

University of Akron Faculty Senate

December 4, 2014 3:00-4:30 p.m.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The December meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Raber. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Schaffer. Are there any changes that anyone wishes to propose to the agenda? Oh, there is one that I need to propose, and that is the addition of the approval of the commencement list for Fall 2014, which was, that list was distributed by E-mail. I propose that that be inserted after the remarks of the senior vice president and provost. I want to make sure we get to it. I don't think there will be a problem getting to it anyway, but let's put it there if you don't mind. Is there anything else anyone wishes to propose by way of change to the agenda as distributed? If there's no objection to the change I proposed, all those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted. We do not have minutes to approve for the October or November meetings. Our Secretary, Senator Schulze is ill and is not with us today. Senator Lillie has graciously agreed to serve as acting secretary for this meeting.

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

On the agenda for this meeting we have a proposal to rename the Department of Associate Studies in the College of Applied Science and Technology to the Department of Applied and General Technical Studies. We have a number of curriculum change proposals and the approval of the December degree candidates list.

As you should be aware, the draft report to the Higher Learning Commission was made available to the university community for review and comment. The period for submitting comments concluded yesterday. After any revisions are made, the report will be submitted to the board of trustees next week, after which it will be submitted to the Higher Learning Commission in

preparation for the focused site visit in February.

The Committee of Chairs of the General Education Learning Outcome Committees has been meeting frequently to develop a template for submitting courses for general education learning outcome approval. The template for the Communication and Quantitative Skills Learning Outcomes should be available by the beginning of the spring semester. The templates for the other three disciplinary learning outcomes should be available about a month after that.

The senate's standing Part-time Faculty Committee has been meeting frequently to develop a proposal to increase part-time faculty salaries. The minimum salaries for the three ranks of part-time faculty members have not increased for the last 13 years. As a result of inflation, the purchasing power of those salaries is now approximately two thirds of what this was 13 years ago. In my view, this enormous cut in the real dollar value of part-time faculty salaries is unconscionable. I expect that in our February meeting we will receive a recommendation from the part-time faculty committee to remedy this situation.

As you may recall, last May the senate's Academic Policies Committee reported that it had unanimously approved a proposal to move the faculty of the Criminal Justice Technology Program from the College of Applied Science and Technology to the College of Arts and Sciences to enable the creation of an integrated interdisciplinary program of Criminology and Criminal Justice. This approval, however, was contingent on the approval of the Buchtel College Council, which is the faculty governing body of the College of Arts and Sciences. I'm pleased to report that on Monday the Buchtel College Council voted overwhelmingly to approve the proposal. Because this occurred only three days before this meeting, the proposal will be presented to the senate for its consideration in our February meeting.

During the deliberations of the council, a fear was expressed that any decision that allows an academic program to be strengthened is contrary to the interests of other academic programs, because the allocation of resources within the university is a zero sum game, and if a program is allowed to become stronger, it will siphon resources from other programs. I was relieved to see that this argument did not carry the day, but I feel the need to address it here because it was

presented as a fear widely shared within the college, and because I've repeatedly heard similar arguments made at the university level between colleges.

It is true that in the short run the allocation of university resources is a zero sum game. In any given fiscal year there are only so many dollars to be allocated. More dollars for one unit means fewer for another. But it is a mistake to focus excessively on the short run. If academic programs are not allowed to become stronger for fear that they will siphon resources from other programs, the revenues of the university as a whole will suffer and there will be fewer resources available for distribution among its programs.

This fear, if we allow it to prevail, leads only to mutual destruction. It also makes the bottom up democratic process of faculty governance an instrument by which the health and ultimately the survival of the university is in peril and it thereby invites the imposition of an authoritarian top down governance structure.

In the long run we will sink or swim together. The ethos we as a faculty need to survive and thrive is not competition and mutual jealousy and distrust, but solidarity. We must support each other and help each other to overcome the difficulties and threats we face.

Some may believe that these threats, principally those that result from the state's short-sighted and shameful disinvestment in public higher education cannot be overcome. I do not share this belief, except perhaps occasionally in my darker moments, but I understand it and cannot prove it wrong. Still let us swim together even if we know we may never reach the shore. Solidarity is its own virtue, a saving grace and our only hope.

Finally, let me take this opportunity to wish you all a happy and peaceful holiday season. This concludes my remarks.

Next, special announcements. John Henry Ramey, Associate Professor Emeritus of Social Work died November 2nd at the age of 88. Professor Ramey earned a bachelor of arts in Philosophy in 1947 and a master of arts in Social Administration in 1950 both at Ohio State University. From 1954 until 1965 he served as executive director of Hyde Park Neighborhood Club in Chicago where he worked with street gangs and addressed other community problems and

challenges including racial integration.

In 1965 he became the Executive Director of the Greater Cincinnati Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. In 1969 he came to the University of Akron as an associate professor to establish the Social Work Program. In 1978 he established the Alpha Alpha Alpha Honor Society for social work students. He retired from the university in 1989. Professor Ramey served as President of the Ohio Chapter and the North Central Ohio Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers from 1972 to 1984. He was a leader in the successful campaign to secure licensing for social workers in Ohio and served as chair of the Licensing Committee of the Ohio Chapter of NASW. He served as president of the Ohio Welfare Conference, the Ohio College Association of Social Work Educators, the Summit County Mental Health Association, the South Central Ohio section of the American Camping Association and both the Akron Chapter and the Ohio Conference of the American Association of University Professors.

He was a member of the American Sociological Association, the Council on Social Work Education and the U.S. Committee of the International Council on Social Welfare. He served as a member of the boards of directors of the National Council on Social Welfare and the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers. He was a charter member of the National Association of Social Workers and the Academy of Certified Social Workers. Professor Ramey served on the boards of Akron's West Side Neighborhoods Organization, and the United Way of Summit County. He worked tirelessly in the background in the planning stages of many initiatives to create programs to improve life and deal with problems in West Akron and in the social service community in Akron.

