

University of Akron

Faculty Senate Meeting

April 4, 2013 3:00 5:08 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We're awaiting one more person to make a quorum. Okay. The meeting is called to order now that we have a quorum. The first item is the approval of the agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda? Moved by Senator Hajjafar, seconded by Senator Raber. Are there any additions to the agenda? Hearing none, all those in favor of approving the agenda, please say aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

The second item is the adoption of the minutes from the March meeting. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes? Senator Hajjafar, and seconded by Senator Raber. Are there any corrections to the minutes? All those in favor of adopting the minutes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The minutes are adopted. Next item is the remarks of the chairman. We have some, I think, fairly important items on our agenda today, so I will keep my remarks brief. The items I'm thinking of include the admissions policy changes that are being proposed by the Academic Policies Committee, the interim grade reporting requirement again being reported out by Academic Policies, and the amendments to the Faculty Senate bylaws that are unfinished business having been reported out by the Reference Committee two meetings ago.

But I do want to say a few things. First concerns the budget cuts that are now in the process of being made. I think it's important that when these cuts are made that they be done in a way that minimizes the adverse impact on the academic programs of the university, and especially that we avoid doing lasting damage to academic programs.

The core mission of this university is to educate students and to advance knowledge. And it's the faculty that perform these functions. Students may be attracted to the University of Akron by it's amenities, but ultimately the reason they come to and pay tuition is to be educated, which is to say they come here for the faculty. And I think we need to keep this in mind when we make the necessary adjustments in light of the current budget situation.

The other item I wanted to address briefly is the issue of faculty workloads, teaching loads in particular.

I wanted to emphasize something that I wrote in an E mail that went to the E mail discussion list for the senate, and that is that there is a university regulation concerning faculty workloads. It provides specific mechanism for determining faculty workloads. It is in my view, quite a sensible one. It's

actually a rather good policy. Under this policy, each department is supposed to have its own faculty workload policy. That faculty workload policy must of course be consistent with the university's policy, but it is of course more specific. It's supposed to be, take into consideration the mission of the department, the degrees it offers and so forth, and disciplinary norms. And it is the departmental workload policy that is supposed to govern the determination of each individual faculty member's teaching load.

I am informed that not all departments have such policies, or at least that there are departments that are not aware that they have such policies, and that others have them, and in some instances they're not being applied.

The decisions being made are not consistent with those policies. Unless and until it's changed by the board of trustees this policy needs to be carried out, and that means that those departments that don't have workload policies, faculty workload policies or think they don't have them, they can't find them and their lost in the mists of time, need to develop them.

And those departmental, those departments that have such policies need to be applying them, and administrators up the line need to be applying them, unless it's determined that there's something wrong with the policy, that it doesn't comply with the university regulation, in which case the appropriate remedy is to send the policy back to the faculty of the department and ask that the policy be corrected so that it's in compliance. But that is the policy that is supposed to determine individual faculty teaching loads. This concludes my remarks.

The next item on the agenda is, the president is not with us, so there will be no remarks of the president. The next item is the remarks of the provost. Oh, I skipped the executive. That's all right. Come on. We'll come back to it.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: No, go ahead.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you. Good afternoon, guests and senators. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee held four meetings since our last gathering on March 7. Three main topics dominated these discussions: Faculty workload, university budget deficit, and the status of the dean searches.

Executive Committee met on March 14 to review and discuss the faculty workload policy. Upon review of University Rule 3359 20 03.2 the Executive Committee feels that it is a good policy, but that the policy needs to be carried out consistently across campus. The rule states university faculty workload policy is designed to give direction to colleges and individual units in creating their own workload policies.

Many differences exist between colleges and departments of this university, and these differences preclude the possibility that a single set of percentages or figures can be rigidly applied to all; therefore, the emphasis given to each activity will depend on the mission of that individual unit.

The rule allows individual units to craft an appropriate workload policy contingent upon the unique disciplinary qualities of the unit. But it has come to our attention that few departments have active workload policies. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee urges faculty to dialogue with their department chairs and to either create a unit policy or review and align current unit policies with the university rule. Of course, the unit faculty must vote on and approve of the unit workload policy before enacted.

Executive Committee next met on March 21st and continued discussions on faculty workload, deficit, and the dean searches. There are currently five units with interim leadership. The Executive Committee is concerned that longstanding interim leadership can ultimately mar the integrity and reputation of the units. We urge the formation of search committees as soon as possible to take advantage of the academic calendar and the critical mass of potential candidates. This is particularly urgent for the School of Law and the College of Education.

The Executive Committee next met over spring break on March 28th to prepare the agenda for today's meeting and for regular senate business.

The Executive Committee met with the president, the provost and the vice provost on April second. At this meeting we discussed how the budget deficit might damage plans to increase full time tenure track faculty in light of the faculty retiring and attrition this summer.

The provost responded that the damage assessment is hard to estimate until the deans return their budget proposal next week.

Senators, thank you very much for your service to the senate and the university, and this concludes my report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions of the secretary concerning the report of the Executive Committee? Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Do we have a date as to when those dean budget reports are due?

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: I believe that the Council of Deans meeting is next week, I believe.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I don't think we can reliably provide that information, but we just heard, that's the secretary's answer. Any other questions? If not, the next item of business is the remarks of the provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Rich. And good afternoon, everybody. I apologize, I will have to leave after I make a few remarks to go over and welcome our guests to an ethics symposium over in the School of Law created by one of our faculty colleagues. I will come back, because I'd like to hear the discussion that will be related to changing the rules associated with the admissions requirements to the University of Akron.

As you know, the Academic Policies Committee has been reviewing our admissions criteria in the context of our pathways for student academic success strategy, and I think we all agree and understand it's not only an academic excellence strategy, but it's also a strategy that provides accountability for the success of our students given their level of preparation. So there's always a path to the University of Akron, but for some students we may not be their first step. So I will look forward to hearing that discussion.

Certainly this time of year is filled with celebrations as most semesters are, but during the spring quarter there's a large number of recognition activities of faculty, staff and students. It's a great time of the year to celebrate the successes of the institution, which have been significant, and will continue to be such, and I look forward to the opportunity to greet you and congratulate you and your students in those venues.

We recently learned that one of our engineering students was named the Goldwater Scholar, the first such designation for one of our students since I believe about 2008. So we'll also look forward to faculty success and stimulating that sort of additional student success, because I know there was a faculty group that worked very closely with a number of students as they submitted for those prestigious recognitions.

I wanted to take a minute to thank the faculty and the staff with regard to activities that support the academic success of our veterans. We have a great veterans office. We're known as veteran friendly. The faculty have done a lot of work to evaluate and recognize the educational opportunities that our veterans have while they serve in the armed forces, and that makes it much easier for our veterans at the University of Akron to understand what their program of study is.

We're looking forward to several deans interacting again with faculty in that regard to evaluate some very specific categories of rank and training to better align potentially that education our veterans receive with any course credit designations that might be appropriate, obviously you know, assuring academic integrity because these decisions are made by, appropriately so, the faculty.

You are probably aware of, and I'd like to thank again those individuals who have been involved in this, that the academic program curriculum guides have all been updated, revised, synchronized appropriately with the actions of faculty senate over the years as reflected in the DARS system. So once we activated a different part of the DARS system, one can imagine that we'll be able to much more accurately and with a greater degree of strategy, know what courses we need to offer when, to what, in what stage of their degree program. That certainly will improve the effectiveness and the efficiency, timeliness of degree completion, and certainly help with earlier scheduling of classes for student registration.

As you know, we meet every month on the last Tuesday of the month with the deans. And that happened to be spring break, so we rescheduled and met this past Tuesday. We will continue as we have in the past to not only distribute the briefing document that we prepare from the Council of Deans meeting directly to the faculty, as well as you would expect to the deans and department chairs and school directors. That was guidance and suggestion from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee,

and I think that was a great idea and certainly assures that, you know, every faculty member is in the know with regard to the topics discussed in the Council of Deans meetings.

