

University of Akron

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 7, 2013 3:00 5:00 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The February regular meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. The first item is the approval of the agenda which was distributed. There was one error in it. The Distance Learning Review Committee was erroneously listed among the committee reports. There's no report from that committee, and it's a subcommittee of the Curriculum Review Committee so it reports to the Curriculum Review Committee in any event.

Are there any other corrections or additions to the agenda? Hearing none, all those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by, is there a motion?

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Moved by Senator Hajjafar. Seconded by Senator Miller. All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

The next item of business is the approval of the minutes first from the November, 2012 meeting. These were distributed just prior to the December meeting but the, too late to really vote on them. So you have had now a month to review them. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the November meeting? Senator Hajjafar and Senator Raber seconds. Are there any corrections to the minutes? Any corrections to the minutes? If not, all those in favor of adopting the minutes of the November, 2012 meeting please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The minutes are adopted. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the December, 2012 meeting? Senator Hajjafar and seconded by Senator Raber. Any corrections to the December, 2012 minutes? Hearing none, all those in favor of adopting the December, 2012 minutes signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

Next item of business are the chairman's remarks. As I mentioned in an E mail to the senate E mail discussion list, I plan for us to take some time in the March meeting to engage with President Proenza in a discussion of his proposed integrator assessor model, the subject of MOOCs, and assessment of

learning that takes place in MOOCs, and perhaps in other contexts and credentialing. I hope and expect that that discussion will be thoughtful and not at all uncritical, but respectful and focused on ideas rather than personalities.

Second, I'm pleased to report that senate committees have been meeting and going about their business. The senate, as large as it is, necessarily does most of its work in committee, subject of course to senate action. I urge the committees to move with alacrity on any action items they may plan to report to the senate so that the meeting at the end of the year, the May meeting or even the April meeting don't become overburdened with too much business. This is what tends to happen, and I expect it will happen to some extent and we'll manage it. But if at all possible I urge the committees to move quickly on action items so that we can distribute the work that remains to be done over the three remaining meetings. There are only three meetings remaining in this academic year.

Third, the Reference Committee will be reporting today on proposed amendments to the senate bylaws. These cannot be voted on today, but they will be presented for discussion in the hope that will to some extent reduce the amount of time we need to take to discuss them in the meeting when we can vote on them, which I expect will be a more crowded agenda.

In fact, the senate will have to wait until April to approve these proposed amendments because of an error in the bylaws that the Reference Committee is proposing to correct, and that is a requirement that 30 days elapse between when the bylaws are formally proposed, which would be in a meeting, and when they are adopted. Somebody wasn't quite thinking about the calendar when they did that. I think they meant you would wait from one regular meeting to the next regular monthly meeting, and in fact those can be 28 days apart. And in fact the February and March meetings are 28 days apart. So adhering to the letter of the bylaws, we'll vote on them in the April meeting rather than the March meeting.

That concludes the chairman's remarks. Next item on the agenda is special announcements. It is my sad duty to report the deaths of several members of the university community.

Kathryn Motz Hunter, alumna and former trustee of the University of Akron died December eighth at the age of 87. She earned a bachelor's degree in business at Ohio Wesleyan University. She served for 18 years as editor and publisher of the Hudson Times, Falls News and Summit County Democrat. In the 1960s she earned a Master's Degree in guidance counselling at the University of Akron and designed and taught several courses here.

After the 1990 death of her husband, John B. Hunter, Kathryn Hunter became President of the First Akron Corporation and served as chairman of the Valley Savings Bank. Hunter served on the University of Akron's Board of Trustees from 1989 to 1996. She was also a trustee at Ohio Wesleyan University.

Her community involvement was extensive and included her service as a founding trustee of both E.J. Thomas Performing Arts Hall and the National Inventors Hall of Fame. In 2010 she received the Bert A. Polsky Humanitarian Award.

John Joseph Luthern, does anybody know the correct pronunciation, because I hate to mispronounce it on this occasion.

>>: Luthern is correct.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Luthern, an associate professor of general technology, died December 10th at the age of 54. A native of Tacoma, Washington Luthern earned a bachelor of arts degree in chemistry in 1981 at Youngstown State University before going on to the University of Akron to earn a master's of science in Organic Chemistry in 1986 and a Ph.D. in Polymer Science in 1991. He joined his alma mater in 1995 as a part time faculty member in the Department of Engineering and Science Technology. He was hired as an assistant professor in polymer technology in 1996.

Doyle Jenkins died on January third at the age of 85. He began working in the Department of Physical Facilities in 1969 and retired from the University in 1990 as a maintenance repair worker.

Dr. Helen Qammar, associate professor of chemical and biomolecular engineering and Director of the Institute of Teaching and Learning died January seventh after a long illness. She was 54. She earned a bachelor's degree at Syracuse University and masters and Ph.D. at the University of Virginia. She joined the University of Akron's College of Engineering in 1989 after serving as an engineer with Exxon Research and Engineering Company and as a fellow with Resources for the Future in Washington, D.C. Of all of the initiatives undertaken by the Institute for Teaching and Learning, Dr. Qammar took special pride in helping to coordinate the University of Akron's Rethinking Race: Black, White and Beyond. Dr. Qammar served as a member of this body and its executive committee.

James R. Rogers, a professor in the Department of Counseling in the College of Education died January 14th. Rogers was a graduate of the University of Akron where he earned a doctorate in counseling psychology. He joined the department in 1998 specializing in suicide and disaster relief psychology.

Rogers received many awards and accolades throughout his career, the most recent being the Career Achievement Award in the Section on Clinical Emergencies and Crises of Division 12 of the American Psychological Association. He was selected for his leadership, for being a mentor to many and for his sustained research training and clinical contributions to the field of suicide prevention. He was a fellow of the American Psychological Association Society of Counseling Psychology, the International Academy of Suicide Research and the University of Akron's Institute for Life Span Development and Gerontology. He was also past president of the American Association of Suicidology. A mentor, teacher, colleague, friend and prolific researcher, Rogers contributed richly to the suicidality field and his work was well known on the local, state and national levels.

Howard L. Flood, trustee of the University of Akron from 1996 to 1999, died January 17th at the age of 78. A retired chairman of First Merit Corporation, was long active in the Akron community. In addition to his work as a trustee, he served on the University of Akron Foundation Board and many other boards. He held leadership positions with many community groups including the Akron Regional Development Board and United Way. Flood received the University of Akron's Honorary

Alumnus Award in 1987 and was given an honorary membership in the chapter of Beta Gamma Sigma.

Dr. Noel L. Leathers, retired Professor of History and Senior Vice President and Provost of the University of Akron died on January 28th at the age of 89. He was born in Columbus, Ohio in 1924, attended the Ohio State University from 1941 to '42 and served on active duty as Japanese interpreter with the Fourth U.S. Marine Division from 1942 to 1946. In 1946 he served in the Joint Intelligence Center under Admiral Nimitz in the Pacific. He was active in the campaigns in Saipan, Tinian, Guam, Palau and Iwo Jima. He was proficient in Japanese, French and German and had intermediate proficiency in Farsi, Korean and Italian.

