of the 99 Best Places to Work in Northeast Ohio. And GI Jobs Magazine ranked the University of Akron among the military friendly schools, a designation placing us in the top 15 percent in the nation.

And finally, just to remind you that our Board of Trustees will meet again on October 21. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks. I will be glad to answer any questions the senators may have.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Mr. President. If I may offer one small clarification. The special committee that I have chaired with the criminal justice baccalaureate proposal does have also as its charge to review the role of Summit College in granting baccalaureate degrees. It's confined to that. And accordingly, the discussion that we had the President's referring to was to the effect that the special committee would work with the Academic Policies Committee to consult with the faculty of the College of Arts, Summit College, excuse me, about

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Clarification noted and accepted. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: about its role. So with that clarification, are there questions of the President? Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Dr. Proenza, if you would allow, maybe you would like to take an opportunity to

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt, may I ask you to address the chair?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Rich, I'm new, so what would you like me to say? If I may address the President?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I prefer it please, if you would address the chair. You may inform us all that you have a question or that in light of certain information you wonder what the President's thoughts are, et cetera.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Chair Rich, I have a question for the President, if you and the body would allow, and it has to do with some of the details of state share of instruction and how these changes might impact our overall budgets. I think it would be good for the body to understand in proportional terms or something like that, how meaningful this would be to us.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: May I answer the question?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Please?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I wish I could. No, seriously folks, let's be candid. The formula as it has existed and it's been modified is not a funding formula. It is an allocation device. And as such it functions poorly, because number one it has no signaling mechanism to the legislature as to whether the funding is adequate either in its distribution or in its conceptualization at all.

Over the past 14 years that I have been here, there has been some effort to try to move some of the elements of the formula towards an outcomes based framework, and that is clearly where the present emphasis is being channeled. The governor, in charging the Gordon Gee and his committee with this task clearly, A, understands that it can't happen overnight. In other words, you can't shift from where we are now to something totally different and expect it to work if you do it from one line to the next.

However, he clearly indicated that he wishes the new formula to reflect course completions and particularly degree completions. As such, clearly it has the potential capacity to affect a great many institutions. And one of its most perverse possibilities is that it would reward those institutions who, as I sort of suggested jovially but seriously at the same time, accept only those students who will graduate no matter what that institution does.

So anyway, a discussion is beginning, it's going to go very rapidly. David Cummins may have a few comments that he wishes to make if you wish to invite that. But it's so preliminary David, that I'm sorry, this is sort of providing you the background and context and direction that's been asked, but there's no further detail that I can add at this time.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Brief follow up?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Yes. And just to follow up, currently our state share of instruction in terms of percent of our funding of our budget, as I recall it's something like 25 percent or so.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: And dropping as it is for everybody else.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: So there's a chance for us if we improve our performance in certain ways, we could see some increase, but it's still will be modest.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: We might gain market share on the available dollars. Okay? I seriously doubt that we would gain dollars that would make that fraction any better. What everyone foresees across the country is that the percent of any public institution's budget that come from the state will for the foreseeable future, if not forever, continue to decline.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Thanks.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions of the President? Senator Loth.

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: Yes. Chair Rich, I would like to get comments from the President on online courses if that's possible.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Does the President wish to make comments on online courses?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: How much time do you have?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Not a lot.

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: I apologize. I don't want to make a broad question, but I wanted his thoughts in light of recent events from the company Coursera that has now added 17 universities, is now to 33 universities and has enrolled 1.5 million students. I think it's pretty clear that the Phoenix University model has now shifted to the Stanfords and all of the top end schools. So the idea that online courses will take over is no longer far enough down the road that we can, you know, think it's not gonna be in our careers. I would say now we're looking at maybe five to 10 years before these major institutions are handing out degrees without anyone ever making it to the Stanford University campus. And that is gonna put financial pressure on other universities, I would say particularly community colleges when you speak about, you know, these lower end universities. And I don't expect you to have an answer, by the way. I just thought it might be interesting to hear your thoughts.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I think there is a senate's record in which I addressed some of this before. I don't remember if it was at the last or the previous meeting. Suffice it to say, from our perspective a couple of things. First, we are appointing a faculty committee to really get us moving a little bit faster than we have been able to move. Certainly Jim Sage in IT has been putting forward the infrastructure for us to do delivery to the desktop capable. We already have one of the best distance learning capabilities anywhere, so we're ready to participate.