In particular at the Council of Deans meeting, we discussed several topics that are clearly of interest to the institution, one being part time faculty. As you know, the Affordable Care Act produces circumstances that at certain levels of work, require health care coverage. You are also aware of the fact that with the budget gap we have not included in our budget planning additional health care costs that might be related to covering part time faculty with health care coverage. So as we worked with the departments related to optimizing faculty activity, we'll also be working with departments to manage the part time activity so as to not unnecessarily burden the institution with unplanned for and further costly health care coverage.

Certainly, aspects of this topic will change somewhat over time as the IRS regulations become clearer, and institutions through their general counsel and human resources departments continue to assess the meaning for everybody in responding to the Affordable Care Act.

With regard to the budget, we provided the deans a framework around which to consider reductions based upon the budget deficit or the gap as we've discussed in our budget forms to the point that was made earlier by Chair Rich. As has been the case in the past, we will undertake differential reductions between academic and academic support units, you know, to the protection of the academic units. So there will be a difference between the two.

In that regard, within the academic units, while we might use formulas to predict or calculate what adjustments for colleges should be, we'll also inform the decisions about the reduction targets by considering the strategic direction of the institution with regard to executing Vision 2020.

The budget deficit discussion also occurred today with the vice presidents and they were provided their target numbers. We intend to meet with the deans actually beginning tomorrow and through next week to discuss strategies to reach those targeted reductions.

The CFO and a small committee will meet with the vice presidents to review the strategies of the vice presidents, to respond to those reductions, and that will constitute the first step in planning for a balanced fiscal year 14 budget.

As the president has said many times and as I'm sure would echo were he here today, clearly, you know, our opportunities remain ahead of us. Our effectiveness, efficiency and productivity initiatives to, you know, reduce costs where appropriate, gain efficiencies and productivity where necessary will only go so far. Our revenue generation strategies will be those if executed in an informed way.

But more often than not, you know, we'll take time to gain momentum to generate revenue. So as everybody has been stepping up in the past and this year in particular and more recently with the overwhelming number of students we've had at student orientations, we can only project that the point that was made by the chair, the opportunities come because of the faculty, is certainly being made because of the strong presence of faculty and vice presidents and others at these orientation sessions.

So I'm quite confident that the presence of faculty, you know, will have a positive effect on the outcome of the larger number of students who are attending our orientation.

Of course you know we all have responsibility for the whole continuum of the Akron experience, you know, from attraction to matriculation to retention to persistence to completion to job placement, and clearly that Akron experience will support that cycle of excellence, that cycle of the Akron experience, because our alumni then will certainly interact with many individuals about the excellent experience they had at the University of Akron and will benefit so much more by their significant involvement because of their Akron experience, because of the Akron experience you provide them.

So with that Mr. Chair, that concludes my remarks.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there questions for the provost? Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I have a comment or a question for both the chair and the provost if you will entertain those. I'm happy to know that the Executive Committee of the senate has read and thoroughly understood the university rule relating to workload. I can say that I don't take much comfort in your analysis, however.

While we have the rule and everyone who's concerned about it has read the rule that I know of, we, there have been at least two waves of teaching load increases, in arts and sciences anyway. I don't know about the rest of the university. And that's with the rule in place. And I'm not sure where the faculty voice has been in assessing those faculty in an individualized and complex formulaic kind of way.

The faculty I've talked to don't know why they've had their increases, have their teaching load increased quite frankly and the conversation, I'm sorry, the discussions that you had about workload related to departmental mission seems to have escaped the analysis as far as I understand it.

I'm not sure why we haven't had faculty input into assessing our teaching capacity as we have with everything else, retention, tenure, promotion and those other kinds of documents. This has sort of been sprung on people over the last couple of months. So any comments you have about that, I would appreciate it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me speak to the part of the question that I think was directed to the chair, and I think this was your, you may have misunderstood the import of my remarks. The import of my remarks is that there is a regulation that specifies a process that hasn't been followed, so I think your critique of my analysis of the regulation is misplaced. Mr. Provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yeah, with regard to faculty workload, you know, clearly important institutional issue. Recently the AAUP has filed a grievance with regard to faculty workload. And where I can comment now is that we'll have to follow the process associated with that grievance process to reconcile the faculty workload issue.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, I would add then that while it's true that the grievance process has to play out, the requirement in the collective bargaining agreement has to do merely with consultation of

the AAUP chapter if changes to workload policy are being made. That should play out. But there is a regulation currently in place that calls for certain things to be done, certain ways of determining faculty workload, and whatever is occurring in the grievance process, it does not in any way release the administration from its responsibilities to comply with that board of trustees rule insofar as what's happening here is purportedly carrying out of that policy.

It needs to be fully carried out. And that means that the determinations of individual faculty teaching loads are to be governed by departmental policies. Those departmental policies are to be made by the faculties of those departments. And no matter what occurs in the agreement process, that's the rule. And unless and until it's changed, that is what's supposed to happen.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Point taken.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions?

Former senator Bouchard seeks permission of the body to speak. I'm going to ask you to vote on this. All those in favor of permitting former senator Bouchard to speak, please say aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. You have the floor.

DR. CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: My question is for you, Mike. You will probably assume I will ask about more faculty, because that's usually what I've talked about, but it's not, because we've given up. What I want to ask about is workload. This relates to points made by Chairman Rich and Senator Witt, because I'm not sure that you realize how this seems to the faculty at large, which is why I decided to come to the forum and talk about this.

What it looks like to the faculty as a whole, it both looks like insulting and like gross mismanagement. I don't want to be insulting myself, but that's what it looks like. It's insulting because it started with the assumption of the faculty was not working to capacity. Which, I mean, we're strained like sons of guns. I have been here almost 25 years and we've been doing more with less every single year. The fact that we can barely get a quorum for the senate means faculty are way overstretched. I had to cut my class early so I could come racing down the hill to the meeting.

Occasionally there's a faculty member who is sliding, but that should be the responsibility of the chair. And what worries me is your office is disregarding chairs who should be the ones to see a colleague and say you know, perhaps you need to up your research activity or take on another class or two. And instead what we're getting is what I've heard described as micromanagement on parade, which I'm sorry to be insulting here, but I just want to tell you what the faculty are thinking.

So for example, I'll just tell you what's been happening in arts and sciences. The deans made a list of every faculty member and then, you know, went down the list. Every faculty member had what I think was a student assistant go through their vitae and add up their recent publications to see were they a research scholar, clearly not paying attention to departments or disciplinary norms or anything.

So for example in our department in history, the student assistant, poor thing, I don't know who it is, said like, this person had four book reviews one page each, four publications. Good. This next person, which would be me, had one book, 400 pages, published by major academic press. One publication. Hmm, kind of a question mark. This kind of data, which is what we were then presented with by the dean's office with your office's direction, said okay, these faculty members are not pulling their weight.

We actually beat this back. And as of a month ago, I thought our department, I'm associate chair, figured okay, they want a little bit more teaching. Those of us who are teaching a small class can pick up a bonus class, which we did. I, for example, am teaching a small graduate class that's required of all of our students on top of regular load. A colleague has been teaching it for the last three years. This is fine. Then as of Monday we get this directive, every single person is going to have to pick up an extra class because you are not doing enough training graduate students. And again, I'm sure it was the student assistant, whoever this poor person is who I'm maligning, went through making a list of Ph.D. dissertations or MA theses we were supervising. I'm doing six or seven, but that didn't matter.

What was even more so is outside of disciplinary norms is that it was completely ignored all nine other things we're doing for graduate training. You've got to get them ready for the comprehensive exams, multiple field, you have everybody on the committee. A lot of masters students do the non thesis options. They apparently don't count. I was told that I was gonna teach four and four, which I found insulting as a distinguished professor with multiple students.

We beat this off. Interestingly, this came from your office. It said, oops, remember I said Monday everybody has to pick up another course? We didn't mean it.

This is what I mean by mismanagement. There are things going on. I'm trying to show you how the faculty is perceiving this. It's especially problematic because registration has already started. Who knows who's teaching what course?

