

University of Akron

Faculty Senate

April 3, 2014

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The April meeting of the University of Akron Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda?

SENATOR NEAL RABER: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Moved by Senator Raber, seconded by Senator Hajjafar. Are there any additions to the agenda? All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by signing aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted. We do not have minutes yet of the March meeting, so we'll defer action on those until the May meeting. I would ask the visitors to move in quietly, because we're already underway. Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the chairman.

First, welcome to those in attendance who are not members of the Faculty Senate and who have not regularly attended its meetings, including faculty, students and any members of the news media who may be present.

I would remind everyone that the Faculty Senate is a formal deliberative body. Proceedings are governed by the bylaws of the Faculty Senate and Robert's Rules of Order. Non senators are not entitled to speak, but may be granted permission. Those seeking the floor should signal by raising a hand at the appropriate time and wait until recognized by the chair.

The major item on today's agenda is the report of the Academic Policies Committee on the provost's proposed suspension of 55 academic programs. By resolution the board of trustees directed the Faculty Senate to review these proposals and provide its advice by today's meeting.

Under severe time constraints APC worked diligently to review each of the proposed program suspensions as carefully and thoroughly as possible. The recommendations contained in the APC report are amendable on the floor of the senate, but the senate must complete its work today in order to meet the deadline established by the board. Any amendments that are offered should be worded in a manner that is appropriate for inclusion in the report.

It is regrettable that the administration, after allowing this academic program review process to stall in recent years suddenly decided to propose the suspension of 55 programs two months ago,

and to insist that this decision be carried out by the end of the semester. Because they waited so late in the academic year, it was necessary to inform students applying for admissions to these programs that they were under consideration for suspension. In some instances it had come to my attention that students were wrongly told that these programs had already been suspended. As a result, some students chose to attend college elsewhere while others chose to enroll in other programs.

Had the administration made its proposal in the beginning of the fall semester or failing that, had the administration been willing to wait until the next academic year to implement the suspensions, it would have been unnecessary to inflict this damage on the university or on the academic programs that in the end may not be suspended.

APC is recommending against suspension of 13 of the 55 programs on the provost's list. If the senate adopts these recommendations, and if the president and the board concur in them, enrollment in these programs is likely to suffer just because students were discouraged from enrolling. Any further evaluation of these programs in the next few years must be cognizant of the effects of this mismanagement of the academic program review process.

The damage to the university caused by the proposal to suspend the 55 programs was compounded by the fact that the administration courted publicity for its proposal. The provost appeared on Fox News Channel 8 in Cleveland touting the elimination of these programs. I cannot fathom how anyone could have thought this publicity would have been helpful to the university.

I am pleased to report that in the last few weeks the administration has been much more forthcoming with the University Council's Budget Committee than it had previously been. I remain deeply concerned, however, about the magnitude of the budget cuts that the administration seeks to impose on the academic units of the university.

These cuts would cause severe damage to the university's academic programs and could well cost the university more in lost revenue than they would save in expenditures. It's time for the administration to recognize that as a principle of budgeting, revenue generating units should not be cut unless the administration can demonstrate either of two things:

First, that the unit has such excess capacity that the proposed cut would not cause a loss of revenue, or at least that any lost revenue would be exceeded by the cuts in expenditures; or second, that the unit costs the university more in expenditures than it generates in revenue, and that the activities of the unit are not so important to the mission of the university as to warrant continued subsidy at the current levels under the present fiscal conditions.

This analysis needs to take into account not only general revenues, but also revenues from student fees, a large amount of which is allocated to athletics.

The end of the academic year is near. The administration needs to either show that its proposed cuts to the budgets of the academic units are justified in this way or reduce those cuts to levels at which they are justified. If this is not done by the next Faculty Senate meeting, which is the last of the academic year, it would be difficult for the faculty to sustain confidence in the administration's ability to manage the finances of the university while preserving its ability to perform its core academic functions.

I'm advised by the chair of the senate's ad hoc General Education Revision Committee that the committee plans to finish its plans for implementing the proposed general education reforms shortly. This implementation plan will be distributed to the colleges and transmitted to the senate soon thereafter. This should allow time for the college faculties to review the implementation plan and if they choose, vote again on the General Education Reform Proposal before the May first Faculty Senate meeting.

