

University of Akron Faculty Senate
November 6, 2014
3:00- 4:05 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The November meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Lashbrook. Seconded by Senator Raber. Are there any changes that anyone wishes to propose to the agenda? All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

Next item is the adoption of the minutes of the September meeting. We do not have minutes of the October meeting, so we are not in a position to adopt them.

The minutes of the September meeting were not distributed until yesterday evening by me, and so once again I want to ask, have you had time to read them? If not, we can put that off until the next meeting. If anyone wishes to do so, just make a motion to postpone until the December meeting. [Pause.] Hearing no motion, are there any corrections to the minutes? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Yes. The September minutes said that we approved the September minutes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That should say the May - -

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: That's what I thought.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: No, wait a minute. The April minutes. Thank you. I trust there's no objection to that amendment.

Any other corrections to the minutes of the September meeting? All those in favor of adopting the minutes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Minutes are adopted.

Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the chairman. We have a light agenda today. There are some curriculum proposals that have been reported out by the Curriculum Review Committee. And although the agenda lists an Academic Policies Committee report, and there was an item of business transacted by the Academic Policies Committee, the report did not arrive. Actually it still hasn't arrived, and certainly not in time for this meeting. So there will be no action item coming to us from the Academic Policies Committee.

The president has informed me that in response to the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate last May, the maximum teaching load for part-time faculty members would be increased from eight to nine hours per semester starting the Spring 2015 semester.

Part-time faculty members teaching more than four credits per semester will, however, continue to be required to report the number of hours they work each week and will not be permitted to average more than 29 clock hours per week.

All but one of the General Education Learning Outcome Committees have either met and elected chairs or scheduled a meeting for next week. I believe the last of them is Thursday. There was one that, last I knew, had not yet scheduled a meeting, and we are

hoping that that will occur soon.

The next step is for the chairs of the eight Learning Outcome Committees to develop a template for academic departments and schools to submit courses for learning outcome approval. We are somewhat behind schedule at this point.

As promised, President Scarborough met with department chairs and deans to hear requests for approval to proceed with faculty searches to meet critical needs, and approved 11 such searches, of which two were tenure track positions and nine were non-tenure track positions.

I have suggested to the President that he explain to this body the basis for these decisions and their relation or lack thereof to his ideas about the future of public higher education or the University of Akron in particular. I expect that he will speak about this in his remarks later this meeting and that there will be opportunity for discussion during the question and answer period immediately following his remarks.

This concludes my remarks.

Next item is special announcements.

I have two deaths to report. Dan Peters, former Director of Basketball Operations died on Monday, October 27th.

Peters, 60, was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer in December 2013 and took an indefinite medical leave of absence after the Zips played Bethune-Cookman on December 14th. Nicknamed Pete, Peters spent five seasons on the bench for the Zips before retiring in July 2014 after a 30-plus year coaching career.

Peters is survived by his wife Nancy and his two sons, Danny and Michael. Peters was honored by the United States Basketball Writers Association in February as the organization named him one of three recipients of the Most Courageous Award.

He joined the University of Akron staff in 2009 after serving as an assistant coach at Ohio State from 2004 to 2009 and at Cincinnati from 1999 to 2004, and as head coach at Youngstown State from 1993 to 1999.

He also was on former Akron Head Coach Coleman Crawford's staff from 1989 to 1991. He's a northeast Ohio native. He was born in Cleveland and grew up in Canton and is a 1976 graduate of Kent State University.

Dr. H. Kenneth Barker, Dean and Professor Emeritus in the College of Education died November second at the age of 92.

He joined the University of Akron in 1996 as an assistant to then President Norman P. Auburn, also as Dean of International Programs and Professor of Education. Barker quickly became Acting Dean and then Dean of the College of Education, a position he held until August, 1985. Barker also held the post of Dean of International Programs until 1978.

He retired in 1987 but continued serving in various roles with the Department of Development and the Department of Athletics until October of 2003. As Dean of the College of Education, Barker was instrumental in establishing the Center for Economic Education in 1975 and was the long-time chair of its advisory board. To honor his contributions, the University of Akron renamed it the H. Kenneth Barker Center for Economic Education in November of 2000.

Barker earned bachelor's and masters degree's at the University of Louisville and a Ph.D. in 1960 at the University of Michigan.

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

The next item is the report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Schulze.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: Since we met last on October second, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on three occasions by itself and once with the president, the Senior Vice President and Provost, and Vice Provost Ramsier. The EC met on October 8 for regular senate business. The EC appointed members to the University Review Committee and the Learning Outcomes Committee.

