

**ROUGH EDITED COPY**  
**may not be a verbatim record of the proceedings**

University of Akron  
Faculty Senate

2016-10-06

**CART/CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:**

Premier Visual Voice, LLC  
CART, Captioning and Interpreter Services  
[www.premiervisualvoice.com](http://www.premiervisualvoice.com)  
216-246-9477

JMC

CHAIR RICH: [gavel] This meeting of the Faculty Senate -- the October meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Sterns, seconded by Senator Saliga. Does anyone wish to propose any changes to the agenda?

All in favor of adopting the agenda as distributed, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted without dissent.

The next item is the adoption of the minutes – first the minutes of the March meeting, previously distributed in writing. Is there a motion to adopt those minutes as distributed? Senator Bouchard moves, Senator Saliga seconds. Any corrections to those minutes? We have corrections. They are my corrections, as a matter of fact.

SECRETARY MILLER: On the first page under Senate Actions, substitute Constance Bouchard for John Huss. The first page got that backwards. Combine Sections VIII and IX under one title and renumber subsequent sections.

CHAIR RICH: Any objection to making those changes? Any other corrections to the minutes? All those in favor of adopting the minutes of the March meeting please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Those minutes are adopted without dissent.

Next is the adoption of the September minutes, also previously distributed in writing. Is there a motion to adopt those minutes as distributed? Moved by Senator Allen, seconded by Senator Clark. Are there any corrections to those minutes? All in favor of adopting the September minutes as distributed, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The minutes are adopted without dissent.

Next is the Remarks of the Chairman.

Since our September meeting, several run-off elections have been concluded. From the College of Arts and Sciences, Linda Saliga, Harvey Sterns and Linda Barrett were re-elected. And Maria Adamowisz-Hariasz, Janet Bean, Kathryn Budd, Larry Snider and Claire Tessier were newly elected. From the College of Applied Science and Technology, Daniel Kandray, John Nicholas, and Scott Randby were newly elected. Also Kenton Steele, a law student, was elected to represent the graduate and professional students. Congratulations and welcome or welcome back, as the case may be, to these new and returning Faculty Senators.

If you have not already done so, please sign one of the posted attendance sheets so that your presence may be properly recorded. And a quorum documented.

We have a fairly light agenda today. Among the items on it are Faculty Senate, University Council and AAUP Chapter representation on the University Board of Trustees committees.

That proposal was developed jointly and advocated by the presiding officers of those shared governance organizations, including me, all of whom served on the Tiger Team and its working group on shared governance issues. It is my hope that each of those shared governance organizations will express support for this proposal. And that the President will recommend it to the Board of Trustees and that the Board will adopt it.

Also on the agenda is the election of a Faculty Senator to serve as a member of Graduate Council. As you will recall, we left one seat open in the last meeting pending the outcome of the run-off elections for Senate.

President Wilson is in Idaho on University business and asked me to convey his regret that he is unable to attend this meeting. Provost Ramsier had to attend a meeting in Columbus this morning. He expressed to me the hope that he would return to Akron in time to attend this meeting, but said he might arrive after it is already in progress.

As you will also recall, President Wilson told us last month that, with support from a donation that he had secured for this purpose, he had engaged the accounting firm of Ernst & Young to conduct an analysis of the University's finances. The President informed me recently that he expects Ernst & Young's report to be submitted as early as next week. So I expect we will soon have a clearer picture of the University's fiscal condition.

The impending expansion of Stark State University into the City of Akron has been in the news again lately. I have recently been in communication with public officials as well as President Wilson about these developments. My message to all concerned has been about the need to avoid a duplication of programs already offered by the University of Akron, particularly those offered by our College of Applied Science and Technology.

There are many programs offered already by Stark State in Stark County that our university does not offer, and that are needed for workforce development in Akron. Many of those would not fit easily within the mission of our University. In my view, those are the programs that Stark State University ought to focus on offering at its new Akron location. It is my hope that, with the support of the relevant public officials, the leaders of Stark State and our University will come to an agreement that minimizes the duplication of program offerings in Summit County. It is also my hope that the two institutions will make arrangements to share various services and perhaps even facilities so as to minimize the cost to each by achieving economies of scale.

This concludes my remarks

Next item is Special Announcements.

Senator Elliott: Is it possible to ask questions about your remarks?

CHAIR RICH: No. [Laughing] Good of the Order would be the place to raise the question. Or if it should happen to be pertinent to any business that is transacted between now and Good of the Order, of course it could also be raised.

Special announcements: Doctor Charlotte L. Burrell, who retired from the University of Akron in April 2015, died on August 17 at the age of 68. Dr. Burrell joined the University in 1987, having earned a B.S. in Criminal Justice Studies in 1984, and an M.S. in Rehabilitation and Therapeutic Services in 1986, both at Kent State University. In 2004, she earned a doctorate in Educational Administration -- Higher Education at the University of Akron. At the University, Dr. Burrell first worked in the Student Financial Aid office. She was its assistant director from 1987 to 1995, and associate director from 1995 to 2001. From 2001 to 2004, she served as assistant to the Associate Provost. In June 2005, Dr. Burrell became the assistant to the Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology, formerly Summit College. She remained in that role until her retirement. For six years, beginning in 2008, she was also a part-time lecturer in the School of Communication.

Roland Paolucci, professor emeritus of music and founder of the School of Music's Jazz Studies Program died September 19 at the age of 78. He joined the University of Akron in 1977 as a part-time lecturer in music, and became a full-time faculty member in 1978. In addition to founding the Jazz Studies Program and serving as its coordinator, Paolucci was the director of the University of Akron's jazz ensemble. He retired in 2000. He earned his B.S. in music at the

State University of New York at Albany, and a Master of Arts in Theater Arts and Arts Administration at the University of Akron in 1985.