It doesn't even save money. Let's do a quick mental exercise here. If you have 600 regular faculty is what we've got, each, if each one of us say picked up a gen ed two hour course easing the old part timers out the door, we would ease out the less experienced ones, the recent hires, the ones who cost us even less. Say \$1,000 an hour. We would save \$2,000 per faculty member for 600 faculty members, \$1.2 million. To save \$1.2 million is it worth alienating the faculty? I'm not quite sure, especially since the alienated faculty then go out the door themselves.

If you had only two faculty in say chemistry who were totally peeved and leave, it would cost \$600,000 each in startup funds to hire a new one, which wipes out your 1.2 million. Or if you didn't make all 600 faculty pick up an extra course, we're talking maybe half a million dollars in savings. If we can spend \$6 million to put a new kitchen in the stadium, I think we can afford a few hundred thousand dollars not to alienate the faculty.

I'm sorry if I seem insulting, but I want you to know how it looks to a rather irritated faculty who's worried. When the accreditors HLC was here, we heard a lot of happy talk about shared governance. And when they're out the door, that's not happening. Thank you for listening.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Do you wish to respond?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yeah. I'll make a few comments. First off, the intention is not to insult the faculty. The intention is, as we've said before in communications related to the briefings from the deans meetings, the intent is to assure we've optimized workloads. So that word has been used. And we've also articulated that we're expecting some work will go up, some work will stay the same, some work will go down.

I think with regard to the approach that we've asked to be taken at the department and college level, that's quite clearly outlined in those previous briefs from the Council of Deans. So I will assuredly encourage the colleges and the departments to follow, to review and follow those recommendations.

And again, you know, as a faculty member, I value the work of every single faculty member on this campus and I think the intent is to assure that according to the departmental documents there's a rationale for the load that's assigned.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: First off, I want to preface my remarks by saying that I have been trying resist a little bit of schadenfreude of hearing people complain about being told they have to teach four four when that's been a consistent expectation for those of us in the College of Education or at least me and others. Regardless of the fact that I have three international presentations and have been extensively involved in service in other activities that's been received, so I'm glad that finally other faculty are beginning to take an interest. And I'm sorry it took their ox to be gored. I'm sorry that we had to arrive at this kind of a mini crisis, I don't think it's a major crisis, we'll see, for this discussion to occur.

I've heard a lot of talk about the importance of students. I've heard a lot of talk about shared governance. I've heard a lot of talk about other things. I've heard promises over the past couple of years. I've heard other people who I trust telling me about promises, and I believe that we're heading unfortunately toward an increasing level of mistrust between faculty and the staff and the administration that is regrettable, and that I hope we will think about before we go too much further and try to begin to find a way to resolve that widening gulf, to see if we can find a way to get back to a process where there is more trust, there is more working together.

In order to do that, I think that if we are thinking in terms of the best future for the University of Akron, and many of us have been here for a long time, we want the University of Akron to succeed. We're here. We want the University of Akron to succeed. We have had some experience in that. We can offer some help. We have not only approved the Faculty Senate, but there's a University Council that I and others have been striving hard to make relevant over the past year or so. Again, hearing promise after promise and having few if any really measurable kinds of outcomes that again is unfortunate. I believe everybody has been entering into these things in good faith, but I think we've gotten ourselves into a bit of a mess, and this particular issue on workload is one of them.

I found out that the workload policy that we have has been used in the College of Education was created in 1997. It says, it's not available anywhere on line. It was one that when I went and talked to our dean, our former dean a couple of years ago in regard to my own workload policy, he told me you know, it was private, but he told me privately that it didn't exist.

And now I'm being told that it does exist. I'm being told that it's a college policy. On its face, on its face it would be almost impossible to meet the rule that the board of trustees at the University of Akron has in place, which Chair Rich has been referring to.

Now, that rule has been in place since 2007. So if it were something just a couple months old, maybe we could understand that there would be some confusion and we would have to have some time. That rule has been in place for that long. And the concerns that I've heard expressed and the kinds of concerns that I'm expressing now about the direction we're going in are, I believe, due to the fact that people have been ignoring those things.

We have a process in place. We have some organizations that are supposed to be helpful in terms of shared governance and so what do we find? What we've heard today, we also find out that at the budget committee meeting a few weeks ago there are 13 committees that have been formed in some way, shape or form to work on some of the budgetary and other issues.

At the University Council Steering Committee meeting yesterday we received a request from SEAC, the Staff Employee Advisory Committee, to ask if they could officially get the names of the committees, the names of the chairs of the committees and the names of the members of the committees. So we've made that request. We did find that one or two people received a memo with the names of the committees and the chairs. So now we have the names of the council, Faculty Senate and 13 committees of some sort or another.

And again, I can't help but be reminded of things like, I just sort of occurred to me, remember the dean in Animal House the double secret probation? We have double secret committees, it appears.

So I want to offer this, this commentary in the light of having worked very hard as many people over the past 10 years or longer, of having been a member of the Faculty Senate back in the day when we were able to help create and pass policies such as a conflict of interest policy that we still have, in which we were a valued and important part of this, this whole process, and I want to let you know that this is a situation that I believe in the long run is gonna be untenable.

So I would ask that we continue to try to find a way this time with some real substance to it to begin to move forward to do better in these kinds of areas.

One area would be what do we do immediately about faculty load? How do we deal with that and how do we get this done? We have some examples here of what some of the issues are. How do we go about getting it resolved? How can we do it this week, next week, be actively involved in getting it taken care of so that we can begin to move forward rather than to spend all our time wrangling over procedure and also trying to figure out what is the opaque process that's going on?

I think we want to be involved. We have offered that many times and I would hope that we can begin to move in that direction again. I do believe, finally, that ultimately that's gonna be up to the administration and the board of trustees to determine.

One more comment I have. I have said for some time that the jury has been out on whether or not the University Council could be viewed as a substantive body or a ceremonial body, and I think for a variety of reasons I've outlined to the provost we're virtually ceremonial. Our secretary just resigned today as a member of University Council, SEAC, and of the Steering Committee because she doesn't have time to take away from her current job to do this work. And that represents to me a very deep loss, because Nancy has been very active and helpful in this process, and people of her caliber and others are bailing out. And I think we're facing some serious problems.

So I urge all of us to think about that and to try to figure out ways in which we can deal with a larger issue, but also the immediate issue is effective ways that will help to rebuild that trust. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Do you wish to respond?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: My response is the intention and the purpose is to create a relationship that moves the institution forward, assure student academic success, completion, support faculty in their teaching, research and scholarship, connect those activities to the community, for the community good, and to assure that, you know, the community benefits from the service of the faculty and the staff, and the relevant learning that those opportunities provide for our students. I think the goals and objectives that were collectively created for Vision 2020 are really the focus of the institution, and that is the perspective from which, you know, we think about supporting, the success of the students, the faculty and the staff, everything.

I have to get to the next meeting, but I'll be back.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. It would be impossible now to direct questions to the provost, so we will proceed with the rest of the agenda. Other remarks can of course be made under the good of the order toward the end of the meeting.

The next item on the agenda is the report of the Academic Policies Committee. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Academic Policies Committee brings for your consideration two proposed rule changes unanimously recommended for your approval. The first is rule 3359 20 05.1 Grading System, Academic Probation and Dismissal.

Hopefully you had a chance to look at this in advance of this meeting. As indicated by the chair, we would ask for your approval today, but if you do have suggested changes to these proposed rules, we would like to hear them today so that the committee can reflect on those and hopefully bring back a final version at the May senate meeting.

This, these changes are primarily obviously on just the first page of the rule B1 reporting grades, replacing the old language on midterm grades with new language on satisfactory performance

indicators that would be applied to students by their faculty in the fifth week of the semester in the lower level courses 100 and 200 level. The intention is to give earlier warning to students who faculty believe are not performing to their satisfaction early enough to enable hopefully students to correct their behavior in whatever way is necessary, directing them to meet with the faculty and/or their advisor, and also to try to limit the burden on faculty in the sense of having to provide actual grades.

Satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance indicator would be enough to alert students that the faculty at that time feel have an issue in the class, and hopefully they'll then correct their behavior. So I'd be happy to answer any questions I can from the committee's perspective on this suggested change.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: In terms of just the wording, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, are you saying that could, that's a vague term. At least I'm, it sounds a vague term. Do you mean F is unsatisfactory and everything less than an F is satisfactory or is there another measure of it? And if so, what is it?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: My answer is no. We deliberately used that language on purpose to not require faculty to calculate a grade, because in some cases in some disciplines faculty may not even have graded assignments yet returned to their students. This is an indication from the faculty as the faculty, as the instructor of record, to the students that they feel these students are performing satisfactory or unsatisfactory. It can include grades. That's a decision of the faculty member.

It can also include classroom attendance. Classroom participation. The intangible things that some faculty may see, behaviors in a student that a student may show up for class but sleep every class period. Is that satisfactory or not? That's really up to the faculty to decide. This is not something that goes on a transcript. It does not exist after the window is closed and the student's been notified. Final grades get reported as always have. The intention is to give the faculty an opportunity to give students a fair warning, for the students to receive said fair warning, but to attempt to not burden the faculty with having to calculate a grade at the fifth week.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If I may add, which I am not sure you mentioned it, that the notice that is sent to the student urges the student to see the faculty member and/or an academic advisor getting advice about what to do in response to the warning. Senator Erickson, do you wish to follow up quickly?

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Yeah. It would seem to me that students would then therefore require that in our syllabi we write a rubric of what on earth satisfactory and unsatisfactory is; is that correct? I mean, otherwise it becomes purely a subjective judgment on the day by the faculty member. As somebody who will be doing it, I'm just trying to get some feel for what I, and from the point of view of the student as well.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: In my opinion, this gives each faculty member the chance in their own way to give students fair warning whether they feel in essence that the student is having unsatisfactory performance. But everyone needs to get one or the other in the context of the faculty

member's professional opinion and judgment in the classroom, that semester that these students are performing and these students are not to the faculty member's satisfaction.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Follow up question would be did APC consider the notion that they would be at least recommending that faculty members wrote something in their syllabi about what that might involve? I am sorry.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: That was not discussed to my knowledge.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: But I think the background was that this is an indication of satisfactory or unsatisfactory completion toward progress, toward completion of the work of the course. The syllabus presumably is going to inform the student what is required for successful completion of the course. This is an intervention by the faculty member saying at a certain point, look, I'm worried. You don't seem to be on track given what the expectations are for this course. Please come see me, see an academic advisor. I think that was the thinking of the committee. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Mr. Chairman, I'm thinking about some of the questions I might get from the college faculty when I would announce at the College Council meeting that this had been done. And I am sure people would say, what does it mean? How do you do it?

And a couple of questions based on this language occurred to me. It says in B1 by the end of the fifth week of classes. Do you mean at the end, or during the fifth week, or could somebody do it on the first week of classes? I'm not asking for an answer. That's the kind of thing that could be unclear in the minds of people. Normally I would think at the end of the fifth week, but again, it's open for interpretation.

Then it says faculty members will assign you know, who are, who are teaching these courses will assign satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance indicators. And you've explained that that could be any one of a number of things. Then it goes on to say such indicators, I assume the ones that the faculty decide will be assigned in the system used by the university registrar, so I'm starting to wonder if somebody asks me how do I do this, do I say you will just have to say at the end of five weeks whether or not somebody is satisfactory or unsatisfactory in your class, which will then generate something that tells them to come and see you or will you have to define what you mean by that? And then that also becomes part of the record of the registrar?

I am just confused, and I know faculty in good faith will be saying what should I do, might be confused by the language. I am in favor of having some way in which there would be this general way to address the issue. I just think there are some mechanics that could be confusing to the people who are going to have to carry it out.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: In response I would say that I do agree that many of the rules we have on this campus the language used can be confusing. I think the way to handle this and how it will be handled if implemented is the registrar will send out instructions like they do for how to log final grades at the end of the semester, how to use the system, what the window is. By the end of the fifth week the implication is that the window of opportunity to put these indicators in will be not one day

but some finite time so that faculty have some time during the week of the fifth week to put these in, and then the window will close eventually.

Students will know the time frame about which they should be receiving these grades, but we don't have those specific details worked out. But that's what the language allows for, is for the registrar to come up with a plan with input from people who need to use the system as to how we're going to roll this out. That kind of detail should not exist in a rule, in my opinion.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I wish to add something, and that is that the indicator referred to there is simply the satisfactory, unsatisfactory. That's all.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: That's where

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Click U or S.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: From seeing this it says satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance indicators. So the intention is that the indicator will be satisfactory or unsatisfactory only, and that that will then generate through the registrar's office a message to the student that says talk to the faculty member.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And/or academic advisor.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I don't see anything wrong with this. I think it's a great idea. I don't think there's any such thing as a perfect rule that would solve everybody's concerns. I like the idea that we have an opportunity to officially ask students to come talk to us. We could do that in class any time I suppose, but this carries a little more weight.

I can see a student who ultimately failed my class, you said I was satisfactory when this came along. How could this happen? We'll have another conversation, there will be tears, there always are, but I don't see a problem with this. I might want to tell someone they're unsatisfactory just because I could tell them they could be doing a lot better. I would have the prerogative to do this until I was found out, and then no one ever looks at it anyway until that graduate, that student assistant looks to see if I have been teaching 123 credits a semester or not, but not how well I'm doing it, just that I'm doing it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions about the policy? Senator Schuller.

SENATOR GARY SCHULLER: When would this be implemented or would it depend on the registrar building that into the system?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I believe the implementation will depend on what work has to be done behind the scenes to make this happen. I believe this could be implemented for fall of '13 unless there's something serious in the system that we're not aware of, but the registrar is a member of the Academic Policies Committee, and I believe this is something that could be done with plenty of notice

for people to know this is going to happen before the fall semester, so they would be prepared by the middle of week five to do it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator Matejkovic.

SENATOR JOHN MATEJKOVIC: I agree this seems to be a very, very good idea. Perhaps to alleviate some of the concerns may I offer a friendly suggestion that maybe we add language to that section indicating that the indicator is not meant to be a predictor of any final grade nor is it part of any final grade evaluation, it's just an indicator making sure there's not somebody saying, you told me I was doing satisfactory and now I'm getting an F, or something like that? Just a thought.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Wouldn't the same issue arise if you give somebody a midterm grade, if you give somebody a B and, because they've earned it, and then they fail the final exam or something like that, the student with equal cogency, which is to say very little at all, could come back and say, but you said by virtue of giving me a B on my exam that I was doing well. How could I have failed? Well, the answer is you failed the final exam.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: In all honesty, I believe that's a good suggestion, but I would suggest that we could incorporate that language in all of the communications that we give to the students, and even when they receive this indication by E mail through the system that they need to go see their advisor, the students would be made aware that when they receive these indicators they're not an indication of a final grade, and these are not, there's no basis for an appeal of this kind of an indicator. It's simply an indicator. I think that's a very good suggestion.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? If not, yes.

SENATOR KRISTEN KOSKEY: I think another suggestion is to make it clear that it's an individual faculty decision, because I can see an issue coming up, I have a C in this class and a C in another, and I've got unsatisfactory by one faculty but satisfactory by another. So I can just see it becoming a headache, you know, with the different expectations faculty might have for different courses and what they're using as criteria. So maybe a statement in the document saying specifically it is, you know, individual faculty defining, you know, the indicator how that's determined might be needed since there will not be a generic rubric that determines it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Ready to vote? All those in favor of adoption of the amendments to the Grading System, Discipline, Academic Probation and Dismissal Regulation, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you. The second proposed change in rules comes from the Undergraduate Admissions Rule 3359 60 02. Now, the copy that you received I believe has draft April 1 of 13 at the top. I want to point out a couple of things.