The EC was updated on University Council business. The EC also discussed preparations for the upcoming HLC visit. The Executive Committee met on October 16th to prepare for the meeting with the president and provost. Immediately afterward the EC met with the President, the Provost, and Vice Provost Ramsier to discuss the Provost's contract extension, part-time faculty loads, general education reform, critical needs faculty searches and the college strategic planning process, review of deans, the criminal justice program proposal, an update on Central Hower swing space, the process of deciding whether to consolidate libraries, and teaching load limits for contract professionals. The Executive Committee met on October to prepare - - I'm sorry. I left the date off. We met - -

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: On a date in October.

SENATOR PAMELA SCHULZE: On a date in October to prepare the agenda for the November senate meeting.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there any questions of the secretary about the Executive Committee report? Thank you.

Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the president.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Chairman Rich. Good afternoon everyone. Thank you again for the opportunity to be here today.

I have distributed some material today to make it a little easier to discuss some of the issues that I know that you want to discuss. The first such handout that I would call out would be the first year timeline. And again, I know that many of you have seen this before, but it's a nice outline on how I am prioritizing my first 12 months. So the first 12 months, as you can see, were spent meeting people, getting to know the team, researching the finances of the institution, understanding the culture. And the first three months have now come and gone. They were extraordinarily productive. I felt like I climbed the learning curve a long way, but of course [there's] still much to learn.

We're now into the second three-month period of time. And many of you are aware that we've begun conversations with each of the colleges that are listed there, and I believe the library division as well, to have conversations about updating each of the college's strategic plan. And the process is to meet with the college leadership in three such meetings and then to meet with all of the faculty in the college over two meetings. So over 60 such scheduled meetings over the nine-month period of time. Hoping to come out of that process with everyone on the same page in terms of the direction of the college, the aspirations of the college, what obstacles they face and having a coherent plan of moving

forward together. The reason that is so important is because beginning in January the third three-month period of time, the goal will be to begin to resource those plans. And that will be the period of time we'll begin to work on the university's annual budget.

We have roughly a \$500 million annual operating budget, so the hope would be that in the development of that budget if we could see resource allocation to moving each of those college plans forward.

Then in the final three-month period, of course, you then have updated plans, you have then resource plans and then it's simply a matter of beginning the all-important work of implementing those plans with new structures and new people if necessary.

And so I share that with you just to say those are the big rocks, those are the big priorities. Those are the most important things in my mind to try to get done to get the institution pointed in a direction we all feel very excited about.

In addition to that, I know that Chairman Rich suggested that we talk a little bit about the process that we engaged to address the critical faculty hiring needs that have been expressed. So I want to talk about that for a moment.

If you will recall, the conversation was that ideally what we would do is to address the critical faculty hiring needs through each of the strategic planning processes with each of the colleges such that coming out of that would be a clear sense of agreement and direction of the priorities of the college which would then inform the critical faculty hiring decisions.

When I shared that with deans and department chairs and others, the feedback that we received was, while that's nice, and while that's an aggressive goal and it's a reasonable goal and it's a rational goal, there are certain problems with that, that the hiring timeline associated with some of these positions is such that if we don't get decisions made in the next two weeks we miss an entire year's hiring cycle.

So in response to that what we said is that we would set up an exceptional process, a process independent of the strategic planning process and deal with those requests that had such a critical timeline associated with them that delaying even two months would cause irreparable harm and damage to the program. So it's a pretty high bar that we set in terms of which requests we would entertain in this exceptional process. But we did that.

We had 14 departments step forward and say we have critical faculty hiring needs that rise to that standard of urgency, and so we scheduled 14 meetings over the course of three days.

The provost and I met with representatives from each of the departments. We heard requests for a total of 23 critical faculty hiring needs, some of which were tenured and tenure track, some of which were non-tenure track, up to 23. In the end, at the end of all of the conversations, we approved two of the tenure-track positions and nine non-tenure track positions.

Now, what constituted the reasons, the rationale for approving some and not all, and essentially it was department-specific, and it was case-specific.

What one could say is that when a department came in and could show that there are critical competencies in academic programs of which there are retiring faculty that only a tenured and tenure-track faculty could possibly provide, then we approved the tenured and tenure-track position.