He graduated from the Oklahoma State University in 18 sorry, not that long ago 1949 with a Bachelor of Science in History and German and a Master of Arts in European History at Oklahoma State in 1950, and a Ph.D. in European History from the University of Oklahoma in 1963. He served as a special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and received two commendations from J. Edgar Hoover.

He joined the faculty at the University of Toledo and served as the Head of History Department and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences there. In 1972 Dr. Leathers came to the University of Akron as Professor of History and Vice President for Academic Affairs in which capacity he served the university until 1988. He taught European and Japanese History until his retirement in 1995. From 1997 to 2000 he served again as Senior Vice President and Provost.

He published a number of books, the most recent just last year entitled "Reflections on the Pacific War. A Marine Interpreter Remembers."

And finally, Sally Pitts Kennedy Slocum, associate professor emeritus of English, died January 28th at the age of 72. Slocum, a native of Spartanburg, South Carolina, earned a bachelor of arts degree at Columbia College in South Carolina, and a master's and Ph.D. in English literature at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. She joined the English Department faculty here in September, 1966 and retired in May, 1996.

If I may be permitted a personal note, and I am sure many others will remember Sally for her learning, her wit, her wry sense of humor and her way with words. I cannot tell you how many times I have met former students of hers who talked about the enormous impact that she had on their lives. This is harder when you know the people, and this is the first time that's been true in this case.

Will you all please rise for a moment of silence? Thank you.

The next item of business is the report of the Executive Committee.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, guests and senators. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on December 20th for regular senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the president later that afternoon. The EC appointed 18 members to the CRC ad

hoc UA online subcommittee for the purpose of assisting faculty and departments aspiring to expand their online presence to do so efficiently and effectively.

The EC also appointed Litza Varonis to the ad hoc clicker technology review committee as an ex officio member for her extensive knowledge and experience with these tools.

Later that afternoon the EC met with the President and Vice Provost Ramsier. The President shared information from state level meetings regarding the state share of instruction and expects the same level of state funding with a chance for a slight increase.

Chair Rich reported on the efforts for a criminal justice baccalaureate proposal. Faculty members from three stake holding departments have made good progress, and their endeavors should result in a stronger criminal justice baccalaureate program while filling a regional need for the expertise with UA graduates.

We also discussed incentives and disincentives for interdisciplinary academic programs with the idea that the criminal justice program may become a model for similar collaborations.

The EC inquired of Vice Provost Ramsier about the follow up actions regarding office space and computers for part time faculty. Vice Provost Ramsier stated that university rule requires part time faculty to hold office hours, therefore the university is obligated to provide that space, and will do so. He also reported that there are currently 109 laptops available to part time faculty. He suggested that two fold approach whereby deans query part time faculty on computing and space needs and also that part time faculty may request specific computing and space needs directly to department chairs and the deans.

We also discussed the heavy reliance on part time faculty here at the university. In light of the recent changes in STRS we also discussed the replacement of retiring full time faculty members and contractual barriers to utilizing retired faculty in case of mass exodus this summer.

The AAUP recently conducted a retirement survey and will assist the university with that data in terms of planning.

The EC met again on January 31st to set the agenda for today's meeting and for regular senate business.

Additional appointments were made to senate committees. Sukanya Kemp was appointed to the ad hoc General Education Revision Committee. Cheryl Ward was appointed to the CRC ad hoc UA Online Subcommittee. There are also vacancies on two UC committees for senate representatives: the UC Budget, Finance and Benefits Committee and the UC Public Affairs and Development Committee. The call for nominations was included in today's E mail Digest.

The EC also discussed overlap of charges between some University Council committees and Faculty Senate committees. Discussions between the respective committees are currently underway. The EC was notified that members of the Higher Learning Commission will meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee during the site visit in March. The EC will prepare accordingly for that meeting.

Senators, thank you very much for your service to the senate and the university, and this concludes my report. I will be happy to take any questions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions for Senator Bove? Thank you.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item of business is the remarks of the provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, everybody. Vision 2020 certainly has established an institutional success agenda, and I think we would all agree that the primary purpose of that success agenda is student success.

Along with our commitment to secure 80 percent job placement within six months of graduation includes our commitment to achieve a 60 percent six year graduation rate, meaning that we must provide every opportunity for students to speed up or maintain progress towards degree attainment. And to assure that we have those students to be successful, actively engage in recruiting students to the University of Akron to benefit from the high quality education offered by our academic programs.

Our Pathways to Student Success Strategy, as we discussed, really set the stage for situating the institution in a very good way with regard to changes in the distribution of the state share of instruction.

As we've discussed and as you have read, the State Share of Instruction will be distributed beginning in fiscal year '14 on the basis of university performance. In particular, 50 percent of total state funding will be based upon degree completion.

And phasing in through fiscal year '15 will include credit for students transferring from one institution to another institution. When they complete at the second institution the first institution will receive credit. There will be a removal of separate funding formulas for the regional campuses so that there's recognition that the regional campuses are a component of a success agenda. They're not a separate entity that stands in an island unto itself, and that there will be eligibility for additional funding for individuals who come from out of state and stay in the state of Ohio to be employed.

Our Pathways to Student Success agenda, the 60 percent graduation rate strategy, is a strategy that is responsive to these performance based adjustments and the distribution of the State Share of Instruction. So we really have taken the right steps just ahead of the big change to position the institution to benefit from this performance based funding distribution.

Concurrent with the announcement or the adoption of this performance based funding formula in the governor's biannual budgets that would be approved by the legislature by the end of June will likely include a cap on both tuition and fees to two percent.

So in the past, the caps have been only on tuition. Fees have been allowed to be adjusted. But in this case the cap will apply to both tuition and fees.

There is good news as well, that money in the state budget will be increased to provide state wide need based scholarships to an additional 90,000 students. Many of our students are need based, so we can anticipate that many of our students will benefit by that increased funding.

Similarly we should benefit in some way, shape or form by the governor's commitment to increased funding of the Choose Ohio First scholarship program. In fact, just released today from the Office of Budget Management is the fact that the governor has proposed a 1.9 percent increase in the State Share of Instruction for fiscal year 2014 amounting to about \$33 million. Not a lot, but an increase.

As well as in '15 another 1.9 percent increase of about \$34 million. Most state agencies are at minimum flat or reduced. And this increase is stated by the governor to be in recognition of the presidents working with the governor's office to change the allocation strategy for state capital dollars as well as to work towards and agree upon this performance based strategy and the State Share of Instruction.

Now, clearly these sorts of approaches to performance related, to student success links, to our delivery of academic programs in ways that are effective and efficient, that really supports and continues to justify our focus on hiring more full time faculty.

So to that end, in conversations with the deans and the department chairs at the most recent dean and department chair meeting, we've had discussions about summer offerings where we've asked deans and department chairs to work in the summer, to have fewer sections with larger enrollment as appropriate without diminishing academic quality, but to maximize the capacity that exists in all of our summer offerings.

We've also asked for a focus on offering courses that we know by our analysis contributes to student completion of their degrees. And we've also asked that special topics, courses, be considered only in the summer if they're going to have full enrollment and really to focus on courses that will contribute in significant ways to degree completion.