In recognition he was recently given the Lifetime of Distinguished Service Award at the Harold K. Stubbs Awards Dinner. Professor Ramey was a founding member of the International Association of Social Workers Groups which was created in 1979 and served as General Secretary until 2003 and Editor of the Social Work with Groups Newsletter for 22 years. Would you all please rise in a moment of silence for our deceased colleague? Thank you.

Next item is the report of the Executive Committee, Acting Secretary Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Since we last met on November 6, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met two times as a committee and once with the provost. The president was unable to attend. The Executive Committee first met on November 20th to prepare for the meeting with the provost. The EC next met with the provost and discussed the teaching load limit for part-time faculty, general education reform, critical needs faculty searches, review of deans, Criminal Justice Program proposal, and the status of the University Libraries dean search.

The EC met on November 25th to prepare the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. At that meeting the EC recommended Jon Miller to serve on the Honors Dean Search Committee. We discussed the HLC report. We also discussed the process for discussion of the president's strategic plan. It was also noted that there are overlapping time slots in the final exam schedule.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions of Acting Secretary Lillie concerning the Executive Committee report? Thank you. Next item is the remarks of the president.

Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Chairman Rich. Thank you, senators, for the opportunity to be here once again. Amazingly, it's been five months already for me personally. Time is indeed flying by. And that's important to me because there are certain things we're trying to get done in a certain time frame.

If you will recall, really the first three months were about getting to know the people that reported directly to me, getting to know all the stakeholders internally and externally who love the institution and get a sense of finances and get a sense of the other metrics. And then in the second three months, began the work of working with each of the individual colleges to update or in some cases for the first time to develop college-level strategic plan. That work continues. I'm happy to report that it's going well.

If you will recall the process is to meet initially with the leadership of each college, to draft a document primarily seven or eight slides of key data for each college, and then two or three slides on suggested directions for the college that we then can take to all faculty meetings, and then hopefully

coming out of that process is a consensus around a set of directions for each college that then can inform the budget process that will begin in January, and hopefully conclude by the end of March such that we have college-level strategic plans now funded, and we're collectively in a position to begin to be implemented and move forward in the last three months of the fiscal year, to organize and hopefully start seeing some of the fruition of the work before the next academic year beginning in the fall.

So I would be happy, once done, to answer any questions about that process, but I couldn't be more pleased about how that work is continuing.

The other thing that I might mention is once the strategic plans for each of the colleges are updated, and then hopefully that process will wrap up by no later than the end of January. The intent would be then to revisit Vision 2020, the university's strategic plan and to ask ourselves does the university strategic plan now need to be updated given all of the directions that have emerged from the college level process.

And so initially the idea has been to form a group of representative stakeholders that would meet in February to collectively look at all of the college strategic plans and then to address the questions about whether the university's strategic plan needs to be updated.

We're targeting Friday, February 13th, Friday, February 27th. We'll begin engaging all of the university significant stakeholders including Faculty Senate and Graduate Council and the other significant stakeholders to participate in that, those two meetings to revisit Vision 2020, again with the idea of being able to have both updated college strategic plans and then updated university strategic plans that can be resourced with the budget process that should conclude in March.

I had also mentioned that we're preparing for the formal budgeting process that would normally begin in January. That would include budget hearings with all of the units, but the informal process has already begun, the, the University Budget Office beginning to collect numbers and to project numbers into the next fiscal year. I myself climbing a learning curve and asking your Faculty Senate Chair, your AAUP President, your Department Chair Representative on the University Council Budget Finance Committee, collectively we're meeting with the Budget Director and helping

me to climb that learning curve.

And it creates also kind of a common level of understanding in terms of some of the challenges that we will face as we begin the formal process in the January to March time frame.

So that represents the key areas of focus. The other things that I would mention is occasionally there is some quite enjoyable aspects to the job. I don't know if any of you heard the presentation by Jeff Hoffman yesterday. The Graduate Student Association brought him to campus. If you are not familiar with him, he gave a wonderful presentation on his work to develop Priceline. He was the founder of Priceline, and just a serial entrepreneur that has done very well and gave a great presentation yesterday.

We've also faced some particular challenges that I'm sure you are aware of, one regarding two of our basketball players that was very unfortunate, but the university seemed to, all involved seem to be handling those situations very well. Of course the country is certainly experiencing some struggles with race relations issues. I'm giving some consideration to forums around the MLK holiday to address the larger issues and our contributions to those.

So the university marches on, and I'm just delighted to be a part of it. So Mr. Chair, we'll have you take any questions that you might have.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions for the president? Senator Saliga?

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Okay. With the budget process and all, we know that we've been told to wait on our hires and so forth, but that makes some sense. Questions have been asked before about what the size of the faculty should be. And it tends to come back to, well, how much money do we have to spend? You know, where is it going? But our primary goal is to teach students. Do we agree with that? We're agreeing.

So the number of students should be really what is driving the size of our faculty and not the amount of money that we have. It should, you know, we should figure out how many faculty do we need, and make sure the budget will go there, and everything else should be secondary. So is that what's happening with this? Because I know right now most of us do not feel that we're anywhere close to being able to serve the 26,000 students that we have.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: That's certainly the argument we make to the legislature. And unfortunately that argument has not prevailed in the years, and so we're feeling kind of the effect of that. I can't argue with your logic. The one thing I would point out, however, is that our enrollment is on the decline, so we don't want to make that argument in terms of, we want to look more broadly at the issue than that.

But I agree. In the world in which it would be a much better world, the level of state support for our institution would be much higher, but it's just not been an argument that has prevailed. And there are probably good reasons for that, just to be fair to the legislators because tax receipts have fallen as the economy has taken its toll on Ohio. The needs of K through 12 are never ending. The constant need for more funding for Medicaid on a declining revenue base has made it certainly difficult for the legislators to find extra money, in their view, for higher education.

