

University of Akron Faculty Senate Meeting

Thursday, December 6, 2012

3:00 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The senate will please come to order. The first item is the approval of the agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda as prepared?

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there a second? Senator Raber. There is one item that the Executive Committee inadvertently omitted that needs to be added to the agenda, and I would ask for a motion to add as the new Item 6 approval of the graduation list for December, 2012. And then renumber the items below. Is there a motion to that effect? Senator Schuller, Senator Clark seconds. All those in favor of the amendment to the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Are there any other additions to the agenda? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote on the adoption of the agenda. All those in favor of adoption, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Agenda is adopted.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of minutes from the October meeting. The November meeting minutes were just distributed, so we'll wait a month, wait a meeting to vote on those. Is there a motion to approve the minutes of the October meeting? Don't all move at once.

SENATOR JON MILLER: Sure.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Miller. Is there a second? Senator Clark, thank you. Are there any corrections to the minutes of the October meeting? All those in favor of adopting the minutes of the October meeting, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

Next item is the chairman's remarks. First of all, I want to wish you all a happy holiday season. I look forward, perhaps in this meeting and in successive meetings, to continuing dialogue regarding both the university's adaptation to the new funding environment in which we find ourselves, and to the changes in, that are occurring in higher education that the president has been asking us to focus on concerning the so called MOOCs. Frank and I are from a part of the country where that has a different meaning,

and the question of the university credentialing people who have taken MOOCs and learned perhaps in other ways as well.

I want to apologize for my voice. I am actually healthier than I sound, I think, but my voice is weak as a result of a recent illness.

I also look forward to the continuing dialogue on the subject of promoting interdisciplinary studies. The president has, I think, challenged us to look at the ways in which organizational structures may impede interdisciplinary work, and I think that's certainly worth looking at. I have previously expressed my concern about the need to continue to have disciplines, even though disciplines as the president points out, change over time. And I would add, over relatively long periods of time.

But one of the things that I would like to do in the coming months is to add another focus, and that has to do with the incentives that may actually impede doing interdisciplinary work apart from organizational structures that exist. I have some proposals that grow out of the work that I have been involved in with the, concerning the criminal justice baccalaureate proposals that I think will address some of these problems in a way that is necessary to facilitate interdisciplinary work, especially interdisciplinary academic programs.

I think the question of the university's reliance on part time faculty is probably due for some attention at this point, in light of recent press coverage, and I hope that we'll have an occasion to talk some about that today and in successive meetings.

I was struck by some statistics here that I want to mention. First of all, that almost 60 percent of the university faculty are part time faculty. That's a higher proportion than for any other Ohio public university.

Second, that the University of Akron has fewer full time faculty per 1,000 full time equivalent students than any other Ohio public university except Shawnee State and Youngstown State.

Ohio State University and the University of Cincinnati have more than twice as many full time faculty per 1,000 full time equivalent students, and the University of Toledo has about 50 percent more full time faculty per 1,000 FTE students.

More than 50 percent of the course sections at the University of Akron are taught by part time faculty, which if my arithmetic is correct, tells me part time faculty on average must be teaching relatively heavy teaching loads.

And reliance on part time faculty has increased, by the University of Akron has increased significantly over the past 12 years. Over the past 12 years the number of full time faculty has remained essentially constant. It's increased only slightly, whereas the number of part time faculty has increased by about 30 percent.

These are, I think, the realities. And the question is, you know, what, if anything, should be done about it, and what can we do about these? But I did want to mention these because I think we do need to focus attention on these questions.

We also, I think, need to focus some attention on our, on the university's support for part time faculty. Part time faculty are, as the statistics I just recited indicate, a huge part of this university without which we could not do the work that we do or even come close. We do need to follow up on some resolutions that were passed by the Faculty Senate to look at the extent to which they have been implemented, including those having to do with providing the necessary technology for part time faculty as well as office space.

There was also a resolution that we passed in the last meeting concerning orientation of part time faculty. Currently university regulations provide for orientation of full time faculty, but not part time faculty. The committee on part time issues, the senate's ad hoc committee on part time issues reported to the senate a resolution that would include part time faculty in the orientation requirement.

We actually need to revisit that, because when I was preparing to submit that item in the action memo to the president and looked at the existing regulation, I discovered that the committee had misinterpreted some language in that resolution. They thought they were correcting something, apart from adding part time faculty to it and it turns out the correction itself was in error. So as you will hear shortly the Executive Committee is reporting out a technical correction to that amendment. Doesn't change the substance of it, but we need to change the wording of it so that the regulation means what it's supposed to mean.

That concludes my remarks. The next item on the agenda is special announcements. There are three deaths that it is my sad duty to report to you. Raymond D. Meyo, who served as a trustee of the University of Akron from 1992 to 2000 died on November 8 at age 71. Former president and chief executive officer of computer pioneer Telxon Corporation in Fairlawn, Meyo served as a trustee of the Old Trail School, Gilmour Academy, Ohio Ballet and the Akron Art Museum, and of his alma mater the University of Notre Dame. He was a graduate of Lakewood Saint Edward High School.

