

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

University of Akron  
Faculty Senate

2016-12-01

**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] The December meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Don't all move at once. Senator Clark moves. Senator Cole seconds. Does anyone wish to propose – actually, I wish to propose some changes to the agenda.

Just to be clear, on Roman numeral two on the agenda, we have actually four sets of minutes that were distributed and we can approve today. There are two from May. The regular meeting and the special meeting in May. I also would propose to add to the agenda the remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost. He is not listed there because he told us that he would be out of town. As it turns out, he did not need to be and he is here. So I would like him to have the opportunity to address the Body.

Also, immediately after the Remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost, we need to approve the December commencement list. And finally, under committee reports, I propose that we insert the CCTC report as new item C and then re-letter the General Education report to D. Anyone object to these changes?

So without objection, the agenda is amended. Anyone else wish to propose any changes to the agenda? If not, all in favor of adopting the agenda please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted without dissent.

Next we have the adoption of the minutes of the April meeting. Is there a motion – Senator Klein?

SENATOR KLEIN: I wanted to propose something for New Business.

CHAIR RICH: You can introduce an item of New Business without it being specifically on the agenda.

Is there a motion to approve the minutes of the April meeting? Senator Clark moves; seconded by Senator Saliga. Are there any corrections to those minutes? All in favor of adopting the April minutes, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion – the minutes are adopted without dissent.

Next we have the May minutes. The minutes of the May meeting. Is there a motion to adopt those minutes? Senator Saliga moves; seconded by Senator Randby. Are there any corrections to those minutes? All in favor of adopting those minutes please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The May regular meeting minutes are adopted without dissent.

Is there a motion to adopt the May special -- the special May meeting minutes? Moved by Senator Kidd. Seconded by Senator Allen. Any corrections to those minutes? All in favor of adopting those minutes please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The May special meeting minutes are adopted without dissent.

Finally, the November minutes. Is there a motion to adopt those minutes? Senator Landis moves. Seconded by Senator Saliga. Any corrections to the November minutes? All in favor of adopting the November minutes please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Those minutes are adopted without dissent.

We are now caught up. On minutes.

[LAUGHTER]

Congratulations and my deepest thanks to former Secretary Schulze and current Secretary Miller for getting us caught up.

Next item on the agenda is the Remarks of the Chairman.

On the agenda for today's meeting are the approval of the December graduation list, the approval of curriculum changes reported out by the Curriculum Review Committee, two action items from the Academic Policies Committee, including a proposed rule change concerning University of Akron students taking courses on a transient basis at other universities, a recommendation from the Computing and Communications Technology Committee concerning the replacement of laptop computers, and the approval of existing courses as satisfying the new General Education Learning Outcome Requirements as recommended by the ad hoc General Education Implementation Committee. This last item represents an important milestone in the years' long undertaking to reform the University of Akron's General Education Requirement.

The members of the several General Education Learning Outcome Committees and especially the Chairs of those committees, who also served on the ad hoc General Education Implementation Committee, have worked long and hard on the implementation of the new General Education Requirement. The recommendations before us today are the result of careful thought and deliberation. We owe those faculty members a debt of gratitude for their service.

As you know, last August the Tiger team recommended that each of the several -  
- each of several of Board of Trustees committees include a nonvoting representative of one of the following four shared governance bodies: the Faculty Senate, the University Council, the department Chairs, the school Directors, and the Akron AAUP. In our October meeting, the Faculty Senate expressed its support for this recommendation. Since then, so did each of the other three aforementioned shared governance bodies. I urge President Wilson to present this proposal to the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees to adopt it. The events of the last several years proved beyond doubt that the Board needs

information and advice that only faculty representatives can provide, and that the faculty would benefit from greater knowledge of the thinking of the Trustees.

This modest proposal would in no way diminish the Board's authority over the University. Rather, it would open up the lines of communication between the Board and the faculty and would go a long way toward demonstrating to the Higher Learning Commission the Board's commitment to shared governance and informed decision-making.

On November 1, in response to changes in regulations promulgated by the US Department of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the University announced that all salaried contract professionals earning less than \$47,476 annually would be converted to hourly employees. This decision was made despite the fact that guidance from the Department of Labor expressly permits employees who make less than that amount annually to remain on salary. And despite the fact that the regulations create a lower threshold than \$47,476 for academic administrative personnel, such as academic advisors, who interact with students outside the classroom. It is not clear to me why the University would choose to convert academic administrative professionals to hourly pay. I made inquiry of the Associate Vice President for Human Resources early this week, but have yet to receive the favor of a reply. I should point out that some of the effected professionals are constituents of the Faculty Senate, namely the academic advisors, who are represented ably by Senator Minocchi. To my mind, Senator Minocchi exemplifies the professionalism of the academic advisors and of contract professionals in general. For years he has made large contributions to the work of the Senate's Academic Policies Committee, contributions that recently were given recognition when the Committee chose him as its Vice Chair. I do not understand why the University would tell him, and others like him, that they are to be converted to hourly employees who must punch a time clock. Although this conversion has been put on hold, pending the outcome of litigation challenging the new Department of Labor regulations, it is quite possible that the

new regulations will -- eventually will be upheld and the University would proceed with the conversion. I continue to await an explanation from the administration.