First of all, the main body of the rule is red lined. That's basically all new language or primarily new language, which is the main issue of discussion today. But I do want to point out that Academic Policies Committee had over the last six months or so also edited the first page of the rule, the first paragraph. If you were to look at the draft rule and the current rule on the books, the paragraphs are different length. You would automatically realize there's been some wordsmithing done. So I want to point out to you to indicate that those changes are not considered in my perspective to be substantive. We tried to rewrite the rule with consistent language. We tried to pull pieces of the rule where sentences were redundantly repeated throughout the current rule and bring them up to the front page on the first paragraph and have them said only once.

We also took out all of the rule language that's currently existing about, in essence which website the student has to log into to enroll, which obviously may have changed by now since the last time the rule was revised. Which type of credit card they have to use to pay with. We took out what we considered to be not necessary information from a rule. So that's the first thing that is not red lined.

The rest of it is actually what we considered to be substantively different than the current rule, obviously. This is in light of attempting to align the rule with the discussion we've had about becoming a slightly less than open enrollment institution in practice.

I've seen some of the comments back from Senator Allen about how this formula works. I think the answer from Chair Rich was exactly on point. The coefficients are from analysis of the previous year's students, and so every year there will be an updated set of coefficients. We intend to actually have this formula driven picture if you will, or data sheet, available on line. Guidance counselors and students in high school can type in their numbers and see where they land on the am I college ready, am I above that line, or am I in the preparatory region. And they can do that in realtime would be our goal, so that guidance counselors in particular can use this as a motivator for students that want to come here to know where they are and what they have to do to improve to move where they want to move into our admissions category.

So I think with that I'll just stop and answer any questions that I can. Of course Chair Rich is also on APC and he will hopefully volunteer to assist in answering some of these questions.

SENATOR DAVID STEER: I'm in favor of this kind of quantitative way of doing analysis. My question is did the committee model this to see what the impact would have been, and what was it?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. The coefficients are based on real cohorts of students. We actually find that this model, rather than having firm cutoffs on a certain ACT and certain high school GPA being the line where you draw admission in the different categories, this allows for a lot more flexibility in which students will be admitted in each category, because if they didn't perform as well on the ACT, the high school GPA is weighted more heavily.

So I think the answer is yes, certainly this was modeled, for every cohort we could go back and look at how many students would have been potentially in each category. We didn't do that for every year, but we have the information.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And I would add that the analysis was done by Professor Steinert. Senator Hajjafar.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: This kind of regression which is over total data, the whole data is usually against the better performing high schools and is for the worse performing high schools. What we can do, we can do a regression model for each high school and then compare the high schools. We can create a group of clusters of high schools, a couple of high schools like each other, and then compare those students with each other. That's what Senator Allen wants.

You know, and this is actually a good indicator for high schools also, you know, we can tell them how your students are performing in the university. So, we can do the regression for every high school and then compare those regressions, those coefficients to see which high schools are close to each other and then group them. And then for that group create a regression, an equation. And for another cluster we can create another equation and accordingly choose the students more accurate.

Because in this case, for over the whole data it might be against a student from a better high school. A better student from a better high school might not get into the university and another student might get into the university if the data are not comparable.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I can't disagree with the concept of doing the modeling by grouping, by high school. I certainly would not suggest that we attempt to incorporate that into an admissions rule or policy, but we could use that information to work with the high schools to show them where they're at and how their students perform. But I would just caution that if you really think about the impact of this as far as admission to the University of Akron and matriculation as a student, I think it would be hard to argue that independent of high school, I think it's easy to argue that independent of high school students with a 1.7 high school GPA and a less than 16 ACT are probably going to perform about as well here no matter where they came from.

So the admissions piece, the deferral piece on the pathways side is probably going to be fairly, I would imagine, independent of origin of the high school where the students came from, because really poor performance is really poor performance.

It's the high end where the students get four point plus in school systems that have a lot of AP and other ways of showing the students are even better than four point, where I think you would see, but they would all be admitted as college ready anyways with this model.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It should be borne in mind that we're talking about pretty low cutoffs here. Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: First of all, since I sent the E mail, I want it to be known that I think this is a great idea in principle. I think it's wonderful. My concern is that you are putting more weight on a non standardized predictor than a standardized predictor. In fact my concern is where you have a 2.5 GPA at a high school which would still be above 2 or maybe even a 3 GPA at a high school, but a pretty low ACT composite that would predict in your regression equation that this person would have a 2.5.

That's not gonna happen in reality because regressions are the average function through all the data points, and in fact if you have a non standardized predictor that is actually functionally lower than what it appears because they have grade inflation. The whole goal of being able to predict whether someone can do UA course work and graduate will be lost. That's what I'm concerned about, not the high end or the very low end. I totally agree with you there. It's where some high schools with a 2.75 to 3.0 may have students that marginally can succeed here if their ACT composite is 18 or under.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Point is well taken. I can't disagree. But I would qualify that sorting by high school using these models what would prevent the model from preselecting a student with a high ACT from a good school and one with a somewhat lower ACT from the same school with the lower GPA student from the same school took all of the AP and harder classes and the person with the higher GPA took a lot of other classes that were a lot easier to get a higher grade in. We're never going to get to that level of detail in a rule.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: As a follow up, if you add a third predictor of school type, not sort by school type necessarily, that I think will mathematically solve the problem where the regression equation will work its magic then and that coefficient the beta weight for the predictor might solve that problem. If you don't do that though, the whole beauty of your plan will fail.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Allen, I would point out that in fact when the regression analysis was done, high school grade point average not adjusted according to the high school was a far more powerful predictor of first year grade point average than was ACT. It's possible you could improve upon it further if you have a reasonably reliable measure of the demandingness of the high school grading standards, but the question is how much additional predicted power would you get?

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Exactly.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Currently, the current analysis that uses high school grade point average and ACT score predicts in the, accounts for within the range of, as I recall, 30 to 35 percent of the variance in first year grades. Now, of course if we could improve it significantly by introducing another variable for which we have a reasonably reliable measure, that would be a good thing to do if all we're concerned about is maximizing predictions. And that is, I think, mostly what we're concerned about.

On the other hand, there is reason to be concerned about what the impact of such a move would be on the diversity of the student body because I think what would happen is that the high schools that turned out the students who if we take them will add to the diversity of student body will end up then being counted in the formula.

Now, to some extent we still may want to do that. You know, what we're trying to do, I think, with the formula is to, I've used the term and Vice Provost Ramsier has used the term slightly selective. This is not in terms of numbers a very radical change. And there are some very good pragmatic reasons why you don't do it in an extreme way, at least not right away, and there are some principal concerns about how far you want to go in that direction.

My own suggestion would be that we in part, because it will obviously put us off for another year to go back and try to develop such a measure and do the analysis that's being suggested, that we try it this way, again keeping in mind this is really, this is going to keep out only students who have a very poor chance of success to begin with, and then perhaps the Academic Policies Committee could study exactly the idea that you are suggesting. But I have someone here who has been very patient.

SENATOR CARRIE SCOTTO: Regardless of the soundness of the mathematics involved, we have an escape hatch, so this rule will not apply to everybody, but just to some people. On the first page of the draft it says, students with admission index score that is slightly below the cutoff for college ready status and documented extenuating circumstances may at the discretion of the admissions office be granted college ready status.

At the entity formerly known as the College of Nursing we have much malignant experience with this sort of thing.

Extenuating circumstances, when it comes to those, those circumstances, whether they be the result of bad decisions on the part of the student or maybe it was just the movement of the fickle finger of fate. Regardless of the cause of the unpreparedness, if a student is unprepared they are unprepared. And when we pretend that they're going to be sort of like prepared, we magically hope that if we just be nice to them and let them in that they will suddenly become prepared, this opens up a huge sink hole that sucks up resources, time and money, and all manner of resources from the faculty and the student. Yes I've had a lot of experience dealing with this sink hole, so I would really hope that the faculty would say, sorry about those extenuating circumstances. Why don't you try next year?