Certainly in our current fiscal environment where fiscal year '14 will be very difficult to manage, but we'll be working towards assuring we manage the fiscal year '14 budget and to secure student success, because we know students enter into majors sooner and complete degrees faster when they have earlier and more contact with regular full time faculty. We've asked the deans and department chairs to assure that faculty workload is appropriate from a productivity perspective in teaching, research and service so that we're optimizing the opportunity for our students to have engagement with our full time faculty which will also have the effect of reducing our reliance on part time faculty.

We've emphasized to the deans and department chairs in making these decisions and adjusting assignments that one size does not fit all, and these adjustments should not be across the board. They should be specific to the individual, based upon productivity and teaching, research and service.

I would be remiss if I didn't remind ourselves that March third through the sixth we have our visit from the Higher Learning Commission. Thank you for your participation and the feedback with regard to our report. Thank you for your anticipated participation in the activities that allow all of us to interact

with the committee that will make our reaccreditation visit a success, because it will be an opportunity to reflect on our performance and to develop strategies to enhance our success.

Looking forward, we have to continue to work towards general education reform ideally with 120 credit hours required for graduation. As was indicated in our report for the Higher Learning Commission, we need to address and focus more on understanding and analyzing student learning outcomes so we're continuously improving the quality of teaching, the quality of learning, and as we've committed to ourselves and to the board, we must finalize our academic program review results.

As you know, a committee is working very effectively and efficiently with updated data that was gathered in the fall. It's been complemented by very effective worksheets for the committee's use and anticipate as soon as that committee finishes meeting with department chairs, I think today, and perhaps as we speak, that we'll be able to begin to review the work of that committee in a very effective way, which leads to the final looking forward point of view, and that is the University Council obviously is on a good trajectory from a shared governance perspective. And we'll continue to work hard to assure that that body effectively represents faculty, staff and students for improving practices and policies related to the success of the University of Akron.

So I know you will agree that the vision that's been created through 2020 is an institutional success agenda, and we all are components of securing that institution wide success, and I very much appreciate everything you do every day to achieve that. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there questions for the Senior Vice President Provost? Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I think that you came close to answering some of the, some of my question. What I'm hearing though now is, this is from my colleagues across campus, is that, that in many cases one size does seem to fit all when it comes to increasing workload, that sort of thing.

In one department verbatim they were told that if they don't have substantial grant activity, that they're gonna have to pick up extra classes, they're just gonna have to do this regardless of whether junior faculty or not, that sort of thing.

And then as far as the summer goes, what we heard in one or two departments for sure is that we're just gonna have to make big cuts in the summer. And the reason was given that we need to provide classes that are less expensive to the university in terms of what we pay the instructor.

And my main, I guess my main point is that as we go through all of this, that there's on the one hand there's the planning process right, that by the time it, it reminds me of the birthday game children sometimes play where they sit in a circle and whisper in each other's ear, and what comes out of the last kid is completely different from the original concept.

This is what happens. By the time you and, you know, your office has discussions with deans that go to chairs and finally come to us in a department meeting, it doesn't resemble what we hear in Faculty Senate, for example. And this is also something only a few people in Faculty Senate get to hear you

say this. Your job is much more complicated than to just go around and make yourself clear on this one issue, I'm sure. I wish there was some way we could clarify these issues so that our chairs understand what your intentions are as you explain them here, and if you have any comments on that.

The only other thing that I do want to point out, and this is in terms of squelching rumors and that sort of thing, because I don't like to work in a place where rumors are flying all over the place, and this is certainly that kind of place in many ways. We've seen some things happen. There's big noise in Bowling Green about firing a hundred faculty because they can't afford to keep the number that they have, right? They have demonstrations, and the Toledo Blade was reporting.

And then the University of Toledo is also doing things to reduce the number of part time faculty that they are using, and ostensibly that was to avoid Affordable Healthcare Act requirements that they offer benefits to some of those folks, as well as reducing the size of their faculty as well. So we start to see this as two pretty good size places.

And then I heard from, this was a direct quote from a friend of mine. I have no reason to doubt him. In their Faculty Senate meeting last week, their president at Bowling Green explained that the, she was talking to an official for the Inter University Council, I believe they have an executive director or something like that, and this fellow told her that he expected by the time the governor's budget was fully formed that there would be language there that would increase the workload for faculty in higher education somehow.

It just seems to me that there you have the IUC somehow micromanaging the state budget. This just doesn't even sound like it's possible for one thing, but they did a pretty good job of getting language in with the SB 5 legislation a couple of years ago, so maybe it's not too far apart.

So I just wonder if there's something that we could do to ensure at least things like retirement retention and promotion is considered, and these as we have to have more full time faculty teaching more often in bigger classes, just keep in mind that we do want to develop junior faculty so that they can one day be as tired as some of us. And I'd like to see just a little more transparency in policy making if that's at all possible. I realize that it's not sometimes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Would you care to comment?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: On that tirade.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I think I am supposed to respond to questions, but I will respond to remarks.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Since there were no discernible questions, feel free to comment or not.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Dispel the rumors.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Number one, what I articulated here today is what was articulated to the Council of Deans and Department Chairs at our last meeting. And what I said here today was articulated to the deans and department chairs yesterday or the day before in memo form. So it's

clearly articulated, the way I described it today in a memo form to the deans and department chairs. I will ask that the department chairs assure that memos out of the office are shared with faculty and that the conversations we have at department chair meetings and council of deans meetings are as well reflected in subsequent faculty meetings. Certainly, you know that line of communication has to be open. It has to be obvious and it has to be transparent.

With regard to what I would consider to be an intersection of issues of accountability and productivity, quite frankly, with the compensation adjustments that have been made over the last three years as well as the significant allocation of funds to faculty positions over the last three years, to continue to articulate for faculty lines at the University of Akron we have to assure that our work effectiveness is optimal at every level of rank. And in consideration of that fact, and in consideration of the fact there is a workload rule at the University of Akron, the perspective from which there has been drift.

So, to continue to articulate for dollars for faculty positions, we have to assure the highest level of productivity. And through that accountability, we'll be able to, I believe, continue to articulate in appropriate ways for appropriate investment in faculty.

I've asked for some information in the last couple of days that would reflect, I had hoped, our commitment to faculty positions at the University of Akron. And what was revealed was that over the last three years we have placed faculty in positions equivalent to nine million dollars. At this moment we have nine million dollars in faculty positions that are open and that are being searched. Over that three year period, if I am recalling correctly, there was about \$11 million in retirements and resignations. That's a seven million dollar net positive in the allocation of faculty positions.

So, I guess that's a way of saying that, you know, to the original commitment I made to move more funds of the institution to the academic side of the house, and appropriately so compensation was recognized as a priority by the board, that's been happening. And this \$18 million in faculty positions over the last three years, not all of which have been completed, you know, is part of, as I discussed three years ago, a strategy to redistribute resources within the institution over time with more resources going to the academic side of the house. And that would constitute my response to Senator Witt's comments.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Could I just, I may have misheard. Would you just go through the dollar figures again? Just, I want to make sure I've got them.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Sure. Over the last three years, nine million dollars has been spent in placing faculty in jobs at the University of Akron. So nine million dollars' worth of faculty have been placed in positions at the University of Akron over the last three years. There's nine million dollars' worth of positions that are now actively being searched. That's \$18 million. Over that same period of time, there have been, I think it's \$11 million of resignations and separations, retirements. That's to the net positive a seven million dollar investment in faculty at the University of Akron.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Senator Clark.