As you may recall, in our last meeting questions were raised again about the continuation of the Gen Ed Core program into the spring 2017 semester. During that discussion, the Provost expressed the view that the Chancellor's approval of the University's Gen Ed Core proposal obligated the University to continue the program until the end of the two-year period for which it was proposed. You may also recall that I questioned the correctness of that interpretation. Since then the Provost made inquiry of the Department of Higher Education. The upshot, as I understand it, is that the University is in fact not obligated to continue the Gen Ed Core program into the spring semester. It is also my understanding that the Provost intends to present a proposal on this subject to the Board of Trustees next week. Which I expect he will speak to us about in his remarks.

The recent release of the Ernst and Young report on the University's fiscal condition was accompanied by the President's announcement of a set of measures to reduce and eventually eliminate annual budget deficits. These measures include financial incentives for faculty members and other University employees to retire. The details of this plan are not yet worked out, so it remains to be determined by how much it would reduce the University's costs, and what the impact would be on the University's academic programs, on the reputation of the University, and on future student enrollment. I hope that President Wilson will address this subject shortly in his remarks to us. Finally, let me wish you all a happy and peaceful holiday season. This concludes my remarks.

Next is the – we have no special announcements today, although I expect we will in the next meeting. In February.

Next is the report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Miller.

SECRETARY MILLER: Since the Faculty Senate last met in November, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met three times and the Faculty Senate officers met one time with the Board of Trustees.

On Saturday, November 7, the officers of the EC attended an executive session of the Board of Trustees' Finance and Administration Committee.

On Monday, November 8, the EC met with the President and Provost to discuss the Saturday meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee as well as developments in the administration's planning for the fiscal year 18 budget.

On Thursday, November 10, the EC met to discuss this Monday meeting and to prepare for the meeting with the President on November 17.

On Thursday, November 17, the EC met for regular Senate business. We set an agenda for this meeting and an agenda for the meeting with the President later that afternoon. At that meeting with the President, the EC discussed the procedure for terminating the General Education Core program; providing better support for part-time faculty; the UA/Portage Lakes Career Center Early College High School; the timing of the release of the Ernst & Young report, with a plan for increasing revenues and cutting expenses; and possible cost savings in graduate tuition waivers, travel, and athletics.

I will conclude the report with two announcements. First of all, all faculty senators are expected to serve on at least one Faculty Senate committee. There is a form on the Senate website that will make it easy to select preferences and email them to Heather. Second, the minutes and transcripts of the Faculty Senate meetings are now published in IdeaExchange, our institutional repository. The main benefit to publishing these documents -- or a main benefit to publishing them on the repository is that they are now full-text searchable. As we're used to with academic journals. All of the approved minutes for this academic year and

the last academic year are now on IdeaExchange. Going forward we will add them only there. My plan is to gradually move all the minutes and transcripts I can locate over to the repository, but it will take time. They need to be done one at a time. We will leave the documents that are now on what they call the forward-facing website where they are until everything is moved over to IdeaExchange.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Are there questions for Secretary Miller about the Executive Committee report?

Next is the Remarks of the President. President Wilson.

PRESIDENT WILSON: Thank you, Chairman Rich and good afternoon to everyone. I wanted to, first and foremost, as we sit here in December after a very balmy fall – first of all it is amazing that we are at the end of the semester and we are here in December and second of all having had the opportunity to work with all of you over the course of the semester I want to express my appreciation and also my admiration for your commitment to students and your commitment to the University and all that you do to make the University of Akron a better place.

I also today would like to welcome our Chair of the Board, Rollie Bauer, who is here with us. We appreciate his time and making the effort to be here. Also as many of you saw the announcements, Barbara Weinzierl -- she is also here with us today. I have recently named her as a Chief of Staff. Barbara and I had the opportunity to work together in the law school for two years as we were looking to turn some negative enrollment around and some other challenges at the law school. Barbara was very instrumental in assisting me and others in doing that, so I am looking forward to having her get to know all of you, work with you, and employ her talents on a greater scale. So thank you for being here as well.

In terms of my remarks and what I want to talk to you about today, I wanted to give you an update in terms of the state of the University. Talk about the Ernst & Young report that has come out and the plan of action -- at least a framework of action is probably a better way of saying it -- going forward as well.

As we look at student recruitments, I am encouraged as we continue to move forward and what we are seeing on the recruitment front. Again, it is early at this stage, but we continue to see positive impact in terms of our recruitment enrollment measures that we have taken. So at this point in time I believe, if you compared to last year, we are up by about 9% over where we were with new applications. In comparison with two years ago, we are still up 5% – somewhere along those lines. The number of students who have committed to us and again being very early it is up by about 86% over where it was last year. So I'm very encouraged by a lot of the outreach measures that are going on. I know many of the faculty have engaged in the high schools, have gone to special lectures. As I get out and about the impact of what we have been doing is really appreciated. Personally, I visited I think 51 or 52 high schools to date. Several of them I visited two times and some I even visited three. So I am close to being adopted by several high schools, so watch out, but that is not necessarily a bad thing. In fact, word is getting out and so I've actually got a date with a middle school now. To go and address some eighth-graders as they look to become future Zips. So I'm encouraged by that.

On the retention side of the ledger, that continues to be a major topic with the Deans, the leadership, I know the Chairs. Within all the colleges. On the administrative side of the ledger as well. We appreciate your efforts to get to know your students, engage with your students, connect with your students, as we look to find ways to help our student continue on the path to graduation. That is where we want our students to go and it is one of the key prongs and things that we can be doing, right here and right now. And so as we get close to the end of the semester, I would encourage you and the faculty that you represent to

reach out to the students, to make yourself available, let them know that you are here for career advice, personal advice, academic advice and the like. It really does make a difference.