But part of our obligation is to continue to make the case for higher education as a high priority, even a top priority, that if we believe, of course the way that we've approached it recently is if you believe in the, in freedom and the American way of life our education is certainly the key to our system working, and if you are not going to fund higher education you are going to have more problems that require more funding in the more negative aspects of our society. So we continue to make the case, but there are pragmatic realities that they are dealing with. And to the extent that they deal with them and the way they have in the past it creates pragmatic realities that we have to respond to.

We're always looking for alternative revenue sources beyond the state support. Philanthropy, federal support, and even that is stressed at the moment. Diversifying our enrollment away from 18 year olds to adult students and the way that they learn and to meet their timetable. So it's just a constantly changing world, but I can't argue with the underlying basis of your argument. It's just that that argument just has not prevailed.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: It hasn't with the state, but what about on campus with us?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I think as Chairman Rich pointed out, in the short term we have a limited amount of dollars and we have to make difficult choices. In the long run

we can invest and make wise choices that hopefully will grow that revenue base. We'll constantly try to balance how much of our budget do we spend on short term needs and how much of our budget do we invest for long-term growth.

And in our world there's only so many dollars to do that on a year-to-year basis. And we try to collect, you know, all the inputs from all of the people who care deeply and have expertise on these issues and get to a collective judgment on what that proper balance might be.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: I'm not thinking so much between departments, colleges here as academics versus administration.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I think academics versus administration versus athletics versus community service versus, we have a broad spectrum of teaching, research and service missions that we're constantly trying to balance. But I would agree with you. Our primary mission is that of education and teaching and learning, and I can't argue that that ought to be the top priority from a funding standpoint, too.

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

SENATOR TERRY HALLETT: I just have a couple questions. I am in the School of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology, and recently we were at our national convention in Orlando, Florida and we had people from Ohio State and other places come up and ask us about the combining of services of Akron, Kent and YSU. And they sent us an article. We didn't know anything about it so we were kind of surprised. And this was quoted by the Associated Press stating that presidents of all three universities had talked of the possibility of consolidating services including those of academic programs. I'm just wondering what that is all about and how that fits in with the strategic plan.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: In some ways it's sad to say, unfortunately that article was more much to do about nothing than substance. The article, there wasn't really much of a basis for that particular article. I'm trying to even remember the series of events that led to the article.

But I got a call one day from a reporter in Columbus who said that, you know, we understand

that you and Kent State and Youngstown State have been talking about partnerships. And I said, indeed that's the case. I said, you have three new presidents, all of which, you know, see opportunities to work together in ways that make sense for the region, that maybe personalities in the past have prevented from occurring. So in our getting to know one another, we discussed and promised to one another if it made sense to partner and made sense to cooperate that we would indeed be open to do that. And the nice part about that is there are some very personable and mutually supportive relationships that are developing.

I told the reporter nothing specific has been discussed other than the general principle of let's work together to do what's best for Northeast Ohio, and where it makes sense let's work together.

And then the reporter began these theoretical questions. And I took the bait, which I shouldn't have done. Well, what might that mean? And I said, it could mean a number of things. It could mean joint academic programs as we already have, it could mean joint sharing of administrative services, which we already have. It could mean one day outright consolidation and merger as has occurred in Northwest Ohio between the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio. They came together as one to do something bigger and better for the region called Northwest Ohio. So it could range across a broad spectrum of partnerships. I said, but at this point nothing has been discussed. And yet then we got the big series of articles that really just kind of took off. So that's the reality of the article. I think if anyone, you know, we can talk about the principles of partnership but there really aren't any specifics that have been proposed to any party at this point.

And I will say this. As long as I have been in the State of Ohio and working in higher education in the State of Ohio we have been constantly pressured from Columbus to look for ways to partner. Look for ways to leverage our resources to do more for the State of Ohio. In some ways we're under constant pressure to find ways to work together. That makes sense. So in some ways the rhetoric is both rhetoric to comply with Columbus' request and also I think the genuine belief that there are times where it does make sense for us to work together in ways that many of you

already work together with your colleagues at other institutions.

We already have joint academic programs. We already share IT systems with Lorain County Community College. So we already have very good examples of what it means to work together.

SENATOR TERRY HALLETT: I also was wondering when we talk about enrollment declining, in my department in Speech Language Pathology we have over 300 applicants just for our graduate program alone every year. We have over 40 in each graduate class. So we have 80 graduate students each year, you know, two, first years and second years. And every one of those graduate students have jobs before they even graduate. So it may be declining in some areas, but in our area we have a large undergraduate population and we have so many grad students we really can't handle them.

So I think that sometimes when they make this general statement that enrollment is declining, that's not necessarily the case. So I don't know whether we should include that in some of our college reports, but I know that's also the case for nursing. We're in the College of Health Professions and we really have more students than we can handle right now.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Right. And that is the reality. There's very different kind of what I will call market demographics going on with each of our colleges. Health Professions because of the strength of the industry at the moment, even though it's being stressed, still has a number of job opportunities and a number of students wishing to get degrees in that field, and we're stretched to capacity. And the nature of that conversation with the College of Health Professions is does it make sense to build capacity to meet that need, and how best to do that in a timeline that allows us to do that.

That's a very different conversation for example, than the one we're having in law where you have much fewer people applying for law school, and they're struggling. Basically the economic reality of that college is heading south. And the idea is how to reinvent oneself to stabilize that downward trend. But overall when you add it all together, the university's enrollment overall has been on the decline now for a few years.

SENATOR TERRY HALLETT: Okay. Well, thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Moritz.