SENATOR SUSAN CLARK: Yeah, I'd like to just follow up. My director forwarded the memo that you sent, and so it's very consistent, but of course when you apply it at a departmental level, it looks different. I am wondering if you provided any more detailed guidelines for how a college, a department, a school needs to adjust things. Because what you have described is very broad and abstract kinds of things that suggest that change needs to happen without, at least to me, it being clear what exactly that's going to look like. So I wonder if there's sort of mid level guidelines that you provided or could provide.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: We certainly will be interacting with the deans and department chairs as appropriate to provide guidelines as they work through making these decisions. We began to interact with deans and department chairs on this issue going into the spring semester actually, so many of the deans and department chairs have a sense of the perspective from which, you know, those principles would be implemented.

In essence, the overall intention is to increase the total student credit hours of instruction taught by full time faculty at the University of Akron, because number one, we have the lowest, we have a very low percentage of credit hours of instruction taught by full time faculty at the University of Akron partly because of our extreme reliance on part time faculty. By doing the former, the latter will be reduced.

And also as I've discussed previously, these kind of activities over time will so call right size our use of part time faculty.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: First I want to say thank you for coming and thank you for sharing this information. I have probably a couple of comments, but I've also got a number of questions that I hope will be ones that other people will like to hear the answer to.

My first comment is that consistent with what Senator Witt said, I remember a couple of years ago right after you came actually saying to you explicitly after a meeting of Executive Committee that what I was hearing from the dean and department chair when they were telling us what was coming down was not what you were saying to us in the Executive Committee meeting, so this is not a new issue. And I just want to say that it's the kind of thing that I think seems to be continuing, for whatever reason we don't know. But again, I had made that point clear, I think others have too, that when we're sitting talking to you about it, fine. Sounds good. Somehow the translation doesn't seem to be getting through. And so that's a comment.

The 60 percent graduation rate that you mentioned the state's looking for, I know that lots of times when we're looking at these things it depends on where we're starting from. I believe the federal graduation rate that folks quote most of the time is for first time freshmen, and what proportion of them finish a degree program after six years. I think that's correct. And so what I'm wondering is, is that the metric we're using here for the 60 percent graduation rate? In other words, are we looking at what is for us a relatively small proportion of our overall student body or are we looking at the entire student body? What is the baseline we're starting from, or do we even know?

Because 60 percent graduation rate, I'm sure could be arrived at by a number of different routes, and it's gonna be important for us to know which one we're gonna be using.

So that's one question. Is that the one we're talking about or is there a different metric that's being used by the state not related to the one that I referred to earlier?

Second, for one of the issues with regard to summer offerings which was very sensitive to me because in the nature of what I do in the College of Education and have always done, it's very teacher heavy, it's also due to the nature of the Ph.D. and career path I selected, also doesn't pay perhaps as well as some other nine month positions around the university. So to me it's real important to have not only the regular nine month employment, but I also rely pretty heavily on the summer employment to make ends meet.

And so when I hear you starting to say, and I'm sure with the best of intentions, let's tell the deans to have fewer sections with larger enrollment, I'm starting to wonder how is that gonna affect me? Does that mean that I'm gonna have the number of courses that I'm able to teach reduced which is an effective pay cut for me. May not be for other people, but it is for me. So is that something that's gonna happen? Could there be fewer sections, therefore I happen to lose out?

Second, related to that, who gets to determine how many people are in a section? When I've, when we have created courses in the past, one of the elements of that is to have the faculty determine what they feel is the right size for the section depending on its level and so on and just, well, a variety of issues. So if the faculty are saying we believe that the right size for an undergraduate section at the junior or senior level should be capped at 25 students, are you saying now that the administration can say no, we want 35, so we're just gonna change it? That would represent a substantive change. So that's the second question.

Third question, offering courses that contribute to student completion. What courses do we have that don't would be a question. Now, there's always a few here and there that are sort of boutique courses perhaps, but I think that's very rare. I hope it is very rare. Perhaps I'm wrong. That's also a question. Then you also mentioned appropriate faculty workload specific to the individual based upon productivity. How do you measure productivity? By the number of articles published? By the number of students who are taught? By the grant that's brought in?

As I had mentioned a few months ago, a couple of years ago, using the university's own figures, I could say I brought in the equivalent of about \$400,000 a year through almost entirely teaching. So is that productivity or is that what you are supposed to do? So we're gonna accept, that's your baseline. You start with that, and then productivity is what you do on top of that. So, the definition of what you mean by productivity could be helpful in helping not only me, but also the deans and department chairs know what it is that you are trying to do.

You also mentioned general education reform and put it in a context of 120 credit hours. It sounded like that was a requirement. So I'm wondering where that requirement comes from. I know that the general education committee had been charged to look at that, but it sort of has morphed a little bit,

and I'm trying to get again where does that come from how does it fit in and what role does the senate itself have in that academic issue?

And then finally just as a comment, at this point you mentioned the University Council and said that part of its role is to represent faculty, staff and students. I think that's absolutely right. I would agree to that. I would just remind you and this body that a large proportion of the voting members of the University Council are administrators, vice presidents and others who are appointed. Each of the co chairs for the committees are appointed by the senior vice president and provost and that's roughly a quarter of the voting membership of the University Council.

So while I think it does represent a voice, an important voice for faculty, staff and students and we work very hard to do that, I think it's also important for us to recognize that this body is not constituted of quite the grass roots way that perhaps some might think. I don't know if you can answer those questions right now or would like to get back in touch with me with some answers later, but those are the ones that occurred to me.

And I once again wanted to thank you for your time and coming here and for taking the time to tell us what you have in mind and to listen to our concerns.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I feel like I just have written a dissertation on higher education and this is the exam. So thank you Professor Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: You are quite welcome.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I think I have these down right. With regard to communication, transparency, aligning understanding and expectations, that is why we have begun reaffirming back to Council of Deans and Department Chairs the agenda of those meetings so that that information can be shared with the faculty, so the conversations across the campus become more informed and more uniform with regard to the conversation that has occurred.

With regard to the 60 percent graduation rate, the 60 percent graduation rate objective of Vision 2020 is based upon the Pathways strategy that was discussed institutionally a year ago. So, if we follow through on the Pathways strategy that as we reported has just begun shifting the profile of the students at the University of Akron, we will over time achieve a 60 percent graduation rate as defined by the governing bodies.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think the question was 60 percent whom

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: As defined by the governing bodies. And right now the percentage of the, the graduation rate is now defined as we've discussed before, new, first time freshmen starting in the fall right out of high school. So that continues to be the norm nationally for calculating graduation rates. We've discussed that a larger percentage of our student body are individuals other than that group. So that's why, you know, the president has consistently, and we've persistently articulated that that measure, you know, doesn't accurately reflect the success of certain institutions.

But given that measure, that metric, our Pathways strategy will, by that metric, over time achieve 60 percent graduation rate.

With regard to summer, my response there would be we want classes that are offered to be at the capacity they're intended to have. And to minimize classes that have unfilled capacity.