Dr. Kathy J. Liszka, professor of computer science, died October 1 at the age of 57. Dr. Liszka joined the University of Akron faculty as an assistant professor in 1993. She was promoted to the rank of full professor in 2007. During her time at the University of Akron, Dr. Liszka also took on a number of other roles including coordinator of computer science from August 2014 to May 2015, interim department chair for six months in 2012 as well. She was an associate professor in electrical engineering from August 2001 through September 2004. Dr. Liszka earned a B.A. in Accounting at Theil College in 1980, she earned a Master of Science in Computer Science in 1986 and a PhD in Computer Science in 1992, both from Kent State University.

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

The next item on the agenda is the report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Miller.

SECRETARY MILLER: Since the Faculty Senate last met in September, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met twice by itself and once with Interim President Matt Wilson. At 2 o'clock on September 15, 2016, the Executive Committee met to prepare for its monthly meeting with the President and the Provost. The EC reviewed and certified Senate elections, and the EC prepared an agenda for this meeting. At 3:00, the EC met with the President, and Provost, and we discussed how the University might and the Gen Ed Core program early, leadership changes in the College of Health Professions, the University's budget, a possible soft freeze on travel spending, and the future of the Excel Center and experiential learning on campus. At 2 o'clock on September 29, 2016, the EC met for regular business. We certified Senate elections, appointed faculty to

Senate committees, and prepared a draft of the agenda for the October Senate meeting. We elected Doug Hausknecht to serve on the Student Responder Committee. We discussed HLC writing teams, the state of IDC accounts, the creation of an ad hoc Responsive Research Policies committee, and the role faculty might play in the crafting of a new University strategic plan or in a revision of University's Board Core mission statement. As Secretary of the Senate, I would also like to remind all Senators that you are to serve on at least one Faculty Senate committee over the course of the year. So let us know which one you would like to serve on if you are not on one.

CHAIR RICH: I would add, if you don't express a preference then you are forgoing the opportunity to have some say in which committee you are assigned to.

SECRETARY MILLER: We also move a resolution today, and I will read the resolution and then I will read the text that you need to hear to support it. The resolution is: Resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the Tiger Team that representatives of the Faculty Senate, University Council, the AAUP Akron chapter and the department chairs serve as nonvoting members of various committees on the Board of Trustees.

Here is the text of the Tiger Team's recommendation that we are resolving to support: the Tiger Team recommends that the Board of Trustees add representatives chosen by the Faculty Senate, the AAUP, UA Chairs, and University Council as nonvoting members of the following Board of Trustee committees: Academic Issues and Student Success, one member from Faculty Senate and one member from Akron AAUP. Finance and Administration, one member from University Council. Personnel and Compensation, one member from the UA Chairs. Rules Committee, one member from any of these groups chosen by the representatives of these groups. And Strategic Issues, one member from the University Council.

CHAIR RICH: This motion comes from the Executive Committee; it does not require a second. I think you're all generally aware of the background of this. We have come through a period in which I think it has become apparent that the Board of Trustees needs information of the kind that probably only faculty and potentially other representatives of these shared governance bodies can provide to them. The Tiger Team thought that the best mechanism to do that would be to have representatives on the relevant Board committees – some of the Board committees there is not a reason to have a representative on, but the Board committees that are in the Tiger Team recommendation were the ones that the Tiger Team thought there was a reason to have representatives of these shared governance organizations on.

This is not something that is completely unprecedented. There are Boards of Trustees at other universities that have such representatives serving on their committees. The proposal is for them to be nonvoting members. Frankly because we thought that would be more easily accepted by the Board. And that the most important function really was for the representatives to inform the members of the Board of Trustees, and also to hear from the members of the Board of Trustees.

Most of the work, most of the real discussion and debate among the members of the Board in meetings is in committees. Usually, what happens in committees is that anything that bears discussion is discussed and then put on what is called the consent agenda for the full board meeting. And that means that all the items that are put on the consent agenda are voted pro forma together as a package, so most of the real discussion occurs at the committee level.

So that is the background of these recommendations. If there are questions, I'll be happy to try to provide additional information. Senator Sterns was also a member of this Tiger Team group. He might also be able to add information.



But this resolution proposed by the Executive Committee is to express the fact that the Senate supports that recommendation in the hope that the President will pass it along to the Board and that the Board will adopt it.

Is there discussion? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I just have one question, a point of clarification. Did I hear Physical Environment, or the parallel committee? And who was assigned to it?

CHAIR RICH: Are you talking about a committee of the Board?

SECRETARY MILLER: Do you want me to read it again?

CHAIR RICH: Yes, but there is no such committee.

SECRETARY MILLER: The Tiger Team recommends that the Board of Trustees add representatives chosen by the Faculty Senate, the AAUP, UA Chairs, and University Council as nonvoting members of the following Board of Trustees committees: Academic Issues and Student Success, Finance and Administration, Personnel and Compensation, Rules Committee, and Strategic Issues.

CHAIR RICH: There isn't such a committee

SENATOR STERNS: There used to be.

CHAIR RICH: Well, right, but I don't think we could ask for representatives on a committee that used to exist but doesn't anymore. Any other discussion on the motion? Senator Budd.

SENATOR BUDD: Just a correction -- it's Akron AAUP.

CHAIR RICH: Akron AAUP. If there's no objection, we will just make that correction. Thank you. Senator Soucek.

SENATOR SOUCEK: In the future, if you're going to vote on anything, can we see it in writing or have it sent to us. Was it sent to us and I missed it?

CHAIR RICH: No. I apologize for that. This was something that occurred to me only recently that we ought to do. And so I raised it with the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee approved it only last night. If you wish to move to postpone it until a subsequent meeting --

SENATOR SOUCEK: That's not what I said.

CHAIR RICH: No, I understand that. I'm explaining what your options are.