That said, the other comments that are made and I will be even briefer today than the other day, is number one, this is happening and we need to read Christensen about disruptive innovation in higher education. We need to read things like Coursera and so forth. I urge you all to read Anya Kamenetz' DIYU, which basically spells what's already available to a student who wants to learn on their own.

At the same time I shared with you the comments that had been made by a colleague of mine, the former President at the Illinois School of Technology who envisioned a spectrum in which some

universities might be able to mount the equivalent of what he called electronic dream teams, that that university would be so good that their course in a team environment, not one faculty member, likely not every course, would be distributed as some of what you have been reading from Stanford and others is now being looked at the world over. And look up J.J. O'Donnell presently Provost at Columbia, formerly a Professor of Classics at the University of Pennsylvania. He's been doing this for 20 years and has great experience.

At the other extreme my Illinois colleague envisioned places where people would want to gather, the. Equivalent of electronic Olympic villages so to speak, where indeed the world's knowledge could be downloaded in addition to that provided by the faculty there where the students and faculty could interact with one another and supplement all of that that's available.

The point I was making is I don't expect that we'll be put out of business, but I do expect and have been saying so for 30 years, that we better pay attention to the transformational changes taking place as a result of economic and technological forces, and I urge you to do it forthwith. Next month will be too late.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Chair Rich, I would like to formally thank President Proenza for his support in bringing Ken Dychtwald to campus. This happened simultaneously with the Board of Regents visit. Dr. Dychtwald had a chance to influence a number of different faculty and students groups as well as the main forum series at E.J. regarding future aging and all the future implications it has on the many aspects of the university. I want to publicly thank him for helping to provide that opportunity.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: May I offer another reference for the senate's edification for all of us?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Certainly. Take notes.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: The Harvard Business Review is known to all of us as a distinguished publication, has an article by Ken Dychtwald, if I remember correctly, the title of which is Let's Retire Retirement. The basic point is that there is no such thing anymore because we can't afford it, but we also don't want to do so because 70 is the new 30 and 90 is the new 40. And I don't know where we're going except I'm glad to be doing what I'm doing.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We're getting older. Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, everybody. You know, clearly the new academic year has gotten off to a great start and I think we all clearly embody the perspective that we stimulate and enable the success of the University of Akron. Clearly our success is

dependent upon the success of our students, and we've embarked upon very many strategies to assure student academic success.

I'd like to point out that retention and persistence are absolutely an essential high priority for this institution. And while our Pathway strategy addresses some of that, we do need to be attuned to the fact that for this year our first year retention is down from last year to this year. So it really is incumbent upon all of us to the greatest extent possible to offer support to our students retaining academic integrity of course, to optimize the potential for their success in continued enrollment at the University of Akron.

Clearly the pathways for student academic success strategy which we've implemented is a persistence in retention strategy. That is, while enrollment this year is down a little bit, about three percent, it is linked to implementing the Pathway Strategy because we did defer some students who weren't college ready to attend the University of Akron. And some by virtue of understanding our Pathway Strategy did not apply, was countered by the fact that we're up by about two percent in enrollment by students who will persist.

So we have complementary strategies going on that together will effectively improve the bottom line of this university and clearly enhance the reputation of the university through advancing the quality of the educational experience of our students.

I think as the President mentioned and has been discussed with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, we're anxious to interact with the faculty to clarify the role the University of Akron will take in the online arena. I think we would all agree that some aspect of online is really gonna be a retention strategy, because students can and enjoy learning through that interface.

Obviously it can be an enhancement to academic learning strategy to be an adjunct to the learning experience in the classroom. We have to figure out how that works and relates to our persistence and retention strategies. And clearly we have unique academic programs or certifications that in and of themselves have a national or even a global attraction because of the unique strengths and capabilities of the faculty in those specifically marketable areas.

We've suggested that we need to pay attention to offering courses and programs to students at alternative hours of the day and days of the week. And I'm pleased that currently we have about 881 evening sections, 144 weekend sections, that combined reach about 20,000 students. That is remarkable effort on behalf of the faculty to engage students when they're available in the academic programs that they want. So that is a great achievement, I think, in serving our community with regard to delivery of our academic programs.

When I interviewed and first began interacting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I was alerted to the report of an ad hoc Committee on Interdisciplinary Research. And that led to, you know, thinking over time about how do we facilitate and foster that kind of activity. And you may realize that our Achieving Distinction Initiative that was endorsed by the board of trustees when they endorsed Vision 2020 is designed to fund just that.