In some cases where the department came forth and said we're requesting approval

for the non-tenure track position for this reason, some that come to mind I think were in the engineering area, we approved the requests when it was shown that the quality of the instruction was such that it was either currently substandard or would get worse if we didn't fill the position. So we filled the position with the requested non-tenure track position.

When the requests came forward and said the greatest need that we have is the ability to cover lower division undergraduate courses, we approved a teaching non-tenure track position because the case that was made had, pertaining to covering classes. We also looked at the mix of the department to make sure that by adding a non-tenure track position it didn't fundamentally change the faculty mix of that department.

The requests that did not get approved simply did not either meet the standard of timeline, meaning that it needed to be addressed outside of the college's strategic planning process. There were many where we said these quite possibly are critical needs, but it doesn't rise to the standard of taking it outside of the college strategic planning process. It can be addressed through the college strategic planning process and the budget process that follows. So in those cases we didn't approve the position for that reason.

There were some cases we didn't approve the request because they just didn't meet the standard of proving that there was a need to hire a faculty member. Some that came to mind basically made the case that, look, we've got 22 faculty in our department. We're down to 19 and we would like to go back up to 22. Well, I understand that you would like to do that, but that's not a sufficient case for making the decision based on the very high bar that we set for this moment. So, again, those can be revisited during the college strategic planning process and budget process, and perhaps a more substantive case can be made in those decisions.

You know, following the decision, I think people understandably asked the question, is this likely to continue? Does this somehow set a precedent that we can expect to see in the future? And I would say no. These are department by department, case by case, very critical, high standard of decision making about the unique needs of a particular department. So nothing can be inferred about the future. We're still learning. I'm still learning the institution. I haven't learned enough about the institution to be able to reliably predict or project much at this point.

I can share with you what I've learned to this day, but nothing could be inferred going forward. On the other hand, the other material that I'm providing to you today are other people's thoughts about what the future looks like. And these happen to be articles that I have received from you, from faculty senators who emailed them to me and said, hey, these are good articles. And I have read the articles, and I agree. So now I'm giving them to all of you. Okay. But these come from your colleagues. I think they're of a quality that they at least begin to address some of the issues about what does the future hold. And more importantly why has the faculty mix changed so dramatically over the last 30 years?

These are two very well written, I think, articles that allow you to dive into that issue. And that's what I think I would encourage you to do. I would encourage you if you are interested in the subject, dive into these articles and other books or literature that we can certainly provide. And then let this conversation continue in the context of institutional planning, college planning in the context of our regular and ongoing conversations together. So that addresses the issue of the decisions pertaining to critical faculty hiring needs.

The last point I would make before turning it over to you for your questions would be, as we look forward beyond this current three-month period to working on the institution's budget, it's my opinion that every year that you begin the process of developing a budget that's a critical moment in time. The issues of resource allocation, because they are linked to core values and shared values and institutional goals and college goals, is a critical moment in time. I'm trying to gear up for that moment, that being the most important set of decisions that I will probably make in the first 12 months. So it's important that we once again kind of reexamine the process by which we adopt the annual operating budget.

You have a wonderful tradition and one you built strength and improved over time, and that is the University Council Budget and Finance Committee. My understanding is that's a group of people that has representatives from the faculty, from the students, from the deans and from administration that meet regularly to provide input and feedback on the development of the university's annual budget, and I assume also discuss other issues pertaining to its finances. That process will certainly continue and we'll hope to continue to build on the improvements that were experienced in the last cycle.

I would also point out that we do plan in the January through March period of time to institute what many universities call budget hearings where you invite in each college and administrative unit to present their budget and their request, and for them to have that conversation with the president, provost and representatives from each of the administrative units. So during that period of time you can expect to hear of and maybe some of you participate in those budget hearings.

In addition to that there are also, I would characterize them as, informal processes that are equally important, that inform the budget process. Because I am new, I have invited, and these individuals have graciously accepted, an invitation to sit down, it would be Bill Rich, Chair of the Faculty Senate, Steve Weeks, President of the AAUP, and Matt Lee, faculty representative on the University Council Budget and Finance Committee.

These three individuals are sitting down with me to climb the learning curve on the budget process as I learn it. So they're sitting down with the budget director and with the CFO when needed to painstakingly go through every step of the budget development process, and we've already we begun. We've had, what is it, two or three?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Two.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Two such meetings, and our plan is to meet no less frequently than every two weeks until the recommended budget is completed hopefully by the end of March.

So that to me is, you know, in addition to following the letter of shared governance, trying to practice the spirit of shared governance where we're saying let's understand this together. Let's have the conversations ideally so that we can build the trust as the foundational element of moving forward as a healthy growing university.