Because this is going to allow any student who walks through to say I see this really cool mathematical thing, but it certainly doesn't apply to me.

And now I have to go teach my class.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you for the comments. Point well taken.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Senator Scotto expressed a good deal of the situation that I have been through, too. I have been here a long, long time and I understand that issue of students that are not prepared. And I have felt her sense of frustration about it. However, I am really concerned as we all are, I think, at the University of Akron with that level of student who is on that edge of being prepared and unprepared.

And in fact the ones that are unprepared, which we've over many years allowed to come in and then pay their money and then, or if it's on taxpayer money, then leave and they go out into where, what? And I think the two parts to dealing with this situation, one is that we need to take in those who are prepared. And I was very glad, and in that regard as somebody who has been trying to read the material especially done by my Nobel Prize winning colleague who came here to the University of Akron, James Heckman, on the whole issue of how children succeed, and as summarized in a book that

has just been published called How Children Succeed by Paul Tough from the New York Times, that issue of poorly prepared, the students who have had poor high schools, that GPA is indeed, it's not just here, but the other research shows that they are really more important. Why? Because the thing that I think you are trying to measure and is unbelievably hard to measure is what he calls, anyway it's to do with perseverance and determination rather than what you had in content. It's your ability to, it's the quote, unquote, character in that sense, the grit is what you have to measure.

And the student who in a bad high school has worked hard and got a good GPA even if it's a terrible high school has a better chance of succeeding. Should we take the ones well below that? No. I was glad to see that, because it goes with the national research.

The second question I have is a confusion on the wording here, and also I think confusion for the student. It says here that if you are in the preparatory stage you should be encouraged to go to a community college or a regional campus. And if I were a student I would say well, what is that? Isn't Summit College a community college? Is it? What is a community college? Do we have one at the University of Akron? If not, where do they go? The nearest community college, each of those, county wide you would have to go to Lorain Community College or you would have to go to Wayne Regional Campus or Cuyahoga Community College or what?

I think when we're talking about, and I worry even more then with the education over the whole issue of the inequality of income in this country, as an economist, part of it is to do with education. Can we solve that problem at the University of Akron by taking unprepared students? No. But I think it is, as we've said here, we encourage them to do, well, what is, you know, the definition here, a community college? Is Summit College not part of that? If so, what is it?

What I also worry about as an economist is that those students will then go to what would be, what I think something called proprietary schools and fork out vast sums of money to not get prepared, because those don't have any record of doing a very good job of preparation. I know this goes beyond it, but at least I think we need to know what a community college is.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: So on the first point, the slightly below, students slightly below the cutoff we built that in and discussed whether we could put a numerical number on how slightly below. We decided to try to again get something in place where we begin to use this. We'll look at the admissions of the students that were slightly below to see if our admissions people are using this in a way that we as faculty, as APC thought this was intended to be used, but it is there to allow for some individualized discretion for students who are close or slightly below the line.

As far as what's a community college, if you look at the university system of Ohio, there are 13 public universities and there are 23 community colleges and Summit College is not listed. Summit College is a college of the University of Akron.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: So you would say

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Wayne College is a branch campus of the University of Akron. So here branch could refer to Wayne College, Kent State Stark, Kent State Tusc, et cetera.

Community college in this language in Ohio would mean Tri C, Lorain County Community College, Stark State College. You need to realize for the students in the preparatory category this past fall that were asked to go to a community college, many had zip codes in Franklin County around Columbus where they could go to community college there or Cuyahoga County where they could go to Tri C or Lorain. The ones here currently were allowed to come here.

In four to five years from now this rule would be in essence deferring them to community colleges, where Stark State is a 15 minute drive from this campus.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: If you are talking about the unprepared student, and I know them well because I've had them many times in my classes, we're talking people from urban high schools, urban high schools here in this county, urban high schools here in Akron. They don't have cars that will allow them to go driving off to places. They don't do that. They use public transport. And our county at the moment is not therefore in what University of Akron has provided in the past is the community college services for this county.

I suspect that what you are saying is that five years from now then I suspect we might find that the county government of Summit County might be starting to think that they need to have a community college because, or alternatively maybe we shouldn't even have to answer those questions. I do, because I'm an economist and I'm worried about the development of Northeast Ohio.

And I think you are, it needs to be something that somebody associated, and we do have community service as one of our goals in Vision 2020, then I'm sorry, then I do think that together with some other people if you need to think that we need to be thinking about what to do about that situation, because I think it's a very serious one and one that we by making this policy, and I think there's a lot of legitimacy in that policy, are leaving a whole lot of unprepared students that are unprepared very often, not through their own fault, but because they went to very bad high schools, hanging out to dry. And that I think should make us all realize that we really need to think about it.

Doesn't mean that we should accept them into the University of Akron and let them fail. No. But we have to deal with that issue at least it seems to me, at least as residents and as service providers for the, for this community.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Wouldn't we want to suggest that they attend Summit College? Or is there some reason why we wouldn't want to run them in that direction? Since we have that here, would we want to send some students to other places or would we rather send them to us?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: That's a very good question. And Senator Erickson raises a similar very good point. As you are well aware, Academic Policies Committee, and there's an ad hoc committee of the senate, has been working with the faculty in Summit College to have them come forward with options for their future.

That is being done now. The faculty are working on a report for options for what they envision themselves as being as a college of the University of Akron or as some other type of entity. We do know that there have been public messages from the Chancellor and the governor asking for a low cost higher ed option in Summit County.

University of Akron currently does not provide said low cost option in Summit County. We do realize there's no community college in Portage County either. The population density is much lower. These are issues that need to be discussed by this campus, I believe, as well as the county, the city, the governor, the state. If we need that type of an institution, someone has to have such institution for the economy and for the region. Whether it's going to be us or not is obviously not gonna be driven by this rule.

This rule may actually help people see the need to make decisions about where students who are not prepared should and could go in order to become more college ready would be my answer.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me adjust by way of my recollection of the discussion in APC that the concern was that what we're doing essentially with respect to the students that we're talking about now is admitting them when the failure rate is extremely high and they're paying considerably more money than they would at a community college, and I think the committee thought it was hard to justify continuing to do that, notwithstanding the validity of the points that have just been made. Senator Elliott.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Would a motion to amend be in order?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It would not be out of order.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: I move to amend the formula to include a factor for the classification

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You need to have the exact language if you are going to.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: I move to amend the formula to include

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: No. To delete certain words, to insert certain words.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: To insert a factor to amend the formula to insert a factor to account for high school.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: What you are saying would be an appropriate correction if we were to recommit this, but you are not proposing language to be included in the rule, okay? You are talking, you are describing the language that should be included in the rule. Now, if you want to actually edit it right now and come up with some language to put in the rule, that would be appropriate for a motion to amend.

Otherwise, I would recommend that you move to recommit to the committee so they can draft the rule language that you are seeking.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Okay. I move to recommit with the direction that they should include a factor for high school classification.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Do we have a second? Senator Allen seconds. Debate on the motion to amend? Yes. Senator McKnight.

SENATOR LYNN McKNIGHT: If you add that factor about the high schools, what does that do with all those students from the low achieving high schools? Like the inner city Akron? Is that gonna eliminate all of those students?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: It will provide a better prediction of where they fit in. So for example if they have a 2.1 from one of those schools, okay, they might be admitted according to the current formula. But a 2.1 from a school where if you just show up for class they give you a B is not the same. So this, including this extra factor would just give you a better prediction. It would recognize the difference between a 2.1 where you just show up and they give you a B or a school where you can show up and you work to get a B.