So as you are aware, the biomimicry program was one of the inaugural programs that was awarded funding to recognize in a sense the in place transinstitutional collaboration that exists at this university. Whereas their proposal also evidenced ways to enhance that interdisciplinary work, and most importantly it's connected to a transinstitutional Ph.D. program in integrated biosciences.

So a really well positioned initiative that truly is the epitome in a sense of interdisciplinary collaboration and activities.

You are also aware that we asked for two proposals to be combined. One linked to intellectual property and entrepreneurship that will link to a proof of concept framework. Really, the intersection of these two initiatives will support not only the biomimicry program as it emerges, but every other achieving distinction program plus any other activity we already have underway with regard to intellectual property and moving ideas through proof of concept, the potential to delivery to a market.

There are 27 proposals, all with great merit. It was a very difficult decision making process and we will interact with the campus in the coming months to enhance and redesign and improve the next cycle of the Achieving Distinction Initiative.

We've interacted previously about the progress of the academic program review. We've asked for departments to update and provide additional information with regard to department level data. The committee has been convened, and I will interact with them in the coming weeks. I think as we've mentioned previously we anticipate recommendations to come on a rolling basis, that will interact with the faculty of course as appropriate through the governance process with regard to any particular actions that might be recommended.

And I think as you know, we've interacted with the board of trustees from the perspective of this being an internal reallocation strategy. In other words, there may be some programs that we'll deemphasize that would allow other programs to be invested in or not. But that is what the Academic Program Review Committee outcome would or wouldn't suggest to happen.

I know you are all interested and eager in finding out decisions about the allocation of faculty positions. I have been interacting with Vice President Cummins related to our budgetary circumstances. Given the fact that the fiscal year 13 budget was based upon flat and we're down three percent, what does that mean? But I've assured the deans by the Council of Deans meeting at the end of this month we'll have that figured out and be able to inform them as to the disposition of faculty searches during this coming year.

We did bring 66 new faculty to this campus this year. I think in a couple of weeks I will have the great opportunity to interact with them and welcome them to the campus. Although as you know there were some welcome activities, orientations and other types of interactions that both welcomed them and the part time faculty to the University of Akron.

With that, Mr. Chair, that concludes my remarks.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions for the Provost?

SENATOR LEANN SCHAEFFER: Chair Rich, I would like to mention to our Provost I think one of the problems with student success is that they're unable to obtain their financial aid in an appropriate amount of time in order to purchase books. Especially in the summer sessions which we're encouraging students to take summer courses, it was three weeks into a five week session they didn't have funds to purchase books. I was lending books to students. And we're also having the same problem during the normal semesters.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: So noted, and we'll look into that to remedy that situation.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions or comments for the Provost? Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Chair Rich, if you could entertain this question for the Provost. I've been talking to faculty in preparation for my time here on Faculty Senate, and one of the things that I'm hearing is that there seems to be a definition of a hireable faculty member in the Provost's Office, and that they have to be revenue enhancing faculty. They either will have high potential for getting grants or have online classes almost ready to go or willing to do that. Is that kind of what you're looking for in the new faculty that come from hires?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I would say the perspective is articulated at the level of the colleges in terms of how the faculty position descriptions are written, with regard to the attributes and qualities and characteristics. You know, the academic program's desires to have join it to enhance the program. Clearly, aligned with Vision 2020 would be expectations of individuals in the areas where they could reasonably generate funding, but they come with or show the potential for that to happen, clearly we need to, you know, bring in faculty who have had if possible experience in online delivery, using alternative methods for instruction.

So I would say that my office has not established any particular set of criteria or standards other than we've interacted with the deans, and in this fashion to suggest alignment with Vision 2020.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you, Chair Rich. I'd like to ask the Provost if in line with the last question there has been any consideration given to the role of those who are extensively involved in teaching as being viewed as generating revenue.

Not this past year but the year before, I was able to review some data on the institutional review website, and it indicated that of the, I think 20, maybe 21 full time faculty members, regular full time tenure track faculty members in the Department of Curricular and Instructional Studies, I alone generated nearly one third of the credit hours, which if it's viewed in the rough approximation to what the cost of the credit hour would be, would have been a multiplier of my salary that I won't reiterate publicly because it's such a high multiplier.



But it occurred to me that with that kind of revenue generation there ought to be some kind of consideration given when you are comparing that to somebody who's generating a grant that over a period of four or five years is going to generate dollars.

You know, teaching is an important part of this, the kind of effort that goes into it. We know from years and years of discussion, and I'm assured by friends that this is a quixotic effort, and that there ought to be a way to recognize that that is also an important part of the revenue generation at this university, and that it ought to be recognized in a way that's more than a pat on the head.