I'm excited about that process. I'm hopeful that coming out of all of this is a sense of clear direction for the colleges and their strategic planning process, a mutual understanding of the challenges of putting together a university budget of the magnitude and size of our budget, and a greater and a wider appreciation of all of the tradeoffs that one makes in doing that.

The last thing I would say before turning it over to you is that someone posed a question to me recently this week, and I think it's a good question. It's one that deserves a good answer, too. And the question was, is your vision for the university simply to fix its finances? And to which I would unequivocally respond, absolutely not. The finances are a means to the end. Not the end. Not what is most important. Not the vision of the university.

The vision of the university is that which we collectively determine through these processes that we are determining. Do I have a personal vision like you for what constitutes a great university? Absolutely. I tried to begin to articulate some of those points in the investiture speech when I talked about what is a great public university. And my hope and personal aspiration that we aspire to be a great public university. And we use the metaphor by comparison to Harvard to say Harvard is great. But we seek to be something more than simply serving the top one tenth of one percent of this country. We aspire to be a great public university, and all that that entails in terms of teaching more of the top 50 percent, not the top one percent.

In terms of the research that we perform that solves local problems, builds regional economy, generally improves the human condition here and around the world, and as our finances allow, perform services to the community that help lift the entire community. But there's always that little phrase at the end, as our finances allow. And it's the reason we end up talking about finances because all that we aspire, our dream, our vision is somehow brought back to earth in the short term by the limits of our resources. And that's one of the, kind of the realities of this world.

One of the great quotes I think of all time because it's such a clever play on words is, if your outgo exceeds your income, the upkeep will be your downfall.

And that's only to remind us that, however big our vision and our dreams are, they do have to fit at least in the short term within the parameters of what we can sustain. And that's the reason we end up talking about resources, because resources are the fuel by which our dreams are envisioned.

So I'd be happy to address any questions that you have at this time.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: One small correction. Matt Lee is a representative of the department chairs on the University Council Budget and not the Faculty Senate.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Okay. Even better.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I warned you about this. I want to ask you about what I've heard called the vision thing.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Okay.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: And of course your vision is not simply to get a handle on the budget, and I totally agree this is very important, but we're not going to put up billboards on 76 that say, "Come to UA. We've got a handle on the budget process."

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: And I'm hoping that your vision is also not all of the other universities in the country are going to hell in a hand basket, so let's join the throng. Some of these charts that you keep giving us could make a person worry.

So what I'm going to ask you about is be a little bit more specific in the vision, in that

you know, great and public are fine words, but they're not specific. We hired you for a five-year term. We have had still on the books, and Mike Sherman reassured me just the other week that Vision 2020 is still a plan, and has very specific metrics for number of faculty, for number of students, for number of research dollars. And so I would like you to share where you see the university might be in five years. And I realize that this is early, but what do you have in more specifics than just let's be the Harvard of Summit County?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Okay. That's fair. Let me answer in two ways. One, to first address the issue of Vision 2020. I've read Vision 2020, and I am sure you have. Many of you were probably somewhat involved in its development and certainly in its critique.

My reading of Vision 2020 is that it is much like many college and university strategic plans. It is very aspirational in nature. It is very high level in nature. It aspires to a lot of things without a lot of details about how one would get there or what tradeoffs one might have to make or how the financing actually might make it possible to do this, and what sacrifices. So to me, like most public university strategic plans, most university strategic plans, it is so broad there's almost nothing that couldn't fit underneath it in some way. Okay.

Now, that may be a little bit of an overstatement, but what I'm trying to say is in my conversations both internally with the board and externally, I have not heard anything contemplated that would suggest that it is in direct opposition to the plan because it is so broad.

In my opinion that's why starting with the colleges and getting to the details and working with what's unique and what each college aspires is a better way to build a strategic plan. One builds the college plan, it then informs what the institution collectively begins to decide are its real priorities.

So in working with the colleges I'm not only trying to bring myself up to speed, everyone in the same direction in order to help the budget process in January through March, I think it then will inform the revisiting of Vision 2020 to then amend that to fit what comes out of the that planning and that budgeting process.

So I'm not worried much about what it says at the moment, whether it contradicts or not, until we get to the end of this process and see what emerges.