SENATOR E. STEWARD MORITZ: [inaudible] interesting news out of University of Alabama Birmingham this week and I was just wondering what sort of [inaudible] the football program is being cut, is on the table here. I mean, that's a huge budget number for us.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: That's a great question. I've never, I've been, all of us in this room on average have been in higher education a long time. I guess on average we've been in higher education 20 years. And certainly in the 20 plus years I have been in higher education there's never been a year at a university where we didn't discuss whether we should continue the athletic program. There's also never been a year where the answer ended up being yes. So it's something that's constantly being debated. I can tell you as recently as in the last week or two conversations with trustees and others, even before UAB's decision about, we've got to do something. You know, staying where we are is not going to work. We've either got to have a new strategy to make it work or we've got to have another strategy to taper it down. But the status quo is a very difficult place to live right now. So that conversation is alive and well, and I'm sure it's going to be alive and well in this next budget process. And once again, you get all of the stakeholders who care about this place together in a process and collectively we try to balance all of these decisions coming out of the budget process.

I haven't researched, I know it's a recent development. In some ways it doesn't surprise me, knowing a little bit about Alabama football and how things work in that part of the country, that UAB would make this decision. It not only probably fits the persona that UAB is trying to adopt, but it was probably also highly supported by the flagship schools in that university. So you can see the political dynamics of how that would work. And so it will add fuel to the conversation of what's the proper balance of athletics at the University of Akron going forward.

You know, being the newcomer I look and say well, it appears we just built the very large football stadium, and we haven't paid for it yet. And so, you know, part of the calculus is, you know, that reality, and all the different opinions. I can tell you it's not going to be a surprise to any of you. We have sports enthusiasts, okay, we also have marketing enthusiasts who believe athletics

is a key part of marketing the university and that everyone benefits as a result of that marketing. They would say something like, don't look at the 20 million for athletics. Just look at it as 20 million in advertising and marketing for the university. That's how they would want you to think. But that's how they believe, the impact.

Of course there have been, you know, a lot of studies about what happened in Marquette when the basketball team wins, and the applications go up. But those are when things go well. When the football team goes five and seven, it doesn't always work that way.

But tongue in cheek, let's hope the men's basketball program, the women's basketball program has a little better season. And I would invite you out to see it. I will say this to you again, just an off comment. The young men and women who play for our basketball right now on the whole are some of the nicest, most talented academically and athletically, folks that you would ever meet. The program has taken a chance on a few players in recent years. And in discussing this issue with the athletic director and the men's basketball coach, they would tell you, we knew we were taking a chance. We poured our heart and soul. And in some cases some of these young people just have a hard time exercising their own personal demons. But those are the exceptions to the rule. If you get to know the great preponderance of the players in those programs you would be proud to call any of those young people family members. And so I would encourage you to come out and support them.

We're a little off topic at the moment, but the issue of athletics is something we're going to wrestle with in the budget process as well.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I hope this will be one that won't take a lot of time. I heard you say in your earlier remarks you are hoping to have this process with the strategic plans [inaudible] colleges finished by the end of January. Which colleges were named to be done by the end of January?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: All of them. The personal goal is to get through the leadership level conversations by the end of the fall term so that all that is left are all the faculty

meetings in the month of January and February. That's the goal. And I would say that we're likely to accomplish that in 90 percent of the colleges.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: So if I haven't heard or I haven't seen a written plan for my college yet, I shouldn't worry.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: You shouldn't worry, because in some cases there's not even a consensus around a good first draft yet. But in other cases the colleges that began on the early side of the process, Business, CAST, Law, they're very close to a first draft. So we'll be, in fact I think we may have the first faculty meeting for Law this semester. But that would be the exception to the rule. Is it Monday?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: CAST tomorrow, Law and Business on Monday.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: In view of what you just said when you see the faculty coming at the end of the process, how do you see that influencing the total process? I mean, obviously in organizational approaches you have top down, bottom up. This sort of looks a little top downish at this point. How are you going to get that faculty meshing with the leadership the way you would like it to come out?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I would describe it as, ideally as an integrative process. And I would like to think of it bouncing up and down, back and forth. I think from a pragmatic standpoint it's always easier to start with a smaller group of people whose job is primarily to do types of administrative work, to create data, to organize it in terms of value added information and to give first thoughts and to frame issues for then the larger faculty to respond to.

You know, it's consistent with the notions of kind of representative government, that you start with the representative body. But do you need ultimately the support, input, feedback from everyone who's going to be impacted. So I like to think of it as kind of starting with those whose primary job is to do that work, but then to set up the most important conversation, which is with the full constituency to say, how does this feel to you? Did the group miss anything that is critical? Is there anything in here that doesn't feel right? Let's have that conversation.

You collect that feedback, go back to create another draft, come back to the full body, say okay, now how does it look? So as this process has worked before, I've never had anyone at the end say, I felt like this was kind of the top cramming something down people's throats. I've never had that happen, knock on Formica.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Sometime we'll have to have a conversation about the theory of representation.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And I do want to point out that, you know, even for the colleges where you will have the first meetings this coming week with the faculty it might be optimistic, unless that first draft is awfully good from the faculty perspective, it might be optimistic to expect that two weeks into the spring semester, which is what, the end of January is roughly, that we will have arrived at the point where you have the agreement that you are seeking.

And certainly for those colleges where the first meetings of faculty won't occur until the beginning of the spring semester, that would be clearly [inaudible]

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I agree. I'm going on prior experience. We've never not gotten to consensus after two all faculty meetings. But I told the group, if it takes three, if it takes four, what's most important is to get to the level of consensus. And truthfully we have probably until the end of March before we would have missed an opportunity to resource the plan to development. So even though I'm shooting for January, February we really have through the end of March if we need it to not miss the funding opportunity.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Clark.

SENATOR KATHLEEN CLARK: Following up on that, you mentioned earlier that you couldn't be more pleased with how the process is going. Could you elaborate on that? Especially, I think because of your approach, the faculty are kind of left in a la la land a little bit. What can we grab on to that we could use for our thinking and planning?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I couldn't be more pleased with the level of the conversations at the leadership level, because there's a great diversity in opinion even among

deans, associate deans and department chairs in terms of how to approach the issue, the principles that one should apply, what the data implies, what it doesn't imply, what are some ideas to potentially address the problems that we face.