SENATOR SOUCEK: I just said in the future.

CHAIR RICH: It does occasionally happen. We try to avoid it. It does occasionally happen that something will come up shortly before the meeting. I understand the concern and if the Body thinks that it requires some further thought individually it is perfectly permissible to postpone it until a later meeting. Which the next one would be November.

Any further discussion on the motion? Senator Bodenschatz.

SENATOR BODENSCHATZ: So it is my understanding that undergraduate student government is a part of the shared governance, so I'm just curious how USG is represented in these committees

CHAIR RICH: Through University Council. Actually twice -- through University Council and Faculty Senate. It is represented in both bodies.

SENATOR BODENSCHATZ: Maybe I am misunderstanding the point of having members of University Council and Faculty Senate -- never mind, I get it. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: My point is that there are various constituencies represented in both University Council and Faculty Senate, and that each of those bodies plus the others will have representatives and those representatives will be accountable to all the constituencies of each of those bodies. They are representatives of a representative body. Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich, isn't it the case that there is someone, an undergraduate student, who is a nonvoting member?

CHAIR RICH: There are two.

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes, so there are --

CHAIR RICH: That's a good point. There are also two undergraduate students who are members, nonvoting members, of the Board of Trustees and who are also on some of its committees. Strictly speaking, they are not representatives of the student body because they are chosen by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Ohio Senate. But yes, there are two student members, undergraduate student members, of the Board of Trustees. Two student members. They are not always undergraduate.

Other discussion on the motion?

Thomas Guarino: I'm a graduate student at the University of Akron. I just have a quick question regarding the selection of -- potential selection of a shared governance member being selected from the University Council. I just thought this body might want to consider that maybe a suggestion or possibly a requirement that that member be a member of the faculty, because I know that not all of the member. Some are administrative members, on the University Council as well. In terms of shared governance, my understanding of shared governance is to bring the faculty into play with the administration and Board of Trustees.

CHAIR RICH: The decision of the Tiger Team was to leave the choice of the representative to the representative body that was to be represented, trusting that they would make good choices. And so the question before us is, do we support that recommendation or do we not? That is our question. Senator Randby.

SENATOR RANDBY: Mr. Chairman I think that leaving it to these University Council committees may not be such a good idea because --

CHAIR RICH: It is not left to University Council committees, it is left to the University Council as a whole.

SENATOR RANDBY: But faculty have a very small minority on University Council. So -- and I agree with the previous Senator who spoke that faculty --

CHAIR RICH: He is not a Senator; he is a guest.

SENATOR RANDBY: Shared governance is all about faculty relations with the administration.

CHAIR RICH: The premise of the University Council, and even to some extent the Faculty Senate, is that shared governance is not only about the faculty. In this body, we have some representatives of the student body, and of academic advisors specifically. So it's not strictly faculty although it is overwhelmingly faculty. In the case of University Council, for better or for worse, the operating principle is representation of the various constituencies.

I understand the point that you're making, and don't want to take a lot of time to go into history. But it was my view, at the time that the University Council proposal was debated, that the faculty were underrepresented on it. It continues to be my view, but in the end it was decided that it was necessary to make that compromise in order for the faculty to secure any say, what say we have in the budget and planning process and the facilities allocation process and the other things that are within the purview of the University Council and not within the faculty Senate since the Board of Trustees took those functions away in the wake of faculty unionization. There is a long history here.

I understand the point that you're making and potentially it might be a reason for the Senate not to express its support of the Tiger Team recommendation. The Tiger Team recommendation is what is, and we will have to decide whether to support it. Whether or not to support it. Perhaps whether to support it with some sort of qualification, but I do think we should think carefully about what the effect of any such qualification would be on the likelihood of the other shared governance bodies doing likewise, or disagreeing, and then ultimately the Board of Trustees agreeing to do what is recommended. I think the likelihood of the Board of Trustees doing what is recommended is significantly greater if all of the shared governance bodies are speaking with one voice, even if no one of them is completely happy with the proposal. Senator Randby.

SENATOR RANDBY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that I believe that is a mistake to think that shared governance is about other bodies except for faculty.

And I believe that we should resist that notion. Especially here, given the situation with University Council.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chairperson Rich, I would like to voice my support for the proposal as stated. The vast majority of these elected members would be faculty members and if we want any kind of sense of community around the University, I think there needs to be some sense that it is not just faculty. Keeping in mind that people on a University Council that are not faculty have no job security, perhaps, so that will tend to balance itself out. But if someone wished to serve on that, I think if we want to have a sense of community in the University, I think that is imperative that it is as you stated.

CHAIR RICH: Other discussion on the motion? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: As a faculty member and Chair of University Council, I would like to speak to the fact that the contributions by all five constituencies have been very valuable, especially in certain planning processes, use of fiscal facilities, budgetary factors; there are many professionals around the table who have been very helpful in decision-making. It is not just faculty. It is also -- we have department chairs, deans, who are also faculty, I might point out. So I would like to point out that this really is, in my mind, shared governance as it should be. With all constituencies involved.

CHAIR RICH: Further discussion on the motion? I take it you're ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion to express the Senate's support of the Tiger Team recommendation, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent.

SECRETARY MILLER: That concludes the report.

CHAIR RICH: As I mentioned before, President Wilson is unable to be here today so he will give no remarks. I see that Provost Ramsier is also not here yet. If he arrives later, we can make some time for him to talk, if he wants to.

So the next item on the agenda is the election of a representative to the Graduate Council. This is a one year term. The seat is currently held by -- well, it was until just recently held by Senator Sterns. Is there -- are there nominations for representative to Graduate Council? Senator Allen

SENATOR ALLEN: I would like to nominate Harvey Sterns.

CHAIR RICH: Do you accept, Senator Sterns?

SENATOR STERNS: I do.