Lorraine Gates Stitzlein, known to many as Rainy, chairwoman emeritus of the University of Akron Board of Trustees, died November 30th at the age of 84. The Akron, she was an Akron native, a member of University of Akron's class of 1948, and former president of Alpha Delta Pi sorority, Stitzlein was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 1988 by then Governor Richard Celeste, and served for nine years. She was chairwoman of the board from 1994 until 1997. Previously she had served her alma mater as a member and president of the Alumni Association's National Board of Directors and the Hilltoppers Buchtelles. She was also a member of the University of Akron Foundation Board of Directors and its Executive Committee as well as the College of Business Administration Advancement Council.

Her long business career included her work with Eddie Elias Enterprises, which she joined in 1958. Together she and Elias, class of '51, founded the Professional Bowlers' Association. She also was the owner and president of Rainbow, Inc., a sports administration and celebrity management firm, and Rainbow Furs, Limited.

Her many honors include the University of Akron Outstanding Alumna Award in 1978, and an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree in 1997. Also in '97 the alumni center was named the

Harry P. and Rainy G. Stitzlein Alumni Center in honor of the contributions of Stitzlein and her husband, Harry Stitzlein, a 1950 University of Akron graduate who died in 1995. He was Chairman and chief executive officer of Malone Advertising.

And finally, Dr. Lewis Rodabaugh, associate professor emeritus of mathematical sciences, died December fourth. He was 99. Rodabaugh taught at University of Akron from 1964 to 1978. He was also a musician, musical composer, inventor, amateur paleontologist and poet. For several decades he served as the organist for the Green Town United Methodist Church. He held many copyrights for his musical compositions. He also held a patent for a wheeled toy that he invented. In 1987 he made national news by discovering the remains of the Cervulces scotti or pyostacine stag moose, an extinct ice age animal, while enlarging the pond in his backyard.

Five years ago, at the tender age of 94, he won an international poetry contest sponsored by the Alabama State Council on the Arts. I wish I had known him.

Would you all please rise for a moment of silence in memory of our deceased colleagues? Thank you.

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

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, guests and senators. I'm happy to inform you that the Executive Committee today will be rather brief. Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on November 8. The first matter of business was to consider a nomination for Dr. Connie Bouchard for membership on the ad hoc general education revision committee to replace a faculty member that has left the university. The appointment was approved unanimously.

The EC next discussed the curriculum proposal software. It came to our attention that some process manuals are not accurate. Several manuals labeled the dean's role in the process as accepting or rejecting the proposal. The EC would like to have the manuals revised to accurately reflect the roles and the duties in the process to conform to the university curriculum.

The role and duty of the deans and chairs in the curriculum proposal process is to review the proposal to make sure each component has been accomplished and then release the proposal to the next stage. This is purely an administrative release, not an approval or rejection of the proposal. The EC also wishes that proposal comments be activated for proposals in process in other colleges and that college level buttons in the software are labeled for release not approval by the deans and chairs. The EC will work with the CRC and ITS boards (inaudible).

The EC also discussed the HLC self study and concerns from some of the writing groups over the rewrites and removal of key content from submitted (inaudible).

The EC met again on November 29th and set the agenda for today's meeting. And before we conclude, we'll turn to the resolution from the part time faculty committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: As you recall the senate voted in the last meeting to amend University Regulation 3359 20 35 orientation of new faculty members. As I mentioned a moment ago, there was

a technical error in the drafting of the amendment. The substance of the amendment was to include part time faculty in the orientation.

What this is is a motion from the Executive Committee to amend a motion previously adopted, that is in the last meeting. The Executive Committee is proposing to change the wording of the regulation so that it reads very simply and straight forwardly, "Before the opening of the fall semester at the university, a seminar is conducted for new," all that is the same so far. And here's the change, "new full time and part time," continue with the original language, "faculty members to acquaint them with the objectives and the various activities of the university." So it would drop out the language about auxiliary. It would simply say, "new full time and part time faculty members." That captures, I think, exactly what the committee was proposing and also has the advantage of being intelligible.

Is there debate on the motion before the body? This comes to you as an Executive Committee recommendation. I take it that you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Senators, thank you very much to your service to the senate and the university. We wish you a speedy deliverance from exams and grades so that you may enjoy the holiday break with your family and friends. Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The next item on the agenda is the remarks of the president.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues, and I would like to begin and end today with best wishes for happy holidays. I want to thank you for all that you do. The chairman mentioned the recent Ohio Higher Education Funding Commission Report, which the governor announced with great excitement last Friday, and I'd like to spend a little bit of time reviewing aspects of those recommendations with you.

We have provided you electronic copies and there are, I believe, a couple printed copies for you who may wish.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We don't believe in paper here.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: That's good. How come there is so much? Well, what I'd like to do is to share a few thoughts that will hopefully place the report in context.