In terms of my prediction of what higher education or what, in particular, this university might look like in five years, it is honestly a little early for me to paint a very clear picture, nor would it be wise, because what a good president does is not dictate a plan. He organizes a process to determine a plan that can get a preponderance of people excited about moving forward, then the president runs in front of that.

That's a better way to think about how one can lead an institution this large, this complex with this many passionate and intelligent people.

Do I have some personal predictions about what higher education is likely to look like? In terms of the articles that you sent me that I'm now giving back to you and distributing, I don't disagree with much that's in those articles. I think they're likely to be what the future looks like, unless we do something extraordinary.

And I know many of you would like to do something extraordinary to buck the trends that those articles do a pretty good job of explaining and predicting. But to buck a trend

means to first understand what is driving the trend, and then making decisions about how you can realistically be different. And I don't fully understand enough about our institution to know.

So for example, someone has pointed out to me that, yes, although the faculty mix has changed in the way that the AAUP and the authors of those articles have described, but that we at the University of Akron have been ahead of that trend, that we've been kind of a leading, an outlier of sorts in terms of being even ahead of the national trends.

I don't know if that's true yet. I haven't done the work yet to determine if that's true. I have no reason to believe it's not true. But more importantly, if it is true, why is that? What are the circumstances that are unique about it that cause us to be a, kind of a leading outlier of sorts even relative to a trend that's pretty strong in terms of the change in the faculty mix.

I can speculate. I have been around long enough to have some hypotheses. I've shared some of the hypotheses with you and gotten some feedback. But it's really too early to know for sure if that's the case. One way of looking at why we might be different is to look at our institution and say, what's special about the place? Where have we concentrated resources in the past to achieve one goal, but then would have weakened our ability to achieve another goal somewhere else?

Some of you who have been here 30 years can probably think of better hypotheses for that than I can, but there are some obvious ones.

You know, we made a big bet in research in certain areas. Okay. And those are expensive big bets. And there was a reason for that at the time, because it was so tied into the industry of the area, and it was so important as a public institution to try to support the economic environment of the area, we concentrated our research in a big way and it paid off to some extent in terms of reputation and in terms of probably helping those industries to some extent.

And that might explain why we are weaker leading indicators in other areas because we've spent our money, and concentrated our resources in one particular area. So during a budget process and planning process it's time to re-examine all of that. Is the decision to concentrate, the original decision to concentrate still relevant? Okay?

If not, let's undo it and let's reallocate. So, I know that's not very specific, but to me a great public university has elements of high selectivity, and it has elements where it lets the underdog have a chance. And you don't have to be one or the other. A great public university with all of its complexity in multiple divisions can organize itself in a way that can serve the top 50 percent of the country not the top one tenth of one percent.

I would like to see us be that institution that does that. I think we have the components to do that already. And it's simply a matter of organizing the resources to make it happen.

I think we have areas of research excellence that are in the top five in the world. We have areas that are simply foundational. There are elements of research that have to exist just to keep everyone relevant in their field. And I see us being a combination of that in the future just as we are now. So taking the resources that we have to get the most out of the limited resources that we have.

Unfortunately, I don't see the economic environment changing anytime soon to

suggest that we'll have lots of extra money to do a lot of new things in the name of service. So we'll have to be more careful and more selective in terms of where we really have the greatest impact in terms of our giving back to the community, in terms of our service to the community.

So that's a general outline of I think what we will look like, but I would like to be the best version of that that one can imagine.

And the last thing that I would say is, you know, I'd like to be the university that first owns Northeast Ohio. I would like to be the clear, distinguished university of Northeast Ohio, clear. It's clear. Not only to people in Akron, but to people in the rest of the State of Ohio. That would be an immediate short term goal, and I would like to find some ways to see if we can make that happen as well. And the question is how do you do that? And that's what we're going to try to determine together as we try to march through this process.

Senator, that's the best I can do for the moment.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions for the president? Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: I noticed in the search for what used to be the combined grad dean and research services that those had been split. Can I infer, and other colleagues infer, that that suggests that there will be a different approach to basic versus applied research and tech transfer, or am I reading too much into that?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: That might be the outcome, but it would be a little early to conclude that. I think that what one can conclude at this moment is to say that the College of Graduate Studies should in my opinion have always been under the academic function of the university. So I am correcting an obvious, in my opinion, kind of shortcoming in the previous structure.

How that then plays out in terms of the impact on basic versus applied research, it's a little early to know, and I wouldn't presume to know at this point. I think what we're really trying to do going forward, because the real opportunity in my opinion is we have now this vacant VP of Research to fill, is to take all of the resources that this community has invested in the name of commercialization, technology transfer, and innovation, and to try to piece something together that is more productive than the separate pieces had been in the past.