In his remarks in the March Faculty Senate meeting, President Proenza gave the impression that the senate has failed to consider expeditiously a proposal from Summit College to redefine its mission or reorganize itself. The president subsequently assured me that he did not intend to give this impression, and I take him at his word.

I wish to make it known to all in this body that the Academic Policies Committee has yet to receive from Summit College a reasonably definite proposal that demonstrably enjoys the support of the majority of the faculty of that college.

When it does receive such a proposal, I'm confident that APC will review it and transmit it to the senate along with APC's own recommendations, and the senate will proceed to consider it expeditiously. This concludes my remarks.

Next item on the agenda is special announcements. It's my sad duty to announce three deaths that have occurred since the meeting before last, I guess it was.

The first is, in no particular order, is Milton L. Kult, Professor Emeritus of Electrical and Computer Engineering, who died December 6th at the age of 88. From 1943 to 1953 he served in the Army Air Corps and its successor the Air Force. While serving overseas during World War II, he performed with the Glenn Miller Band. Professor Kult joined the University of Akron faculty in 1954 as an assistant professor of electrical engineering. He was promoted to associate professor in 1957 and professor in 1982. He served as head of the Department of Electrical Engineering from January 1980 until his retirement in August of 1983. Professor Kult continued to teach for the department until end of fall of 2013 semester. His teaching career at the university spanned 59 and a half years.

Jesse Hayes, who served in a variety of roles during a 30 year career with the university, died March 24 after a 20 month battle with pancreatic cancer. He was 62. Hayes was a graduate of both the University of Akron and Bowling Green State University. His career at the University

of Akron began in 1977. In October, 1991 he was named Acting Assistant Dean of the University College. He also taught as part time faculty in Business Technology from 1989 to 1996. He continued to serve in various administrative roles, retiring in May, 2007 as Director Emeritus of the Academic Advisement Center.

Patricia Taylor died on February third at the age of 75. Ms. Taylor taught physical education at the University of Akron for 30 years, working extensively with student teachers. She retired in 1990.

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

Next item on the agenda is the report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Bove.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, senators and guests. During the month of March the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met three times as a committee and once with the president.

On March 13 the EC met for regular senate business. The budget dominated much of the discussion. The UC Budget and Finance Committee is performing a rigorous analysis of the university's revenues and expenses and will present recommendations to the UC by the end of the year.

The EC also discussed the progress of the academic review programs, Summit College, the Criminal Justice Programs, the implementation of the General Education Curriculum, as well as the need to elect a COIA representative for the remainder of this academic year.

The EC next met on March 20th for regular senate business and to prepare for the meeting later that afternoon with the president. We discussed the evolutionary process of Summit College, and Vice Provost Ramsier reported that a mission statement and a newly proposed name were crafted and will be voted on by faculty after spring break.

We also discussed the CRC curriculum proposal software being at a crossroads of technology that will force us to either update the current system or migrate to a new system. Other issues discussed include the Criminal Justice Programs, the Academic Program Review and the Assistant Provost for Online Learning.

The EC last met on February 26th for regular senate business and to prepare the agenda for today's meeting. At the March sixth senate meeting, the CCTC recommendation to form a committee to review online course evaluations was referred to the EC. The EC referred it back to the CCTC to form a subcommittee.

Senate election reports were due back to Faculty Senate Office by March 15. To date only two have been returned to and ratified by the Executive Committee. We would like to congratulate

the newly elected senators, Jeff Franks from the University Libraries and Heather Howley from Wayne College.

I urge the rest of the constituents to complete elections and return the results to the Faculty Senate Office as soon as possible. Thank you, and this concludes my report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions of Secretary Bove about the Executive Committee report? Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the senior vice president and provost. I should mention that the president is not here, and advised me in advance that he would not be here.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Rich. My remarks today will be brief so I can listen to the discussion related to academic program review. I do want to point out that the great work of our colleagues, Don Visco, Dale Mugler and Matthew Shocky, working with our students, again this year secured on behalf of the university three Goldwater Scholarships. Two scholarship awards and an honorable mention. Cale Crowder and Greg Howard received scholarships. Honorable mention was given to Melissa Boswell. These individuals are in biomedical engineering.