First as I think you understand, this was neither unprecedented or unexpected. Earlier in the year the governor had appointed and requested a similar kind of analysis with regard to the way that capital funds are allocated and the presidents came together under Gordon Gee as they did this time as well, and the result was quite satisfying, and indeed the governor was very pleased, and which any time you can get a governor to be pleased with anything you are doing is a good thing to make happen.

So clearly the state had telegraphed its intentions in this case, the governor in particular, but also this sort of direction was anticipated many years ago when the general assembly implemented funding based upon course completion and enacted a statute that phased out the operating subsidies for academic remedial courses with the exception of three small institutions.

Secondly, all affected institutions, both two year and four year universities, provided input, particularly our business officers from all of the IUC member institutions engaged in extensive discussions of these recommendations. Throughout the process, it was an intensive process, I think about three months in totality. Their concerns and advice as well as provosts and presidents themselves were communicated to the specific members of the commission, and the result is what you will see. There are three basic takeaways from the report.

First, fiscal protections have been removed, such as the stop gap provision that existed. And also rather than a much longer running average, a three year running average will be applied. This has made the formula more dynamic and more responsive to changes from year to year and obviously makes all of us hopefully be a little bit more on our toes with regard to all we do that affects how we receive state funding.

Secondly, the focus on completion and graduation rather than enrollment is a direct response to the governor's call for greater accountability and helps to integrate his priorities into this formula, which all of us believe is a good thing.

Now, please understand that which accomplished a great deal and moving half of the available SSI to completion and course completion and graduation was perhaps a matter of debate. Some people wanted it to be phased in much more slowly, and others certainly in the legislature and the governor's office believe that everything ought to be available only in terms of actual outcomes.

So clearly 50 percent, while a significant number, it's also a compromise relative to what full accountability may be in the eyes of others. And assuredly I would like to suggest to you it is prudent for us to expect that this may well rise over time in the years to come, and we recognize that the change in the formula will likely affect some of the institutions including ourselves in the short term possibly in modest negative ways.

But it is consistent, and it's important for all of us to understand that, it is very consistent with the strategies and policies that we have advocated under our new strategic plan, Vision 2020, as well as through the Pathways for Academic Success.

Thirdly, regional campuses will no longer have a separate funding formula for main campuses. All higher education institutions are integrated. Previously funding was set aside for regionals on a course completion basis. That is gone. They'll still receive separate budgets, but the mechanics are the same across all institutions.

Fourthly, there are two main benefits that I believe we will gather from this report. First, again, higher education has its say in the funding formula. Previously this was something that tended to be handed down from the board of regents. In fact the governor asked Gordon Gee to bring the presidents

together with our staffs I think is significant testimonial to his expectations, and if we can deliver he will be excited and behind us. And with that we can hopefully continue to enjoy some comparative control over our own destiny. There's no question that if we didn't do this they would, so please be clear on that.

The second benefit I think is the governor, as a result of our agreeing to engage in this work and now delivering as he said last week as privately indicated, that he will do at least one, we hope, perhaps two, depending on the fiscal condition of the state. The first is that unlike other agencies which are being asked to plan for a 10 percent decline in funding for the next biennium, he hopes to be able to hold this at least constant and perhaps provide some additional, albeit perhaps modest, funding.

So while I can't guarantee that, he did suggest that verbally to all of the assembled groups last week and when we first met with him, so it is hopeful therefore, that a, we can retain the autonomy and control of our destiny that we have and hopefully not be subject to budget cuts in this biennium and perhaps even a modest increase.

Finally, the recommendations endorsed by all of the presidents, obviously from across the state, have clearly met with very positive reaction not only from the governor, but from the press and business constituents, et cetera, and in the long run may be one of the most important steps that we've gained, we've taken I should say, to hopefully experience better regard and support for higher education in the future.

Let me just mention a couple of other things. When we last met, I indicated to you that we would be initiating a national dialogue in the national meeting of the, national association, excuse me, the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. Falling back upon old habits. APLU. Association of Public and Land grant Universities. There's a subgroup there of Urban Serving Universities, and we held a dinner meeting. It was important in the sense that I am told by staff of APLU that an unprecedentedly large number of university presidents attended the discussion. They typically don't attend anything, okay, and I was privileged to be one to share with them the integrator assessor model that I reviewed with you last month and introduced to the campus community at the November 8th State of the University Address.

I hope you noticed that certainly our own local newspaper was intrigued and positive about this approach as was the Plain Dealer when I met with them about an hour ago.

In Denver where the APLU was meeting, there was a general consensus for the urgency for higher education to explore and develop new content models such as MOOCs. And I remind you that MOOCs are new only in name and in terms of size but they have been around for 20 plus years. So don't think just because it came out of Stanford it's somehow or another revolutionary or necessarily immediately signifying of quality. Quality will be defined by actual results, and that of course is being proved to be the case.

But I think we also need to rethink as a course of this discussion pricing and financial models for higher education. We concurred also that it's in our own best interest that these innovations be driven

by the universities themselves and our faculty rather than by third party vendors who sometimes do very good things and sometimes not.