And what I'm pleased about is number one, the diversity of opinions and perspectives, and the comfort with which people are expressing those differences of opinion, and the fact that none of it yet has gotten personal. It's just a group of good people getting together saying, let's tackle this issue. Have you considered this? No. I think that's a bad idea. Have you considered, yes.

And it's just a spirit of kind of teamwork that's just really, because normally by now you would have at least one person that would have stood up and would have been so concerned about the nature of the conversation, I don't know what it might be, that the emotions would have overtaken someone and they would have said something they probably would regret in retrospect. And that just hasn't happened yet.

And so when I see that happening, I said okay, there's a spirit of teamwork. And that's what you hope for, because if you have got that you have your highest likelihood to get to a good set of solutions when that happens.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Again, following up, as a representative of the largest college, I want to be able to, I think I hear it from what you are saying that the faculty should take seriously that their opinions matter.

What you need to know, I think, is that there's a long history. With me being around a long time I'm aware of it, but no, a lot of people are, too, is that when it comes to things like planning just before finals or just before the end of the spring semester, we're supposed to get our input in and then lo and behold, this doesn't fit with how we could possibly do so effectively, and then it all happens.

And so we've got a lot of burnt out faculty that I have to go to my constituents and say, this time you will be heard. It really matters that you try to attend. And in our case, and there really is enough time, because in our case two meetings you've got to be kidding me, to get our college, there

is no way you'll get our college to meet. You've got to get different times and different places and it's going to take weeks just to get people so that they can fit with the teaching schedule to be able to come.

And I need to be able to say it really matters that you do. The kinds of things that you were saying. These are the things that you should be thinking about. These are really, really important because as, I need to tell you that otherwise people are saying, yeah, right. He wants input from us, but look at the time frame he's talking about. It's not, you're not really serious. I mean, when I say it's really important, they say to me, you're not really serious. And I say, well, I'm going to hear you say that if it's necessary to go to the end of March to do it, then you will. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. I think what you can take back is to say we had always planned to have at least two meetings. The whole process is scheduled on the thought that you are going to need two meetings. But you are right. This is the first time I've dealt with a college as large as Arts and Sciences. So it's also important for you to take back to say, but all that a college needs to say is we need more time, and we'll take more time because it's more important to get it right than it is, with one caveat. The budget process is going to wrap up about the end of March. So if you take too much time we're going to lose an opportunity.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I understand it. But it is an unwieldy college, and it is one if you want two meetings, so that you want me at two different meetings because you are going to do one and then come back and get feedback, is that how you want it? Then that's six meetings, at least. For our college you need at least three different meeting times, at least three different meeting times for the first meeting and another three for the second meeting, and that, and it's unwieldy, but that's the college and yet it's the most, the largest number of faculty in the university in one place, and you really need our feedback, so thank you.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I agree. I agree.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: In an unguarded moment one time you said that you liked it when I asked you hard questions.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I don't know that I meant in public, but go ahead.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Okay. So I have a hard question about gen ed. As you know, we've been working for over three years on revising our gen ed program. And as Chair Rich mentioned, we're now in the implementation phase, and it's been a totally faculty driven process. The whole idea is to have a single set of gen ed requirements for the whole university, all the different colleges, and to have it intensely rigorous, not something somebody can just slide through.

And yet the other day, and I heard this from at least three different people, so I'm pretty sure it's accurate. You commented to a selection of chairs the idea that maybe we should have some sort of alternate, easier version of gen ed out there, and even voiced the idea that perhaps we could quote, "farm out" gen ed to some online company like Straighter Line.

I looked them up on line. They basically are a program that zips through some really easy version of gen ed. And on their website they talk proudly about how such fine for profit universities as Strayer and Capella took them as transfer credits.

And so my question for you is did you do, which one of these is the correct thing? A, were you making a joke in very bad taste? B, were you randomly throwing out just sort of some random thought which you are now going to regret and which the faculty had already rejected? Three, are you planning to change from an executive perspective the process that's been going on for a long time and is faculty driven and was unanimously adopted by the senate last spring? Or four, are you going to say that you need to learn much more about this process, and even as we speak are hoping to meet with Dr. Linda Subich, who's in the Dean's Office of College of Arts and Sciences, and who had been the organizer and coordinator of this faculty driven process. I happen to know that she's even here today. So is one of those the answer?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Number five is retirement, probably.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I'm sort of hoping for number four.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I would have never used the word easier. So that premise is incorrect. I would have never used that, because that wouldn't be consistent with my

notion of what general education is and what it's trying to accomplish.

And the example that I used recently and the only example that I used recently was that I was at a dinner sitting next to a gentleman in Cleveland, and I asked him what does he do? And he said, I started a company called Adapt Courseware, and we developed high end general education courses and our company is now working with five universities to help support the delivery of those companies. I said, really? I said, do you still do that? No. I sold the company. I'm still on the board. I still have a small equity stake. And I said, what's the name of it? I want to look it up. That's fascinating. I wrote it down. The following morning I woke up, I get the laptop, I pull it up, and they supposedly spent, I had two different numbers provided to me.

He said that they spent a million dollars a course to develop these courses, okay? Someone else said no, they spent 750,000. Anyway it's a lot of money to develop each of these courses.

So I pushed the little video, and some of you may be on line already with your iPads looking at this. If you push the little video it walks you through what this is. And what it essentially is, it's a very, kind of sophisticated text book, online text book. It's got the ability to learn a subject by reading the text, just like a text book. It's got the ability to watch the lecture, and the 3D simulation that they created with all of this money to learn the content. It's got a section to have practice problems that tracks your progress, and shows you your level of mastery on the topic, and then it's got another section of data analytics that would in some ways be helpful in terms of proving learning assessment. Okay.