CHAIR RICH: Are there any other nominations? Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations be closed, and that Senator Sterns be elected by acclamation? Moved by Senator Clark, seconded by Senator Howley. All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Senator Sterns is elected representative to the Graduate Council. Congratulations, Senator Sterns.

Next we have committee reports. I believe all of these are merely informational and have been distributed in writing. Let me just ask -- are there representatives, chairs or other representatives of these committees, who wish to give a report orally?

Next is the report of the Graduate Council representatives. Senator Allen -- and I assume that Senator Sterns, having not been a representative until just now, has no report -- but Senator Allen?

SENATOR ALLEN: Chairperson Rich, at the risk of initiating the ire of Senator Soucek again, I do have something to present. [Laughing] Something that is a proposal, as well, to the Senate for your consideration. I apologize for the late nature of this, given that there is some pressing components of that that require the late nature and that it is just being formulated right now.

Provost Ramsier has requested that the Grad Dean, in conjunction with the Grad Council, conduct a five-year graduate program review. This is mandated by the Ohio Department of Higher Education. It doesn't stop there though. We also have an HLC issue on our site visit that it is required that there is a mechanism in place for systematic review of undergraduate programs, as well. The recommendation is that this be done simultaneously. A five-year review of graduate programs and undergraduate programs, and I think in some cases, that would include associate degrees as well as baccalaureate degrees.

Charles Beneke and I were elected by Grad Council and appointed by the Grad Dean to co-chair this committee. There were three members of Grad Council that were elected to be part of this committee, as well. Shiva Sastry, from Engineering, Nicole Zakaria from Polymer Engineering and one additional Grad Council member who declined to participate. But we will find a third person and then the recommendation is to also appoint two people and these appointees would be from collegiate deans that have primarily a graduate affiliation, and two additional people that would have primarily an undergraduate affiliation. And the four people from that group, the three people from Grad Council, and then Charles Beneke and I would then serve on that committee and there is a proposed order of the review of that as well. And we believe that that would satisfy the criteria necessary for accreditation for HLC, and also the criteria required for subvention for graduate programs from the Ohio Department of Higher Education. So we request that the Senate consider approving this proposal.



CHAIR RICH: Two questions for clarification purposes. The first is, the four who are yet to be named -- who is to make those appointments?

SENATOR ALLEN: The collegiate deans. The idea is there would be representation spread across the colleges. So the idea was that this would be a democratic approach where some people came from Grad Council, some people came from the deans and with the emphasis that there must be undergraduate representation on this, it can't just be primarily graduate-oriented faculty. If they are going to also be reviewing the undergraduate programs.

CHAIR RICH: So the college deans collectively would make those four appointments; is that correct?

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes, that is my understanding. Probably the Deans Council. And that probably my guess is that this would have to come from -- at least one person from the former Summit College because of the peculiar nature of that group. So they would have representation as well. Not that that is a bad thing or a good thing, it needs representation, in my opinion. Separately.

CHAIR RICH: My other question, again for clarification, is what exactly is it in the nature of legislation that the Graduate Council passed? Was it a resolution --

SENATOR ALLEN: It was a resolution that the Senate consider this for approval to implement in a very timely manner given that that plan has to be in place as we understand it for HLC to accredit the University. It doesn't have to be fully implemented and completed, it just has to be -- the plan has to be in place.

CHAIR RICH: So this is legislation coming to us from the Graduate Council, which is in the nature of a Senate committee in this regard. It does not require a second. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I want to have it clarified. You said it was a five-year program review, so is this something that we would start now and do for five years? As opposed to do it in the next twenty minutes over the last five years? Which is usually how things work.

SENATOR ALLEN: I will put my 10 cents worth in. This is not program review as has occurred in the past. It will be over five years -- approximately 20% in year one, 20% in year two, and so forth. We even have a proposed list. It's just -- the mechanism is substantially different this time.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: Also point of clarification. This would be something separate from and different from the current assessment program we have all been doing for the last two or three years?

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes and no. Right now we have a requirement that all graduate programs be reviewed every 10 years and that includes an external review. We are now at the point where some programs, the ones for year one, have not had that done and we will be in violation of what used to be [indiscernible] requirements and could lose subvention for all graduate programs. So this is mandated by the state, not by us. Believe it or not, I swear, I am not a masochist. This is a whole lot of work and it just absolutely mandated by the state.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Randby.

SENATOR RANDBY: I just want to say that if this is going to go forward, that it's essential to have CAST represented because we have many baccalaureate

programs as well as associate degrees. And so we must be represented in that committee, if it is going to go forward.

SENATOR ALLEN: My apologies, Senator Randby. That is CAST I was referring to. I concur.

CHAIR RICH: Other discussion on the motion? Are you ready to vote? All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

The next item is the report of the University Council representatives. Who are Senators Roy and Allen. Former Senator Roy and Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Hello again.

There were really four things mentioned, I think key things, at the University Council. Provost Ramsier discussed the HLC site visit and its importance for accreditation. Nathan Mortimer and Shiva Sastry discussed the University budget. It is still a work in progress. My understanding is there will be more closure on that in October. Later in October. Dr. Sastry presented a motion from the budget subcommittee of the University Council that \$1.8 million in indirect cost funds be -- to 270 accounts of faculty members -- be returned to those individuals in a timely manner and this motion passed. So it was sent to the Provost. The recommendation -- the proposal to University Council to return \$1.8 million in indirect costs that were temporarily swept, has been to return that to a total of 270 accounts. Many of those are to different people, but some people have more than one account so it is not 270 separate people. And this motion was sent on to the Provost because it passed. A motion was also made that the Grad College should move from the Polsky building to the fifth floor of Leigh Hall and that Institutional Research would move from the fifth floor of Leigh Hall to new office space in Zook Hall. My understanding is there may be a potential issue with that, though. With moving to Zook Hall. In terms of its proximity to the

Provost for the HLC visit. I think that might be a little bit of an issue but is not an issue. The question is where they would move, either to the third floor of Zook Hall – the third floor of Leigh Hall or Zook Hall and Senator Sterns can clarify that because he is also Chair of the Facilities committee.