The assembled presidents and their senior staff identified a number of areas for collective exploration, developed an action and I thank Holly Harris Bane and several others who were there, the provost was there, Jim Sage and, am I missing anybody who attended the APLU meeting with me? Anyway, it was very well received.

We have assembled an array of topics here and we've begun through a committee that the provost and Dr. Ramsier have identified focusing on content aggregation, assessment and credentialing of learning, platform development for student centered learning, regulatory and policy issues, research on innovative models, financial models to reduce costs to students, as well as funding for our collective ability to obtain initial investments to support these activities.

And we are continuing in the process of dealing with this, developing online resources for many of you who have expressed an interest in doing so, and certainly any of you who want to support any of these work groups, please let Dr. Ramsier or the provost know and we'll get you involved.

Let's see. Two last things very quickly. I also had the privilege, as I do annually because we're members of the Executive Committee of the Council on Competitiveness to attend their annual meeting in November, November 16. And I was asked to serve on a panel innovating for the future solving grand challenges and seizing opportunities for growth. And I had one great surprise which I would like to share with you, because this was truly music to my ears so to speak. The moderator of the session was a gentleman named Robert Litan. Dr. Litan was formerly a Vice President of Kauffmann Foundation. He's now a Director of Research at Bloomberg Government, and importantly, the Bloomberg organization was the sponsor of the media aspect of the Council and Competitors meeting. But in the beginning, his introduction of me he had this to say, and I quote him: "I will just give a commercial for Akron. A not so secret source of a tremendous amount of research and development and innovation in the United States" among other things. But that clicked, okay?

Ladies and gentlemen, next week Friday and Saturday commencement. I encourage you to attend our commencement ceremonies. We will confirm more than 1500 degrees on Friday evening and on two ceremonies on Saturday, so please do participate. This is a joyous time not only because it's the holiday season, but because these young men and women are completing their academic work to date.

So finally, may I again wish you a very happy and restful and delightful holiday. Thank you for your attention. That concludes my remarks. Happy to take any questions should there be any.

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

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Yes, sir.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Regarding the discussion about the new funding formula, it was hinted at or suggested that there could come some pressure for grades to be inflated in some way. And very briefly, it hinted that even administrators could change grades after the instructors had to sign the

grades. I had never heard of that before, so I wanted to ask the question. Is that actually technically possible, legally possible?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: It is not, and it is certainly not anything that I would advocate. There is a general concern as it has happened in many other settings that you know, when you are gonna get paid for X and you know, you have in your capacity to maybe do a little bit better here or a little bit better there that you might. And this is of course understood. And will it happen? I do not know. I urge you to explore the very best means of being, if you wish, utilizing the best academic integrity process, methods, et cetera that you can. But it's certainly not, we don't change grades, we won't change grades and that is certainly not something that is permissible by law either. Mr. Mallo, is that correct? That is correct.

VICE PRESIDENT TED MALLO: No, sir, it's not correct.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I'm sorry. It's not correct. Would you please care to correct the record? May I ask him to correct the record?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The chair recognizes Vice President Mallo.

VICE PRESIDENT TED MALLO: Your Honor, there are circumstances recognized in Ohio law as well as nationally when the administration can change a grade without violating the academic freedom of a faculty member. Those are situations involving egregious actions by a faculty member.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: My apologies. In other words, if you mess up we'll correct it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, now we have to define mess up.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Let's not go there today.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I prefer Vice President Mallo's formulation.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: As a lawyer you would.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I too have heard some of those ideas about the new funding formula, and I wanted to point out in my own college just today we seem to be doing just the opposite. Our dean's office sent around a list of students who have incompletes that are coming up to be turned into Fs or they're in danger of doing so, and they sent those directly to faculty members so that we could go take a look. And we now have a computer system that allows us to make those changes without the usual five day delay with hand written forms and that sort of thing. So I think we're moving in the right direction.

I also note that it seems, we seem to be a friendlier campus today from one employee to the next than I've, I've just noticed this over the last six months or so.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: You have been smiling more, David. I noticed.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Other people have been smiling at me. And I think this really catches on. We're all stressed and we have troubles, but nonetheless, so just my two cents there. And I think when we do hear of a situation that might need a little attention in terms of changing grades erroneously or something like that or allowing people to pass courses that maybe should get lower grades than they did, we should really maintain integrity as best we can, which is a tough problem anyway.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, David. I do think indeed that David is correct. Not only that we do have a friendlier campus, but we're increasingly attentive to the well being of our students and trying to address issues as they come up as promptly as possible. I know I send something to Rex almost every day and he very graciously says, we'll do, or something like that, and takes care of it within 24 hours if at all possible. And that brings good will back to us, because things don't linger around. And the provost likewise just last week handled a matter in instant time which was very gratifying because it got back to important people that were concerned about this particular student. So we gained a great opportunity to do well for ourselves.

