

University of Akron

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 2, 2014

3:00 4:40 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The October meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. First item of business is the adoption of the agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda as adopted, as distributed? Excuse me. Moved by Senator Raber. Seconded by Senator Schaffer. Are there any amendments to the agenda anyone wishes to offer? All those in favor of adoption of the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted. Next item is the adoption of the minutes of the May meeting. Those were submitted to me by Frank Bove yesterday afternoon, distributed by me electronically to the members of this body yesterday evening. I don't know whether that's really enough time. So I guess what I will do is I'll ask for a motion to approve those minutes, and then if somebody wants to suggest we defer them after a motion and second, we can do that. Is there such a motion? Senator Bouchard moves. Senator Clark seconds.

Does anyone feel they need more time? Okay. 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 a relatively light agenda today. The only action item on it is the approval of the curriculum proposals reported out by the Curriculum Review Committee.

Among the documents distributed along with the agenda for today's meeting was a report of the Distance Learning Review Committee, DLRC, containing recommendations about the proctoring of online exams. DLRC is a subcommittee of the Curriculum Review Committee. The report appropriately was made to CRC not directly to the Faculty Senate. The CRC has yet to act on any of DLRC's recommendations.

At the direction of the chair of the Curriculum Review Committee, it was sent to the Faculty Senate for informational purposes only. If you have comments about the recommendations you wish to make to the Curriculum Review Committee so they can take them into consideration in determining their recommendations to the senate, please send them to the chair of CRC, Rex Ramsier.

As you will recall, last May the Faculty Senate passed a recommendation that the teaching load limit for part time faculty members be increased from eight to nine credit hours per semester, and that part time faculty members no longer be required to report the number of hours they work each week.

In the September Faculty Senate meeting I had reported that the administration had referred these recommendations to outside counsel for a legal opinion, and that this opinion had not yet been received by the administration. I'm informed that the administration has received the opinion and the issue remains under discussion. To date, no change has been made in these policies.

As you know, in August the deans were invited by the central administration to submit requests for authorization to conduct searches to fill full time faculty positions that were budgeted for this fiscal year if and only if there is a critical need, quote unquote, to fill the position. Deans submitted such requests several weeks ago. Decisions were promised by a certain date which came and went without any decisions having been made. More promises were made and broken.

In our September 4th meeting the provost was asked when these decisions would be made. He replied that he hoped to have them all made by Friday of the next week, which was September 12th. It's now October 2nd. To my knowledge no such searches have been authorized. The president has said that as much as possible the decisions about which full time faculty positions to fill should be based on the planning and budgeting process that will conclude during the spring semester.

Earlier this week he agreed to meet with individual department chairs and their respective deans to consider pleas to conduct searches if the failure to fill the position would jeopardize program accreditation or otherwise destroy the program. My view, which I pressed to the president in a meeting yesterday, and with which he expressed agreement, at least in principle, is that those grounds for authorizing the initiation of searches this fall are too narrow.

Year after year full time tenure track positions have gone unfilled. Year after year the academic programs in certain departments and schools have withered as a result. The quality of those programs have suffered as have their reputations. Consequently, student enrollments have declined, as students have sensibly opted to pursue their education elsewhere. The morale of the faculty who teach in the programs and care about their quality also has suffered.

The plain fact is that at a university the quality of its academic programs matters. If the quality of its academic programs declines, its reputation suffers, enrollment and completion rates

decline, and so do its revenues. When these things happen, the university goes into a downward spiral.

In a perfect world all decisions about which full time faculty positions to fill would be determined by a thorough university wide planning and budgeting process. We do not have the luxury of living in that world today. I'm hopeful that our current president will be able to move us closer to that world than we have ever been. In the meantime, however, we must deal with the world in which we now live.

There are some faculty positions that any reasonable planning and budgeting process would tell us must be filled. As to those positions, there's no reason to wait until the spring and there are good reasons not to. In many academic disciplines, if searches are not begun by the middle of October, the best candidates are lost to other universities. Let us not fool ourselves. The planning and budgeting process will not conclude until well into the spring semester. It can take up to a month, occasionally longer, for a search, once authorized to clear the bureaucratic hurdles within the university.

What this means is that waiting to decide which positions to fill until the planning and budgeting process has concluded will result in most of those positions remaining vacant during the next academic year or at best being filled on a temporary basis with visiting faculty.

Programs will wither, quality will decline, program reputations will suffer, faculty morale will sink lower and students will go elsewhere to pursue their educations. We desperately need a sound planning and budgeting process. I fully support the president's efforts to create such a process, and I trust that he has the skills, knowledge and determination to bring it about.

But what we need right now is triage. There are some decisions that can wait and some that should not. This concludes my remarks.

(applause)

Next item on the agenda is special announcements. Andrea D. Martin Sands died on September 2nd at the age of 80. Andy, as she was known to those of us who knew her, and I'm one, earned a bachelor's degree in Library Science and a master's degree in English. She worked first in the Government Document section of Bierce Library and later in the law library. In 1978 she became an Assistant Law Librarian. She oversaw government documents and served as a reference librarian for students, the faculty and the public.

She retired sometime around 1990, I'm sorry, I don't know the exact date. She was a great supporter of the Humane Society and for many years a member of the Copley Historical Society.

Marion Ruebel died on September 28th at the age of 81. Over the course of a nearly 28 year career at the University of Akron, Dr. Ruebel held many positions from professor to provost to university president. Native of Manson, Iowa launched his academic career as a high school

teacher and coach after earning a bachelor's degree in biological sciences in 1958 at the University of Northern Iowa.

In 1962 he earned a masters degree in School Administration at Northern Iowa. In 1969 after several years as a high school principal he earned a Ph.D. in Educational Administration at Iowa State University. The next year he came to the University of Akron as an Assistant Professor of Secondary Education. Over the next two decades, Ruebel served as an Assistant Dean of the College of Education, Dean of University College. Executive Assistant to the President, Interim Senior Vice President and Provost, Acting Vice President of Student Support Services and Director of Alumni Affairs and Governmental Relations.

During this period Ruebel never completely left the classroom. He continued teaching undergraduate and graduate students as a Professor of Education.

After retiring from the University of Akron in 1994, Ruebel became President of Saint Vincent Saint Mary High School in Akron serving as Chief Executive Officer of the 600 student school. He returned to the University of Akron in 1996, to serve as its president, which he did through 1998. During his term as president, Ruebel focused on enhancing scholarship opportunities and academic support for students. Scholarships for Excellence Initiative was launched to increase the number of full time academic scholarships, and the University of Akron's 125 million dollar fundraising campaign concluded three years ahead of schedule.

Senator Sterns, do you wish to add anything about President Ruebel?

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Well, I had the good fortune to serve under President Ruebel in a number of different roles. The [inaudible] gerontology was under the University College at the time that he was the director. He was a great supporter of each of the programs on this campus including what is now African American studies, Negotiation Peace Studies, and other areas as well.

I had a great deal of interaction with him as Chair of Facilities Planning regarding in his role as Provost and President.

The thing that I think that is really special is that in this chamber in 1998 we created the Retiree Association. He supported that greatly, and the Center for Life long Learning, which is now manifested in our SAGE Program.