When I speak of the separate pieces, I speak of ABIA, I speak of our Research Foundation. I speak of the support organizations within the university. I speak of the city's Bits and Bytes Enterprise that it's beginning. I speak of the research function at Akron Children's Hospital and Summa and Akron General. There are all of these pockets, some of which have competed with one another, not played well together, that represent an opportunity. And some of which have been extraordinarily productive, I should say that. But there's a unique opportunity at the moment to get some insight from people inside and outside the institution and not to forget our industrial partners as well. Get input from them to say, can we fashion something together that makes sense? Because, frankly, the Knight Foundation is done putting money into some pieces of what I just mentioned.

You can't count on those resources to be there to sustain what has been. So the real opportunity, this is where I do plan to take a little time to get a lot of input about how to bring these pieces together and produce something that's more productive. And maybe the outcome of all of that is both better basic and applied research. I hope so.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Thank you for addressing the critical needs for the faculty there. I noticed in your letter that there were five critical needs administrators being hired. First of all, what percentage of our open administration positions is considered critical?

And secondly, I did notice for the Dean of CAST that there is a new expanded title there. Could you address why that has occurred?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Those are great questions. So the open positions at the administrative level are the person that runs all of the IT for the university. That position has been vacated. It has been filled by a gentleman by the name of Nathan Mortimer. By his own admission it is not his strength or his skill set. He was clearly simply a place holder. And in an age where technology both running the university and its potential applications, the educational enterprise is only growing by leaps and bounds every day. There were a number of questions about that. It was hard for me to imagine not hiring. So I put that in the, kind of the critical needs area. So that would be point one.

Point two is another one of the positions is the advancement, the fundraising, the governmental relations, and the enrollment management functions, the person that leads those efforts. The person that we have now is beloved but is stepping down, phasing out. And so again, given the declining resources in so many other areas, the importance of philanthropy and importance of enrollment and the importance of relationships with legislatures that determine our funding, it was hard for me to imagine a structure that did not require filling that position.

The VP for Research position was one of those. We've already talked about that. It was hard for me to imagine. Actually I did give some thought to it, though, to be honest with you. I thought about not filling. But I was afraid of, number one, given the fact that it's such an area of strength at this university, even if we could have made it work, I also worried about the signal that it would send in some way. The unintended signal. And that did factor into my decision.

So in the end, based on all that is currently in pieces that needs to be brought together, given the historical significance, given the connection to industry which is a key part of this person's responsibility, I've decided all of that, that was hard to imagine where we don't have a VP for Research.

The other two positions are the Honors College Dean. We have a dean, a great, very accomplished dean that has announced his retirement. It's a key part of the strategy for us going forward, frankly. We see growing numbers in that area. We need to attract more well-prepared students to offset the increasing numbers of unprepared students coming to our institution. It's a key strategy such that in this world of a changing university, that part that has the most chance of retaining that liberal arts college culture is the Honors College, okay? And there are going to be a number of people that still want that experience, that great experience. And so we want to provide a place within our larger system of serving all different types of students where they can go to be served in that very high quality way. So it was hard to imagine not filling the Dean of the Honors College. And that will be probably an area of hopefully additional growth for us going forward.

And lastly is the Dean of CAST. It's been filled also by an interim, Vice Provost Ramsier. We're giving him some additional duties on the graduate studies. And CAST

represents also an opportunity for us to serve better the less traditional elements of our student population which we need to grow.

As the direct-from-high-school population declines, the importance of growing the adult student population, the international student population, the military population, and the online student population, okay, ideally hybrid, but there's a strong online component, CAST has the potential of kind of assembling those and fashioning a level of services and degree programs that will be very attractive to some of those segments, the military, the adult and the online in particular.

And we have not also, the last point that I would make is we have tended, I think, to, my impression, to discount the community college elements of our university system. We're more of a university system than anything else.

We have got again, highly selective top-three programs in the country, and we've got at least two community colleges built within our university. Wayne College is really a community college in my opinion. I could be wrong, but it essentially looks like a community college. And Summit College, which now we call CAST, has elements of being traditionally a community college.

I'm still trying to figure out what Medina is and Lakewood is. We might even have more community colleges than I know of. So in discounting, maybe for fear that somehow it would diminish other parts of our university, we have created more financial hardship for us, I think. Because Stark State is now here, and Stark State's relationship, is there any way to delete anything [inaudible]? Stark State's relationship is so close with other universities, once they get into that pipeline, we may not ever see those students.