You may recall that last year we had a Goldwater Scholarship recipient, Renee Calderon, daughter of Dr. Thomas Calderon. And I think this is just the beginning of increasing focus on working with students to secure such prestigious scholarships that are really nationally recognized. So good work to the faculty and obviously to our great students for submitting those applications.

You will receive a debrief on the Council of Deans that we had at the end of March where you will have an update on admissions and yield. We remain cautiously optimistic with regard to the number of applications we've received, the number of admissions that have happened, and the number of confirmations that are occurring.

Certainly as we discussed previously, May first is really the deadline for students indicating where they will attend, and we look forward to great success in that regard. Thanks to everybody here who has been working with the Office of Admissions staff and others to write notes to students who are interested in attending the university. Those who have applied, confirmed who have been offered scholarships, the feedback we have received has been that those targeted communications have been very effective and have influenced student decisions to attend the University of Akron.

You also find in the debrief on the Council of Deans presentation that Chief Financial Officer Cummins did on the distribution of the State Share of Instruction. I urge you to take a look at that presentation. It's not easy to understand, and for that reason I'll be asking Vice Provost Chand Midha with others to delve into the details of the distribution of the State Share of Instruction so that we can more easily understand it and understand how our actions or inactions,

I guess, may otherwise influence the distribution of that share of instruction to the University of Akron.

I think that exercise will teach us a lot and help us plan some actions and we'll wait to see what that good work reveals.

You are probably aware the mid biennial budget legislation suggested that faculty workload be adjusted by 10 percent by, I think it was 2017 with full reports being provided to the chancellor by 2019. I may not have those dates exactly right, but the point was that in this legislation it was proposed that faculty workload be increased 10 percent.

The Inter University Council works with all the state universities to interact with the state legislature. They had been told that some form of legislation would come out of this bill. The IUC has always taken the position that faculty workload should not be specified legislatively. That is the position that they took. That is that there should be no legislation whatsoever related to faculty workload.

I'm pleased to report that on behalf of the university we understand that that legislation will now have excluded from it the reference to increasing faculty workload by 10 percent by a particular date. So the good work of IUC on behalf of all of us effectively helped influence that legislation, I think doing the right thing and for the right reasons.

So with that, I'll end my comments and defer questions and listen to the great discussion. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Would you be willing to entertain questions that don't relate to the academic program review?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Sure. For a few minutes, yes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions for the provost other than those that may relate to the academic program review and the proposed program suspensions? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I just wanted to ask you about something I heard on the radio this morning. I don't know if it's true or not. It said that the university and the City of Akron between them are going to be ponying up for a new downtown arena. Have you heard about this?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, I heard about it at the state of the city address by the mayor yesterday, and apparently there are some discussions going on about an arena. I don't know the details of how it would be funded. I know the institution has a high level of indebtedness related to bonds, and we'll have to see what the report of a committee that's studying this is.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: So is the university planning to pursue this?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, as I think was indicated in yesterday's address, our board of trustees is interacting with other individuals in the community to discuss this option.

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

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I've just noticed that an item that the Executive Committee had intended to put on the agenda somehow did not make it onto the copy that was distributed, and that is the approval of the graduation list. And this is something we need to do. I trust that there would be no objection if we take it up now, which is when we would have taken it up had it been on the agenda anyway. Is there a motion to approve the graduation list?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns moved. Seconded by Senator Allen. Any discussion? All those in favor of approving the graduation list, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

Next item is the report of the Academic Policies Committee, chair of the committee and Vice Provost of the University, Rex Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As mentioned in the chairman's remarks, Academic Policies Committee has tasked itself in the last two months with reviewing the proposed program suspensions. And you have in your possession a report, narrative report that lists all of the programs that we reviewed.

As you will note, some have been added that were not on the original list. So this report comes with recommendations for each program on the list as a recommendation from committee, which I believe does not need a second. So I would be happy to entertain questions on the committee's behalf.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Debate on the proposal and motions to amend are in order as are questions of the chair. But I do want to start with one item, and that is item number 27 in the report considering the Theater Arts Master's Degree. It's been called to my attention that the number in the parenthetical in the first sentence is apparently inaccurate, and so I would ask for a motion to amend this report by deleting the parenthetical approximately to annually.