But what's really interesting is I was doing research on the aging of bus drivers a number of years ago and Iowa was the state that had the best data, and the minute I called they said, do you know Marion Ruebel? So he was obviously well known in education circles in Iowa. He was enthusiastic. He was one of the greatest supporters of students that I've known, and faculty. A great person in every way, and so I know that he will be very much missed.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Sterns. Would you all please rise for a moment of silence in memory of our deceased colleagues? Thank you.

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

SECRETARY PAMELA SCHULZE: Since we last met September 4th the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met twice by itself and once with the president, the senior vice president and provost and Vice Provost Ramsier. The Executive Committee met on September 18th to prepare for the meeting with the president and provost. Immediately afterward the EC met with the president provost and vice president, and, I'm sorry, Vice Provost Ramsier to discuss faculty position searches, faculty enrollment and revenue update, status of the College of Health Professions dean search, teaching load limit and hours reporting requirement for part time faculty and implementation of the general education revision.

The Executive Committee met on September 25th for regular senate business. EC appointed members to the Accessibility Committee, Distance Learning Review Committee the Faculty Research Committee and University Council.

The Executive Committee certified the senate election of Nidaa Makki of the College of Education. As a result the relocation of the Department of Counseling from the College of Education to the College of Health Professions, the Executive Committee reapportioned Faculty Senate seats between those colleges with the result that the College of Education's apportionment was reduced by one seat and the College of Health Professions apportionment was increased by one.

Senator and Counseling Professor Rob Schwartz retains his seat and now represents the College of Health Professions. The Executive Committee appointed faculty to serve on the eight General Education Learning Outcome Committees.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Secretary Schulze. Are there any questions about the Executive Committee report? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Yes. When will we find out who's on these committees?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: It's live on the web now and an E mail will go out with an announcement about it, too. But if you are in a hurry, I see you don't have a device, but you could probably borrow one and check it out. Any other questions for our secretary about the Executive Committee report? Thank you.

Next item is the remarks of the president. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Chairman Rich. Senators, thank you for the opportunity to be with you once again. It's amazing how much more comfortable one is the

second time that you have an opportunity to do something, so I do feel much more comfortable and at home today. So again, thank you for the invitation.

Let me talk to you a little bit about the last 90 days. It's already been 90 days, and what I see happening in the next three months.

As you will recall, what I hoped to accomplish in the first 90 days is what hopefully any good new rookie person needs to do, and that is to listen a lot during the first 90 days. So I have had the opportunity, actually 75% of my schedule has been just meeting people for the first time and getting to know their thoughts, their aspirations for the university both internally and externally. That includes multiple stakeholder groups, Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, student government, student trustees, boards of trustees, legislators, business leaders, et cetera, et cetera, alumni, community organizations. So there's been a lot of time spent just creating the personal relationship that is so important to them individually and to the university at large.

I see that continuing, but not at quite the, to the same extent, because there's some real work of the university to be done. And that's where my time and attention is currently focused. The next 90 days is really to spend time with the colleges, each individual college over the next 90 days to complete a process that will allow me to get to know the university from the college level to the institutional level.

The process is fairly straightforward. It's one that I've seen work in the past, I've experienced in the past, and that is to envision a series of approximately five meetings. The first meeting is with the college leadership. And I believe in all cases that first meeting has already occurred with all of the colleges. With the college leadership, it's really a time again, where I sit and listen for about an hour and a half, listen to the college leadership talk about the college, the composition of the faculty, the issues that they face and the goals, the marketplace, what's happening with enrollment.

And so for most of the one and a half hours, I will sit and listen. They will also hand me a great deal of material to read, which I've enjoyed doing. In all cases I think I've made my way through all of that material.

Then once through the material, we schedule a second meeting. In fact, some of those meetings have already occurred. Not all. For example, I had one this morning, and I won't say what particular college, but in this case we assembled the same college leadership together. And this time I do a little bit more of the talking. I say okay, based on what I heard you say and based on what I read in the materials that you provided, here's what I heard. Now, did I get it right? Are these the issues that are important to you? Is this what's going on?

At that point in time I will also share some thoughts about, have you thought about doing this? Have you thought about doing that? And in that case I usually will do what one would predict and surprise them with a few questions. So I say, look, take the time that I had, you now take the

time, ponder some feedback that I've provided and let's have a third, schedule a third meeting. None of the third meetings have occurred yet, but they will during the month of October, November or December.

After the third meeting, there should be some coming together, a meeting of the minds in terms of a shared vision of where the college is going and should go. And at that point, if the college has already not done so through its own process, we then schedule an all faculty meeting within the college. We explain the process, the issues that were discussed, the proposal for a shared vision of moving forward and then we ask for a general feedback from all faculty within the college.

Based on that, I would say that 75 percent of the time that I've done this in the past, the college faculty give it the thumbs up. But the 25 percent of the time that that does not happen, a second meeting is scheduled so that we take the feedback from the first meeting, we usually form some type of task force of the college faculty and the college leadership, and we work through what is a proposed reaction to the feedback, through an amended plan or a rationale for why the feedback was not followed. And a second all faculty meeting is scheduled, is held, and in every case we are now at a point where there's an agreement of where the college should head.

Now, that's critically important because if all of that gets done by December the budget process for the following fiscal year begins January. Then it's a matter of how do you resource the shared vision of the college. And the budget becomes an instrument by which these plans are fulfilled rather than an instrument that kind of drives the strategic thinking.

So that's the ideal world that Chairman Rich described, that if we can get this done, and I think we can, we'll be in a much better position to align resources with what we need to accomplish.

As Chairman Rich also described, this is not a perfect world, so there are issues that need to be addressed in the meantime. And the most pressing issue is the one that he reported on, which are the critical faculty hiring needs of particular departments. So over the last couple of days we've had the opportunity to meet with deans, associate deans, department chairs, also constituency leaders who are part of the president's biweekly staff meeting, and we've talked about, I'll use Chairman Rich's term, a triage process, an emergency process by which these critical faculty hiring needs are addressed.

The first such meeting occurred this morning, and more are being scheduled this week and next week. Most will occur next week. And they're good conversations. They're not easy conversations, but hopefully they will yield the decisions that will allow the institution to move forward in ways that make sense for the department and the university as a whole. So I'm optimistic about that.

Other than that, I would be happy to kind of address, whatever, do we do that?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Yeah.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Be happy to address whatever particular questions on any topic that you might have. Are there questions for the president? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Yes. Back at our first book club last month, I asked you about the sort of bonus program review, and at the time you denied knowing anything about it. But I think what you are describing now you may not have just recognized the term bonus program review. That's obviously what's going on.

And this sounds like the kind of thing that, no problem, I think we can all be on board with this. But did you know that the Dean of the Graduate School is talking about starting this year a full bore five year thorough academic program review that would include bringing in outside people, doing the full kind of, you know, 10 years' worth of data analysis? Did you know about this?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: We did have a conversation at a meeting with the Vice President for Research and Dean of College of Graduate Studies where we talked about what is the institutional understanding of the term program review, because it means different things at different universities. I've seen it mean two very different things.