But the way I look at this is that this is just like an interactive text book. And I said, well, when I was having dinner with him, I said, how do the universities that you work with use your product? And they said they used it in some cases in, as a way of flipping the classroom, so not replacing the traditional classroom experience but supplementing it much the way a text book would.

Or in other cases it becomes a full, what they call personalized adaptive learning set such that when they finish the course the student either takes a CLEP test to earn credit if they're doing it on their own, or if they're working through the university a faculty member will determine whether

learning objectives were achieved and grant credit. And that's the way they work with the universities.

I asked the guy, how does the economic model work? He said, he said, the way it works is this replaces the text book and we basically offer the product at no more than \$99, but we work backwards in case of discounts based on the number of students. He said normally a text book would cost at least that, so it's no more costly. So I shared that example with a group, which I'm sure then got a little twisted and turned by the time it was shared with you.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Okay. So what you are saying then is you are going back to two, which is that you sort of threw out some idea which, in fact, has been rejected by the faculty as an alternative to gen ed. And there's still hope for you to go for answer four.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: Remind me what answer four was.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: To plan to meet with Dr. Linda Subich to understand how for the last three and a half years this project has been carried out.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I can't wait.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You'll like her. We all do.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I will.

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

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you. I can get up. Hello. I had a question that I hope is appropriate for this forum that I was concerned about, and it's something I don't understand, but I was wondering what the vetting process was, whether it went through the Office of the President and what discussions about this occurred.

I'm not involved with it, but I was rather embarrassed to see that for the Black Male Summit our speaker is Stephen A. Smith, who, I think it's good to get interesting people, but I was wondering if everyone was aware that he was suspended by ESPN for a week for his comments regarding the Ray Rice incident which he basically said, you know, well, women really have to think about what they say if they want to be safe.

And I wondered what the process of choosing this person was. I am not a member of the

black male demographic, but I think in any situation having that person as the primary speaker causes me a lot of concern and embarrassment for a, what I understand is a program to help strengthen, you know, a population. And I was wondering, I've heard no conversation about this. I was just very surprised at the announcement, and I didn't know where to take my feelings. And since it seems like a done deal, I wanted to make sure everyone at a high level knew what they were doing and were happy with the choice and feels as though it represents the best of even an extra level of what UA is offering to their community. And I was wondering, you know, how we were involved. When I say we, how that decision was made and whether those things were taken into consideration and still considered that to be the best option.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: I think that's a great question. So to answer it directly, no, the President's Office wasn't involved in the selection. In fact, I'm learning for the first time who the primary speaker is going to be. That would have been a decision I'm sure that would have been delegated to our Office of Diversity who plans and organizes the Black Male Summit, which I'm sure as you know has a great history of support and has done great things.

As it pertains to a particular speaker, these can be tricky issues for universities to deal with, but I would urge us to kind of use our shared governance process in this case.

I would encourage you that if there are sufficient numbers who believe there's something that should be done in this case to alter the planned series events, that it should be discussed, debated. Whether it's student government or Faculty Senate or University Council, and let's let everyone weigh in as to whether we as a university community feel comfortable with the speaker that we have planned for the event, knowing who we are as an institution, knowing our core values. But in some cases these core values may conflict in some ways and we need to find the proper balance to applying those core values.

So I will certainly withhold judgment, personal judgment, and would encourage us to use the processes that serve us well to examine this concern that you expressed.

SENATOR LISA LAZAR: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR DOUGLAS HAUSKNECHT: Just a brief, quick question. I don't know if you are aware of our somewhat odd President's Day holiday coming up in February. It's a non-class day, but it's a work day. I know you are trying to put these meetings together with large groups. I'm just offering as a suggestion that would be an opportunity to maybe to look at.

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: No, I'm not familiar with it. I dealt with one that I think was an odd issue around the December holiday period, but I'm not aware of this particular one, so I will ask Mike to fill me in if he knows something about it when we're done.

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

PRESIDENT SCOTT SCARBOROUGH: All right. Thank you, sir.

(applause)

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

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you very much, Chair Rich. Let me start off with wishing everyone a happy, healthful, restful and invigorating holiday spent with your colleagues, your family and your friends. You deserve it. We all deserve it, so let me start there.

As you know, we continue to send out the Council of Dean meetings debriefs so everybody across the campus knows the primary topics that were discussed during those meetings. If you have any suggestions as to the content or the presentation or other types of ideas, please feel free to let me know. I will continue to do that. And again, I will just point to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee as having that conversation and making that recommendation and I think it's continuing to serve the institution well.

As you know, next week we'll hold fall graduation. And as you know for the agenda today you are going to endorse the faculty approved graduation list. The timing is right because the board meets next Wednesday and we'll be able to take action on that before graduation. So thank you for providing outstanding academic programs to those who will walk the stage next week as a result of all of our good work.

I don't know if you are familiar with the Purdue Index that came out this past year where

working with Gallup they surveyed I think about 30 or 40,000 college graduates and they asked them about various aspects of their college experience, asked them about various aspects of their engagement in their work, asked them about various aspects of their satisfaction with their life.

And I know there's many individuals in this room who could evaluate that survey with probably a higher level of analysis than I would be able to do, but generally speaking, you know, the individuals that I believe experience the type of programs that we offer at the University of Akron report feeling more engaged in their work, and seem to report a better well being than those who have not when they're going through college, you know, have been very effectively touched by faculty members and staff members in very significant ways in addition to being involved in research or experiential learning or immersive learning and service learning.

So I just want to say that I'm quite confident that our students graduating from this institution would likely be those who are very engaged in their work and are very much better satisfied with their life, and I think that's related to the great work that we all do, and in particular the faculty do at the University of Akron.