I'm using myself as an example because it seems to me that it's such a clear indication on my part, the teaching that I do, the student evaluations are good, I'm involved in service, I do a lot of other kinds of things. And yet over and over again what we hear about is biomimicry, which is fine, and other kinds of things, which is fine. But there are other ways in which revenue are generated by this university.

So I would encourage, ask the Provost if there's been recently any way to look at that aspect of things as we look forward to finding ways to find and develop new faculty lines.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Sherman.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: My responses started with, and my comments, student success through teaching. And clearly the institutional reputation is significantly based upon the quality of the academic experience. That is what each and every one of us does every day in the classroom, you know, when we're teaching.

So I don't, while there's no intention to devalue instruction whatsoever and any comments or perspectives that are articulated. And from a perspective of budgets, we will be looking at perhaps moving to a budget system where we all in units collectively contribute to the success of the unit, and when an institution starts looking at those sorts of things at an individual faculty level, the institution has lost its perspective on its mission.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions for the Provost? Thank you.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I appreciate it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The next items on the agenda are senate elections of a vice chair. This is for the vacancy created by my succession to the chair. The term ends in the fall of 2013. And alternate representative to the Ohio Faculty Council, that's a term that ends in the fall of 2014. So we'll proceed first with the election for vice chair. Are there any nominations? Senator Moritz?

SENATOR E. STEWART MORITZ: Thank you, Chair Rich. I'd like to nominate Jon Miller for vice chair.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other nominations? Any other nominations? One last time. Any other nominations? Is there a motion to close nominations and elect Senator Miller vice chair by acclamation? Senator Erickson moves and Senator Schaeffer seconds. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Congratulations, Senator Miller.

We'll proceed now to the election of an alternative representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. The, actually I wonder if Senator Sterns, would you be willing to briefly describe the Ohio Faculty Council? Your experience on it is much more recent than mine. At one point I think I was an alternate, but it's so long ago I think it best the Senate hear it from you.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Mr. Chair, I would be happy to do that. The Ohio Faculty Council is made up of representatives of each campus, the Chair of the Faculty Senate plus typically one other individual. And what happens there is a monthly meeting at the Board of Regents where all of the universities share what has been going on in their campuses regarding faculty issues, faculty deliberations.

The Board of Regents also uses those meetings as an opportunity to share information with the Faculty Senate representatives regarding various initiatives from the Board of Regents as it affects academic programs.

Some of the more recent presentations have included the Chief Financial Officer from State Teachers Retirement talking at some length regarding the changes in the rules and regulations as they were being proposed. Other examples would be curriculum initiative such as the one dealing with the military service credits. There was a Board of Regents forum about how important it was to accept the new military service credits and approaches in translating that into academic credit on campuses. That would be an example. It's very interesting.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Sterns. The time that they regularly meet is when?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: On Fridays once a month. I don't remember exactly which Friday.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And so the role of the alternate is to represent the faculty of the University of Akron at these meetings when the regular representative is unable to make the meeting. The question that I meant to look up

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Second Friday of the month.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And time of day?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: One leaves Akron around 9:00 and

SENATOR RICHARD MANGRUM: 11:00 to 3:00.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: What I don't recall, and perhaps you know Senator Sterns, one of the representatives is the chair. It so happens that I have class this semester on Fridays so that I can't attend. I don't know whether the alternate can attend in place of the chair.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: The alternate can attend. And not only that but Rudy is our, is the current chair of that committee at the state level.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So, at least for this semester my hope would be that someone steps forward or is nominated and agrees to serve who will represent the University of Akron faculty in my place for the remainder of the semester. In other words, I think you should expect to have a need to attend meetings at least this semester and probably to some extent next semester. With that in mind any nominations? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: There is a question I wanted to clarify based on something I heard Senator Sterns say. It's my understanding that one of the automatic representatives is the chair. I also thought I heard Senator Sterns say that Rudy Fenwick, who is our regular representative is still on this body. So we're talking about someone who would be an alternate to the regular representative; is that correct?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: What I heard Senator Sterns say is that the alternate could attend in place of either of the two representatives. I don't have independent knowledge of that.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: And further on alternates attend anyway just to keep continuity.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. With that in mind, are there any nominations including self nominations for alternate representative to the Ohio Faculty Council? Please? Well, we have some recruiting work to do. Without nominations, we can't of course elect someone, so, we'll put this, the Executive Committee I predict will put this on the agenda for the next meeting. And if you get tired of it, you can prevent that from happening by stepping forward.