One is, I think it's more the Higher Learning Commission view of program review, is that every program over a life cycle, say five to seven years, I'm just using that as an example, is put through a process by which it is reviewed both internally and externally for purposes of continuous quality improvement. How does the program stack up against peer program, what must be done to improve the program? That's the program review in my opinion in the traditional sense and in the HLC's point of view.

There's another definition of program review, I think the one that you are alluding to and one that George was describing in the meeting where all programs at one time are put through kind of a metric or a series of metrics and analyzed on a number of factors. And those who come out the other end that do not satisfy the metrics are somehow reviewed in depth, and are put in a position of being questioned as to their continued existence.

That's not my view of program review, okay? If you are going to do something like that, it makes sense to do it in the context of what I described earlier, a process by which you view where is the college in general going, and then how is each program contributing or not to that college's direction. So I would not, I would see us frankly heading in the traditional sense, not in the sense of putting something through kind of a metric. Does that make sense?

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: It does, but it's not what the chairs are hearing. And the reason I bring this up with you is as you know the dean of the graduate school does not report to the provost. He only reports to you. And there are a lot of really good reasons we do not want

to get cranked up and bring in outside reviewers. Going rate for an outside reviewer is 2,000 bucks so if we're pinching our pennies this isn't what we need to be doing.

First good reason is we just spent 10 years doing it and we're doing more this semester. And to start all over in essence says who cares about the last 10 years? What we discovered doesn't count. We're going to start all over. That's a really good reason not to do it right now. Another good reason not to do it right now is we're just starting gen ed changes. And we're going to spend two years revisiting every aspect of gen ed. And our faculty, as Chair Rich has pointed out, we're shrinking like a son of a gun. We don't have enough faculty to assess gen ed and to do a full blown program review of the grad programs at the same time. There just ain't enough of us. Aren't enough hours in the day and night. Maybe if we gave up sleeping.

And then finally, a reason to not do it right now is that because we have so many programs that are in transition, I think if we did a kind of assessment now which is what Dean Newcomb is talking about, it would give us a very unfair vision. I mean, like biology would be told that they should not have a pre med program because they don't have anybody to teach anatomy. And they're hoping desperately this year to hire someone. But okay, if I was an outside reviewer in biology, I would say close down the pre med program because they aren't set up to have it. So that would be, you know, clear, useless information. Then you would have to re do it. No, no. So I'm just, I'm urging you, slow it down. You are the only one that can do it.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Yes. So, the good news is in this case is you and I agree 100 percent on that. That won't always be the case, but in this case it is. So just to reiterate clearly what we agree with, I agree that right now is not the time to do this definition of program review, that I articulated.

Secondly, I agree with you, the much more important thing is to get general education work done that connects to the Higher Learning Commission process.

Number 3, I agree completely that the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies should report to the provost.

Number 4, I am probably the person who can help get to where you want to go, where I want to go, and I think you will see we'll get there.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you. I'm Lisa Lazar with the library. Welcome. I missed the last meeting. I just had a question of clarification. When you were talking about the five meetings, after the third meeting you would meet again with the leadership of the college or in my case it's the library, and that's where they would be coming together for a shared vision of where the college should be going.

Now, when you said if the college wasn't already doing that, there would be a fourth meeting?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. So my understanding just from visiting with some of the college leadership is that some of them plan to engage, quote, "engage faculty" while the first three meetings with leadership and my [inaudible] are ongoing. Some plan, because it's new to them, they're not exactly sure how this process is going to take place.

We're going to get through the first three meetings, then begin the process to engage the larger faculty. I think each college is handling it slightly different. And at this point, not knowing the colleges well I don't know whether or not, which process fits the college best. So we're trusting the college leadership. But in the end, all faculty will be in the room at least once, and if there's not consensus at least twice to be a part of this conversation before anything is decided.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Okay. So regardless of, you know, the feeling of the leadership you will be coming to meet with all of the faculty?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. It's just a matter of timing that will vary.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Landis.

SENATOR WILLIAM LANDIS: Mr. President, welcome. I want to compliment you, because I think that you have done a very, very good job in 90 days and more than 90 days of course before you came here. I want to compliment you in your efforts to meet the faculty. I know that the faculty in the Department of Polymer Science really enjoyed the luncheon that you hosted about a week ago.

What I'd like to know is whether or not you can give us some insight in 90 days as to what, I don't need a litany, but what might be the three, two or three really best things that you have seen about the university and the three difficulties, most difficult aspects of what you are perceiving.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Sure. I'll be happy to do that. I obviously spend a lot of time thinking about that. One of the things that I'm trying to do in this first 90 days among others is to get a sense of what are people especially proud of?

Now, everyone loves their program. So step aside from the personal love for your own program, but I'm listening carefully. What do people identify as the real strengths of the institution both internally and externally, because those lists sometimes differ. We know our institutions better than the average person on the outside. But it's important to know both. One is important in understanding what you need to do from a marketing sense. The other, the internal view is important in terms of knowing where to invest, okay?

One of the common principles of strategic management is to build on one's strength, okay? To leverage existing strengths. To create an identity for the institution where the average person on the outside says, oh, well, my son or daughter's interested in this program. Everyone knows that

Akron is where you go to do this. To do that. And not every program needs to enjoy that popular reputation, but we need enough in the areas that will draw the sufficient numbers of students that we need to make the collective enterprise work.

So I have enjoyed, as I'm getting to know each program, primarily through conversations and through reading the materials, kind of developing my own list of, you know, clearly strong programs around which you can build a reputation that will draw enough people that will lift all boats, okay?

You have to do some matching with what your strength is and what people are looking for and then create kind of a marketing program around that.

So you know, off the top of my head, you know the list. The average person on the outside knows we that have this magnificent history in polymer science and polymer engineering. The average person on the outside knows we have this great 100 year tradition in the College of Engineering. The people on the outside interestingly know that we have a great history of intellectual property law. People on the outside will interestingly mention our dance program. People on the outside will mention the Bliss Institute for Applied Politics. On and on and on. So I'm kind of developing this list of what the outside public understands is our key strengths and then looking at it and saying okay, how do we build, invest and such that it provides the number of students to do that?

I think that's what I've enjoyed most and that's probably what's most critical to me understanding, as I meet with each college. Before I started doing this, I probably should have had a longer list in front of me.

The thing that I guess I'm most concerned about is no surprise, and I will give you the ultra short version. You know, every public university is struggling financially right now. Doesn't matter if it's the University of Michigan or the University of Akron. Every public university is struggling right now, because the money that they used to have to do all the things that they've historically done is just not there anymore. And it's a result of population demographics, it's a result in cuts in state funding. It's a result of limits on federal research funding. It's a result of tightening of eligibility for federal financial aid. It's all of those things being added together that just make things feel extraordinarily tight.

And universities have coped, but they haven't necessarily managed the change to a sustainable economic model. They coped by deferring maintenance of the campus. They've coped by not providing good people compensation adjustments that are merited and needed to remain competitive in the marketplace. They've done it by going to more part time faculty. They've done it by these bandaid approaches.

And everyone has. I don't know of a single institution right now that would meet the standard for a sustainable economic equality model. Not a single institution. But I knew that coming in. That's the state of the industry right now.