In terms of finances, as you know, the Ernst & Young report came out. It was published and I am happy to field questions about that as we move forward. As you'll notice with that report, there was a framework that was put forward as well. This framework was a byproduct of leadership team administrators and academic administrators sitting down and talking. I had discussions with University Council Executive Committee, with Faculty Executive Committee and others as well. The thing that is a little bit different about this than maybe past proposals was we could have spent some time very quickly putting together a thorough, comprehensive plan that includes the nuts and bolts about what we're going to try to do to achieve fiscal stability. But the way that I wanted to do this was to put together a framework of things that I believe that we can do within the space of two years if we work together, come together, to really put us on solid financial footing. And stability. And so there are several prongs inside of that that I want to talk about in a little more detail. I am happy to field any questions that you might have.

One of the first things that we've been talking about is to have all of the departments -- academic and administrative -- find ways to save expenses and having that start now. As you know, this year we are really operating on a \$30 million deficit. 18 million of that being covered out of a one-time draw on our bank account to help cover that. We have gone out and refinanced our \$450 million worth of debt. We have been able to save some money based on low interest rates. We have accelerated part of that so we have \$7 million of accelerated savings. That is a one-time savings. We also have been holding the line to the extent possible absent critical hires on hiring. So that has allowed us to save money as well. And so as we try and be fiscally conservative and prune as much as possible without having a negative impact on the students and those that

support the students, including the faculty. We are moving forward this year with the hope that that \$30 million will be sufficient.

Now what we are talking about is for the next year what we need to be doing in order to plan. Because as you saw in that report, if you looked at it, we have a very robust senior class and we anticipate that many from that senior class will actually be graduating. You also saw we are challenged in terms of our freshmen class. Our freshmen class being down by 19%. If normal, traditional retention rates hold, it will go down even more than that. So this year we know what we are looking at. Next year we are looking at being a little more challenged in terms of the enrollment. That's why I am bolstered by what I am seeing in the community, the trends that we see. I do believe firmly that we will be able to recover from the downturn that we saw this year in new freshmen enrollment. We also saw in transfer enrollment, as well. So we will be looking for ways to do that. But I am bolstered by that. At the same time understanding that there will be an impact going forward next year. So as we try and be conservative to the extent possible, while trying to find ways to innovate and to try to stay away from layoffs and cutting programs. That is where this framework was developed.

Now if this framework does not go well, and I do not want to go down that road -- you will find out I am an eternal optimist -- if it doesn't go well then we will have to look at doing other adjustments. I was asked on the radio what those adjustments might be and I said if the bridge isn't there, I don't even need to be thinking about that bridge. So we're not that point yet. But it is a critical time in terms of where we are. You have seen some of the challenges that are facing us. And so as we look to go forward I think there are some innovative things that we can do. Part of that is re-examining and revamping our scholarship system.

We have seen over the past several years is as our enrollment has dropped from about 29,700 down to 23,152, the amount of money that we has been scholarshiping has been going up. If there was cash underneath those

scholarships that would be great, but that is not necessarily the case. And so that is one of the things that I have been doing with our Moving Forward Making a Difference scholarship campaign is trying to raise cash for this semester that can be applied for next semester. We have been making inroads with the amount of fundraising that we have been doing and I have been encouraged by the support that we have been seeing and what we have been able to do but we have a long way to go. We'll be looking to do some things very creative with the scholarship system. What those are is still yet to be determined and so one of the things I have asked Barbara Weinzierl to do is to put together a working group that involves a lot of folks that administer our scholarship program, including also Deans, members of Faculty Senate, of University Council and the like, to talk about scholarship strategy and policy. And then to come forward with a recommendation in terms of what we might be able to do, a little creative and innovative, modeled after what we did at the law school a couple of years ago and something that has worked quite successfully. The idea is, you stabilize that scholarship, you invest in the students, and you have scale-ups as you move forward. Students are actually able to pick up additional scholarship dollars the longer they stay – not the longer they stay in school – the quicker they proceed, as opposed to the longer they stay in school. And so if you have got ramp-ups on the scholarships, when they hit 30 credits, when they hit 60 credits, when they hit 90 credits, there is an incentive for folks to be able to complete their degrees quickly. There is an incentive for them to complete their degrees, which will help us in terms of the amount of support that we receive from the state. So we look forward to having that discussion within the framework that we are planning to move forward with that as well.

In terms of the early buyout that was referenced in Chairman Rich's Remarks, that is something that we need to be discussing. It is not something that I have a grand master plan that has already been developed that I'm going to spring on folks. The idea is there is a framework in place. The framework being we need to explore a buyout. Because if things that are within this framework don't work,

then we are going to have to explore other options and those options are not going to – they are going to be of a different -- of a different route that we don't necessarily want to go down. But in terms of the early buyout and I wouldn't call it an early retirement because nothing has been determined. It could be length of service, it could be based on a whole bunch of things, what we will be doing is we will be putting together a working group to discuss that. And so Faculty Senate will be represented within that. We will have University Council as well. We will be having a lot of different folks that deal with this on a daily basis to put forward a plan as we move forward.