With regard to student completion and boutique courses, I think you would be surprised that the percentage of boutique courses that some departments have on the books that students are taking above the elective number actually contributes zero to completion.

Now, that's not saying it's not contributing to education. But in terms of completion, once you get above a certain number of electives, you know, the more elective courses you take, the longer it takes for a student to complete. That's particularly the case when the vast majority of our students don't take nearly 15 credit hours a semester. So that's a major issue with regard to the interface of course offerings and student completion.

You know, clearly changing the student profile will help with, you know, the credit hours taken per semester. But we also have to work harder to lift up our students' expectations and our expectations, their aspirations and our expectations of them so that they take advantage of the plateau between 12 and 15 credits, the tuition is flat. So for every student it's to their benefit to take as many courses as they can within the semester within the plateau to complete as soon as possible.

With regard to the use of the word productivity, whatever you want to call it, productivity, effectiveness, efficiency, you know, contributions, it's really an individual's work in the area of teaching, research and service. That has to be discussed and understood and developed in appropriate ways according to the contract, according to the RTP requirements, and need to be consistent with assuring a high level of excellence as we've adopted those measures through the academic program review process.

So the academic program review process really is a process that is about productivity. It's about efficiency, it's about effectiveness, it's about productivity.

With regard to the gen ed reform, quite frankly, if we don't go to 120 credits for graduation, the state will enact, the Chancellor will require institutions that don't have 120 credits to have 120 credits for graduation. We strongly suggested that the General Education Reform Committee consider their recommendations from that perspective. And if I understand correctly, how we came up with 128 was a matter of arithmetic. Rex is shaking his head. They really had no basis of academic nature or hypothesis or anything.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: For the record, I believe Rex may have been nodding his head rather than shaking it.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Sorry. I apologize. Nodding, in the affirmative. You know, clearly I don't think, well, none of the actions that we intend to pursue or suggest or discuss I think, you know, either through the University Council or through leadership is intended in any way, shape or form to

bypass or not be considerate of appropriate governance processes. So I think I caught them all. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: When you ask compound questions you are taking the risk that the person won't answer them all.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: And I apologize. I am not ignoring you by writing notes.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I just want to say thank you very much while I have the chance.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Provost Sherman, I applaud your goal toward the seven million net on the faculty side, but I have a concern that from what I've heard is that, and I promise one question, by the way. I have a concern that I've heard a whisper number of up to 300 people are planned to retire in the next three years. If we assume that 100 people really do retire by this summer, all of a sudden if you assume that the cost per faculty member would be say, 100,000 with benefits and so forth and so on, you are right there at 10 million more. So your net seven million becomes a deficit of three million, if I am doing my math correctly, for this fall.

And then you add that the next two years, and then I keep hearing these numbers from Kent State that they have about 1200 faculty in their bargaining unit and we have around 700. What I'm concerned about, to get to your goal which I thoroughly support, we have a ways to go, and that we're maybe getting to the goal by increasing workload per faculty which has to have an impact on research and service. So I would ask you to confirm your commitment to what I think your goal is, if I understand it correctly, that we really will work toward having a net increase this fall even when you consider the retirements that you don't know about and won't know until this summer, that we're pretty sure are going to occur.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I think what I'm, if I may

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Or I can clarify if you would like.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, the commitment is to provide the highest quality education to our students, and to do that in an effective, efficient way that values the integrity of the use of in a sense state and student resources. So from that perspective we have to assure that everybody is working at capacity or at expectations on the basis of the perspectives, the principles, the expectations that exist in rule and in practice. And that through the academic program review process intersecting with the effectiveness strategy, that in a sense will bring us to a state of equilibrium with regard to the proportion of full time to part time faculty. The overlay on that, all of the ifs, well, those are all if buts, if thens. If this, then that. If this, then the other thing.

We, every semester, have to and will meet the instructional needs of the students we've admitted to and enrolled at the University of Akron. And I think what you are hearing me say is we'll do that in an effective, efficient, productive way that uses institutional resources with a level of integrity that when we interact with the board and interact with our stakeholders we can assure them that every dollar spent is a dollar spent with a high level of outcome.

I know that didn't answer the question with regard to numbers, but over time, you know, these things change. And who's to say whether previous faculty to student ratios were ever the right ones in the first place?

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: But getting back to your main point before that, this was the foundation of your argument of moving stuff over to the faculty side, we have a very real possibility that in fact it will drift, to use your term, back the other direction even more than it used to be, if my numbers are correct. And I'm pretty confident that they're not that far off.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, I can tell you right now that we're not seeing them in human resources.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Okay. Well, it may be off some, so it could be.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: You are off a lot. As far as we know in human resources, you are off a lot.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It's important that we speak one at a time so that the transcription can be accurate. Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I only have one question I guess, I hope also. This is relating to the issue of summer teaching. And I understand what you were saying, and I'm getting this from everybody who has reiterated it, that you are trying to expand the size of each section as much as you can to the quote, capacity. And I do understand that.

And I'm not the person at the moment who is involved in planning for the summer, but I understand in the summer in general is one issue.

And in the second, we've just been added the second one, and it's the second one that I think makes it more difficult. First of all, one issue also in the summer is trying to find the times that students can take classes. What you are trying to do is to make each one bigger, but the problem is often that you may not have it at the right time. And if there's such a thing that will take all of the students, that's the reason for cutting it down into different sizes and different times. And in the summer that's a particular problem.

But the other one I have a real question about is the change last year to the three weeks at the beginning. Those three week ones you want to have students working, taking classes that are going to add to the completion of their degrees. I think what you mean is not just adding the credit hours but adding major credit hours in their majors; is that right? Or ones that are part of the major gen ed requirement? If so, that three week, I know in our department, and I am not the only one in our college, those three week classes, there's no way that I could teach Principles of Economics in three weeks. You can't do it. It's just not a possible thing. So you can't do those kind. You have to do things like workshops and service learning and all sorts of things like that that add to the credit hours, but you know, are not the kinds of things that you were mentioning earlier. And I think all of us have had problems with that change to that three week and then to five weeks.

It's a real problem. And I don't know if we can deal with it this summer, but I can tell you that I'm not the only one that said that that is a real difficulty and it prevents, I think, doing effectively what you want to do. Because if you have to have each section larger, then you maybe need to have three and five and the time ones go in between periods in the summer to try and deal with it.

I mean, I just think by setting the scheduling in the way that was brought in for the first time last year really makes your second objective more difficult. That maybe is a comment or a question. Can we change it? That's just a

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: With regard to the schedule, it is articulated through the faculty with regard to summer offerings.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: No. The schedule was taken away from the faculty under the governing agreement. Absolutely it's not us.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Is it possible for Rex to address the summer issue question?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If he would like.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Permission to address the senate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Proceed.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: May I ask what the question is?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Can the summer schedule be changed?