SENATOR LYNN McKNIGHT: What happens to the students who earn a 3.5 at the low ranking schools?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: They'll be admitted.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The 2.1 at this kind of school that you are talking about, that person would be, without adjusting for high school, that person would only be admitted if they had a pretty high ACT score under the existing formula. This is going to, it will not be done around the, you have to go up higher on the scale before it's easy to imagine that having an impact, unless the student has a reasonably high ACT score.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: If I might add to add to Chair Rich's comment, again, as Senator Allen realizes, this distinction would act on the middle of the distribution of students. All of those students will be admitted anyway. It really won't matter if we call them emergent or college ready. They'll be admitted and they'll succeed or not regardless of high school, if this addition to the formula would really only impact the difference between college ready and emergent.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Could I ask for a point of clarification? Chair Rich mentioned the variance was 30 percent. Does that mean the R squared value?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: When we regressed high school GPA and ACT score on first year grades in college here the R squared was between, as I recall between 30 and 35. And in fact there was not much difference between the R squared when you just regress high school grade point average and the R squared when you regressed both high school GPA and ACT. High school GPA was far more predictive of first year grades than ACT to the point where I personally considered the possibility that maybe we should only use high school GPA. But since we do require it, it seems like that will stop requiring that they take it. Why use it? Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: I think what you are getting at is well, what Liz was referring to as achievement motivation. You have the issue of motivation in GPA which is not captured in your standardized one time test. However, you may be capturing a huge proportion of that variance in GPA by half of the people that are earning that GPA, because again, it's based on the total cluster, and you are accounting for 30 to 35 percent of the variance at most. And as a native Ohioan and as a non declared member of a minority group, I would much rather be told by a university in the long run knowing what I know now that I am not likely to succeed at a university than spending thousands and thousands of dollars and failing out.

Actually, I think I'm putting on my Rex persona here too, because from what I've heard I think someone else agrees with that. It's a tough decision. And I'm all about access, but not if its probabilities of success from a stochastic perspective is so low that we're not doing anyone a favor. It's time we get serious about this and do what we're saying we're doing. If we say we're worried about access to different diversity groups, are we worried about that as much as we're worried about them coming here and then failing? It's, and that's the big issue. Do we really want to have validity in this process?

And I'm saying you probably can't tell if you have a valid process until you see if the increment in increased, predictive amount is significantly greater when you add the other parameter. And I am saying that people at 2.75, if you add that additional parameter for some schools, and I would recommend collecting data over five years to do that, to make your empirical argument, may surprise you that there may be people with a 2.75 GPA in a high school that have no chance of succeeding or getting a degree from this university. And that's all I'm asking. If we really care about what I'm, what we're doing, then we need to consider this.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would say that my own experience in doing this kind of statistical analysis of human behavior is that you actually tend to, you are doing pretty well when you get to the 30 to 35 percent, and it gets very hard to account for a greater share of the variance when you are talking about complex human behavior like academic

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: We're empiricists. What does it hurt to try?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It's a question of time. Do you think this is good enough for now that we can go back and see whether with a collection of additional data we have a sample size problem by the way we're going to have to collect a lot more data, and then see okay, how much better is, are we at predicting first year grades with this additional variable. By the way, you may think of another one in the meanwhile. But if we always don't do it because there's another variable we could have considered, we'll never do it.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Can we authorize the admission of this unofficially to use this formula until we come up with the right formula which Senator Allen wants?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think the body has no such power.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. This discussion is both fascinating and high level and I think that the, I would agree with those who said that this is a good idea. We have on the floor right now a motion to recommit with a specific instruction to consider something. Would it, would, if such a motion were to pass, this is a parliamentary inquiry, were such a motion to pass would the committee be limited to only considering that or could they look at other issues as well that might have arisen in the discussion today?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I see no reason why the committee could not look at other issues. It would have the mandate to make this particular change, but I see no restriction on what else it might propose.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: I am not a statistician. Much of the discussion is over my head, but I feel the issue is we have a rule change that we're asked to consider that everyone agrees on. Is it an option to say yes, go ahead with this, but request that a plan be made for its evaluation and revisiting so that it can be further refined while still getting the basic change made? I feel as though if everyone agrees this change should be made, my layman's perception is that we have several groups of very intelligent people who have different opinions on whether or not something would be an effective tool to use. So my thought would be to pass what we know and we feel strongly is a good idea, and reserve and have further discussion or inquiry as to what do other schools do? Do they weight high schools? Do they not? Has this been proven or disproven?

I can't imagine this being unique to our situation. Maybe this particular formula, but is there an option for the senate to, in addition maybe to considering the rule, passing the rule as it stands but to also make a recommendation for how it would be assessed in the future and the options for further consideration, or has the committee already

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Certainly that could be done. I think you would be speaking against the motion to recommit.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: If you would like me to do that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think you already said something that constitutes an argument against the motion to recommit. There is certainly no reason why if the body were to pass this and the board were to enact it, why there couldn't be an evaluation, a follow up, additional studies to determine whether there are other variables that we could use that would increase the, our ability to predict first year grades. All of those things could be done. Senator Steer.

SENATOR DAVID STEER: I am against the motion to recommit. I think the rule as written, the flexibility built in would certainly take care of some of the issues that were brought up earlier.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would emphasize that I don't think anybody on the APC thought that with the passage of this rule, if it does pass, that we would be all done and that we wouldn't be evaluating, we wouldn't be, you know, fine tuning or proposing fine tuning of this. Senator Elliott.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Point of clarification, the data base that you seem to have some familiarity with, does it have the high school listed?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I don't know the answer to that question.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: In most cases we know the high schools students came from.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Then it will take a long weekend, less than that, to do this. So the time efficiency of doing this is

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Wait a minute. Are you talking about treating each high school as a nominal variable in the equation?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Not individually but classifying.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Then you need to develop the scale on which you're going to categorize that. How would we, just think about this? How would we, especially in a long weekend, especially in a weekend or a long weekend, how would we actually figure out this high school should be rated a five and this one a three and that one a two?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: I have lots of ideas. I can get it done in a weekend. Promise.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, that was reassuring but notably vague. Senator Buldum.

SENATOR ALPER BULDUM: I believe it is adding more than a single parameter categorizing schools, some urban areas, some private. There's such a wide variety, and I believe this is opening a can of worms and should be well studied. We have a really good (inaudible) should be studied and it shouldn't be rushed.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: If you want more, there's a data base out there on the Board of Regents website that provides the proficiency scores as a function of median income, okay, so you can immediately classify schools just through that, okay? That was, each school system is designated right there so you can measure the deviation of a school district from that average and you can instantly classify each school in five grades according to their deviation from that

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So we would be determining whether a student's admitted or what category they fall into based on the median income of the students.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: And proficiency scores. Deviation from the general curve for median income versus proficiency scores, because that's another standardized test. So everybody is participating at the same level, and there you have a direct measure and you can get at least five school systems, five gradations very easily.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other debate?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Sounds to me like the debate now is on the motion to recommit. So whether or not this would be sent and what the procedure would be if it were recommitted could be a

time for the committee, if it were recommitted, to consider in more detail. I think with that in mind, I would like to move the previous question.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there further debate? If we don't need it, I will go through the procedure of voting on moving for that motion to move the previous question. I don't hear further debate, so I take it you are ready to vote on the question of whether to recommit this motion to the APC with the instruction that it develop and include in the model a measure of the high schools, but I think we mean there is the difficulty of the grading standards of high schools. That is the motion to recommit with that instruction. All those in favor of the motion to recommit, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

MANY SENATORS: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think we need a division of the house. All those in favor of the motion to recommit, please stand. You need to anyway. Nine. All those opposed, stand. The nays have it.

We're now back to the main motion. Is there any further debate on the main motion?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: I move to recommit with the mandate to strike the wording about extenuating circumstances.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there a second?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: I think my second left.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion was to recommit with the instruction to the committee to eliminate the provision in there for admitting someone who falls slightly below the cutoff if there are extenuating circumstances.

SENATOR KRISTEN KOSKEY: I second.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Debate on that second motion to committee?