One of the concerns being, well, if you have an early buyout package you lose talent. What is going to happen with the replacement of that talent? That is something we all need to talk about in terms of moving forward. Naturally if every single position is replaced it does not make 100% sense to do an early buyout package. There has to be things that are done strategically. Who would be eligible? Who would be interested? Those are all things that we need to be looking at as well. And those are things we will be discussing and I'll be happy to answer questions about those, too.

Another one of the prongs that we have been looking at is graduate assistantships. In terms of graduate assistantships, it is time to have a conversation. Again, there is not a plan that is in place from my end. This is something that the Graduate Council is really tasked with looking at in terms of what their mission and what their mandate is. And so we will be looking to the Graduate Council. That may be expanded in terms of the input that is put in. But as we look at our budgetary challenges and we look at the amount of money that we need to adjust so that we have a stable budget, understanding that our bank account not only is not bottomless, but that it has some challenges in it as well, there is some research that has been going on to figure out, okay, what exactly can be done so that we are not harming students, so that we are not harming faculty, so that we are able to go out and support what we do. So those are big

things. I want to provide some figures that we have looked at to kind of give you an idea of the situation and where the University of Akron stands.

At this point in time we have about 3250 graduate students. Among those graduate students we have about 1283 who are actually receiving graduate assistantships. So that gives you an idea of how many folks are having their education paid for in terms of tuition remission, plus receiving stipends, versus those that are actually paying for their education.

The total that we have in terms of GA funding here at the University of Akron is \$23 million in tuition remission. In stipends, it is about 8.7 million. So if you combine that and do the math, we're looking at about \$31.7 million in terms of what we are doing. By way of comparison, from the data that we have been able to receive -- I am not standing here verifying the accuracy of this data, but it's what we have been provided with by the institutions -- Cleveland State, by way of comparison, has 4500 graduate students. Among that I am not sure how many of them are receiving graduate assistantships, but I can tell you that Cleveland State is using \$9.5 million for their GA program. In comparison with the \$32 million that we are using here at the University of Akron. If you look at the University of Cincinnati, they have approximately 11,000 graduate students and among their 11,000 graduate students they are spending -- so that's about 3.5 times what we have -- they are spending close to \$50 million. So you can kind of see the balance that we have there.

Wright State, they have about 3600 graduate students. They are currently spending about \$14 million in graduate student assistantships. And so as we look at that, we need to spend some time and really analyze the system. Have the discussion about what we can do differently to continue to support our graduate students, but also to really make the correction that is necessary so that we can not only be financially stable, but that we can continue to thrive and that we can continue to move forward.

As we look at those types of things, that is really where the focus is going to be. Coming together, working together, being unified as we move forward really is key. But the runway is not long. It is something that we really need to move on and we need to act quickly. Part of acting quickly is also, what are we doing to invest? What are we doing to grow? And so as we look at that, we have been talking about growth and investment in terms of admissions. And so we are in the process of hiring additional admissions recruiters. Some of those recruiters have already started to come on board, and we'll continue to fill the slots that were previously authorized. We will continue to do innovative things in terms of recruitment and admissions. I will continue to be involved. I would invite all of you to be involved. I know that we just sent out a list of faculty and topics to the different high schools and the middle schools in terms of University of Akron faculty that are willing to go out to the high schools. I have engaged in conversations with superintendents, with principals, about activities that we can be doing here on campus. And so we really appreciate your engagement and your efforts in that regard as well.

Another thing that we will be looking at is more flexibility in terms of our offerings. So we will be having a workgroup that will be chaired by Jerry Tudor who is Dean of Wayne College. He has volunteered to lead that group that will be a cross-section of representatives around campus that will be talking about evening programming, what we can be doing on weekends, maybe some things that we could be looking to do terms of the online world. Against this being a framework, will be having those discussions about what we can do, but understanding that we really need to move forward. We need to be looking to do things in fall of 2017 because we're talking about the 2017 – 2018 budget as well.

The international prong, that framework, that is another area where we see a lot of promise. We do a lot of great international things that are here on campus. With my background and expertise, that is one of the things that I would like to

take the lead in, at least preliminarily. So you will see me sending out a call for folks who are interested in talking about international programming, engaging in recruitment of international students and the like and we will be coming together. One of the things that we have planned there is to actually go out and get international recruiters so that we can enhance our international recruitment base. We want to look at having a robust international programs office. Something along the lines of an Institute, and having the folks that are able to staff that in terms of not only immigration, but making sure that we can service our international students and we can have international activities and global activities for the students that are here at the University of Akron. One of the things that we have seen at the School of Law over the last two years was by really bringing the international programming in to the center and the core and focusing on that, we have been able to attract students from around the state of Ohio, from around the United States, that are interested in international matters. We've been able to do that as well.

Another thing that we'll be looking at is we'll be looking at increasing our fundraising efforts. So in addition to the Making a Difference Moving Forward campaign, we'll be looking at bringing on new folks for our developed office. The idea being that there has to be accountability. There has to be targets. These are the things that I have been looking for that I think we can do a much better job at in terms of retention and development and a whole host of things and making sure that we are able to move things forward.