Okay. The next item is committee reports. The first committee report that I have listed is the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Is there someone who has a report to offer from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities? No.

Curriculum Review Committee, Vice Provost Ramsier was unable to make this meeting, and I understand that he's asked Senator Hajjafar to report on the committee.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: The CRC report is regarding six course proposals that have gone through curriculum process successfully without any objection, and now they are in front of you for approval.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And those have been distributed electronically, I believe, and on paper as well.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Yes. And they are here.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any debate? Hearing none, I take it that you are ready to vote. All those in favor of approving these proposals, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Thank you, Senator Hajjafar.

Next item is the report of the ad hoc Committee on Part time Faculty Issues. Senator Osorio?

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: You should have a paper copy from a brief set of minutes from our first meeting in September. And we discussed several issues. The faculty orientation, for which we are very grateful that some part time, new part time employees were able to attend.

We had a long discussion. It was not clear who exactly knew about it or who got invited, and it turned out that in the information hall that followed the orientation session there was no information for part time faculty available from HR. It was only for the full time faculty.

So the questions the part time faculty were asking weren't getting answered. So we're in the process of investigating, thinking about who we might want to approach making sure that this next year, August of 2014, there is something that takes place for part time faculty, that helps get the entire picture communicated particularly to the new faculty that are brought on at the beginning of the year.

We also discussed that faculty survey only briefly because we still haven't got all of the results, part time faculty survey, excuse me, all the results compiled. They should be ready for our October meeting. And when we have those results, we'll share that with the Faculty Senate.

We are in the process of discussing the idea of making the ad hoc committee standing committee of the Faculty Senate. And again, we're going to investigate possibly bringing resolution regarding that later.

And finally, a big issue that gets discussed every time we meet is how part time faculty can be represented where the decisions are made to review part time faculty salary, probably the biggest issue to deal with.

And in the rules that salary review should be happening every year. It's in the rules actually written to the senate. The senate can't do it anymore. We're assuming that would now be a function of the University Council. Part time faculty does not have any governing body to send representatives to the University Council, so we're also discussing how we might get representation on the University Council in some way or another. So that's what we've talked about.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Osorio.

The next item on the agenda is the report of the University Council of Representatives. Are there any such reports?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: There are three people who happen to now, I think all the senators who represent the Faculty Senate on University Council. The three who represent the Faculty Senate on University Council. There happen to be more people on the standing committees. And that's me, Senator Erickson, and Senator Witt.

And I would just point out in response to the comments from, that we just heard is that the part time faculty do have representatives through, do have representation through those people on the University Council, because you are members of the Faculty Senate.

So if there would be the desire to have somebody who is a part time faculty member as well, that needs to be addressed through the current process.

There are a number of things that are going on with regard to the University Council, and I think I will just speak to a couple of them, and then if the other representatives wish to say anything, they can.

As you may or may not be aware, the, back in September of 2010 a set of bylaws based on the Faculty Senate bylaws that had been worked on and agreed to by every constituency that would be on the University Council were proposed to the Rules Committee of the board. The Rules Committee of the board then responded with a request that while using those as a principle resource for the creation of a set of bylaws, the University leadership would work on ways to develop the University Council further including having a clearer role and representation for the Provost.

By August of 2011, the, and the way that the university leadership elected to continue that was to use the people who had been members of the University Council Exploratory Committee, which by that point had, because it had made its report had automatically been disbanded, to use those folks as a way to continue to work through this process.

By August of 2011, there was a document that was in some ways similar to it and many ways substantially different from the bylaws that had been proposed that was being referred to as a white paper or a governing document.

That is, that particular white paper is what the Office of Academic Affairs which then seemed to have the responsibility for getting the University Council started developed upon it, used in setting up elections and or selections for representatives to the University Council itself, which includes 37 people from across the University.

We found in the first months, I was elected co chair, the Provost is automatically the other co chair of the University Council last, I think November or December. And in trying to work with the information we had, which is namely the white paper that was being called the governing document, we found that that was so vague in general that we really had to pass some interim policies so that we could determine who was a member of the University Council and what their terms were. That was not being provided for by the white paper.

So since December a large proportion of the time that I've spent and others have spent, have been to clarify who's on the body and what their role is, and further to clarify what the role of the University Council is.

In order to do that, we had agreed that the first year would be one in which we would sort of go forward with what we had and try to figure out then what worked and what didn't work so we could

then create a set of bylaws that would at least allow people who perhaps weren't aware of the past nine or 10 years process an idea of what this body was supposed to do.