Is there such a motion? Senator Clark. Seconded by Senator Saliga. Is there any debate? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

Is there debate or a question for the chair, meaning the chair of the committee, or a motion to amend? Senator Kemp.

SENATOR SUKANYA KEMP: I would like to make a motion to amend the report to recommend against suspension of the Drafting and Computer Drafting Technology Program substituting the following rationale for the rationale in the APC report:

The manufacturing industry in Northeast Ohio is undergoing a resurgence. The biggest challenge faced by the manufacturers is obtaining employees with the correct skills and knowledge base. Graduates of the Drafting and Computer Drafting Technology Program possess the skills manufacturers need and desire. Additionally, drafting and CAD skills are a core competency in most if not all engineering technology programs.

Consequently, these four drafting and CAD courses need faculty. Thus, suspending and eventually eliminating the program truly eliminates a revenue generating opportunity for the university. An associate degree in the Drafting and Computer Drafting Technology Program provides graduates with an opportunity for gainful employment while also serving as a pathway for students to transition into an assortment of engineering technology bachelors degrees.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there a second for the motion? Senator Jones. Debate on the motion. Senator Arter.

SENATOR ROLAND ARTER: One of the things that I don't think people look at is it's not just a drafting program, per se. That program feeds other programs. Mechanical engineering technology, manufacturing engineering technology, and construction and surveying. That program feeds other programs. So before we do away with a program, it would be kind of a good idea to figure out what we're going to do with that functionality so that the other programs don't suffer because of a lack of a drafting program.

So I think we need to talk about, more about the functionality of the program and not just whether we keep it aboard or not.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other discussions? Chair Ramsier, do you wish to address this?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: I would only emphasize that currently as the report from the Academic Policies Committee points out, there are no full time faculty in this program. The last one is retired. As current interim dean of the college, I see no potential in the near future to



invest in full time faculty in this program simply because the other programs that have a lot more students in them are already very short of full time faculty. So that would be my input.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I had a question. Did the committee consider the issue that was brought up by the senator? In other words, how that would affect other programs and how is that going to be dealt with, would you be hiring somebody part time that was within this? I mean, I'd like you to sort of address the issues brought up by the senator.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Certainly. The expectation is that if a program is suspended or admissions to a program are suspended does not mean some of the courses in the program will not be taught. If any courses are now being taught in this program, they're being taught by part time faculty or by full time faculty that are on loan from another program where they're actually needed as well.

So the courses that would be needed for the other programs would presumably still need to be taught. It's not necessarily about cost savings. This would require investment in brand new faculty lines in an area where we have no current full time faculty, where within the same department there are programs that are, at least by the very numbers of students enrolled, more viable and are down to two or one full time faculty themselves in the same department. So speaking as interim dean of the college it would be hard for me to defend hiring brand new faculty into a program that needs to be rebuilt in some sense when the neighboring program in the same department is now basically losing some of their very last faculty.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So if I may, that then I think leaves the question of whether it's feasible to offer this program solely with part time faculty.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Personally I've always advocated even in the Curriculum Review Committee process that the university should not have degree programs that don't have any full time faculty. I just think that's a bad precedent to set, and I wouldn't advocate proliferating that if I could help it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SHIVAKUMAR SASTRY: Chair Rich, I wish to speak against the motion. I am in favor of the recommendation from the APC. I base my view on a dozen years of industry experience. I've worked in the manufacturing industry with a leading automation vendor. I conduct research in advanced manufacturing technologies.

I would like to see a program that is better aligned with the needs of the future manufacturing industry, and those needs have to do much more with modeling, with implementing [inaudible] technologies, with physics. So I'm not sure that the program as offered is consistent with those

objectives of what the nation needs. And if there's such a program proposed, I would be happy to review it and make a [inaudible]

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there other discussion of the motion to amend? Senator Kemp.