And there are ways to fix it, but there's no way to fix it unless we do it together. So the first step is to build the relationship, build the trust, build the common base of understanding of the macro environment. And then once you've done all of that, then and only then can you focus on your institution and say, okay, how do we move the institution to this sustainable place?

And it's doable. And what I'm trying to think through is how do you do it the right way, the best way? There are a lot of ways to get there, but what's the best way to get there with the minimum downside in getting there? And then once we're there, we can look one another in the eye and say, we've done the hard work. Now let's look forward to the future that we believe we're going to create together. Then you start looking forward rather than back.

That's the remedy for the kind of hard work that you have to do. And so that's what concerns me the most, getting us through that process. But right to this point, I think we're off to a good start, and I appreciate your earlier comments, because it's at least some feedback that we are off to a good start and building those relationships. Does that make sense? Maybe a follow up? I shouldn't do that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I'll let him do a follow up if he wants.

SENATOR WILLIAM LANDIS: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. I will also of course, Mr. President, join in the welcome. Good to see you here. 90 days goes fast, obviously. I also enjoyed being a part of the first book club and I hope to be at the second one, but you're going to have some competition with the soccer game.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Oh, is it the same time? I didn't know that.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: So some of us are going to have to make some tough choices in that regard. Who do we support?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I don't like my odds on that one.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: And I also wanted to say that in terms of sort of the general plan that you have outlined for the next 90 days and some of the safeguards that you have put into it, at least on the floor of this body, I think those sound very good.

I would perhaps not have to urge you, but ask you to also be aware of the fact that in some places, and I'll use my college as an example, in the past year or two we've lost two of the four departments we had. And we've had some leadership changes and some other challenges.

And I don't want to say that there's fear among the faculty, but I would say that there's deep concern. And there's gonna be the kind of suspicions, mistrust, lack of, you know, not wanting to perhaps necessarily move too fast that can sometimes I think, mask strengths. So I would urge you as you are going through this process to make sure that if there is a difficult time perhaps in my college, perhaps in some others, that we also be sure that we're aware that there are strengths there, and it may be that in order to have those really flourish and grow in the way that some of the other programs have done we need to pay some attention to them and provide external support rather than the constant kind of critique that can sometimes cause a reduction in confidence.

So I'm hoping that that's one of the things you will bear in mind as you move forward. It may not be needed for every college and may not be needed even for my college, but it just seems to me that that would go a long way toward helping to restore some faculty confidence in the approach.

The other thing, the actual question, Mr. Chairman, that I wonder if the president has had to chance, given all the other stuff to consider, is the future of some of the shared governance that we've been talking about for a time. In particular at this point the University Council, but also the role of the Faculty Senate and other ways in which you are envisioning the shared government moving forward.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: The particular issue I think that was raised in this forum or another forum recently in terms of what to do with the proposed draft University Council bylaws, so I've asked the board office to resubmit those to the Academic Affairs Committee of the board so we're, I think the history as it has been shared with me was it was submitted to the board, but the board said they wished to wait until the new president was here to move forward with deliberations. So I'm going to, okay. New president's here. So now I'm resubmitting it to the board to begin the process.

Beyond that it's just more of doing the things that are supportive of the spirit of shared governance. And I think, I won't say, but there are members of this body, and we've exchanged E mails, and it's a good dialogue and I think we're off to a good start. I think we're going to do some things especially during this first year that might even go beyond what you would normally do to be consistent with and to strengthen that spirit. So we're going to do those extra things behind the scenes that help build a solid foundation.

And I am already feeling bad that I didn't list more programs. So for example, when I only mentioned, I'm thinking about Chairman Rich here. When I mentioned the intellectual property law, the wonderful thing about going through this process is the average Joe knows about, or

Jane, knows about intellectual property law. But once you get into the college, you know, you learn about the litigation, constitutional law, the emerging healthcare law practice. I mean, it builds the understanding. And then you are saying okay, where's the potential going forward?

Because law, like so many colleges, is you know, suffering in enrollment decline. I've said it before, but I'll say it again. Half as many people are applying for law school as did 10 years ago. That may be high right now given another year of data. So law schools are going through tough times right now. And they've got to decide what to do.

There's some amount of reinventing that must take place. What you do is you start with the strengths, whether it's international property law or healthcare law or constitutional law or litigation, and you say, you know, how do we make this more distinctive? How can we make the case that if you are interested in X, Akron's the only place you would want to go? It's clearly better than the other options that you have in the region. And that's the kind of conversation we're having with each of the colleges right now.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Howley.

SENATOR HEATHER HOWLEY: Chairman Rich and President Scarborough, thank you very much for your commitment to meet with faculty about your plans. I just had a quick question. Will the faculty have access to these plans when you do make that fourth visit prior to your meeting so that we can give responsive feedback?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. They're distributed prior to the first all faculty meeting.

SENATOR HEATHER HOWLEY: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Were there any other questions for the president? Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you very much, appreciate it.

(applause)

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me just add my own comment that I'm extremely encouraged by how consultative the president has been to date.

Next we have the remarks of the senior vice president and provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you, Chair Rich, very much. Good afternoon, everybody. When we last met, it was right after the school year opened and we had first day information related to student success and enrollment.

As you know, since this was a week or so ago, and the census information is information that is often reported to state and federal officials with regard to higher education institutions and I think it would be appropriate to reiterate the continued good news related to the census information that we recorded after the first week because really the good news that's reflected in the numbers is certainly the result of the excellent work of the faculty, the staff and students to move this institution's agenda forward.

So if I may, to assure this is in the record, make some points related to the census day information. We had the highest number of applications in our history; more than 18,700 compared to the previous year. The highest average GPA, 3.37, in history for this entering class. Largest entering honors freshmen. Significant gains in retention of all students who entered as freshmen a year ago, and the highest number of entering minority freshmen honor students, and a significant rise in retention among all minority freshmen who entered in 2013.

So let me make a few points with regard to specific numbers.

Overall freshmen enrollment, that is overall freshmen enrollment held relatively steady at 4,131 students compared to 4,177 students last year. Only a 1.1% decline. A significant improvement in the declines in previous years, which were 8.6 and 9.4.

Among the first time full time freshmen on main campus pursuing a bachelor's degree, an important group of students, because they're referred to as the entering cohort, which really is the cohort that relates to four year and six year graduation rates that are now reported nationally and in so many web sites, our enrollment was up 7.9 percent compared to last year again with the average GPAs up higher.

The Honors College is seeing record enrollment of 578 new freshmen compared to 354 last year. So the Honors College enrollment nearly doubled. Minority students comprised one quarter of the entering class, and nearly seven percent of the entering class comes from outside the State of Ohio. So really a significant compliment to the work that everybody's done to make the University of Akron a destination institution as we so all want to create that type of distinction as the president has mentioned.

I think really impressive are its retention rates for this year compared to last fall, of last fall's entering class. Minority students entering in the fall of 2013 have been retained at a rate of 63.9 percent, which is up about 15 percent compared to the previous year. African Americans entering the fall of 2013 have been retained at a rate of 55.9 percent, 60% up 15% from the previous year. African American males entering fall of 13 have been retained at a rate of 58.8 percent, up 15.7 percent compared to the previous year.