In the course of doing that, we also then received names from members of the constituencies to staff the nine standing committees of the University Council.

Because of the fact that there was not a clear line of how your proposals moved through this, we set up something at the instance of the Office of Academic Affairs called the issue brief process.

That process in itself generates concerns that arise from anybody who has a UA Net ID and password, and we found over the course of time that some of those related to policy, a number related to complaints.

For example, a student who complained about not being able to find parking and who further said, my tuition pays for this, therefore I should be able to park where I want to park. That's in the nature of a complaint that doesn't seem to be worthy really of time for a body that's supposed to be involved in policy and in, nominally at least, some forms of the decision making process.

What I have found, and what I think some of us have found is that there is a fundamental confusion over the function and future of the University Council. Those of us involved in the University Council Exploratory Committee believe, and I think this is reflected in the current set of proposed bylaws that we have, believe that the role of that body is to be involved in planning and recommending to the board of trustees policy that may be important.

So the policy such as, for example, what is the policy on part timers' compensation review would be, in my view at least, a topic that could be considered by the University Council if it had that kind of ability.

The other, and so that then would be a place where people would come together from a variety of constituencies, they would meet in the committees, the committees would then decide and make proposals up the line through the University Council and University Council would then send those proposals on to the President, perhaps in some cases the Provost.

What has developed for a variety of reasons, over the year is that the white paper envisions that the Provost will appoint co chairs and co conveners to each of the standing committees. Those people, the co chairs, vice presidents they usually are, those people are supposed to be responsible for obviously co chair duties and also responsible for the administrative tasks that a committee needs to carry out.

Not surprisingly, I would report to you that we have found that what's happened is that because the vice president, who is appointed to be the co chair, has been appointed by the provost, they are seeing their role as being, you know, perhaps a little more important in terms of setting the agenda and controlling what goes on than we had anticipated in our earlier incarnation.

So right now we have a situation in which we have a fundamental difference in this in the way this is viewed. And we're working out via the bylaws that have been proposed a number of issues that seem

to be coming to a head. I thought that yesterday we had some clarification on this at the University Council Steering Committee meeting.

Today I have to tell you that from a different perspective that the statement of the provost when he just left about not looking at individuals in terms of what was going on is discouraging, because part of the, one of the big issues that the University Council is facing is that some members are being told that their service on University Council has no official function or capacity, therefore it has no, it's not part of their job in the sense that it's gonna be evaluated, therefore it's not being viewed by some, some supervisors, we have heard, as being important or worthy of notice.

As you can imagine, a situation in which we have a combination of individuals who feel that they aren't being rewarded for the work they're doing in any way combined with a system where the vice presidents are controlling the administration and the rest of it, is leading to a process by which many people are viewing the role of the University Council as being purely advisory to the administrators if those administrators wish to ask for our advice.

That's different than what we thought we were setting up. That's different from what the proposed bylaws have. So we're in the process of clarifying that. And once that's clarified, I think a lot of other questions will be able to be answered in many ways that will let us know the future direction for our shared governance here at the University of Akron.

The

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The chair hopes that Senator Lillie's report will conclude soon.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Senator Lillie's report will conclude soon, but because we have the benefit of someone who is going to be able to give us a transcript of this, it seems important to Senator Lillie to make sure that this summary is stated for the benefit of the Faculty Senate and for your consideration.

I would say that the hope is that by the end of this calendar year this will be resolved. And I think that's all that I have to say in that regard at this point. Thank you. Thank you, thank you. Thank you for your kind reminder of the time.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Lillie. And thank you for that very informative report. Seriously. Any other reports or questions?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I just wanted to make one addendum to what Senator Lillie was saying. For those of you who were wondering exactly what the issue is, a new performance appraisal approach has been created for staff.

In the past, service is one of the categories that was included in the evaluation. In the new evaluation there was no inclusion in that. And part of our discussion yesterday is basically pointing out that this is an oversight. If it wasn't an oversight, it certainly does not reflect a key principle in the white paper, which is that this service must be recognized.

And I can tell you after many years of service on Faculty Senate and committee chair, we've had many fine people who are contract professionals and staff who have contributed to these committees. And for it not to be seen as a valuable service is very problematic.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you for that clarification, Senator Sterns. Anything further on University Council?

Is there any new business? Any new business? Anything for the good of the order? Hearing nothing for the good of the order, is there a motion to adjourn?

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Hajjafar, seconded by Senator Raber. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Meeting is adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)