CHAIR RICH: One question about your third item: indirect costs. Senator Allen, you reported that that resolution was sent to the Provost. My understanding of the University Council bylaws -- No, my understanding of the University Council bylaws, which I believe Senator Sterns can confirm in a moment, is that all the recommendations of the University Council go to the President. The President may pass them along to the vice presidents, including the Provost.

SENATOR ALLEN: My apologies. That's why having a serf make this report can be problematic at times. My apologies.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Just a comment. I don't think the word sweep is the correct term. The accounts held were frozen. I think there is a difference between accounts being frozen and sweeping. The money has been held in individual faculty members' names and has been held in abeyance. Sweep means taken away. This proposal is an important one because it says that investigators and grant recipients should receive their indirect costs which they have earned. And that is the intention.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: One follow-up on that. They are actually two separate issues. One of them is the feeling of the committee, particularly the subcommittee, is that there is an ethical and moral responsibility to hold fast to the rules that were agreed upon. In the past. In the future, what the Office of

Research decides to do with allocating indirect cost, that is the University's decision to make. That is not ours. Maybe we have a say in it. But for the past, when a certain allocation of indirect cost was approved, many people feel that that was a moral imperative to resolve that. And that is what this is about. That does not guarantee anything in the future. We don't know about the future until it occurs.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: This is been brought up a couple times in meetings I have had with people. Is there any discussion by the University Council committee to think about the impact of that frozen time period on peoples RTP and going for tenure. Like an extension of the tenure clock, or some sort of mechanism in place for people whose research basically got stopped?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: My recommendation is that that is not the purview of University Council so much as it is of the AAUP's discussion with the administration of the University. Senator Sterns may have comments on that as well, but that, I think, would not be our purview.

CHAIR RICH: I would add that I think Senator Allen is correct. Because the RTP process is governed by collective bargaining, that it's the Akron AAUP -- Akron AAUP. Sorry, I got it wrong. I didn't say chapter.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: Senator Budd.

SENATOR BUDD: I believe, and this was in the last CBA, let me check the current one, but I that's a really good point. There is provision in there if somebody is coming up for tenure or promotion and wants an extension of time, they can request it. And so begins with them, I believe. So we can check that but I think there is provision in place for that.

CHAIR RICH: Anything further? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: This is just a question for Grad Council. As I recall, 11 months ago –

CHAIR RICH: We were talking about University Council.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: [indiscernible] Grad Council. There was talk 11 months ago about taking stipends away from TA's. And fortunately, nothing happened then and the thought was that it's too late to do anything for the coming year because we're about to start admitting people and giving them money. Now it's 11 months later. Has anything happened?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: I would like to defer that answer to the Dean of the Grad College, who was sitting behind us because I do not want to misstate anything. So if it's okay --

CHAIR RICH: The Chair recognizes the Dean of the Graduate Council. Graduate School.

DEAN MIDHA: Thank you. Thank you for asking the question. We have no plan to change the assistantship model on this campus which was discussed last year, and we went through all the pain. However we will be looking at tuition

awards, the subcommittee of the Graduate Council has been working on it through the summer and they have brought the initial discussion to the Graduate Council. For example, last year you heard that we are spending somewhere around \$35 million on the graduate programs in terms of tuition awards and assistantships. What we looked at was, it is less than \$30 million, somewhere in that range. Theoretically it was counted when students are given tuition awards, 15 credits each semester: fall, spring and summer. However, when we looked at the data for the last two years, most of the students take 10 credit hours during fall, spring and summer. So we're looking at the potential savings in the theoretical model and we would like to recommend that part of those savings, if we limit the tuition awards to 12 hours for each semester, then part of those savings should go back to the colleges, perhaps to adjust the stipends which have not been adjusted for years. But this is premature right now. That is the first meeting we discussed and we will be discussing it in the next meeting. But there is no plan to get away from the assistantship model.

SENATOR ALLEN: And in fact to help grad students, not hurt them.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. We are ready for new business, I think. Are there any items of new business? Senator Elliott.

SENATOR ELLIOTT: Yes, I would like to put a motion on the floor. I move the formation of an ad hoc Faculty Senate budget review committee. I've -- if anybody wants to see this in writing, I have extra copies.

[LAUGHTER]

So you can read along. So I will start over. The formation of an ad hoc Faculty Senate budget review committee. The committee's task would be to compile budget -- it should say information -- from various sources, including requests to the CFO via the President, to prepare a final report for the February Faculty

Senate meeting that clarifies for the faculty how revenues and expenditures are being applied to missions of academics, scholarship and service at the University of Akron. That is the motion.

CHAIR RICH: Is there a second? Senator Nicholas seconds. All right. Debate on the motion?

SENATOR ELLIOTT: There are some more words there. I'll let you read those.

CHAIR RICH: Well, not everyone has those in writing. Are there enough copies?

SENATOR ELLIOTT: The headings that I have for the brief rationale are Why Now? What about Redundancy? And Why Not?

Why Now? – we have heard in this particular meeting some references to the budget and questions and confusion even just in the last response. I have been active in these kinds of budget reviews since 1992 if anybody remembers Peggy Gordon Elliott, she had an interim budget advisory committee, I was on that.

Over the years there has been a trickle, trickle, trickle of budget information that whenever it gets to the point where it is a little bit interesting, suddenly the trickle stops. You don't get any more information. So I would like to – by having a Faculty Senate committee, it wouldn't be bogged down with some of the things that University Council seem to get bogged down with. It's got nothing to do with actions or suggesting or making recommendations about what people should do. It is about trust and transparency. I think that now is a good time.