Eligible students entering fall of 13 have been retained at a rate of 67.5 percent, up nine percent from the previous year. And first generation students entering fall of 13 retained at a rate of 66.6 percent up 8.8 percent from the previous year.

So the combination of I think adjusting slightly the entering class as well as the high quality instruction and our great academic programs that these students benefit from is paying off dividends with regard to retaining those that we spent so much time and energy bringing into the institution.

As important is the fact that student credit hours of instruction were down 2.5 percent having budgeted for four percent overall decline, that differential now is under consideration by the University Council Budget Committee, because we also have to understand while students' credit hours didn't decline as much as we had predicted we have more students taking more credit hours, thus entering the plateau. So we have to understand the effect of that on the actual budget, and that committee will be looking at that, I think they meet tomorrow, actually.

Next to last I'd like to say that I'm looking forward to working with the Faculty Senate to support the revision of our general education curriculum, especially linked to an enhanced and robust learning outcomes assessment process that not only improves student learning, but also has concurrent with it an approach that enhances the ability of faculty to teach for improved learning outcomes.

And I think as you've heard indicated by the president, it's an exciting time with regard to visiting the colleges through the strategic planning process.

As I might have mentioned at the last meeting, I asked the deans last April and May to put together a welcoming packet so to speak for the president that reported on progress towards Vision 2020 goals and other points of pride and information related to the college. He received those in the summer as he was coming to the university and transitioning. Those as well as the initial interactions with the deans and their leadership has collectively served for, as you saw demonstrated by the president during his comments, he's learning a lot about the great programs that we have in every college at the University of Akron. So with that Mr. Chair, I'll end my comments. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there questions for the provost? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Thank you. It's good to hear that the retention is up. I know that was something that we worked on last year. We had the retention summit and then a group was put together to

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Retention subcommittee, I think it was.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Yes. Thank you. They were looking for, had an RFP for the grants for it. What ever happened with those? Were grants issued? I just don't remember hearing.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: No. Grants were not issued. The committee did great work reviewing the grants, but with the new president coming in and looking at our overall budget

situation, the suggestion was made let's hold off on making those decisions so we can come up with a collective approach to supporting faculty across the institution to support student success.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to, as you ask us, to address questions through you. I wonder if the provost remembers the last time I asked him to clear up, you know, a rumor I had heard about what happened to the funding or to the application fees. And I wondered if you had had a chance to look into that. I mean, I know there's a lot going on. But that's what I am wondering, if there's been any clarification about that.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you for reminding me of that. From a meeting that I know was held yesterday with a number of members from the registrar and from admissions and other offices on campus, I mean, I have to verify this, but I understand we're still collecting the 45 degree application fee from about 150 students. General counsel, do you know that number to be close?

TED MALLO: It's very close. That's the number that actually are here and enrolled.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Okay. Those are the number of students here and enrolled who have not yet paid, and the collection process is underway. I cannot tell you how many applied and were admitted but did not pay, given the fact they did not choose to attend. We'll have to find that information.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: If I may, I was under the impression, perhaps mistaken, that application fee would be part of the process of making application before you are admitted to the University of Akron. And that's the, that was the core of my question. We had 18,700 applications at \$45 an application. That starts to add up. Certainly some application fees might be waived for good reason, maybe even a lot. But that was the core of my question at that point.

I also did ask the last time because it was a rumor, if it was true that some people were here and not paying. So you've helped with that part of it. But I was wondering if you could help with the other part.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: No, because I only ran across this committee yesterday having done their consultation, and I don't know if the general counsel can address the other question, but I certainly can report on it now that the committee has met.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I'd like to add something to Senator Lillie's question. For me it's not just about how much money it generated. To me it bears on the meaning of the statistics that are offered. If we say that applications went way up as we do, are we using the same measure this year, last year as for the year before? If in previous years an application wasn't considered to be

complete and therefore an application until the fee was paid, but last year a decision was made to count it even though no fee was paid, then the comparison is false.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Sure.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And not entirely honest. So I think that's a concern as well.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I certainly understand that, but I think we're comparing apples to apples, but I certainly will verify that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Just to follow up to your remark, which on the meaning of the applications, it would seem to me what is important is the, how effective they've been.

So has the ratio between application and results, at least we need to have, certainly we may be looking at the absolute result, but did we need all of the applications, because there was a cost in the application. The benefit is enrollment. And I would hope that's the information being collected on this because you can, essentially, I hate to say it this way because it's not necessarily true, it could well be that it was very effective, but you know, I mean, it is possible to have wasted money on 18,000 applications because there were so few results compared to one where you may have had by 6,000 but 4,000 came in?

And I can't remember what the size of the freshmen class stayed about the same. I understand that it didn't go down, and I do understand that, but it just seems to me that applications again, if there's a fee collected all the way along, then that's something that is different.

But I think the idea that you should look at the benefits of the application process versus the costs of it are, you know, essential.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Certainly that's understood. I believe there's a presentation scheduled at the next University Council meeting to address many of these issues. But just to clarify, first time full time freshmen entering the main campus pursuing a bachelor's degree was up eight percent. So as a result of this additional application we were up eight percent in new, first time, full time freshmen.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: May I just ask one more question that's just sort of nagging at me? Does this mean that if somebody were to apply to the University of Akron they would have to pay a fee to make the application or not?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: That's a good question. What I don't know is if you have to pay the fee and you push the button and it doesn't go if you haven't paid the fee. I can't answer that question.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: It begins to become a question of whether it's an application fee or an application fee suggestion at that point. And if it's an actual application fee and 10,000 of the 18,000 actually paid it that's \$450,000 by my quick calculations. And that's a lot of money in the College of Education.

I don't know about others, but that's a lot of money in the College of Education. And so that's why it, that's also part of the question. So if you can't tell me, Mr. Senior Vice President and Provost, whether or not students pay an application fee, who can?

I mean I don't, I'm sorry. I just, it seemed to me like a very simple question and apparently it's much more complicated, so please help me understand it.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I said the committee met yesterday and they're writing a report and I will be able to answer these questions specifically at the next meeting.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I'm Chair of Scheduling in our department and we're starting to think about next summer. So my first question is are we still planning to have a cap on how much money can be spent for summer instruction as we've done the last two years?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: A cap on summer instruction?

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Yes. On the cost of summer instruction.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Colleges have their budgets. And within their budgets are dollars, and within their dollars money can be spent to support summer offerings.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: So the answer is yes?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Each college has its dollars allocated to it to choose to deliver academic programs. So the college has the authority to spend the money within its allocation across semesters as per the college decision.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: But I'm going to suggest that this be changed, okay? Now, let me explain why. It's very simple. It's that summer is an opportunity for the university to make big bucks. And any sort of limit and saying this is the budget, you can't go over the budget, restricts the number of student credit hours we can generate in the summer. The limit on a summer course is 12 students for a part timer teaching it, if they have more than two or three students in there they make money.

For a full professor, if you have more than seven or eight students in there you make money. Which means that the more courses you offer, the more money you generate. And I know that in our department we've had, and this is college wide. It's not just us personally. We've had

restrictions put on, so we've been able to generate fewer student credit hours each summer because we couldn't offer as many sections.