From a Higher Learning Commission perspective I will only add to the comments already made and to again express thanks to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the University Council Steering Committee that worked together to draft the narrative related to shared governance. And as you know, there's input coming in, input has come in from across campus and from the board of trustees, and that input will form the narrative that will be submitted to the Higher Learning Commission.

Learning Outcomes Assessments were reported on as you saw in the Council of Deans debrief by Dr. David Steer. Please take a look at that presentation that was made. It's on the Learning Outcomes Assessment website, or in that deans debrief there's a link to that website. From what I can see and understand things are moving along quite well with the institution implementation of that across the spectrum of courses, and I believe it's interacting quite well with the consideration of the reform of general education.

I don't think I will add any more about the comments related to strategic planning. That

was discussed quite well with the president. And again, I want to express congratulations and support to Chair Rich and to those of you who have been involved in the discussion related to the criminal justice system. I think the comments you made earlier are quite well taken, and I do believe the end result of those discussions will result in very high quality, enhanced and great academic programs for our students delivered by a very outstanding faculty. So with that, I will end my comments and ask for questions or comments.

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

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: This is just a simple question. Last spring we heard that in the sort of reconfigured CAST they would no longer have the developmental programs. So where are they? I have no idea.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I think at the present point in time, and Vice Provost Ramsier being Interim Dean of CAST can address that, but I believe that at this moment they continue to reside in CAST, or not.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Slight correction. We have the administrative function of developmental programs is monitored by the Student Success organization, Stacey Moore's area, but the academic functions are monitored by our office in OAA. So part-time faculty hiring and changing the course scheduling and adding and dropping classes all comes through our office.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: So it's not in the college then.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: No. It's a centralized unit with dual reporting lines, administrative and academic.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions for the provost? Senator Saliga?

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: There has been a push, I know we've heard some in our department, and I've heard from some others about making courses available on line, going entirely on line. The push that we're hearing about is for college algebra to go completely on line. And you know, I'm hearing one side of it coming here. Our faculty really are not in favor of this,

but it keeps coming back from our chair that this is what we need to do. We have to do it.

My, one of many concerns I have with it is how that would fit into this new gen ed scenario, you know, much bigger picture going on with this.

But this all seems to be coming from a grant proposal that was funded coming from the Provost's Office. Could you enlighten me a little bit as to what that proposal is and why this pressure is coming?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yeah, the work is out of the Transformational Planning Grant from the Urban Serving Universities in APLU. To deliver the grant, the College of Arts and Sciences is working with the faculty in Spanish to look at meeting the requirements of the grant to plan for the potential to deliver Spanish for the Health Professions in a modularized approach. And it's just a planning grant to see how that might be carried out.

The discussions I understand that are underway are those that would ask the question might such an approach apply to College Algebra or not? And I understand that that's happening between the Dean's Office and the department chair and the faculty.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: This may be another example of how things can get mistranslated as it comes through the administrative hierarchy. So maybe that needs clarification with the administration of the college. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you. I had a question about the Learning Outcomes Assessment that Dr. Steer reported on, and it relates also in a general sense to our discussion earlier today about the general education process. The elements of the general education process include learning outcomes. It also includes an assessment aspect to it.

What I'm hearing, and perhaps you can help clarify, is that this appears to be a different process that's going to potentially create some confusion among people who are trying to work on how the general education requirements are going to be adapted in order to handle some of the institutional assessment issues that have arisen.

So I'd like to hear a little bit more or ask you to, you know, to clarify exactly when did the

Learning Outcomes Assessment Program which has now apparently been reported on to the board come to this body for its review and approval, and how does that relate to the general education outcome?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, the Learning Outcomes Assessment initiative is coming out of the arts and sciences largely, that from my understanding of it are interrelated to the evolution of the general education program, so my understanding is they're not in conflict with each other.

I can't really explain that probably at the level of detail you would like. So if the chair might recognize perhaps Associate Dean Subich, she might be able to better address the answer to that question in a more specific way, because I don't believe they are in direct conflict with each other.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Associate Dean Subich, do you wish to address this?

LINDA SUBICH: Sure. What was discussed at the Council of Deans was the overview of the entire campus Learning Outcomes Assessment. And one piece of that was the illustration of the new general education Learning Outcomes Assessment, that that would be a part of the overall campus strategy. So it wasn't actually reporting on what assessments had been done, but that was part of the overall plan going forward. So it was not in contradiction.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: It shows how they actually integrate.

LINDA SUBICH: Yeah.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: If I may, when I have been discussing in my college some of these issues about the need to consider assessment as a major part of the general education initiative, which I believe is accurate, I am receiving a lot of shrugs and eye rolling and other reactions which seem to me to indicate that perhaps people are hearing something different.

The past couple of years have also been times in which there have been, and I don't know how else to characterize it, but there have been confusing communications in which sometimes a particular action, by let's say a faculty body is misconstrued and turns into something entirely different. And it creates a lot of problems. It creates a lot of confusion. It creates a lot of mistrust. It creates a lot of having to go back and fix it. And what I'm hearing here is not that you

don't understand it, or Linda doesn't understand it or Connie doesn't understand it, but the people who are actually going to be doing this work really don't understand it. And this really needs to be communicated in a very clear, articulated sense as a unified program so people can see how it fits together, or you are going to have more of what Senator Erickson referred to as people saying, oh yeah, really? I will believe it when I see it kind of attitude.

And you know, as I think Chair Rich said, we don't need that. So, please figure out a way to communicate this clearly. And if for some reason it has turned into some kind of a parallel process or one in which the same terms are being used when there should be different terms, that this be corrected and we don't just simply shove it under the rug or pretend like nothing happened, or pretend if you were just a little smarter you would understand it, because this is not going to be helpful to our future as a university. But I thank you very much for your time.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I would ask that perhaps we take a look at the presentation that was presented, and if there are questions or concerns about this perspective, let's please consider those so that we can clarify what the confusion is. If we could do that, that would be great.

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

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it.