Redundancy -- I guess I mentioned the University Council. There is may be some overlap. I have exchanged emails with Shiva Sastry, who is active on the budget aspect of University Council, and he is a little uncomfortable that this may become an unfair burden on them. If we have to impose requests of budget data



that they then have to be our servants and go do things for us. I'm trying to avoid that by saying we should be able to make requests to the CFO directly via the President. And so the President is the place where the buck stops. So all we are really requesting is data that a lot of it is already available but it needs clarification. For example, what was the exact name of it? The report that President Scarborough put out last year -- Revenue and Expense by Department report. There were line items in there like benefits. When you do the math on benefits divided by salaries, it's like 70%. But in the Board of Trustees report, it's 30%. Why are those numbers different? We should be able to figure those things out. We should have an understanding of that that the faculty -- an explanation of that that faculty can understand. The point is that this report would be by faculty for faculty. And it wouldn't get bogged down with other constituencies and confusions.

And then Why Not? What is the argument in favor of keeping faculty in the dark? I don't understand that. I could go on and talk about some more examples of things that are confusing. The last sentence gets cut off and basically it just mentions the importance of timeliness. I have that extra two liner if anybody wants one. It didn't format correctly when I printed.

CHAIR RICH: So do I understand correctly that the purpose of the committee would be to gather information and then inform the Senate?

SENATOR ELLIOTT: Inform the Senate in a formal report.

CHAIR RICH: The only thing that I would mention, which I have mentioned to you privately just before this meeting, is that this goes back to history again, when the Board took away the Faculty Senate's role in budget and planning, that was followed by the creation of the University Council as a way of having some sort of shared governance mechanism to address those as well as some other issues. It left the Senate in a position where it is right now, which is that what say

the Senate has about budget and planning is through the University Council. So, to the extent that anything might go beyond this body, that is to the extent that the committee might be in a position of making recommendations -- and I'm not sure that that is what is entailed by your motion in light of what you just said -- the mechanism would be that our representatives, the Faculty Senate's representatives to the University Council and its Budget and Finance committee, would be -- I don't want to use the word instructed, but would be at least informed by whatever action the Senate might take. On matters of budget and planning as well as facilities, whatever the Senate -- whatever action the Senate might take really goes through University Council, rather than directly to the President. As opposed to academic issues, where our legislation goes directly to the President. And in conjunction with that, let me just add that it is not clear to me, and I'm not saying that this won't happen, but it is not clear to me that the administration would respond to this by saying yes, we will give this committee all the information that it is requesting. They might -- and I don't know whether they will or not -- but they might take the position that the official mechanism is the University Council and its Budget and Finance committee. They share information with them, and then University Council or its Budget and Finance committee can share the information with the Senate and its committees. I want to be clear that this is not an area where our bylaws would say that the President must respond to this request. Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I think Senator Elliott is asking the right questions and one of the biggest concerns that we all have right now about the Budget committee of University Council is having open and transparent information. And so, the Budget committee, at this point, of University Council is asking the same questions that you are asking. The President's response is what we heard in the Chairman's Remarks today about the Ernst and Young -- that that will give us a grounding for the current accounting situation. We have even had discussions about possibly adding more individuals to the Budget committee. To accomplish what you would want to accomplish. So I would like to suggest that we consider

some kind of way of integrating it, rather than having two separate committees. I don't there's any difference in the questions being asked by the five constituencies, as the faculty are asking. The real issue is transparency and knowledge.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Elliott.

SENATOR ELLIOTT: That sort of came up in some of the email exchange with Shiva Sastry

SENATOR STERNS: Who is Chair of the Budget committee

SENATOR ELLIOTT: Right. His contention, if I interpreted it right, was that if we have too many committees, faculty won't get their research done and our ranking will go off the scale on this Times Higher Education ranking that just came out. And that was his concern. My perspective on this is faculty have their own perspective on things and their own sources of confusion. We would welcome all the data. If the data is there, then why – what is the problem with just sending it to us? The amount of extra work that would be a burden on me, I think I am as busy as most faculty, I would willingly accept. I don't really see an extra problem and I wouldn't ask anybody to serve on the committee that didn't want to.

CHAIR RICH: Well, it is the Executive Committee that makes appointments to committees, and I would only express the hope that, if this motion passes, there be a sufficient number of members of the Senate who are willing to serve on the committee that the committee could function. I do understand and appreciate Senator Elliott's willingness to serve. Senator Soucek.

SENATOR SOUCEK: Since I have been here, it seems to me that it is not that the budget process is obscure. I don't think anybody knows how much money they have in the University and where goes in particular -- at any given moment.

It seems more like a stock market that goes up and down on a daily -- depending on what our enrollment is and such. The inputs and outputs. And I always get the impression that the University budgets by the seat of its pants because it's always surprised by what's coming next. I don't know if any more information would help anybody here.

CHAIR RICH: I believe Senator Soucek has just argued that it's hopeless it.

SENATOR ALLEN: I think the idea for a committee is a very good one.. I know we spent, actually before my time on University Council, at least three years of very heated discussions to get this so that even University Council could have a say in this. And my concern would be the same as Chair Rich, that we wouldn't want to do anything to harm that access to sit at the table that -- we had in the past, where we lost all access.

I do believe, from what I have seen from Nathan Mortimer's budget, actually we do know pretty precisely where the money is. The problem comes in more when you get to money that hasn't been officially spent yet, that some people think they may have, but we're not sure they have, and how you deal with that determines how much money we have available. That is the complicated issue and I can go into much more detail after the meeting if you would like to. But in fact, they have very precise numbers. They have to wait until a certain time every semester to find out how much subvention they get from the state, but actually they have very specific numbers.