As we look at the budget for 2017 and 2018, really we are looking at a target of trying to either increase revenue or realize savings to the tune of \$20-\$25 million. Assuming that we put all those pieces into place and they are allowed to grow, will move forward to about \$37-\$40 million, I estimate, by year 2, which will be 2018 to 2019. Assuming things go well. If not, then we will have to cross another bridge and we can have other discussions along those lines. But one of the things that I want to reiterate is, the plan that has been put forward really is that

framework. We are looking for input, we are looking for involvement, and we'll be having discussions as we move forward, and really trying to put that plan in place. We really appreciate your input and your cooperation. Really helping us at this crucial time to move forward and as we get ready for our 150th anniversary here, in I guess 2020, I believe. 2020? It is coming on up. Really having that foundation so that we can have not only our 150th anniversary, but we can have 150 anniversaries beyond that. And so with that, thank you very much. I am more than happy to take questions.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for the President? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I wanted to ask a little bit more about the Ernst & Young report. What we saw on the website was very sort of upper level and X number of students and Y number of total revenue. Whereas when I have seen budgets for the University before they were always down to the nitty-gritty in terms of how much money is spent in this office and this program and these academics and these sports and these things. Is there a version of that, that is like that?

PRESIDENT WILSON: There isn't. Because we are not talking about a budget. That is what we're going to have to do going forward, is sitting down and getting to the nitty-gritty. What Ernst & Young did was they came in and did an analysis of the data that we have, the finances of past years, looking at what we have, this year. Off of that, you can kind of get a sense of where we are going. So the nitty-gritty is something that we need to get together, in terms of the different colleges, the different units, and come up with our budget for 2017 and 18. So that was kind of setting the table for that.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. I was sort of surprised because what we heard earlier this fall was that the CFO could not figure it out and, at least based on what I saw, it liked most of it you could have just gotten off of the IR website.

PRESIDENT WILSON: Well, if you could have got that off the IR website then I should've hired you, because I didn't see it. Couldn't find that and I appreciate that. But really having seen with the Ernst & Young team did -- part of what I had heard coming in was, we can't get this data. We are not sure what these are. You need to have that foundational information to move forward, and because it wasn't there, plus it's always good to have an independent third-party come in and actually look at that. That was concrete in terms of, okay, this is where you are, these are the challenges that you have, hey, let's look at things going forward and with Ernst & Young one of the things I neglected to point out was they have special expertise as well and so they provided a list of different places where they think they might be able to go out and save us some money. Whether it's utilities, whether it's IT, different things that we might be able to do better. So part of the team coming in was looking not only at the numbers but, okay, based on the situation here are some suggestions where you might be able to do a much better job on the expense side or on the revenue side as well.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I sort of assumed we should be making those decisions.

PRESIDENT WILSON: Oh, we are making those decisions.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Thank you.

PRESIDENT WILSON: Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the President? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich and President Wilson. When I looked at the Ernst & Young report, probably the most interesting slide to me was the one that had our core budget and our auxiliary budget. The core budget one seemed pretty

balanced to me, but the auxiliary budget was \$35 million in the hole. I was just wondering if you could explain a little bit what the \$35 million deficit was in the auxiliary budget.

PRESIDENT WILSON: Sure. Absolutely. In terms of your auxiliary budget, there are a number of factors, at least the extent of my understanding, that going into that. If I misquote anything up there in the back, just throw something at me. Part of what you have is when you have a downturn in students, you have an impact across the board financially. So what we have seen is we have seen that impact kind of play out. One of the things with auxiliaries, for instance, is student housing. With student housing, we were built for a certain number of students. We don't have that number of students because you have seen that downturn from 29 to 23, and we will see a downtick before I believe we will start back up again. So we have 300 empty beds, for instance. And so part of that is if you don't have students that are there, then you run into a deficit there. Fewer students on campus means fewer meal plans, it means fewer people using the student union, those auxiliary things that you have. Those are part of the components as well. Fees for the student rec center. You also have the athletic side of the ledger, which we know runs at a deficit as well. And so you have all of those things that are combined into one, and that's really where your auxiliaries are coming into it.

I'm sure I leaving something out but you have a byproduct of that. So what are we looking to do that? I am putting a lot of pressure on the athletic side of the ledger to bring in more revenue and to decrease expenses. I was with our athletic director this morning for an hour, talking about exactly those things and we will be looking at ways to do that. We have been looking at ways to make sure that our residence halls are filled. And again, this is all brainstorming. But for instance, one of the things we have been talking about is our athletes are only required to stay in the dorms for a certain period of time. Well, having them stay in the dorm for a longer period of time. So we will be moving forward different

things like that. Making sure that all of our beds are filled and we have meal plans and different things that are happening here on campus to bring down those auxiliary things. So bit by bit, piece by piece, we are looking to work together to find ways to close the deficit, not only the general side but the auxiliary side as well.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: One quick follow-up to that. Everyone I talked to around campus, we know what situation we are in. We knew we have some tough things to do. The one thing that would really help faculty deal with this and again we understand we are probably going to have to make substantial cuts, too, but what would really help us is if we saw the same magnitude of cuts on the athletic side. And I know there are things that are being done because I think about \$30 million of that \$35 million amount is from athletics.

PRESIDENT WILSON: I think it's about 24.

SENATOR ALLEN: Well, I stand corrected. \$24 million.

PRESIDENT WILSON: I'm just here to is help out.

[LAUGHTER]

SENATOR ALLEN: It would really help us – and again, we are coming to points we have not been to before. If we really made the same magnitude of cuts on the athletic side as on the academic side. And I know hard things are being done, like playing teams that are going to -- just hurt us. To generate revenue. But there is generating of revenue maybe of 1 million or \$2 million but when we are asking to cut millions and millions and millions out of the academic side, we ask you, as a group, and I have talked to a lot of faculty members about this, to give

us your word and to have the trustees to give us their word, that they are considering this. That this is not business as normal. Again, I don't want to belabor this, but if we go back and look at what the budget was when we had 29,000 students, for athletics, versus what is now, I think it is higher now. We can work together and deal with this, I know. But what we are begging you is, this time we really work together and have, if you will, shared suffering. And not unilateral suffering like we had in the past.