And the argument is always made and I think I've heard you make it, be more efficient. Well, it doesn't work that way. If you have the same course taught at three times, morning, afternoon and evening, and you have say 20 students each time, there's a happy belief, scrunch them together, one professor, 60 students. Life will be good.

No. If you cancel the afternoon and evening sections, you will still have maybe 20 or 25 in the morning section. That, it's not fungible especially in summer school. The students who want to work in the morning and then go work at the hot dog stand in the afternoon, they're not going to start taking an afternoon class because that's the only one available.

Evening students are a completely different group. And since evening enrollment tends to be lower, it's the ones we have to cancel first. So I think the university is throwing away money or encouraging our kids to go over to Kent or up to Tri C by putting a limit on the amount of money available for summer instruction. And I want you to think about it before it's too late.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I will do that. And you do need to know there's no fixed lump sum of dollars for summer, and the colleges have total budgets.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions for the provost? Thank you.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you.

(applause)

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next we come to committee reports. First the Curriculum Review Committee, Vice Provost Ramsier, who is the chair of the committee, is unavailable today for sad reasons. His wife's sister died yesterday, so he could not be with us. In his absence Senator Hajjafar will report on behalf of the CRC.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: There are two items in the CRC report today. Item one is a set of course proposals that have passed all necessary stages including CRC and now is presented to this body for approval.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: All right. You have the list of course proposals on two sheets. This comes to us as a recommendation of the committee, it requires no second. Is there debate on the motion to approve these proposed curriculum changes? Senator Ducharme.

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: There are two Death and Dying classes that the Philosophy Department objects to for several reasons. Summit College has two Death and Dying classes proposed which would increase a credit hour from two to three credit hours. The justification for that is that they're adding ethics into the Death and Dying courses, and so that raises a flag, is this now the Bioethics of Death and Dying class?

Also there was no syllabus attached to these course requirements or to these classes, so one can't tell what the syllabus maybe reveals. Is it Psychology of Death and Dying, Sociology of, Bioethics of? Can't tell.

Also there are no criteria on the faculty who would be the personnel teaching the course other than Summit College. Also, of the two proposals

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: For the record you are referring to proposals 14 9719 and 14 9728; is that correct?

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: Yes. Thank you. And also these two proposals, one is a 200 level to move from a two to a three credit. And the other is a 300 level to move from a two credit to a three credit. And they're absolutely identical. So multiple problems like that. And so I would move that those at least be removed from the list to be acted on and to be referred back to CRC for more attention.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. There's a motion to divide the question and to refer the proposals 14 9719 and 14 9728 back to the Curriculum Review Committee with the instruction to

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: Instruction to review the details and also to contact and to interact with the departments of interest. Philosophy Department for example only learned about these two classes two days ago.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: He's trying to get the instruction down, so they know what the motion is.

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: So the motion is for the committee to meet with the Philosophy Department at least, or other parties of interest in these classes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. There's a motion on the floor. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Gatzia. Testing the limits of my eyeglasses back there. It's been moved and seconded to divide the question and refer back those two items to the Curriculum Review Committee with the instruction that was just stated. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR DWAYNE JONES: I ask that Associate Dean Kennedy be recognized to discuss this issue.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Chair will gladly recognize Associate Dean Kennedy with no objection.

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: Interim Associate Dean.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Interim Associate Dean.

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair Rich. I appreciate your indulgence. As the originator of the Death and Dying courses in question, I'm here today to offer some clarification. I appreciate Duey's concern having just received word of this a day or so ago. I received word of this about 2:00. And I believe there's confusion that I can clearly eliminate. If you don't mind, I can send an E mail to Duey and John [inaudible] who I've met for the first time today and we've already had a discussion about this.

There's confusion about what actually is in the proposal. First of all, it seems to concern our Respiratory Therapy Program. And the good news is that Death and Dying has not been, is not now, nor will it be in the future a required course for the Respiratory Therapy Program.

Death and Dying is an established part of the university's general education curriculum social science area and was originally developed and approved as a two credit course in the 1970s. In addition to serving as a general education elective taken by both CAST, formerly Summit College and other UA students, the course has long been part of the undergraduate certificate in Gerontology as Harvey Sterns the Director has pointed out.

In the early 2000s the course was approved as a quote, unquote, "split level course," that is as a 200/300 course. This was done to serve baccalaureate degree students who needed upper level electives, and thus would take the course at the 300 level and to maintain the 200 level for the associate degree seeking students. This split was modeled after the graduate/undergraduate course split 400/500.

Students taking the course at the 300 level complete a capstone project which entails a significant work product that students in the 200 level are not required to complete. In terms of course content, death and dying serves as a broad introductory level course in the field of thanatology. It is taught from applied focus meaning students learn the basic concepts and theories in thanatology with relevant application to and skill set development in their personal and professional lives.

This is best illustrated in the course objectives. The primary course objectives of this course are to A, increase students' ability to describe and discuss the sociocultural, psychological and physical aspects of death and dying; identify and characterize the processes of bereavement, grief and mourning and apply sensitive and effective responses and when dealing with issues of loss, death and dying in their personal and professional lives.

I have proposed to increase the credit of this course at both the 200 the 300 levels in order to reflect developments and growth in the field of thanatology. This will allow for expanded, updated coverage of relevant topic areas such as psycho social and diversity issues, family systems, life span developmental perspectives, suicide, suicidal behaviors and legal and ethical end of life issues. Thereby significantly enhancing the course content and most importantly the skill set students acquire upon successful completion of the course.

Unfortunately, the clumsiness of our current curriculum proposal system requires that each level, 200 and 300, has its own curriculum proposal.

My credentials: A Ph.D. in Psychology, Cognitive Aging, certification in thanatology, death, dying and bereavement from the Association of Death Education and Counseling the nationally recognized thanatological organization.

My experience: Peer reviewer for death studies and eight plus years as a bereavement specialist for Hospice of Medina County are solid.

As to the Respiratory Therapy Program proposal, as outlined to me in discussions with the program director for RT, students are and will be, will continue to be required to take Introduction to Ethics their second year, spring semester from the Philosophy Department which fulfills the program's accreditation requirements.

The RT proposal seeks to include in its curriculum a course already approved through the curriculum system last spring titled Death and Dying for Healthcare Professionals. The rationale from that curriculum proposal is frequent encounters with death and dying are part of all healthcare professions yet rarely is any formal education regarding these very human experiences provided to students training for these careers.

This course addresses the distinct death education needs of students entering healthcare professions. Students acquire a foundational knowledge of basic thanatology, the requisite skills needed to work effectively with the dying and bereaved and critical self care strategies necessary for coping with death and dying experiences in both their personal careers and personal lives.

The Respiratory Therapy program curriculum proposal states that with the approval of the Death and Dying for Healthcare Professions, the program is finally able to offer a course that is both related to medical ethics and the field in which our students and graduates thrive.

In closing, it may be that more dialogue such as this, the faculty in the Respiratory Therapy Program would be willing to entertain an or option whereby students in their program have the option to either take Bioethics or Death and Dying for Healthcare Professions. That is merely my suggestion and not my decision to make, but it does seem a logical one to offer.