CHAIR RICH: I do want to clarify, in case anything I said was misconstrued. I did not express the view that the creation of this committee would threaten the functioning or the viability of the University Council Budget and Finance committee. I expressed some uncertainty about how the administration would respond to requests for information from this committee. But I did not express the other view and I don't think I really hold that view.

SENATOR ALLEN: I am sorry I didn't mean to convey that. That was my point, too.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: One of the things about our coming visit of the Higher Learning Commission is that there will have to be straight and clear answers to these very issues. As you know, the financial parameters that are used to judge whether or not we are in financial health or not, we are at risk now based on the calculations. And so I think by the very nature of the Higher Learning Commission visit, we will have to disclose everything. As we should.

So I think -- and I also say that when Senator Rich and I have had to face some of these dual concerns, there have been times that we have cooperated and created a special joint committee. I don't know if it is appropriate to do that. In this case. But I just want to say that I certainly want to cooperate and get you the information you want on behalf of the Council.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Elliott.

SENATOR ELLIOTT: I think all of these things are really in support of the motion. We are not proposing that this committee obligate any actions. All we are going to do is request that the information that is out there be assimilated by faculty for faculty. And so I don't really see a problem. Everybody has expressed that they are willing to provide the data. Let's just let the faculty mangle it around, because there are ways and ways of putting the numbers together that faculty may or may not understand. People who can best assess that are the faculty. The Faculty Senate is the place to do that.

CHAIR RICH: I think there might be one exception to your characterization of the points that were made in debate. I think there might have been one in opposition, and that is the argument that it is hopeless

CHAIR RICH: Is there any further debate on the motion?

SENATOR HARIHARAN: The University of Akron used to publish a book called Fact Book. The last addition that I saw was 1992 or 1996 and I do have the book in my office. There, all the budget numbers, how the money was distributed, how spent in particular year, all the facts were there. So this came when Proenza came as President, the first year it was alive and then afterwards it disappeared. So that is one of the reasons why what you are looking for is needed. To bring back, so everyone knows what is happening at the University. So I support what Senator Elliott is suggesting.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Randby.

SENATOR RANDBY: It may be that the information may not be given to this committee if it is formed. That says something about transparency which I think is important. I've been wavering about this proposal here but I am inclined to support it because it encourages transparency.

CHAIR RICH: I do wish to clarify. I did not say that the information would not be forthcoming. I just said I am uncertain whether the administration's position would be that the mechanism is University Council, and therefore the information would be shared with them and can be given by them to others, of course, including members of this committee. I don't know that's the position the administration would take. I can imagine that possibility. Or the opposite.

Any further debate on the motion? I take it you're ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion to create this committee please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent.

Is there other new business to come before the Body? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: This you have the handout -- it was by the sign-in sheets -- about the interdisciplinary initiatives. I was asked to bring this resolution forward. Reading in front of people -- not my strong suit, guys.

Whereas the faculty have been challenged to find ways to stress and expand on the strengths of UA; whereas the interdisciplinary strengths and opportunities of UA have been stressed in the 2010 report of the Ad Hoc committee on Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness of Faculty Senate, in which they stated that both students and faculty are enriched we reach across disciplinary boundaries, students are prepared for more diverse career paths, and doors are opened for faculty to pursue exciting new venues for intellectual inquiry; whereas some major successful projects in these areas, notably integrative biosciences in EXL have brought recent positive publicity to the University, but many other effective initiatives also exist across campus, we resolve that the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate sets up an ad hoc -- a new ad hoc committee on interdisciplinary initiatives to develop an implementation plan for encouraging interdisciplinary teaching, research, experiential learning and community engagement.

The task for this committee should include identifying and documenting existing interdisciplinary programs and activities on campus, in teaching, research and community engagement including certificates, minors and joint majors. Documenting specific institutional barriers to interdisciplinary activities, for example, cross-listing of courses, joint appointments across units, and faculty load issues and involving administration in suggesting methods of resolving

them. Suggesting how to establish an institutional space in which faculty from different disciplines and others can brainstorm and develop ways to add and improve interdisciplinary approaches to academic programs and research. Working with EXL center to set up a process to create, enhance and expand interdisciplinary learning opportunities and community engagement. Suggesting methods to publicize the interdisciplinary initiatives on campus as a source of the strength of the University of UA experience. Determining the minimum resource needs to make this initiative possible. This committee should bring its recommendations to the February meeting of Faculty Senate to allow for action on the plan to start in the spring semester.

CHAIR RICH: We have a motion, which I will not attempt to restate. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Hausknecht. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Saliga, do you wish to speak to the motion? You may decline if you wish.

SENATOR SALIGA: I believe it's a good idea. There are lots of interdisciplinary things that have been done, and are going on, that need to be brought together and publicized or duplicated among others. We probably have lots of people doing the same thing. I'm for it.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I would like to speak in favor of the motion. Actually, this committee was created when I was Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the initiative originally came from President Proenza, as a way to do more innovative and cooperative approaches. So I think that is part of it. As someone who has chaired an interdisciplinary Center for 40 years, which involves faculty from 21 different departments, across the University, and I know Women's Studies has a similar multidisciplinary, long-term involvement with multiple faculty, one of the biggest issues and one of the reasons why we should do this is a number of these programs have not been getting the visibility and support that they really have. It



is not – it is not a resource issue. This is an issue of awareness creation. Why are these programs not more publicized within our bulletins? Why aren't they more available in terms of any kinds of mail-outs, and broadcast to our student body? People find these programs that we have already and there is one in [indiscernible] studies as well. We used to have, in the old schedule books, special pages in the front that promoted these committees. There is no reason why we can't have these electronically, as part of our scheduling outreach. But that is not for us to decide in this body. We should create a committee like this to speak to these issues.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Feltey.