So yes, we want to do that. At the same time, not to counter this, but just to add a little bit of dimensions and context, as you may be reading, there are efforts to explore whether the so called semester credit hour is really evaluating more, what are some other ways of assessing what has transpired other than whether a student was in class and got a grade, because often at least in some places certainly not the University of Akron I assume, some professors are, might be inclined to just count seat time. And we've always valued as we say the attendance, and it is to be valued, but if the student shows that he or she has learned the material, that should be valued first and foremost.

So there's a lot of discussion taking place, which I think in the end result will serve us all. Thank you, David.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions for the president?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Happy holidays, colleagues.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Mr. President. Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the president, of the provost, excuse me. That's the second time I've done that.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Good afternoon, and lest I forget, I certainly want to wish you the best for the holidays and a wonderful upcoming 2013 where even better things will be happening at the University of Akron as a result of our collective good work.

To the point of the president's comments with regard to the distribution of State Share of Instruction, the chancellor having convened a task force on completing college in Ohio, issued their recommendations in late November related to college completion.

We've been talking about college completion, successfully completing degrees at the University of Akron for the last 12 and 18 months, and in particular related to an agenda of student academic

success. The Pathways Strategy that will influence our student profile will in fact address this issue, not only at this institution, but at other institutions where the students that we defer to them having successfully completed them coming to us and then completing again really sets the stage for how our successful result of this actual change in SSI distribution, performance based.

I mean, the student academic success strategy is one that will raise graduation rates. Raising graduation rate, pure and simple, will adjust the distribution of State Share of Instruction across the institutions, and for that, we will benefit from that perspective.

The report points out that 50 percent of students who begin college fail to earn a degree; that 60 percent of jobs in Ohio by 2020 will require some level of post secondary education; and that Ohio is in the bottom 25 percent nationally for the percentage of adults with a baccalaureate degree. Again, the student academic success agenda is the completion agenda.

To that point, the only requirement of the task force report is one that asks each institution to develop through the endorsement of its board of trustees a campus completion plan.

Clearly the work of the Academic Policy Committee with the Faculty Senate to review and adjust perspectives related to admission of students to the university as well as our own efforts to be responsive to emergent students and college ready students in ways that will help them complete sooner, again, is one that is predicated of helping us achieve a 60 percent graduation rate or higher.

Clearly our board of trustees will endorse such a developed completion agenda, and we look forward to working with the appropriate bodies at the institution to assure that our completion agenda is one that reflects our priorities and our interests and intent in supporting student success.

Thanks to everybody for contributing their input to the draft of the Higher Learning Commission Report. The steering committee has met. I believe adjustments to that report are forthcoming for another round of comments from the campus. So we'll look forward to your input. Any additional suggestions, as I recall in this stage, directly related to correcting errors in the accuracy of information or statements.

I believe we're on track with submitting that report to the Higher Learning Commission before the end of the month. I believe we'll become aware in the very near future of the composition of the committee. That's still being finalized, and the board of trustees was briefed on the overall process and the steps of the process by Vice Provost Ramsier, so I think as an institution we'll be situated in a very good situation with regard to continuing reaccreditation.

Last month I mentioned to you that having interacted with the vice president for business and administration and chief financial officer that we have worked with the deans to distribute about seven million dollars' worth of funding to support faculty hiring over this next year. We've had subsequent interactions with the deans with regard to program delivery, and we'll be making some modifications to our initial recommendations to further assure that the academic programs can be covered by faculty.

Again, I will note that the \$2 million in Achieving Distinction Initiative is really a faculty hiring strategy that also incorporates with it staff support for the work by the faculty hired through that program.

I had the wonderful occasion just today of interacting with the principle investigators so designated by their faculty colleagues on the intellectual property and entrepreneurship and proof of concept proposal whereby the execution plan that they've proposed is very well thought, very proactive and gives a lot of forethought to such an initiative not only supporting the success of faculty of the University of Akron with the licensing and commercialization of our intellectual property but creating a framework whereby if we get it right, and I'm sure we will, there will be a positive impact on really the region from an economic prosperity perspective.

So you and those faculty members are to be commended for, in such a short period of time, really two months, coming together across disciplines and putting together such a wonderfully thought proposal. And I'm looking forward to having the same type of interaction with those individuals working on the biomimicry proposal.

Again, completion is what we're about. Completion is what we do. We're focused on improving completion, and I know working together we will achieve a much higher level of completion by students, to receive a valuable education from the University of Akron. So thank you, and again have a great holiday, and I will see you very soon.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Will you take questions?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions for the provost? Senator Cerrone?

SENATOR KATHRYN CERRONE: This is more of a comment than a question. I am from Summit College, and we recently received conflicting messages about the future of our college, and we've been assured by you and the president that faculty input is important and that we have shared governance, yet we've also been told that the future of our college might be influenced by the administration and the board. And we're a little upset about this.

And we also wanted to let you know that we are planning to meet in the next two weeks, actually over break, to make sure that we know our vision and mission and how we fit into this university and that we are going to be doing that work, and that we expect that the administration will honor this input when decisions are made.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I should add that any such change is, of course, something that would have to come to this body. Senator Steer.