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: Having served on scholarship committees, I know there are extenuating circumstances that cause a student's GPA to drop, for example a student's parents are incarcerated but the child is, was very bright, and so I would hate to not have the ability to, in some unusual cases, make exceptions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Another example might be someone who is ill when they take the ACT.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: Exactly.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: I wanted to mention the cutoff is not affixed for every year. That is a variable cutoff. It will change from year to year, so instead of slightly going down, the cutoff can go down.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other debate? I take it that you are ready to vote on the motion to recommit with the instruction to remove the language about exceptions for extraordinary circumstances. All those in favor of the motion to recommit, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

MANY SENATORS: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The nays have it. Motion fails. We're back to the main motion. Further debate on the main motion? Hearing none, I take it that you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the adoption of this change to the admissions policy signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So that concludes the EAC report. And the next?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Curriculum proposals which were distributed, these came to the CRC without objection and we recommend that you approve these curriculum proposals.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there debate on the curriculum proposals? Hearing none, I conclude that you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the proposals, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Computing and Communication Technologies Committee. Do we have an oral report? Okay. No oral report. The next item on the agenda is the ad hoc Committee on Part time Issues. Do we have an oral report? No.

Next item, unfinished business, bylaw amendments. These amendments were presented two meetings ago, Faculty Senate bylaw amendments. These were presented two meetings ago and discussed at the time. We couldn't vote then, because of the 30 day rule which is one of the rules we're proposing to change, make it 27 days so we don't have to lay over for two months depending on the calendar.

The, there was, two months ago when we discussed this, no real discussion about any of this, no controversy about any of this except for the Well Being Committee, one of the proposals is to eliminate the Well Being Committee because essentially it's defunct. It's not actually doing anything, it doesn't meet.

There's a committee of the, I am getting ready to nod in the direction of Senator Lillie. I believe there's a committee of the University Council that's supposed to address the issues, and the questions were raised two months ago about whether that committee is functioning well enough, and if not whether that means that perhaps this committee, defunct as it is, in reality still should be kept on the books as it were.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: It would depend on what you are talking about. Talent and Resources Development Committee, it depends on how you are defining university well being.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This is not athletics, though.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: But the Athletics and Recreation Committee as it's currently named for the University Council does include that aspect of well being, which is represented by recreation. It's not just athletics. It's athletics and recreation. So it appears to me that at least nominally University Council does have some input there.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. If there is controversy about that one item we can divide the question. And assuming the others are uncontroversial, which they seemed to be two months ago, we can take that question separately from the rest. But if there's no controversy about either one of them, we can just proceed both on all of them together.

So let me ask. Is there debate about either the elimination of the Well Being Committee from the bylaws or any of the other amendments that have been proposed? One one thousand, two one thousand, three one thousand. Hearing no debate, I conclude that you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the amendments, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye. All those opposed by opposite sign. The motion passes without dissent.

Is there any new business to come before the body? The chair is aware of none. Senator Elliott.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Would it be an appropriate time to suggest a resolution regarding workload policy?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Certainly.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Okay. I wrote something.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The chair is relieved to hear that.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Whereas the existing workload policy of The University of Akron stipulates a process that involves faculty in setting workload policy at the departmental level;

Whereas many departments do not currently have workload policies in force, requiring time and data before such policies can be set;

Whereas registration for Fall 2013 classes has already begun, necessitating assignments of faculty workload in the present;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate urges that changes to workload practices not be considered for the Fall 2013 Semester.

Instead, the month of April, 2013 should be devoted to timely collection of current workload data and the establishment of department approved workload practices across campus before the end of the Spring 2013 semester.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There's a motion. Is there a second?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Second.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There's an emphatic second. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Witt.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: I just have one question, Richard, regarding those who have already had workload increases imposed upon them for the fall semester.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: This would negate those.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Until analysis could be done by faculty and departments. Is that your intent?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: I guess if a department already had a workload policy in force and whatever was being established for Fall 2013 was consistent with that workload policy, then I guess an argument could be made that they should do that.

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Or if they have to, what I heard was if they didn't have a specific workload policy they have to develop that first before any imposition of increased teaching could take place. That's your intent?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Right.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Would you re read that quickly, please?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Whereas the existing workload policy of The University of Akron stipulates a process that involves faculty in setting workload policy at the departmental level;

Whereas many departments do not currently have workload policies in force, requiring time and data before such policies can be set;

Whereas registration for Fall 2013 classes has already begun, necessitating assignments of faculty workload in the present;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate urges that changes to workload practices not be considered for the Fall 2013 Semester.

Instead, the month of April, 2013 should be devoted to timely collection of current workload data and the establishment of department approved workload practices across campus before the end of the Spring 2013 semester.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The problem you have there is that you are talking about change to workload policy. And what I'm concerned about is that the answer may be we're not changing the policy. We're just applying it. I don't consider that to be a very good response, but I am concerned.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: So strike the word policy? Is that what you are suggesting?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Yeah. Although I don't think you wanted to say no one's workload can change.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: Unless it's in compliance.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That was the concern that I had about your response to Senator Witt's question is, I'm not sure it's as clear as it could be that it would get implemented, which is a big if, I think. Undo the changes in workload that have already been ordered.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Workload practices.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: May I ask a question of the maker of the motion for you, is the intent of the motion to register that the Faculty Senate is in opposition to the changes that have been made in workload or is it to register the opposition to any changes in policy at this point? From what I've heard it seems like we seem to be concerned about the changes that have been made, changes in workload that have been made that I've heard people speak about. So I'm asking what the intent of the motion is.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: The intent of the motion is for the departments that don't have a workload policy, the changes to workload are in violation of the process that is on the books right now.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: But that doesn't mean that they can't have workload, we have a fault in the process as a result of which the workload, the teaching load cannot be assigned on the basis of the policy, because there's no policy, right? And that can't mean anything in particular about anyone's workload for next fall, right? It means that we've got a fault in the process that has to be corrected. If you, as to make our motion, wish to say something further to the effect that I'm not sure exactly what it would be, that changes in workload have been made recently should be rescinded, then I would suggest that you do that specifically.

I'm not sure that language would accomplish that objective if accepted, although I mean, I hesitate there because I don't think you really want to say nobody's workload could change.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: I think if we change the word policy to practices, it solves this problem. There are practices that are in existence that are demonstrable over the course of years and it's against deviations from those practices.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any objection to substituting the word practices for policy in this situation? Senator Loth.

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: It sounds like this statement is just saying what is already stated. I'm not sure I understand. Is it changing anything from what is currently the rules for our university

teaching load? It's sort of like this is saying don't do something that breaks the rules that we currently have.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Because they are.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I take the motion to say ultimately comply with the existing workload policies.

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: That's basically what it says.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And I take it that the need for such a statement is based on the perception that there is noncompliance.

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: Then I would move that we add that very clear statement that was obvious to everyone else to the beginning of his statement. It should be the title of it. Why would you beat around the bush?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Hang on one second. Is there any objection to the movant's proposal to change the word policy to practices? Because if there's no objection, we'll do it without objection. Now we have a proposal to add a clause.

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: Summary statement at the beginning.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Does the senator have particular language he wishes to propose?

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: How about the language you just said? It was obvious what that was about. She can read that back. I don't remember what it is. It sounded like everyone agreed with it, that you are enforcing the rules that are currently present. We would like to ask the administration to force

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: To me, I'm speaking only for myself, it seems clearly implicit in the resolution as written that there's a concern about noncompliance. Why else would there be such a resolution? I'm not sure why it's necessary to make that explicit, but if it is, somebody is free to move to amend the motion, but you need language to do that.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Just for the record, because I think as much as in favor as I am of doing something positive about workload as I've said, is it, for the record is the intent of this policy, I'm sorry, of this motion, if passed, to register discontent with and to make at least an implicit recommendation that any changes that have been made should be rescinded until they're in compliance with the policy, Senator Elliott?

SENATOR J. RICHARD ELLIOTT: Yes.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Can that be part of the record? I'm asking that that be part of the record.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You just made it part of the record.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Sometimes the minutes and the record are slightly different, so I'm asking that that be part of the record so there's as little confusion as possible next time we talk about it. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If there's no motion to amend, I'm going to quickly conclude that you are ready to vote on the resolution. All those in favor of the resolution, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Is there any other new business to come before the body? Hearing none, anything for the good of the order? I declare us adjourned. (Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.)