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: The three week section plus the five weeks, and the difficulty in that. Is there something that could be done to make that easier? Because you are trying to make the

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe the precise question is what is the process by which the summer schedule is changed.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: That would be a question.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: It was very clear we tried to align our academic and summer calendar with Kent State and the other surrounding institutions because of our joint programs. It was shared with the Akron AAUP Executive Committee as well as with the EC of Faculty Senate, and then it was implemented through the board action. If you want, if you can't teach Principle of Economics in three weeks, then teach it in five.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: We do. But we can't use the three week section.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: There are departments historically that have taught the same class all three five week sessions with 12 students in each section.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I understand your issue on that one, Rex.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: So now we have two five weeks teach Principles of Economics.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: You are trying to get as much, I'm listening to the objectives and goals at least of the provost.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I don't believe I heard the provost say or the memo that's been submitted to the chairs that, it does not say we have to maximize intersession teaching. It says we want to try to maximize the use of our resources across the entire summer. There are some courses we cannot teach in three weeks and everyone knows that. So we would never ask people to propose the teaching of them.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: No, but you can't, the things we can teach in three weeks you've sort of said may not be taken seriously because they may not meet the kind of requirement that you have just added, which is they must be meeting the additions to the major, not just adding credits to the hundred and whatever credits you need, they need to be.

I was trying to get it from the provost, but I think what he's saying the question may be that you would want those that would be more highly relevant to him or to the administration, to have courses that added to the major or added to the gen ed directly than anything that just added to the number of credits that you need to have.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. We want courses to be offered so the students can complete their degree.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: But you need to complete the degree with a number of credits as well.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. The average number of credit hours of an undergraduate bachelor student from this campus when they graduate is 142. And with respect to the boutique courses, there's a certain department, the last time I counted, has 87 300 400 level courses on the books. Okay. We're being very methodical about this, but there are expectations.

And the memo that we sent out this week will be shared with all faculty to see exactly what we discussed face to face with all the chairs and directors. There should be no miscommunication of these issues in my opinion.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Is there any, Senator Speers.

SENATOR SUSAN SPEERS: I understand what we're doing here, like Les Mis, we are looking down, look down. I would like to look up for a second. And you know, Congress had, you know, eight percent at best approval rating and they still, after screaming deficit, deficit, deficit, they gave themselves a raise.

I look in the newspaper and our president has been given a 25,000 dollar bonus. My question is, you know, for accomplishing his goals okay. And so at a time when we are very, should be very sensitive about the money and shouldn't be voting ourselves huge raises or whatever, I wondered if the president

actually gets a raise and a bonus, or is his bonus just his raise? Because I got the impression he got the bonus if our enrollment went up.

And I remember him coming in here in spring or somewhere and just saying, we've got to get enrollment up. And I thought, well, probably for his bonus. I am sorry to be so cynical. But now he gets this 25,000 dollar bonus. And I know you can't speak for the board, but in the paper it says because he accomplished his goals. Is that his pay raise or he gets a pay raise and a bonus?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I guess I will accept the statement that I can't speak for the board.

SENATOR SUSAN SPEERS: You don't have to, but that's a fact.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I can't speak for the board.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe you have just been responded to.

SENATOR SUSAN SPEERS: I just wondered, does he actually get a raise?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think you had your answer. That's the only one you are gonna get today. If it's appropriate for the senate at all, it better be directed to the president when he's here.

SENATOR SUSAN SPEERS: Okay. I was late. Sorry. I have a class. I just don't understand the

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: There are minutes to the actions of the board, so those are public record. I would suggest that would be an option to answer your question, but I cannot speak for the board.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: All right. We need to wrap this up. Is there a senator who has a question who has not already spoken? Senator Schulze.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: I was wondering, I know that, and I think it makes a lot of sense to have the priority to be that we offer classes that lead students to degree completion in the summer to help them graduate more quickly. I think that's a wonderful idea.

Which is the more important priority as we try to plan our summer schedule? The amount of credit hours we bring in, or whether or not the course leads to degree completion? Because we have classes that are not required that bring in more credit hours than classes that are required that are, you know, that bring in fewer. So just to help guide us. I mean, I do have a second question but

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I would say the memo to the deans and department chairs answers that question.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: Which I haven't seen.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Would you care to inform us what the answer is, or is that something

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: It states expectations of credit hour production, provides an allocation of resources for summer instruction. And with regard to how the summer is configured, it's the

collaboration of the department chair with the faculty in consultation with the dean to deliver the summer schedule.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Did you have a second question?

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: I did, if that's okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Hurry, please.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: I'm sorry. Unrelated, the president has really been trying to push us forward in terms of having more online offerings, which is also something, you know, I teach online courses. I think it could be a very good thing.

One concern some faculty have expressed is that if they put their content up in Springboard and offer their class as web based, that it's no longer their intellectual property, that the class and all its content and anything the faculty has developed for the class belongs to the University of Akron.

Is this a legitimate concern or how, what is the policy? I guess I am not aware if there is one on course development and intellectual property.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: May I suggest that that's a question that should be taken up by the ad hoc Online Committee, because I think it falls well within its purview.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: Okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt, you may have 10 seconds.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: One very short question. Here it is. You mentioned the workload rule that we operate under at the University of Akron and mentioned that there has been drift from it. And I would just like to know where to find the rule. Is it the workload article in the collective bargaining agreement or is it some other kind of workload rule?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: There's a rule on the books that specifies workload. It's 3335 47 point whatever.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Permission to speak.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Granted.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: We have a faculty workload rule. Go to the Office of General Counsel website, click on rules and search faculty workload. And I forget the number but there's a rule, okay, and it's very, it has guidelines for, but leaves lots of flexibility depending on disciplinary norms. But there is a faculty workload rule.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think the question has been answered.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: You bet it has.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Sure.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item on the agenda is the Curriculum Review Committee. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Chair Rich. Curriculum Review Committee brings forward for your consideration a list that was previously circulated of curriculum proposals that came to the CRC without objections. This came as a motion, unanimous motion from the members of the Curriculum Review Committee for your consideration.

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

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed, nay. The motion passes without dissent.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Just a short question regarding the curriculum proposal system, the actual computer system that's used to bring these to the attention, it's really a very difficult system to use. And I'm wondering if there's any progress at all on making it more user friendly or scrapping it for something else or what. You know, if you make a mistake and you upload a document, you can never take it off of there. It stays forever. And then as you go through the committees, they say, what the hell is this document that means nothing? And then it gets sent back to you. We've had proposals come back to us five times like this. I'm lodging a complaint.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would remind the senator that his words can be preserved in perpetuity in the transcript.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: (inaudible) crummy, because that's what I think of it.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Chair Rich, I would like to respond. On behalf of the Curriculum Review Committee, I would say we understand there are concerns. The Curriculum Review Committee itself took it upon itself and some members of the senate body are on this committee, to work with the people in the IT area that are responsible for this program.

We did have a meeting where they presented a list of basically complaints that they had received, and we prioritized them as a committee what they should try to work on first, second, third down to number eight on the list of 13 or whatever it was. And so we are making progress.

Unfortunately, I found out yesterday that one of the people that was the primary person that we needed to work on the curriculum system has been assigned to work on the data warehouse project. So some of the work that this person would have done did not get done yet. We haven't lost sight of the fact that it needs done, but that's an update actually I need to give to the Curriculum Review Committee. I learned this yesterday.

So we in all honesty, in deference to the provost's position, and I agree with it, of moving more money to the academic side, what that means is replacing positions on the non academic side is not as quick as it used to be.