(applause)

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item on the agenda is the approval of the list of degree candidates for the Fall 2014 graduation. Is there a motion to approve the list? It's moved by Senator Jones, seconded by Senator Allen. Is there any debate? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Next item is the report of the Academic Policies Committee. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Academic Policies Committee

brings one motion for your consideration. As was mentioned in the chairman's remarks, faculty of the Department of Associate Studies in the College of Applied Science and Technology wishes to change the department's name to the Department of Applied General and Technical Studies hopefully before the fall 2015 semester. It's been approved by the faculty of the department, faculty of the college, CAST, and by Academic Policies Committee unanimously. So we bring it to you as a motion from committee.

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

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

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

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item on the agenda is the report of the Curriculum Review Committee.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Curriculum Review Committee brings forward a list of curriculum proposals that have made it through the system without any further concerns or issues. So these were unanimously approved by the committee to bring to you for your consideration and approval.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there any debate on the motion? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

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

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We have an informational report from the Athletics Committee. I don't know whether there's anyone from the committee who wishes to report orally. Is there? I take it not.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Well, if I may, I just had, I suppose lawyers would call an ex

parte conversation out in the hallway with the chair of the Athletic Committee, and he has reported that he was also beginning a discussion about the consequences of the University of Alabama at Birmingham dropping football. So that is also something that I think will be discussed.

Finally, there has apparently been introduced in, I believe it's the House of Representatives a bill to regulate NCAA sports due to some of the scandals that have occurred nationally recently.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the report of the University Council representatives. Do any of the representatives wish to report?

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I was not at the last meeting, so I am going to defer to the other representatives.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I'm shortly going to conclude that there is no such report.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: It's not that I've not been doing my job as a University Council representative. I have, because I am chair of the committee and I have been busy doing that this morning, all about retirement and all of that stuff. But let me in terms, is, Senator Sterns, you were on the committee and perhaps you might be, you would be better to summarize what was passed.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The chair recognizes Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: One of the things that was presented, you know, each month at University Council a particular committee reports on what was happening. And this time it was the Development Committee of the university and they reported on their activities. I think it was apparent to those of us that were present that it was pretty much a report from Mr. LaGuardia of his personal activities, and that there was a concern that perhaps more committee involvement, more committee participation, a further discussion of priorities and other things take place within the committee. And so I think that was a lesson learned.

The other thing was, the major focus was on whether we should be a smoke-free campus. And we had a rather interesting discussion regarding research evidence regarding tobacco products as well as the category of e-cigarettes. And since there was some debate considering information on e-cigarettes not being yet conclusive in terms that we know they're probably not health

promoting, but we don't know if they're detrimental, the whole thing did not happen yet. But I think eventually we may, well, we may be known as, University of Akron, the place where you can smoke.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I rise here to point out that we also have evidence based reasons from our colleagues to the east of us regarding cell phone usage and the effect of stress on undergraduates. I wonder if perhaps the University Council would like to bring a motion banning the use of cell phones so that we can improve the health of the students.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The chair interprets this as a rhetorical question.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I would point out at the last University Council meeting which Senator Lillie could not attend I said that I stood to speak in his stead. So in essence he said, well, I didn't say it exactly, I could not do it as well as he did, but I did point out that the reason that we tried to control, that we have for bringing in something like this is the effect on other people. That is as an economist that it's the secondary effect that we have the right to govern. And if the serious costs on other people who are not, certainly the people who smoke those cigarettes make their own decisions and their own health is affected, but is the effect on other people as well, that we needed to evaluate this.

And it was the representative of the students who busily looked up the reference given by the chair of the committee on the negative effects of e-cigarettes who looked it up and said, excuse me, but you just took that out of context, because it said that at this point we haven't got the evidence to see whether it has effects on people outside.

And I thought that was really, as a teacher I thought, yes, this is very good work by our students, right, to have made that point. And we didn't have to say very much, I guess. I didn't have to say anything more, and we did not vote, we did have a vote and it was a split vote.

But I think this would be, the point, I think, was made by the students in this case. And then senator, you should, Senator Sterns, you should talk too, about the fact that there was a resolution brought by the students on, that the fees, that the general fees that in fact a very large percentage of which go to athletics should be named athletic fees.

Have you got extra things to say on that? Because it was in that case voted which way? It passed. There was a lot of, there was a number of administrators who said no, no, no, no, no, but it passed. It was a split vote, but it passed. And that was a really important thing too, and I think we should be, University Council has all of the constituents of the university, and this is where I think we can be very proud that our students are putting in a major part of this activity.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Erickson. Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: The number I heard from that, by the way, was about \$300 less a year than the Cleveland Plain Dealer's article two years ago claiming the University of Akron was actually spending on athletics per student. So I would hope that we would actually look up the numbers and make sure, if we're going to do that, that that's representative.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: If I might add.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: That is a good point that Senator Allen is raising, because I believe that we did, that it was presented to the University Council. We actually didn't have the latest up-to-date figures, and so there was a desire to get the latest figures so that we could indeed communicate the actual dollar cost of the athletic fee and the general fee.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: I just wanted to add that within the past year the athletic directors presented to the Athletics Committee information on the budget which would indicate that the budget for athletics at the University of Akron totals about \$25 million. How that's divided up is a matter of some, some debate and perhaps confusion. But if we're assuming approximately 25,000 students and a budget of \$25 million, then we can come up with a rough estimate of about a thousand dollars per student.

Now, how much of that is actually charged to the students and how much of it is represented by a scholarship, that maybe it's not a direct charge can be argued. But I don't think there's much argument that it's at least \$600 per student per year, and perhaps up to a thousand dollars. And I think that's what I wanted to, you know, point out. And so this issue regarding athletics is certainly an important one.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Okay. Any other questions for the University Council representatives? If not, is there any new business to come before the body? Any new business? Anything for the good of the order? I take it you may be ready to adjourn. If there's no objection, we stand adjourned.