SENATOR SUKANYA KEMP: I just would like to mention that there is no faculty in the program because two faculty full time retired and that position was not filled. But this program has great revenue generating scope, and therefore in doing a cost benefit analysis the benefit perhaps outweighs the cost.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there other debate? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I'm just rising to make sure I'm clear when the time comes to vote on what we're being asked to vote on. My understanding that if we voted to accept this particular amendment, it would change the language to include the rationale that the senator stated. It would also change the language to recommend against suspension of the program.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That's correct.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: And if we turn it down, then the language that's here would stay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That's correct.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other debate? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion to amend, which would alter the report so that it recommends against suspending the Drafting and Computer Drafting Program, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: All those against the motion, please signify by saying nay.

MANY SENATORS: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion is defeated. Is there any other debate? We're back to the main motion, which is the report as a whole. Is there any other debate on or amendments to the motion? Senator Marion.

SENATOR NANCY MARION: I am making a motion to reconsider the recommendation that degrees in Public Administration and Urban Studies be suspended. Reviews were conducted.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Marion, if I may, I'm not clear on the meaning of your motion. What you said was to reconsider. One could only reconsider a motion that has already passed in the same meeting.

SENATOR NANCY MARION: Then I would like to

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are you moving to amend?

SENATOR NANCY MARION: I would like to amend the report, the recommendation, I'd like to amend the report to change the recommendation that degrees in Public Administration and Urban Studies be suspended.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Now, which are we talking about? Which degrees exactly? Which programs exactly?

SENATOR NANCY MARION: Urban Studies, master's degree.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Would you please do it by referring to an item number in the report?

SENATOR NANCY MARION: Items 21 Master's Degree and 22 the Urban Studies and Public Affairs Doctoral Degree.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

SENATOR NANCY MARION: Sorry. The reviews were conducted on only one degree, but it did not include the partner with Cleveland State. Three degrees were proposed to be suspended without any program review. This violates the assertions of the principle in evidence based participatory process. It appears that the university does not want these degrees to continue, but there has never been any explanation.

The standards for judging programs as stated by the provost are disconnected from any assessment of the degrees. There is no good financial rationale for these decisions. The four degrees on the termination list all fit with the university's urban and community goals. Graduates are employed and active in their chosen fields. The programs are financially successful. The degree suspensions will change that. [inaudible] will exceed revenue. Most telling of all, eliminating the degrees will produce no financial gain for the university.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I take it the motion was to include the language you just read as a rationale.

SENATOR NANCY MARION: Correct.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: There's a motion. Is there a second? Senator Jones. We have a motion and a second. So the motion is before us now. Debate on the motion is in order. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: A question similar to the one I raised before. Do I understand, I was trying to follow the exact items, and I'm not sure I got it clearly, so there may be others

who have the same question. On the report that I have it appears that there are three urban studies.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Two masters.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Well, there are three items; 20, 21 and 22. Now, the master's degree is number 20. Ph.D. is number 22. There's something called Urban Studies Thesis Master's Degree. And I'm trying to make sure I'm clear on whether or not it's all three of those, 20, 21 and 22, or simply a subset.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Marion.

SENATOR NANCY MARION: There would be all three, yes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: As I understood it, Senator Marion's motion included all three. Thank you. Debate on the motion? Senator Anderson.

SENATOR TURNER ANDERSON: The senator referenced that there were multiple graduates from the program being placed across the state. However, in my reading, a couple of them said that no students have graduated from the program in the last five years. So I guess I'm interested to know where the discrepancy lies, and I guess which is the reality.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: A reasonable question, and I hope someone can enlighten us.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: To the best of our knowledge at the committee level using all the data that we have and generated at the university level, the report indicates there have been no students graduating from these programs in the last five years. That should be accurate. We've discussed these at some length in the committee. These programs and this department that houses the programs have had issues in the past. And I believe the accreditation for these programs is no longer in effect.

And so just to give you, there's certainly, due diligence in my opinion was given and due process over the years to these programs. And the committee, I stand behind the committee recommendation in this case for sure.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Again, it's a clarification here. I think at least the Ph.D. program is done in, I think Senator Marion said, in conjunction with CSU. So what is CSU's position on its participation in these degrees?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: It's been clear for many years that our joint program with Cleveland State University and its doctoral track, it is not really a joint program. It's a program on paper only. There's limited to no communication between the two faculties.