PRESIDENT WILSON: I appreciate that. Absolutely. You have got my pledge that serious discussions are happening. They will continue to happen. We will continue to work so that exactly what you're talking about is the road that we're going to go down. There has to be sacrifices across the board.

CHAIR RICH: Are there other questions for the President? Senator Hariharan.

SENATOR HARIHARAN: Your remark about this graduate student expenses -- it is not very clear to me that if you gave two [indiscernible] -- I mean one is 9 million and the other was [indiscernible]. You compared it to Cleveland State and Cincinnati. Are you comparing apples to apples or only the stipend [indiscernible]?

PRESIDENT WILSON: In terms of those figures, and what I can tell you is our 1283 graduate students, they get about an average of \$24,500 in support costs. So as I talk about the \$24 million, that is tuition that those students could have paid, but that we are just remitting. We're just saying, come on and we are not going to charge you any tuition. We're going to give you tuition free. Then on top of that, we are paying a stipend. And so that is where that \$9 million figure is coming from. In terms of are we comparing apples to apples or apples to oranges, the question becomes what are those graduate assistants actually doing? How does it work out? That is part of what needs to be analyzed and looked into. It can't be me just coming out and pointing my magic wand and

saying this is what we are going to do. We need to have a conversation about exactly what is going on. I know out of those 1283 that -- I think under 400, if I remember, under 400 are -- under 400 of those are teaching. So at those other institutions I am not sure how that breaks down. But these are things that we need to look at. The idea is -- and we have some other challenges that are out there as well that I think Senator Allen is going to talk to us about later -- but you have our master's degree programs that really are built on a doctoral model, based on what I am seeing. Another thing I'm seeing is we have master's programs -- and again, this is things where other folks can talk about this better than I can -- but we have master's degrees that typically range between 30 to 40 credits to complete. Well, we have, at least our current policy and regulation right now allows master students take up to 170 credits. And so what is happening is, students just continue to stay in the pipeline and so we are not getting any credit in terms of state subsidy for folks that are graduating because they are staying so long in our system. So you do not have opportunities for new folks. Another thing that I have heard is happening -- whether it's true or not I don't know -- so I am just saying these are some of the things we need to talk about -- is with some of the graduate admissions committees, what I have been told is the practice is you will have six graduate assistants slots, and so the admissions committee goes out and goes to get six students. So we are basically giving away education and we are not going out and getting another six or 12 or 24 students that might be willing to pay for the quality education that we provide here at the University of Akron. So these are things that we need to discuss in terms of, okay, we are in a situation right now with, based on our practice and what we have done, doesn't make sense. Anecdotally, I have heard different things about, there is a program that if you go out and you get a \$3000 scholarship from a private entity, then you can go and you can get tuition remission. From us. Now why that is the case, I do not know. You know, would the student come here without that tuition remission? Just the \$3000 scholarship? I would hope, given the quality of our programs, that that would be the case. These are just things that we need to be asking and trying to figure out.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Hariharan.

SENATOR HARIHARAN: So one thing you touched about there was international programming. International recruitment. One of the barriers we've got, across the country, there is a differential due to [indiscernible] domestic students and international students. How about you make the international students fee the same, and then you can attract globally, overnight. Many students.

PRESIDENT WILSON: That is another thing that we ought to discuss. Because I can tell you that is one of the strategies the law school used, well before I came, for out-of-state students and international students. Mind you, the tuition in the law school is little bit under 25,000. But it is something to look at in terms of scholarship, tuition, those types of things. What would make sense for the students to come in and be here with us. So that will be part of the discussion.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Galehouse.

SENATOR GALEHOUSE: President Wilson, I have two questions. First question, for these graduate student scholarships, are they discounted the same way that undergraduate student scholarships are currently, right now? As if it is a discount, rather than cash backing it, correct?

PRESIDENT WILSON: Correct.

STUDENT GALEHOUSE: So my second question is, are undergraduate student dollars that undergraduate students pay, is that the money that is backing the majority of these graduate students that are going here?

PRESIDENT WILSON: So your first question is correct. In terms of your second question, the dollars that come in and where they go and how they flow -- it's kind of a little bit murky along those lines. If you have your graduate -- it could be one of two things. It could be your graduate student who are paying full price and their tuition is being used to subsidize the other students. That could be part of that pool. It depends on how many paying graduate students you have. But if you do not have enough there, could it be coming from the undergraduate students? You have different revenue sources. It could be all graduate students, it could be partially from the undergraduate side, it could be coming from athletics. You have all of these different subsidies that are there. So that second question is a little more complex than the first. But that could be one of the possibilities.

CHAIR RICH: Senator upside-down Braun.

[LAUGHTER]

SENATOR BRAUN: As long as what I say is not upside down.

[LAUGHTER]

I would like to follow up on what Senator Hariharan talked about. About this GA discussion and potential [indiscernible]. This is not a new thing. This issue of cutting the GAs has been going on for a long time. There was a decision to make that cut and then somebody saw the light and they are not cut. So let me give you a scenario of unintended consequences here. I'm talking about engineering, in particular. Once you start to cut these GAs, if you do not bring in paying students, what is going to happen you're not going to have enough students in the system to actually teach the graduate courses. We have a rule about teaching graduate courses you have to have 6, 7, 8, 10 whatever the number is then the courses get canceled. Then whatever students you have in the pipeline

cannot take the courses. So the bottom line is you have destroyed the graduate program. Totally. Completely.