So areas like IT have not been able to restaff, so they've had to re task some of their people onto projects that they weren't originally on. So, I hope that answers the question.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Thanks.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item, I should mention that I should have mentioned it earlier when I proposed taking the Distance Learning Review Committee off the agenda, there is a written report which I had overlooked from the Distance Learning Review Committee. It's merely informational. Any action would have to be reported to the Curriculum Review Committee and through the Curriculum Review Committee to us. But you do have in the materials a written report from the Distance Learning Review Committee which I commend to your attention.

The next item on the agenda is the ad hoc Committee on Part time Issues. We have a written report. Is there any oral report?

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: No addition to that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Faculty Research Committee, I know we have a written report. Is there an oral report? No.

CCTC we have a written report. Is there an oral report? No.

Reference Committee. Senator Morath.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: The Reference Committee met on January 29 to discuss some proposed changes to the Faculty Senate bylaws. Those changes, along with a written description of those changes were E mailed to senators on Monday evening. So there are no copies here, but you should have all received the bylaws red lined with a description of the proposed changes in your E mail.

We won't be voting on the proposed changes today as Chair Rich noted. We'll be voting in April on the proposed changes. But today I thought we could go through some of the substantive changes, and they're not highly controversial, but if there were comments about some of the changes, they could be made.

Now, Chair Rich, my idea was to go through the proposed changes one at a time and solicit suggestions that way, as opposed to going through all of the changes and soliciting responses at the end.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think that's a good plan.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Okay. So this is just going through the description of the substantive changes. There were some stylistic changes that were made, but this discussion is just to comment on the substantive changes.

The first change that was made substantively occurs on Page 3 of the red line version of the bylaws that you received. And this change adds language so that when the senate has legislation that goes to the board and needs to be acted on by the board, that the senate will now receive notification as to what has happened with that legislation. So legislation that needs board action we'll get a report on so we'll know if it's been approved, modifications or disapproved. There's currently no mechanism that we hear from, we do hear back from a legislation that requires president action.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We also hear from the president when he has referred legislation from us to the board. The gap is there's no requirement that we ever be informed about what the board's action was.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Okay. The next change substantive change occurs on Page 4 and 5, and this adds language that makes the administrative assistant come under the direction of both the chair of the senate committee and the secretary of the senate. So currently the administrative assistant in the bylaws is sort of monitored by just the secretary. So this adds language that the chair will also be responsible for assigning duties to the administrative assistant.

And part of the history for this is that originally the administrative assistant had a lot of duties that had to do with taking the recordings from senate hearings and transcribing those. And that has been alleviated with the use of a court reporter. So some of that has freed up time. And okay, so that's that proposed change.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any discussion about that?

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: The next change occurs on Page 9, and this eliminates the University Well Being Committee. We've eliminated that committee, and that committee has, for all intents and purposes, has been taken over by the collective bargaining.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That committee has not met in quite some time.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: It's not that it's been taken over by collective bargaining. It's been some other way. It's not a functioning committee.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: It's not a functioning committee, so that committee has just been removed as a standing committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That's the proposal. And if there are reasons to leave it in, this would be in order for members of the body to express those reasons, preferably now, but if not now at least in a subsequent meeting. One of the things that we've been looking at is, you know, given the changes in the role of the faculty senate, what adjustments should be made in the committee structure. And this is one of those questions for discussion by the senate. Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Well, on that issue, it seems to me that it's a good idea to have faculty members involved in issues of well being and health insurance and that sort of thing.

As I understand it, and I was a senator back when it was a functioning committee chaired by Liz. Quite often the idea was that gradually it was ignored and decisions were made without benefit, and then collective bargaining came along, and the idea was that it was an economic issue, and that senate had no business; is that correct?

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Well, wasn't

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If the senator will please direct his remarks to the chair, and the chair will recognize the senators.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: So it seems to me if the body wanted to, it could assert itself over this domain more and maybe ask that the committee stay active and cooperate with both the administration and the collective bargaining agent to get the best health benefits that all the employees could enjoy.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Information that I was given by someone who has been serving on that committee to the extent that there's been any activity by the committee at all has been that what would happen is there would be some discussion of one of those issues, and then an administrator would end up saying, well, this is something we have to take to the collective bargaining process. And the feeling on the part of at least some of the members of the committee that, you know, there was not much that could be accomplished given that that was always the response. Now, I don't mean by that that therefore the committee should be eliminated.

That's a question for the body, but that's sort of the background, Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I would be the first to say that the Well Being Committee, the Well Being Committee was not removed by the board of trustee some years ago when we started on collective bargaining. We ourselves in the senate, you need to look at the chronicle to look at what was in the minutes of what we did at the time, because in the past resolutions on what, how to bring in, when there was collective bargaining, how to bring in the well being issues, because the well being issues involved not just the faculty as a bargaining unit but the other employees of the university, a number of which were not covered by collective bargaining.

And we came up with all sorts of ways, which you can go back and look, and which to a certain extent were carried out, but then not, in form but not in practice. But that was some CFOs ago. And it is, however, meant to be part of the role of the bylaws that were under discussion by University Council included the specifics of the role of the Well Being Committee as part of the objectives when we had them in a detailed form. They are being put in general form, but nobody has said that the role of, I think it's HR and whatever else should not include well being. It is supposed to include well being.

How effective it's going to be as a committee, because it is part of a very large one, instead of having its own one as we ourselves had put it in as a, when we proposed the changes in the bylaws, we proposed bylaws, I don't know. By about, you know, a week or so when we finish the bylaws at

University Council we may find that there is a role for faculty voice. Some of these issues that is not strongly expected in the University Council. But it was meant to be the role of University Council. We're going to see whether that occurs or not.

I think that's why I want to say for sure to take it out, though I thought maybe this time last year because it was meant to be University Council, it's still meant to be. And I don't know how effective that's going to be.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We do have two months before we vote on it, so perhaps we'll learn something in the interim. Is there any other discussion on that point? Next.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Okay. The next change comes on Page 10. It's section F3 and this amendment eliminates the power of a permanent or standing senate committee to appoint ex officio or non voting members. Currently the Executive Committee appoints ex officio members and would continue to do that to the standing committees. And this conforms, this change conforms the bylaws to the senate's practice. And standing committees would still be able to invite whomever they chose to attend their meetings.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: This is sort of a technical question that always seems to come up when we talk about the term ex officio. There seems to be a lot of people maybe around the country who think ex officio automatically means non voting. I've always understood that ex officio is somebody who's automatically part of a body because of their office. So I'm getting confused when you are talking about the senate appointing ex officio members. Are you talking about the senate? And so what I'm asking is a technical, what are you referring to? Can you help me understand this?

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: I used the word ex officio, but in the description of the substantive change it says appoint non voting members. So I apologize for that confusion. So it's, eliminating the power of a standing or permanent committee to appoint non voting members to the, these committees.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The Executive Committee in all of the regards appoints members of senate committees. This simply puts the non voting members in the same position of the voting members.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: But what I heard you say is that the committee, any committee can still invite anyone they want to give them help. They just can't make them a member without the consent of the executive.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: That's correct.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Any more discussion on that? The next amendment comes on Page 10 and 15. These are sections F1 and F13. It's adding a new standing Committee on Part time Faculty Issues. And so there's a description of what this committee would address as well as establishing it as a committee, permanent standing committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This was the recommendation of the ad hoc Committee on Part time Issues which was referred to the Reference Committee. Any discussion on that?