I hope this helps. If I can answer any questions that you might have, I would be more than happy to do so. Thank you for your indulgence.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Senator Hajjafar.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: A few comments. After a proposal goes through the university review, there's two weeks that everybody can make objection. And since there was no objection, it had gone through CRC and now it's here. Now Senator Bouchard

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Ducharme.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: I'm sorry, you are so popular. As a Senator, he has put an objection on these proposals. If this body recognizes these objections, it is CRC's duty to put these two parties together and discuss the differences over that. That's the procedure. I think it's

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Meaning if it is referred back. That's what CRC would do.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: That is what I think we should do.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Ducharme, did you wish to speak?

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: Thank you. So I think then we agree. Elizabeth, thanks for your comments. Those are great.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: I have no doubt

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: But there's no disagreement, correct?

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: I think it's for the body to sort all that stuff out, so that my motion still stands, so that we could instead of just getting this information here at this meeting and not carry it on with the meeting try to sort all this stuff out, to have it referred back to committee, to CRC.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. I'm frankly not sure which side of the issue to come down on, but I wanted to say a couple of things.

As the co editor of a book on end of life issues and persons with disabilities, as a speaker at the Fourth Undergraduate Bioethics Conference on Disabilities, as a member of the American Society of Bioethics and Humanities and having addressed the [inaudible] Group meeting and having some other kind of similar qualifications, it occurs to me that issues related, in particular with end of life issues but others like that are too important to be left to the bioethicists; that it's the kind of thing that needs to be addressed by a wider range of people.

So I applaud the idea that the Associate Dean Kennedy brought forward and also the rationale as to why this happened. At the same time, it does sound like this is a perfect example, perfect time for us to show that our process as a senate and also in terms of curriculum can be used in a way that may be able to resolve this short of a pitched battle.

So starting out with not knowing which side I'm on, I'm now in favor of referring it back.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: I just wanted to comment on the fact that our system, which I know well since I helped to develop it for the curriculum review.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I don't know if I would admit that if I were you.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: Remember, it's much better than the earlier one. It's far from perfect. According to this approach, any program that was affected by this change should have been notified. Since this course has been an integral part of the certificate in gerontology for many, many years, I received no notification electronically or any way that the credit hours were being changed, for instance.

So our program is not working the way it should, because one of the key ideas behind our curriculum review was that every program that used courses was to be notified at the time of this review to have comments. So you can't object if you don't know about it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: May I ask a question to which I do not know the answer? What would be the consequences of the delay that would be entailed by referring it back to committee in order to work out some of these things? Can someone address that? Associate Dean Kennedy.

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: I don't know if I can address it, but I'm not quite sure what part we're going to send back. Is it the Respiratory Therapy proposal that's in question? I thought the distinction about the 200, 300 and the Death and Dying course is independent of what the respiratory program does.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion concerns items 14 9719 and 14 9728. That's why I wish to, that's why I earlier tried to clarify that so we know what we're talking about.

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: But I'm not sure that we do, because I think the objection was made prior to understanding what the proposals were about. That's my, so I'm not sure if there's an objection to death and dying going to three credits, or if it's because the Respiratory Therapy Program wants to add a different course in the bioethics. Do you see what I'm saying?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I see what you are saying. Senator Gatzia, did you want to speak?

SENATOR DIMITRIA GATZIA: Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to ask a clarifying question, because it seems to me that if the Death and Dying course becomes a three credit course, then it will affect the Philosophy Department since students might be able to take it in place of Bioethics, because the clause was [inaudible]

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: Not the Death and Dying course. That's the other course. Not mine. Not the one proposal

SENATOR DIMITRIA GATZIA: So the other course would affect it. I think that's support for Senator Ducharme's motion, because since at least one of the departments is involved, the Philosophy Department is affected by this, I think the department should be involved in making this decision.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I want to make sure, I'm not sure that there isn't still some confusion here. We're only talking about those two proposals, 9719 and 9728, both of which are labeled Death and Dying. Everybody understand that?

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: There has to be two proposals for Death and Dying, because it's a 200 and 300. The other proposal is the Respiratory Therapy program.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Which we're not talking about yet.

SENATOR DIMITRIA GATZIA: But that's where the concern is coming from.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I understand. Senator Scotto.

SENATOR CARRIE SCOTTO: As the Chair of our Curriculum Committee at College of Health Professions, I'm getting really familiar with our curriculum prevention system, I mean our curriculum

(laughter)

SENATOR CARRIE SCOTTO: And I can understand both of these situations, because I have been up against it many times. So everything you said is right and good, and everyone is behind you. But then you come to the things that Senator Ducharme said about these are the things that are missing. We don't understand what this is, and what that is. The syllabi don't match up. When we're looking at those proposals, we're looking at those very specific things. And those are missing. And if they aren't there, then we should address them.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Associate Dean Kennedy.

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: They are there. The syllabi are there. I put the proposal together. If you send the Death and Dying courses back, the proposal for the Respiratory Therapy Program is back in originator review because it was sent back by CRC looking for the syllabus because it wasn't attached. If you send my courses back, you've done nothing to deal with the Respiratory Therapy Program issue. My syllabus, I promise you, are there.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: You asked earlier, Mr. Chairman, what the effect might be of this body returning the two proposals to the Curriculum Review Committee. I think that would be similar to any referral that this body makes. It would go to the Curriculum Review Committee. These two. They would not go back to the originator unless the Curriculum Review Committee wanted to send them back.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Right. I didn't mean that. I just meant the practical consequences, is there some urgency to making the decision now?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: What I was going to say was that we seem to meet every two weeks in the Curriculum Review Committee, and so it would be, practically speaking, a month, perhaps more, that would be the holdup.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And the question is what if any problems would that create with the proposal? Senator Hajjafar.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: I wanted to make the same comment, the CRC meets next week, Friday. And that can be put in their agenda for that.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Associate Dean Kennedy, do you wish to speak?

ELIZABETH KENNEDY: I don't see that there's a problem to fix with my proposals. I don't think that applies to the question. I think the question is about the proposal that's in the originators, that the CRC sent back to her, because it was missing a syllabus. Someone confused my sweet innocent [inaudible] with this mean, nasty program that wants to kick somebody out, and they're independent of each other, I promise you. And it's just that because we had to do two proposals for Death and Dying, and I know the syllabi are attached because I did them, that made it through CRC without a flag.

If the syllabus hadn't been there, as is evidenced by the program being sent back, that proposal, it would have been sent back to me. But it was not. And delaying it for no apparently valid reason, I don't understand why we would, that kind of makes us into this, gosh, we can't get anything done system.

There's nothing, if you are all, as my colleague suggested, if you are supporting what this course is about, who it reaches, the students that take it, it's an elective course. It's not required by any program. And yet I have students from the health fields as you might imagine, psych and sociology students take it to get their certificate in gerontology. I have engineers in there. Now, that's a fun class. I have theater majors, I have law students. I have all kinds of people in this class. I have had early college high school through the 60 Plus program.