And then if you want to make a comparison between the money that I spent on athletics versus the money that I spent in such GAs for education this is an institution for education not football and basketball and swimming and so forth. We are here to teach. So it seems to me that the priority should be, and I would urge you to -- just like the previous Senator did, to seriously consider this that rather than cutting GAs, go and cut sports programs because we are not getting to be known for our sports programs but we are getting to be known for the quality of our graduates. That should be the priority.

PRESIDENT WILSON: And let me just give you a couple of thoughts and a couple of answers. One, when you talk about GAs, what exactly is a GA doing? That would be the first question that I think we need to look at. Is that GA teaching classes? Well if so, we have less than 400 of those, based on what I'm hearing so far. So if I were to take the number that I threw out, the 1200, and reduce that to 400 only, it still preserves your masters program and now I am spending -- instead of spending 30 million, now we are spending 10 million. And some of the other cuts that we are talking, about things we need to do, we don't have to do. And there you have your classroom. Now let's say that your GAs now are doing research. Now the researchers, my understanding, are going out and getting grants so shouldn't those GAs be part of those grant proposals and be funded by the grants as opposed to being funded by other graduate students or undergraduate students who are paying tuition? We also have GAs that are doing administrative work. We have GAs in the athletic department. We have GAs in the student union. We have GAs that are doing a whole host of things that are doing administrative work. Are the students going to come to the University of Akron if we do not give them a GA-ship? Or, could they, say, come here pay for their education understanding it's a quality education and we're going to help them get a great education and to move into the career workplace by only saying

you know what, we are not going to give you free tuition, we're just going to give you a stipend.

Or we're not going to give you free tuition, we're just going to pay you on an hourly rate. There are ways to actually do this that I believe are more fiscally responsible than the way that we are doing it right now, that won't hurt the quality of our education. They won't impair the masters programs and what we are doing. But we're not in a situation right now that you can go forward and say, you know what, we're going to pay everybody to come here or half of the people to come here -- and it is literally paying. It is saying, hey, here you go. Get your tuition for free plus we are paying you money. We just don't have those resources to operate the status quo. And so as you shift and you go okay let's look at athletics and you say no one is coming here for athletics. I beg to differ. Because I can tell you, having recruited for this University for the past two and half years, when I go out of state, people know about the University of Akron because of our soccer program. Which won a national championship. They know about the University of Akron because we had three Olympic medalists that went to Rio, one of whom brought home a bronze medal. They know about it because the high school students go out and they watch ESPN and they watch Akron go across the ticker. They understand about those type of things. So I understand about athletics. I am not saying that athletics should be untouched because I think we need to have some serious conversations in terms of reducing our expenses and increasing it, but it is not as simple as just saying it does not impact. Because I can also tell you another thing, having been here for 4 1/2 months, that every other day at least, I hear about the baseball program that we cut. Every other day. I hear about it. In fact last night, I probably heard about it four or five times. And what everybody says is how in the world could you cut a program like that? How in the world could you do that? And what I hear from the high schools -- and I have been to over 50 of them -- some of these are from principals who played for our baseball team, or they know somebody who played for the baseball team, if you're going to go out and you're going to cut these

activities that are part of the University experience, how can I send my kids to you? That is just what I hear. So is not as simple – if it was simple, we would not even need to have the dialogue and conversation.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Braun.

SENATOR BRAUN: The example that you gave about athletics, the individuals, the Olympics, the soccer team, I don't think those are the biggest expenses in the sports program. And fact, those are probably the smallest expenses in the sports program. But purposely the football program is left out, which is the biggest expense in the sports program. So this is my first answer. So let's be blunt about this. Where the major expenses are. Those are individual athletes and the soccer team is basically run on a shoestring. If you really look at the soccer stadium, which brought so much reputation -- I agree with you on that -- and you look at the football stadium; look at those two. Big difference. So just for a matter of record here.

Now in terms of what the GAs are doing, they are doing both research and teaching. They do research for their thesis, they are doing teaching of different sorts for getting -- for earning the money they are given. When you are saying, go out and get research money for those. That is very easy to say. The exercise of going out and getting research money is a very complicated one that may be you are not very familiar with because you are from the law school. But the way it is that is very much a matter of both quality of the proposal but also there is a factor of luck in getting those. So you cannot really go and plan on running a graduate program and say I am going to base it only on the research because one year the research may come in and the next year it may not. But the GAs that are institutionally provided, that is a fixed and well-known thing and you can base on that. In the research, there is a lot of lottery there. Ask anybody who is in the engineering program and if they tell you otherwise I will debate them. I can see the thing that you see, but I would urge you to see the thing that we on this

other side see, as well. I think basically we are pretty dire straits financially. And I think that the cuts should be made in such a way that the academic programs will be safeguarded. I think that is what actually makes our reputation. I agree with you, there have been a couple of very good examples of athletic prowess but those did not come from spending a lot of money.