So CAST is a way, as we think about how to serve a more diverse student population, is a way to grow student populations in these nontraditional areas. As we think about our system of higher education offerings, it was again I think a critical position to find someone that knows how to do that well, that has a track record of organizing to do that well. And many of you know also that I'm playing around in my mind with this idea of the portal college structure where the Honors College is kind of a portal college for well prepared students, and CAST has the potential to be that great portal college for underprepared and nontraditional students and provide those services that are unique to serving them in a way that helps them persist and ultimately graduate.

So given all that thinking, that's the reason we decided we've got to go forward and find the leaders who can implement this strategy and bring everyone together to do that well. Again, if I had to do anything over in the first four months that I have been here, it would have been to have created two emails, not one, when I announced the faculty decisions and the updates on administrative stuff. Lesson to be learned. Never include that in the same email again.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions for the president? Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SHIVAKUMAR SASTRY: Thank you very much. This might sound a little obvious, but I want to be reassured. As we think through our strategic plans and start thinking about how we can better fit within our community, I want to be sure that somewhere we're looking at the quality of our graduate programs and keeping a tight handle on that. I would like to know what you are thinking about this.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: No question about it. You know, when I think of people talking about our graduate program, I immediately go into three categories. I don't know how your mind works, but my mind immediately subdivides it into three conversations.

Conversations about our doctoral programs, okay, both professional and research based. Conversations about our masters level programs. And again, I divide those in terms of more professional orientation and more research-based master's program. And then lastly, the pure, old-fashioned professional schools, the law school, et cetera. So my mind divides them into those kinds of buckets, because in my mind there are different strategies and different dynamics playing out and different economics playing out in each of those buckets.

Some of those graduate programs are critical towards achieving our research mission. Some of those graduate programs are critical to achieving our teaching mission. Hopefully both somehow can contribute to the service mission as well.

So, long story short, all of those are critically important, but how we approach each one will be slightly different. But I think in ways that we can all be excited about. I mean, as we struggle with limited financial resources, the doctoral programs we do in the name of research. But there isn't enough external grant funding to make the economics of that work. So we do as much of that as we can, and then we can't do any more.

Because you are essentially scholarshiping and paying those students to come and be research assistants, graduate students and teaching assistants. And that may be where you get some economic benefit. So we'll try to grow that as much as we can until we can't make the economics work anymore.

In the professional programs, a unique set of issues. We need to grow those because those are paying students. We need to be more competitive in those, because there's a return on those investments of those students. Those students are willing to pay the tuition and fees that help us try to accomplish everything we need to accomplish. So, and masters degrees will grow more profoundly than bachelors degrees over the next many years as more adults retool and as more undergraduates understand they need a masters degree just to learn their discipline well enough to compete in the marketplace or even to get their resumé looked at in the interview process.

So the masters degree, the graduate programs, both research focused and professional focused, are critically important and we need to do better in those areas.

And then there's some unique issues like the law school. The law school is probably the most challenged part of our university right now. Half as many people wanting to go to law school today as 10 years ago. Finances getting worse and worse, and the market getting more and more competitive. So I am thankful that we've got, and I think we've gotten great feedback on the new dean. I feel like we're in really good hands. If there's anyone who can help us determine how to reposition our law school in this changing environment, this person can probably be helpful, and the feedback from the law school has been great so far, too.

But yes, I would say all pieces of that equation are important. The question is, how do you fashion each piece in a way that accomplishes what you are trying to accomplish with the research base that you currently have?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions for the president?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Anybody on this side of the room?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That's the quiet side. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the senior vice president and provost. Provost Sherman.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you very much, Chair Rich. Good afternoon, everybody.

The Higher Learning Commission report is well underway and thanks are expressed to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as well as the Steering Committee for the University Council for working together to develop the draft document that in the very near future should be distributed to campus for campus feedback, and certainly we'll look forward to your insight as we enhance that document through that shared governance process.

The board of trustees will have a chance to comment on that document as well and all of that input will result in the document that would be submitted to the HLC in advance of their visit in February of 2015.

As you know, I believe the board of trustees at its last meeting endorsed for transmittal to the chancellor the University of Akron Completion Plan. Thanks to Chair Rich for his guidance and advice on that document and certainly to the University Council for their conversation of and feedback on that document and ultimately endorsement of that document prior to the Board of Trustees' action.