We understand that Ph.D. students have an almost impossible time trying to find enough faculty to sit on their committees, because we don't have enough expertise in these areas to support dissertation committees. Those that are left in the faculty that do have the right credentials then have to basically be advising potentially way too many Ph.D. students.

So again, I believe that the committee did look at all of the evidence that we could find. We did request feedback from the department directly to try to elucidate some other rationale for why we should maintain these programs or something along those lines. We did not receive any compelling evidence that would indicate that these programs could be salvaged with the current structure and with the current staffing levels.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other debate? Ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion which would alter the recommendation of APC so that, to recommend against suspension of the Urban Studies Master's Degree Program in item 20, the Urban Studies Master's Degree with Thesis program in item 21 and the Urban Studies in Public Affairs Ph.D. program in item 22, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign.

MANY SENATORS: Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion fails without dissent. I don't believe I have ever said that before. Are there other motions or debate? Senator Schwartz.

SENATOR ROBERT SCHWARTZ: Could the vice provost share with us the rationale for APC's decision to add additional programs for suspension beyond the original 55, and the process that led to those decisions? For example, were any of those programs reviewed first by faculty in those programs themselves? Did any of them go through the university curriculum review process, et cetera.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes, I can answer that question. During the APC's work we requested from departments, directly from the faculty, input on the proposed suspensions, and in addition to that, any programs that the faculty themselves thought should have been on the list that were somehow left off the list. Even those that they had already begun to do curriculum proposals to suspend.

We felt it was reasonable in asking about the list as it stood to ask if people had already decided to put something on the list that we just weren't aware of. And that's where the additions primarily came from. These were submitted by the departments that offered those programs that indicated they no longer either wished to or felt that they could. And some actually were in the system I think already, but this is sort of a way to get it all packaged together in one place.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I would refer the senator to the language in items 43 through 49, which are the relevant items in each instance that indicates that the departmental faculty recommended the suspension of admissions, meaning recommended it to APC.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: If nothing else, it saved people from doing a curriculum proposal, which we all know poses challenges.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let's not go there. Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I would like to point out that the program in Community Service Technology that had a Gerontology option has existed for many, many years principally drawing on courses that were upper division. So many people have moved it from the associate degree level into the bachelor's gerontology certificate.

Now what has happened is that with the retirement of a key faculty member, that relationship stopped. I did enter into discussion with the key person who is taking over Community Service Technology about continuing the Gerontological Certificate option and I think the faculty just decided not to do it.

But the fact of the matter is that we've done that linkage for a long time using a lot of existing faculty. So I just wanted to mention it. I am not against the recommendation. I'm just pointing out that this is another example of where retirements have affected programs that have been longstanding. And I think we could be more creative in solving some of this.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. I have a question and a comment. A question first. The language in 43 through 49 I think you said, says the departmental faculty has recommended. The question is how did they recommend that? Was that through the result of a vote of the faculty in a meeting transmitted by minutes, or was it the chair of the department saying that that was the will of the faculty? Can you say what the source of that knowledge of the will of the departmental faculty was?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I can speak directly only to 48 and 49, and perhaps the chair of the committee can address the others. In the case of 48 and 49, the Music Piano Harpsichord and Music Organ Programs, there was a faculty vote that was duly reported to APC by the director of the school.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Yes. My recollection, the 43 through 47 are all from Summit College. It's my recollection that the faculty in those departments actually voted on it and these came from the College Level Curriculum Committee as well. It was voted on at that level.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. And the comment is that since I took over as chair of the Undergraduate Review Committee in January, we have completed the review of several hundred proposals. So what was a logjam has apparently changed, and I would like to bring your attention to that as well as that of the senate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And the chair wishes to offer sincere congratulations.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Much deserved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: But the senator misspoke. I think you meant University Review Committee.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: That's what I mean. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there other debate on the motion or motion to amend? I'm beginning to think you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, which is to adopt the recommendations in the APC Committee report, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed please signify by saying no. Motion carries without dissent.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next we have the University Libraries report. Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: One second to get the, thank you. We do have a written report from the last meeting, but we did have a meeting this morning, and I have a, I'm going to orally report on a written statement here.