SENATOR DAVID STEER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask if, in relation to the \$7 million which we all welcome, I think some units are finding out what it is that's gonna mean for them, and

that's a good thing, but that includes rollover of unfilled hires from last year, if I am not mistaken, visiting positions that are existing, and staff. And when it's all added together, we end up basically flat. And that doesn't count any of the faculty who might retire, well, basically who haven't put paperwork in prior to October 15th. And I'm wondering what the plan is for replacing faculty who will most certainly retire but haven't made that decision yet between now and the end of the academic year.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yeah, the \$7 million that has been allocated is the result of consultation, as I said, with the CFO. Given the overall financial circumstances of the institution with enrollment having been flat last year and gone down this year, I think we've made, well, we have made it clear to the deans that this is the first consideration of the allocation of dollars for faculty positions.

As we all know, it takes time to search for faculty positions. So between now and next fall, as we become aware of any additional decisions by faculty with regard to their tenure at the University of Akron, we'll have to, you know, consider those decisions as they emerge and then appropriately respond to assuring that the academic programs and the courses are delivered. So it's really an evolving, as you would expect, consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions of the provost?

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: You mentioned the Achieving Distinction Grant. Will the people who submitted grants but did not get funded receive some kind of feedback so that we can work on revising what we submitted? Because obviously we want to work on that sooner rather than later.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Right. When we do the next call for proposals, we'll provide feedback to the campus as a whole with regard to improving the proposals that would be submitted. And it would be at that point in time as faculty decide they would want to rework a proposal, we'll meet with those groups to provide advice.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would ask for the sake of the transcriber that all senators please use their yellow name tags so that we may easily tell who you are, and that those of you who have yellow name tags that are upside down turn them right side up. And that those of you who have the blank side facing the front of the room, please turn them around so that the name can be read from this perspective. Are there other questions of the provost? Senator Osorio?

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Chairman Rich, I would like to just request any kind of information or update that we might be able to get from the provost on the resolution that was passed last October of 2011 from the ad hoc committee on part time faculty issues that requested analysis and some kind of addressing of the situation of both current technology for part time employees and the office space for part time faculty.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yeah, with regard to the latter, we've brought that issue in terms of the space to the attention of the deans and asked the deans to interact with their faculty in appropriate

ways to attend to the space needs of the part time faculty as appropriate. I believe I reported previously that through the laptop refresh that happened, I think last academic year, I think the process has been completed as I believe but can't have confirmed by Jim Sage, that those laptops that were refreshed for current faculty were then upgraded with memory, hard drives and what have you, were checked and replaced if necessary, any issues with them were addressed, and those were re purposed for part time faculty utilization. And I will add that in the orientation in this past fall the part time faculty were involved and included in that orientation.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Osorio.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Could I just ask about that technology refresh? I have talked to part time faculty who don't have access to any university computers. Is there any recourse? Is there something they can do then to seek out the laptops or whatever that is available?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I believe those are all assigned to the colleges and I would anticipate requests would go through the department chairs to the deans to consider technology needs of part time faculty.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: On that issue, I think you that can call Herb Matheny and if he has computers he can, he will give you one. He will just almost bring it to you. You know, this is a situation, I think, where we have resources and not everybody knows we have the resources. Every time I've needed a part time faculty member, a laptop for one, I have been able to get it. You know, this is for the last 10 years.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: So we'll work with the deans to query about part time faculty needs and get that information to the CIO so if there are those issues we can reconcile them. Absolutely. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions for the provost? Senator Klein?

SENATOR JANET KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to follow up on what my colleague here said about faculty hiring. And we had a nice visit from John the other day in the history department. But at the same time I'd like to make the connection to student success. It's, you know, as you were talking about, we're not even keeping up with retirement. We got a couple lines for which we're very grateful. That's not even, we just lost two colleagues, we've lost others previously, we never replaced a Russianist, I know other departments are in a similar position. So it seems as if the amount allocated will only cover about half of the vacant positions from people leaving and retiring. Yesterday we got notice that one person is going to retire. So we can't even keep up with this.

And our students, in addition to being taught by part timers, an enormous number of part timers across campus, whatever their majors, they sometimes can't get letters of recommendation. When they want to apply to grad school or a job, they can't get letters of recommendation from full time faculty because

they've taken so few courses with them. So I think it's something to consider. You know, I think student success needs to be linked very distinctly to hiring more faculty. Thank you.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I absolutely agree.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I just want to, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the provost that we have requested a number of occasions some kind of creative transition approach so the faculty who are retiring are able to continue to contribute post retirement to fill positions that are necessary, and that I know that we have been exploring that, but we need to be more aggressive about that. I know this involves some negotiations also with the AAUP, but the fact of the matter is I have yet to hear you spontaneously mention anything like a creative approach to dealing with post retirement faculty. And I think with the numbers of people who are contemplating retirement, I think we need to publicly begin to address that.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Absolutely. I think we've talked about faculty indicating to their colleagues their intentions, as soon as possible bringing their intentions to the department chair and the dean so as these decisions are made we can be as proactive as we can with regard to appropriate replacement or covering of those instructional responsibilities.