You will recall the Chancellor gave us a little bit of time for the new president to come on board to be involved in that process, and it is now posted on the Board of Regents' website.

As you know and as the chair has mentioned, the committees that are pulled together to work on gen ed reform. Gen ed reform is really an exciting opportunity for this institution to reimagine, re-envision its curriculum, the learning outcomes expected of our students that make them citizens of the world that will do great things as a result of that education.

Assessment of general education is very important, and Faculty Senate's going to do a great job reforming and revising the general education curriculum. And, I would hope that the outcome is one where students are easily guided to a collective of courses that meet the outcomes of the gen ed categories and create an assessment process that demonstrates a continuous improvement in the quality of learning that happens as a result of the great work that will come out of reforming the general education program.

As the president mentioned, the college strategic planning visits are going very well. I believe we have all of the third visits scheduled for every college by the end of November. As he mentioned, the fourth and possibly fifth meetings will happen soon thereafter. We might be able to get a couple of the fourth meetings scheduled before the end of the semester, but certainly the fourth and possibly the fifth meetings will begin early in the next semester so that the outcome of that process, as the president has mentioned, can inform the budget process for fiscal year 16.

With the adjustments that have been made for the Dean of the Graduate School and

Vice President for Research we're going to pull the Achieving Distinction Initiative back under the Office of Academic Affairs. We'll seek a report on both of those initiatives and we'll assess the reports, the progress on those initiatives and readjust as appropriate to assure that our investment in those areas of focus provides the return that is appropriate from that kind of investment.

We'll be communicating with the deans in the near future. Clearly the decision that's been made with regard to part-time faculty teaching so that the processes and the outcomes of engaging part-time faculty for the spring are clear and can be rapidly undertaken.

And I want to really thank the Health Services Group, University Communications. I think they've done a great job in keeping us, the campus, the students, the staff and the community updated quite well on issues related to communicable diseases, in particular Ebola. They're doing a great, great job in monitoring and interacting with students and faculty where that type of interaction is appropriate.

Finally, in addition to the dean searches the president mentioned, as you know, we brought on recently the Dean of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering, Eric Amis. Matt Wilson came in recently for the School of Law, and we're really pleased to indicate that David Gordon recently joined us this past week as the inaugural Dean of the College of Health Professions.

It has been reported to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that we have three deans where reviews have already started with regard to feedback on the collective bargaining units, and the faculty recommended individuals from different groupings of faculty to constitute the committee that will inform the review of Dean Haritos, Krovi and Midha.

And finally, I am certainly honored to serve as your provost and to help support, stimulate and enable our collective academic excellence agenda. And with that, Chair Rich, I will conclude my remarks and offer responses to any questions.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I'm going to start with a question. Concerning the increase in the part-time faculty teaching load, you said that in the near future that would be communicated to the dean. My question is when is the near future?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: We mentioned it last Tuesday at our Council of Deans meeting. But we'll do a written communication. Rex is raising his hand.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: [inaudible] send out a memo on the topic and it's on my desk to edit to make sure it goes out appropriately. So it should be out tomorrow.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there other questions for the provost? Other questions for the provost? Last chance. Thank you, Mr. Provost.

Next we have the committee reports. As I mentioned before, we do not have an Academic Policies Committee report. We do have a Curriculum Review Committee report with action items. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Chair Rich. Our Curriculum Review Committee brings to your attention a list of curriculum proposals that came through the system without objections or concerns. We bring this to you as a motion to approve from the committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Motion comes from the committee. It does not require a second. Is there debate on the motion? I take it then you are ready to vote. All those in

favor of the motion to approve these curriculum changes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We have a written, informational report from the Faculty Research Committee. Is there anyone who wishes to report orally from the Faculty Research Committee?

We also have a written, informational report from the Part- time Faculty Committee. Is there anyone who wishes to report orally from that committee?

Next item is the report of the University Council Representatives. Is there such a report? Senator Erickson, you might be the only representative here today.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: That's correct. From University Council?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Correct. I'm not requiring you to report, but I am offering you the opportunity.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I think that University Council next meets on the 18th. It did meet, the last meeting of our council there was, I think as far as, there was no major issue that was brought up at that meeting. That's the best way I think of reporting it.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Erickson.

Is there any new business to come before the body? Any new business? If not, anything for the good of the order? Good of the order going once. Good of the order going twice. The Senate has concluded its business, and without objection we stand adjourned.