The Faculty Senate University Libraries Committee met this morning with Interim Dean Phyllis O'Connor from approximately 9:30 to noon to discuss the recent proposal of Dean O'Connor and the University Libraries heads to consolidate the Science and Technology Library with Bierce Library. Dean O'Connor has pledged to provide usage and budget data as well as the scheduled capital planning feasibility assessment to the committee to support the rationale for the proposal.

The Faculty Senate University Libraries Committee solicits input from the academic community to help us evaluate the proposal and to advise the dean. University Libraries Committee also welcomes alternative strategies to address the pending cuts to the library budget and to better serve the teaching and research mission of the university.

The Faculty Senate University Libraries Committee will be in regular communication with Dean O'Connor and will report on the proposal in time for the May meeting of the Faculty Senate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions of Senator Lazar concerning the University Libraries report? Thank you.

Next item is the Faculty Research Committee. We have a written report. Do we have an oral report? I gather not. Part time Faculty Committee. Do we have an oral report?

SENATOR SHANNON OSORIO: No.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Thank you. Athletics Committee, we have a written report. Do we have an oral report? No. Next is the report of the University Council representatives. Who would like to report, if anyone?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: The next meeting of the University Council is this coming Tuesday. You may have seen in the E mail Digest that there is some effort to focus the efforts of the various standing committees of the University Council, and so that's also available for your further review. And further than that, I really can't say too much. Perhaps one of my colleagues has something to add.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Not really, because we're just about to start, it's a long time since the last meeting, and indeed we started discussing those goals and objectives for each of the committees. But they are on the website and feedback to us, the faculty reps or to the committees, we've got faculty representatives

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson, I would ask you to stand. The only reason I didn't interrupt you earlier is because I thought you weren't going to say anything, but now it appears that you are.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Faculty need to give feedback to their representatives. Each of the committees have a faculty representative. And if you look at those goals and you feel that they are, you've left out something, University Council has left out something, then tell your faculty representative or your University Council representative, the committee or University Council representative, and make sure your interests are being evaluated and discussed.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: In one moment I will call on Senator Lillie, but I did notice in the E mail Digest that the item concerning the Budget Committee at the University Council didn't mention anything about reviewing the proposed fiscal year 2015 budget; however it is my understanding that the committee is busily working on that. Please contradict me if I am wrong.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Senator Hajjafar is

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Yes.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: There's one unique characteristic of University Council that you might want to bear in mind. The University Council year in terms of business and terms ends April 30th. That was specifically designed so that the students could indeed finish up their year in time to finish their finals, and then the next group would come in.

So if you hear that kind of discussion, that's something for you to be aware of. It's not the end of the semester. When the new University Council year starts, the new term starts. It will be May



first. So I'm sure there's going to be confusion of some sort, but this is my effort to try to damp it down a little.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Anything else from the University Council representatives?

The chair is aware of no unfinished business. Is there any new business for the senate?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Permission to speak.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Granted.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: The Curriculum Review Committee submitted a report that did not make the seven day deadline. And I would ask that the body entertain a motion from the Curriculum Review Committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Has that report been distributed?

HEATHER LOUGHNEY: It didn't make the agenda. It came after the agenda. I believe it was sent.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: When was it sent?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Tuesday.

HEATHER LOUGHNEY: I believe it was Tuesday morning.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Does the body wish to waive the seven day rule and allow this report to be brought to the senate? All those in favor of doing so, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Please proceed.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Curriculum Review Committee distributed two items. One is simply an informational report indicating that the Curriculum Review Committee did an independent review of the proposed program suspensions from a curricular perspective and found no reason to disagree with the Academic Policies Committee recommendations. It's a report for information only.

The proposal, the report that we would request action is on a list of courses, curriculum proposals that have come through the system without objection or unresolved comments, and so we bring these to you and ask for your approval.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Is there any debate on the motion to approve these curriculum proposals? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of approval, signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any other new business? Any other new business? One more time. Any other new business? Any good of the order?

SENATOR DAVID WITT: Harvey's leaving.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I hate to spoil my playboy image, but I have to go teach.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe Senator Witt has just implied that the departure of Senator Sterns is for the good of the order. Is there anything truly for the good of the order? If not, I take it you are ready to adjourn. Meeting is adjourned.