I know we've having discussions with the general counsel's office with regard to the retire/rehire issue as it relates to the language in the contract, and I believe we'll have some sense of that in the near future.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Ducharme.

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: I would like to ask the provost, last year you gave us some numbers of the percent of the university budget that you were able to have to run the academic side, and if the administrative side was high, and you were hoping to see that change, and I wondered if you could tell us what those numbers are currently, and how that graph is going?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Certainly that would be something we would be working on to report to this group in the spring as we did last year in the spring. My response to this would be that all of the principles we're following have the intent to do just that.

So for example if any reductions occur, reductions are twice as great for the academic support unit than they have been for the academic units. Similarly, if you consider the compensation adjustments that have been made, those in and of themselves have shifted a greater proportion of our compensation budget to the academic side of the house. So those two principles carried out over the last two or three years effectively have that (inaudible). But we'll share those numbers in the spring at about the same point in time we shared them last spring.

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

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The next item on the agenda is the approval of the graduation list for December, 2012. The list has been made available to you electronically. Is there a motion to approve the graduation list?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns moves, seconded by Senator Schuller. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed, say nay. Motion carries. Next we have committee reports. First the Academic Policies Committee. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Academic Policies Committee brings five resolutions for your consideration today. Let me explain the basis of these resolutions. Our, the initial intent was to basically work through the numerous rules that contained reference to university college and remove them since functionally university college no longer exists. As you know, university college was a college without any faculty of its own. It was simply an administrative structure.

So in doing that, we've also attempted to clean up other language in these rules that would in essence carry the names of units, i.e., we have preferred to say advising or admissions as the office responsible for admissions rather than the office of admissions. For if the title office of admissions is in a rule, and there's some need to change the name of that unit to the admissions office, then we would have to come back and change the rule again. We've seen this many times in the cleanup of rules over the years that there's a lot of inconsistency between titles of non academic units locked in to the rules. So that's another part of the intent here, okay?

So first I will bring to you resolution, be it resolved Academic Policies Committee unanimously recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the revisions to Rule 3359 2 02. This comes as a committee recommendation. I would be happy to answer any questions about the proposed revision.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: These were all distributed electronically. Senator Lillie?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Just for the sake of clarity Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that even though the resolution is written in a very general way approving the revisions, that the minutes of the record at least will have the specific revisions that we are approving.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That is correct.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any debate on the resolution to amend Regulation 3359 2 02? Hearing none, I take it that you are prepared to vote. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying aye. Aye. Opposed say nay. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Next, Academic Policies Committee again unanimously recommends approval to the revisions as disseminated to Rule 3359 20 05.

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

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed signify by saying nay. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The third resolution, Academic Policies Committee unanimously recommends that the Faculty Senate revisions to the distributed Rule 3359 20 05.1.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any debate on the resolution? All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed, your enthusiasm is waning. Opposed, please say nay. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, Academic Policies Committee recommends approval of the distributed revisions to Rule 3359 42 01.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any debate on this resolution? 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.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And last but not least, Academic Policies Committee unanimously recommends the distributed revisions to Rule 3359 60 03.1.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any debate on this 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.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The next item on the agenda, don't go anywhere, is the Curriculum Review Committee report. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The report is basically a motion from the committee of, the Curriculum Review Committee of the Faculty Senate to approve the distributed list of curriculum proposals that you see tabulated on the handout and distributed electronically. This comes as a motion from the committee for your consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any debate on this resolution? Senator Lillie?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Once again, as a clarification, it's my understanding that if there's no objection to a course proposal, there's no action needed by the Curriculum Review Committee. Is that the case, or does it have to go through there anyhow?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The Curriculum Review Committee reports those items to the senate and the senate votes on them.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: The Review Committee actually reviews each one, right? You could make, you could send it back for further revision if there was something missed by one lower committee, right?

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, to answer the question, please remember that we've added a new committee as a subcommittee of the CRC called the URC, the University Review Committee. It's taken the task of really doing the quality standards, quality control review of every proposal. CRC does receive all proposals and discusses them and vote on them to provide the motion that we bring here. Of course if there are objections, the Curriculum Review Committee is then tasked to hopefully resolve the said objections before they come to the senate floor. But we do have in our possession all of the proposals before we bring them here.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any other, are there any other questions or debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I understand that there's a written report from the, I know that there's a written report from the Athletics Committee. Is there an oral report? Okay. Ad hoc committee on part time issues.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: We would like to introduce the resolution, I'm not sure what is the exact protocol, we read it now and then it comes back?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Yeah. You are going to report to us the recommendation of the ad hoc committee on part time issues. I will preview this by saying that because, that this will be referred to the reference committee to draft language for a bylaw amendment. So I expect that there will be such a motion after your committee presents this resolution.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Okay. All right. So we would like to present a resolution then to convert the ad hoc committee on part time faculty issues to a standing Committee on Part time Faculty Issues given the nature which we've heard more about today of both the number of us and continual nature of issues that arise. The text of it was mailed electronically. Do you want me to read it?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: As I recall it's short enough that it bears reading.