It is a general elective that serves the university well. I even have Stark State interested in the course. So I don't think that by sending these two proposals back you are accomplishing anything but delaying something that doesn't need to be delayed. If there's an ethics question and it's related to a program content, then address that curriculum proposal, because you will not find that problem in mine.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Jones.

SENATOR DWAYNE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had the pleasure of serving on CRC with Senator Hajjafar. And one of the things they're very careful about is making certain that syllabi and those things are attached and available. Consequently, I would believe that the

syllabi is there. There may be a problem with content for some other proposal, but not on syllabi. I speak from my prior experience.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Ducharme.

SENATOR HOWARD DUCHARME: I was just gonna say, it seems to me the amount of discussion already is evidence that it should be, that it should go back to CRC for sorting all this out.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Are there any further comments? Is there anything that hasn't been that said needs to be said? I'm not asking is there anyone who hasn't said it.

Okay. Are you ready to vote on the motion, which is to refer the two items that we've been talking about, 14 9719, Death and Dying and 14 9728 Death and Dying back to the Curriculum Review Committee with the instruction stated previously by Senator Ducharme?

Okay. Are you ready to vote? All those in favor of that motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed, please say no.

MANY SENATORS: No.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We need a division of the house. Senator Hajjafar, would you please be seated temporarily? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by raising one hand. You have to leave your hands up. We're going to do it again. 22. We agree on 22. All those opposed to the motion, please raise your hand. Keep your hands up. The motion is defeated. It's a tie vote. We're back to the main motion. Senator Hajjafar.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: I think too, as the chair mentioned in his report, is just for information.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We're back to the main motion, sorry. We're back to the main motion, which is the approval of all of the others. We still need to approve all the others. Is there any debate on the approval of the other proposals or any motions with respect to them? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: This is not debate. This is just a clarification. Since the motion to separate failed, that means that the two items we were discussing are now back being considered under the main motion.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That's right.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other debate or motion? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote on the main motion. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign.

>> Nay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Motion carries. Next.

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Item 2 is a policy recommended by DLRC to CRC regarding 100 percent online courses. That is to ensure that stated tuition and fees represent cost accurately. And this report you have received a complete report, and that's just for information.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Correct. So this item that you have just referred to is merely for the information of the senate, correct?

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: Yes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This requires no action. Anything else?

SENATOR ALI HAJJAFAR: No.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Hajjafar. Next we have the report of the Athletics Committee. Is the chair here? This is just an informational report. There's no action proposed. So if there's somebody from the Athletics Committee that wishes to speak, please raise your hand and I will recognize you, and otherwise we'll move on for the next report.

Next is a report of the University Libraries committee. Senator Miller.

SENATOR JON MILLER: I submitted a written report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Written report only. Okay, thank you. And the Communication and Technologies Committee, I don't believe the chair is here. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? This is an informational report only as well.

Okay. That concludes the reports of senate committees. Next is the report from the University Council representatives. Is there a University Council representative who wishes to report? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you, Chairman Rich. The University Council continues to operate as it operates, and you heard the president say that he has referred the bylaws back to the governing board. So hopefully that will clarify some of the issues that have arisen.

At the last meeting, I made a motion that suggested that it would be good, similar to the way the senate does it, to have the proceedings of the, or not the proceedings but to have a transcription of what goes on in the University Council meetings, that would be distinct from but supplementing the minutes. Because the minutes properly speaking are matters of action and not necessarily matters of word for word transcription.

After quite a bit of discussion, the motion failed, so the University Council has decided it does not want to have its discussions or deliberations transcribed. And so I would urge you if you want to have an idea of what's going on, to come to the meeting. As far as I know it's still public, and to hear that. The minutes have historically and continue to be fairly sparse, so you know, once again, it's a situation in which sometimes decisions are made and referred to and it's not always clear exactly how large they are or who they might always affect. However, at this point that's about where things stand with regard to the university, with the University Council.

If I may, there is one thing I want to say about the Athletic Committee report. But I'm finished with University Council for now.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me just ask, do any of the other University Council representatives wish to report?

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: No. I think that's about it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: If there's no objection, I would like to allow Senator Lillie to report on the Athletics Committee. Isn't that what you said?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Yes. I just wanted to see if there was an objection.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lazar, are you objecting?

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: No. I actually had a question. I just wanted to, it's my understanding that those meetings are open to any member of the University of Akron and the public?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: My understanding is that the University Council meetings are public meetings.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Just as this meeting is a public meeting. That may not mean that there are a lot of people who want to come, but if they wanted to they could. That's my understanding.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie, would you like to report concerning the Athletics?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. The thing that occurred to me after you asked if there was anyone from the committee is I think an important one.

As you know, there's been over the past couple of years a really important issue of head injury and concussions with regard to the student athletes. And the Department of Athletics has started a process by which they would like to develop a policy that would cover perhaps ways in which faculty and others might be appropriately made aware when that's the right thing to do, of the fact of a concussion that's been sustained by a student athlete and perhaps what the consequences of that might mean academically.

In the course of that discussion we also brought up the student absence policy of a few years ago that also started in the Department of Athletics and turned into a policy that came to this body so that students who are engaged in any university sanctioned activity, athletics or others, can also fall under that policy.

So with that in mind, and that previous cooperation in mind, the Athletics Committee is asking the Accessibility Committee to set up perhaps sub groupings of the two to see if there are ways we can coordinate that kind of policy for everybody who might experience a head injury or a concussion at the University of Akron, and to make sure we go forward in that regard. And that seems like an important topic, and I thought that the senate would like to know about it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Is there any new business to come before the body? Any new business? Anything for the good of the order? Senator Hallett.

SENATOR TERRY HALLETT: I just wanted to make an announcement of a convention we're holding. My name is Terry Hallett and I'm in the School of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology at the University of Akron, and I'm the Faculty Advisor for our student organization which is called the National Student Speech Language Hearing Association, NSSLHA.

We are hosting a one day, state wide convention on Saturday, October 11 at Quaker Square from 8:00 to 4:00. And as it happens, one of our topics is concussion in sports athletes. Our keynote speaker is Jim Tressel, President Jim Tressel from YSU now. And our theme is Succeeding By Leading.

And I just wanted to mention that Jim Tressel had told us that he would present at our convention last spring. Later on he was hired as president at YSU and he actually has several events that day, but he's still coming that morning, so we're really happy to have him.

We have students in the field of speech pathology and audiology from Ohio, West Virginia and Pennsylvania coming, and we would like to invite any students in related fields to the convention. You can access that information, the registration for this October 11, one day, state wide convention at Quaker Square on the website for Speech Pathology and Audiology.

And if anyone in a related field here knows of any students who might be interested, please contact me and I would love to send information to your department. The tickets are \$25. That includes free parking at Quaker Square, a free lunch buffet, free breakfast buffet, convention tote bag with a convention T shirt and other items.

And we'll also have people presenting on a variety of topics. And the topics include as I mentioned concussion, healthcare. We have people presenting on evidence based practice, telepractice, language and literacy topics, hearing loss and the family, sign language certificate programs and other related topics.

So we would really like to invite any students at the university who are interested to attend our convention. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Anything else for the good of the order? I take it you are ready to adjourn, and the senate having concluded its agenda, I declare us adjourned.