SENATOR FELTEY: Chairman Rich, I just had a question: do we know the status of the EXL Center at this point, given their recent loss of and reshuffling of leadership? It seems that EXL is integrated into this proposal, so it would help to know if that center is stable.

CHAIR RICH: My understanding is that the EXL Center continues and will continue to exist and it now has two co-directors.

The Chair recognizes former and longtime Senator Erickson

SENATOR ERICKSON: I was the one who initiated this proposal -- this resolution. I initiated using the help of Peter Niewiarowski and Carolyn. So Carolyn and I, and Peter and I, were the ones who pulled together what is a lot of stuff. The College of Arts and Sciences has interdisciplinary as part of its whole strategic plan. There is no way at this stage, as Senator Sterns says, of integrating. And Carolyn Behrman was enthusiastic about it.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chair Rich. I am in support of this. I created the Middle East Studies and Asian Studies certificate programs shortly after I arrived on campus. And my colleague, Martha Santos, revived the Latin America Studies certificate and we did this with zero support, and it is very hard to get this publicized. We have to create our own flyers and get them out. There is no financial support for these. Nor is there any support for even just getting the word out. So it would be nice to have a center that helps. These are truly interdisciplinary certificate programs.

CHAIR RICH: Further debate on the motion? Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: I, too, would like to speak in favor of this. At various points I have tried to set up some kind of a class where I would be a co-faculty, and the teaching load and institutional structure of the University just has not permitted that. I know, serving on the CRC over many years, various structural programs exist that make it difficult to have interdisciplinary across Colleges and things like that. So I think explicit attention to how there can be structural modifications, teaching load and so forth, would be immensely useful.

CHAIR RICH: Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to the motion? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Well this isn't exactly opposition.

CHAIR RICH: This is false pretenses.

[LAUGHTER]

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I was on a committee, and I think it was a Senate committee, probably in 2008 or 9 or something, and we did all these things. Julia Beckett, who was on the Senate at that time, chaired it. We met for months and

months and we identified all of the barriers to interdisciplinary work, and we came up with lots of nice lists of ways to overcome the barriers. And Mike Sherman became Provost and he said thank you so much and we never heard anything about it again. I think it is a great idea. If I say I am speaking against it, I am certainly not speaking against the idea. Maybe I'm just getting despondent in my old age.

It is sort of seems that our single biggest problem at the University right now is we are bleeding faculty. We are down about 100 tenure-stream faculty from just three years ago which is 20% of the faculty. I feel very uneasy having even the best committees in the world getting established on top of the fact that all of us are already doing five or six really important committees. Maybe just words of despair.

CHAIR RICH: Professor Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I, too, was on the committee. I have the report in my hand. Unfortunately we had a lot of detailed conversation, but the report turned into something a little more limited. Basically because we thought -- the report was given in April 2010, and it states at the end that we would be hoping to go on with this in the fall. But as Senator Bouchard said, it went into a black hole and didn't come out.

I think this committee was to start from where we were, and to get over that last hump, to actually pull stuff together and get those -- that next step. Action would be spring. Between now and then, one of the things we have to do, and this was made clear by both Peter Niewiarowski and Carolyn Behrman, that we need to involve in this committee some of the administrators who can make that difference. In other words, if we're going to say we're going to get a change in certain kinds of things they we're going to have to get some support in the administration for getting them done. Otherwise it will be another black hole. So

they said make sure the committee includes people who can essentially get what we say actually into operation. And I thought that was a reasonable idea. But of course it came too late to -- you will notice that it doesn't say that everybody on this committee has to be faculty.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Randby.

SENATOR RANDBY: I am choosing not to despair about something happening because I have worked with Senator Nicholas and our colleague Stan Smith on an interdisciplinary program in digital forensics, which is in place now, and right now we're working on a cybersecurity program, which we hope will be approved this year. Even something as simple as a list in the undergraduate bulletin of interdisciplinary programs and a webpage on the University web site of interdisciplinary programs would help. What we need is publicity. I think this committee, even if they only end up getting those things done, would be a great thing to do.

CHAIR RICH: I have heard one expression of despondency, but no opposition to this. I wonder whether you are ready to vote? Or do you wish to continue to debate this? All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent.

Is there any other new business to come before the Body? Any other new business? If not, Good of the Order. Senator Elliott.

SENATOR ELLIOTT: In your original comments you mentioned the Ernst & Young report. Will that be available, or subject to a public records request?

CHAIR RICH: My hope -- and I don't know this for a fact -- my hope is that it will be disclosed voluntarily, without a public records request. I can't think, offhand -- and I am speaking off the top of my head, so I could be wrong -- I can't think

offhand why it wouldn't be subject to compelled disclosure under public records law, but my hope is that that won't be necessary.

SENATOR ELLIOTT: As do we all.

CHAIR RICH: Anything else for the Good of the Order? Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: I would like to announce that a PhD student in the history department, Pinar Odabasi Tasci, has just been awarded the very prestigious Fulbright-Hays grant and this may be – I asked Karl Kaltenthaler -- he is the coordinator for Fulbright on campus -- if anyone else had ever received one at the University of Akron and he believes nobody else has. So she is the first. And this is the big Fulbright. The other ones are known as the half brights.

So this is a very, very prestigious dissertation research grant. I wanted to announce that.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Anything else for the Good of the Order?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we clap or something?

CHAIR RICH: You may.

[APPLAUSE]

CHAIR RICH: Anything else for the Good of the Order? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Akron AAUP is doing Faculty First Friday at Longview on Friday. So all faculty are welcome. Whether you are members of AAUP, or just members of the bargaining unit.

CHAIR RICH: But not if we are not members of the bargaining unit?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: No.

CHAIR RICH: Anything else for the Good of the Order? I take it you're ready to adjourn. If no one objects I will just [gavel].

[MEETING ADJOURNED]