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: Whereas during the 2010, 2011 academic year 1,518 part time faculty taught 5,639 courses making their contribution to the university's academic mission unarguably significant. Despite their strong presence and significant contributions toward student success, part time faculty do not have a permanent avenue for discussing teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty Senate is the only governance body on the University of Akron campus charged with representing the faculty's academic interests as well as the instructional standards and practices afforded the faculty, although they currently hold two senate seats. I'm reading the wrong one. I'm sorry. Currently hold two senate seats. The part time faculty as a whole needs a standing committee to discuss relevant issues to bring before the senate on a continual basis, be it resolved that the University of Akron Faculty Senate change the status of the committee on part time issues from ad hoc to standing committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. This will require referral to the Reference Committee because the motion does not have in it proposed language. I think it would need to do that anyway. Is there a motion to refer this to the Reference Committee? Senator Cerrone. Is there a second? Senator Clark.

I would urge you, speaking as a long time member of the reference committee, only to vote to refer it to the Reference Committee if you favor the motion in principle so that we don't ask them to do work that turns out not to be necessary. So if for some reason you were opposed to making the committee a permanent committee of the faculty senate, I would urge you to vote against the motion to refer because all we're asking the Reference Committee to do is to draft the language that would effectuate the commission of the ad hoc committee.

Having said that, is there debate on the motion to refer to the reference committee? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries.

We have a written report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. I do not believe we have an oral report. Any of the Faculty Senate reps to the University Council wish to report? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: As many of you are aware, we've had a long process in order to develop a body that we're now calling the University Council, which is included now two sets of bylaws and one document that was called a white paper, and have gone through several iterations of review as to the characteristics and function of the University Council, and I want to report to you now as a Faculty Senate representative that the ad hoc bylaws revision committee that was established by the University Council last spring has reported. The bylaws have been submitted to and reviewed by the standing committees of the University Council and also by the steering committee of the University Council. At the next regular meeting on December 11 will be the consideration of those bylaws.

In, I think it's today's E mail Digest, there is or ought to be links to two places. One is to a password protected site where you can see and read the bylaws, and I encourage you to do that. And when we get the bylaws as some of you are aware, the devil is in the details. So I encourage you, those of you who are interested, to read it very carefully.

Secondly, there is also reference to a list of constituency representatives, that would be members of the faculty senate or, I'm sorry, representatives that were elected by the senate to represent them on University Council. At present that's me, Dave Witt and Liz Erickson. There may be others who are faculty senators who are on the University Council and may speak, but those three are the three that are the formal reps of the senate.

If you have recommendations to make, specific recommendations to make, to amend any part of the bylaws, please be sure that those specific recommendations with language we hope are made to one of the representatives before the meeting on December 11. I don't know how long it's gonna take. The meeting is, I think, an hour and a half long. That's what it is scheduled. I am not sure if we'll get through everything that has to be discussed in the bylaws, but I want you to be aware that that's coming up.

And so this would then, if it were a successful effort at this particular meeting, it would keep us in sync with the calendar that we've been saying that we would hope to be able to be completed on our part by the end of the calendar year.

However, once again, look at it very carefully and make sure that you understand what it's doing, and if there are any recommendations for change, send them through those constituency representatives. That's the structure of this particular body, the University Council. It's a little different from the senate, so I wanted to make sure to bring that to your attention.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie, would you remind everybody where they can find the draft?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I thought I referred to the E mail Digest today. It's in the E mail Digest today, and the site itself is, I believe, a Share Point site that you can access with your UA net ID and password. I do not have the URL at this point.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: But it's linked on the University Council web page, right?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I was going to say you ought to be able to find where that is by going to the University Council web page. However, to actually view the bylaws my understanding is you have to have a UA net ID and password in order to do that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Lillie.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: May I ask Senator Lillie if the UC will actually vote on the bylaws on December 11 or may it carry over? The current intent is to present the results of the process that I've described to the University Council. And as the co chair and one who usually presides, my intent is to have the University Council consider that in a seriatim fashion, meaning look at it paragraph by paragraph essentially, and to make any changes that the University Council itself deemed might be necessary.

If they found no changes, it's possible that it could be done very rapidly. And so it's possible that if it's acceptable to the members of the University Council that we could proceed through that process expeditiously. If there are issues that need to be brought up or amendments that need to be made, and they are made they could be considered in due course. That's the intent of what we expect to happen at that meeting.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Any other questions of Senator Lillie? If not, we have a written report from the University Libraries Committee. Is there an oral report? Don't feel obliged. Is there any new business to come before the senate? Any new business? Anything for the good of the order? I take it you are ready to adjourn. Is there a motion to adjourn? Senator Hajjafar. Is there a second? Senator Chronister. All those in favor of adjourning, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. We're adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.)