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: The next change comes on Page 15. This is F14. And this has to do with subcommittees. And the standing committee can only abolish those committees it has established. So, the standing committee cannot abolish a subcommittee that was established by the board of trustees. So the standing committee can only abolish those subcommittees that it itself has created.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This is one of those provisions that there was no need for it before, because there used to be no standing subcommittees, and now there are, so we have to fix this so it's consistent with that fact.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: The next change is on Page 21 Section H6 AI. And this changes the date by which general elections should be complete from May first to March 15. And we've made the date earlier in the semester so that there's enough time before the end of the school year to have election results tallied and appointments to be made and all of that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The bylaws require the Executive Committee to make committee appointments in May. To my knowledge we have never met that deadline. This, I hope, will give us a chance to do that.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Okay. The next amendment is section I2 on Page 23. And this is the change that Chair Rich earlier discussed about shortening the days between a proposed amendment and the vote that actually occurs on the amendment from 30 days to 27 days. So we would, if this change was already in the bylaws, we would be voting next time we met on these proposed changes. But we can't, because not enough days have elapsed.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This would accomplish what I think the drafters meant to accomplish in the first place but failed.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Okay. K, this is on Page 25 of the bylaws, and this amendment makes it permissible but not mandatory for the chair to appoint a parliamentarian. So right now it's required, but our chair has currently served as a parliamentarian before, so now it's at the discretion, I guess, of the chair to decide whether or not a parliamentarian would be necessary. Okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This too would bring the bylaws into line with our actual practices.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: And it clarifies that we're using the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order and not the out of print original version.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Per Senator Carlisle.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Okay. And then the following at the end of this description here, there's a couple of changes that at first blush seem substantive but are not. I just wanted to bring those to your attention. They're stylistic.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There's a reference to a financial aid committee as if it existed.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: There's no financial aid committee. That's deleted. That language has been deleted. The other, there's unnecessary language that has been deleted from Page H5E that just, if you can't attend a meeting you can't attend a meeting. You don't need some sort of explanation there.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It's not quite that. It's not that if you are unable to attend a meeting, but if you are unable to regularly attend meetings then the senate can declare the seat vacant. And currently it specifies the reasons for the inability, and of course it doesn't name them all, but if you are unable to regularly attend meetings the seat should become vacant whether it's because you have pressing personal business or frivolous personal business.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: And then the last change is H6D on Page 23, and the student government body at the law school is known as the Student Bar Association not the student, not the law student council. So that just corrects that language there.

So if you have any other suggestions as you are reading through the changes, feel free to E mail me, and I guess we can bring those concerns up at the next meeting.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you.

SENATOR SARAH MORATH: Or in two meetings when we vote on it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The next item of business is the report of the University Libraries Committee. We have a written report. Is there an oral report? Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: I just wanted to please ask, well, I wanted to ask the senators to please help the university libraries with their four year survey. We are going to be sending out via E mail a survey to 100 faculty members, 1200 staff and contract professionals, 1200 undergrads and 1200 graduate students.

We do this about every four years. The survey is a LibQUAL survey that was created by the Association for Research in College Libraries. It gauges the library's performance or opinion on library's performance in terms of collections, services, and libraries place. It's about a 10 to 13 minute survey.

Please, please participate in the survey, encourage your colleagues to please encourage your students to fill it out. I hear there will be prizes, since we don't have them in hand, for those who fill out the survey.

This is the main tool that the libraries use to plan, to do their strategic planning, to plan ahead how money will be spent and the direction that the libraries will go. So if you think about, if you like our renovation of the first floor, that was a result of opinions gathered at the last library survey.

This will be submitted, or it will be sent out on February 25th and run until March 22, so please, please participate and please encourage your students and colleagues to participate as well. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We have a written report from the ad hoc Online Subcommittee. Is there an oral report?

And then we have the Faculty Senate representatives to University Council. Is there a report from any or all of them? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I've always been interested in founding documents for you know, for faculty roles because I think it helps people who are unfamiliar with it to begin to get a feel for how things are going, but I'm starting to get tired of bylaws and bylaws changes finally.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So we have accomplished something.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: We are in the process, well, we'll see. It sometimes is rejuvenating to see sometimes how people think they can improve things.

The next meeting of the University Council is, we hope, gonna be the one in which the bylaws that we've been working on for some time, Senator Erickson, Councilor Erickson was the chair of the ad hoc committee that actually prepared them this past summer and we will have, we hope by the end of the next meeting, those in a form in which they can be sent on to the president. And the president can then either send them on to the board or he can send it back. There's a process that we have in that regard.

So if you haven't looked at the bylaws, they should be available, I believe, through the University Council website. So you should be able to see them. Now, the members of the University Council right now are Senator Witt, Senator Erickson and myself who are representatives of the faculty senate itself. There are others who are members of the University Council because of their roles as chairs of committees or co chairs of committees. So there are some representatives there.

One of the amendments that was made and passed at the last meeting was to eliminate the Research Committee from the University Council, so that there would be a single Research Committee that would emanate from the senate. So you should be aware of that. If that continues to be upheld, then that is, that's an important change.

There is, there have also been some, and I think it's been alluded to by our chair and also others, some ideas about overlapping roles of committees. One of course, is the Research Committee. It appears that that may no longer be overlapping if there's not one on the University Council.

The other would be the Athletics and Recreation Committee and the Athletics Committee of the Faculty Senate. There will be and has been some interaction between the chairs of those bodies over the last month or so that may bring forward recommendations in the future. And there's also been some discussion about not having more than one student affairs committee.

So these are more in the nature of explorations than they are of discrete initiatives, but you should be aware of them.

The other thing that probably would be good for folks to bear in mind is that as the University Council become a little bit more in tune in the process, I'm beginning to hear from more and more people saying, why do we have University Council and a Faculty Senate? Shouldn't we have just one body? And that is something you should be aware of. Because that would just sort of put the final nail in the coffin of faculty governance, I believe, if something like that were to occur.

But I do also want you to know that I think our next meeting will be after the HLC visit, after we have completed the task of the University Council and the bylaws, and we see what the president has to say about it. I hope to be able to report to this body my sort of conclusions about the nature of the effort on shared governance that we've been going through for the past 10 years and to what extent we hope to set out to achieve.

The other thing that's gonna happen is that there will be a specific report from the talented development human resource folks who created the Power Point presentation that Senator Witt just referred to on an E mail message today, and the subsequent of that is to have a brief presentation of what has been available to folks since November with the opportunity for a discussion.

So please either send on your questions or comments or concerns to Senator Witt or one of the rest of us and make sure that you have anything specific that you would like to us bring up as your representatives of this body with regard to that particular report. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Next item is new business. I think there's a 5:00 class in here, so we need to wrap this up. Are there any items of new business? Anything for the good of the order?

SENATOR GARY SCHULLER: I was wondering if hearing the bylaws changes earlier that were read off, does that mean we can make a motion to shorten February to 27 days?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That would be for the good of the order. Anything else for the good of the order? Is there a motion to adjourn? Moved by Senator Hajjafar. Seconded by Lazar. All in favor signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

(Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:55 p.m.)