PRESIDENT WILSON: And a big part of what my message is is it's not as simple as it seems because as you look at athletics, it's part of the entire package that does draw students here to the University. So whether you like athletics or not, that is part of the reality that helps draw students in. It also helps draw donations in. And donors as well. So these are all things that we need to be looking at, talking about, having the discussion about. On the research side, fortunately, I come from the science and technology side of the ledger. I am one of those intellectual property lawyers, somebody who is actually worked for a hydrological and meteorological instruments company. Somebody who has actually work for an electronics company, and somebody who's been involved as essentially a Provost over an undergraduate program and masters programs as well, so I have an understanding of what goes into the research side and how difficult it is to get research grants. My sole point is we need to have the experts and everybody looking at exactly why are we so much higher than everybody else and what can we do to go ahead and look at things? If we're talking 30 million I'm not saying let's scale it down to 5 million, let's scale it down to 10, but hey let's have the discussion about what we can do more efficiently, what can we do better, so that it does not hurt the students. It doesn't hurt the academic side of the shop. That is the angle that I am coming at. I am all about students. All about supporting students. I'm about supporting my faculty, as well. And so this is a comprehensive discussion but we've got something right here that I think needs to be looked at because there are some programs that are non-science and engineering -related that have GA-ships. Does it make sense, if they are not doing research, if they are not teaching, to have those GAs? Those are the questions we have to ask.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Coffey

SENATOR COFFEY: Sorry, I have got a cold. I want to say I appreciate the position you are in and you have a global perspective that really nobody else has and you're really responsible for things. So you've got tough decisions. And you and I have disagreed sometimes over the budget and you have been willing to listen and compromise and so I do not want this to be taken as an attack, but I do have to say -- with Senator Braun and Senator Allen I do feel I need to -- not defend the, but to fill in some details. My understanding is that football loses about \$5 million in operational losses per year. That is exclusive of the stadium. My also understanding of other Division I programs is that we actually should be happy with 5 million. That it could be 10 to 20 million in losses. That Division I football is extremely expensive and only 10 or 15 schools really profit from it. So one of the proposals that has come up over and over again is dropping to either Division III or just cutting it altogether. I think you mentioned the phrase three times "having that conversation" and this is that conversation that I think everybody wants to have but we have not had it yet. The competitors we face, whether it's Stark State or Western Governors, what is the advantage? They don't have athletics. They don't have it at all. So we can be a great school without athletics. In fact, I come from the patriot league. A patriot league undergraduate institution. Excellent Division I basketball, excellent Division I everything, but we don't play Division I football. Or they didn't. And so the idea is, given the expenses, and I think this is what Senator Braun was mentioning, it's not that we shouldn't have football or we want to have an attack of academics versus athletics, it's that if I were to strip all of the line item titles before the numbers, the line item number of Athletics, of football losing \$5 million, says boy, there's a program we have to get rid of. Because my understanding of the budget is -- sorry my voice is going -- you talked a lot about making tough decisions now so we maintain control of the budget. So nobody makes a decision for us. We don't want to be a Third World country that the IMF comes in and says this is what

you're doing – were not Greece; we don't want to be Greece. What that means though, is that this is an extremely difficult decision, but we can't justify it anymore. We tried. We made every effort. Those losses could get worse, not better. And as hard a decision as that is, we have to publicly discuss whether or not to drop football. You said you have talk to students and there is no question that soccer and basketball and having athletics in general is fine. But when I talk to students -- first of all, I'm a social scientist so I like behavioral measures of what people think, not just surveys and we all know -- as a political scientist I know polls can be wrong.

[LAUGHTER]

PRESIDENT WILSON: There are a couple of great quotes in there I want to use, by the way.

[LAUGHTER]

SENATOR COFFEY: But I've got a behavioral indicator of preference, which is the lowest attendance in Division I. And when you talk to students about it, one is there is an extreme resentment towards the taxes they pay for football. A deep-seated resentment. But also when you sit down and talk to a lot of students, they are working moms and working dads. They are not the traditional student. I went to an undergraduate institution where you had time to go. You took your classes and a lot of these elite institutions that have these Division I programs, the students have the time. Our students work two or three jobs. I had one student one semester who was taking care of a sick father with cancer, and three kids, by himself. That is not unusual here. He can't go to a game. Ever. It is not why he came here. He came here because he lives here, he could take classes and he was trying to get a job. I know I've been long-winded here but I think, given what I understand about the finances of the institution, we have to cut football. Or drop

to Division III. If we don't, those choices you talked about somebody else making for us, that could happen soon. Long-winded, but that's it.

PRESIDENT WILSON: I appreciate the input. I appreciate the input, the thoughts, we do – we do need to talk.

CHAIR RICH: Any other questions for the President, keeping in mind we do have other business to conduct here? Senator Hallett.

SENATOR HALLETT: I have a quick question. And that involves Information Technology Services. Especially if you're talking about expanding our online courses and our international program. I understand that the IT service staff has been cut drastically. And I know, having worked with that staff, that they have really good people but many of them are students that are also taking classes. We really do not have the people that we need. And if we want to be competitive, and we want to have quality online courses, we need the people there to be able to repair the computers. To be able to help us expand the online courses. The people that we have are excellent and they work very hard, but we do not have very many. And the problem is, especially with computer repair, in the past if something happened to a hard drive they were able to retrieve the data. They had the time and the resources to do that. Now, if we have a hard drive that is fried, and that has happened in my department several times recently, they don't have the capacity. I met with someone recently, and he was trying to retrieve the data and he just said, I really don't have any more time. I have to go to class now. And you'll have to just -- you've lost your data and we'll just have to reimage the computer. If we're going to have all the services, especially online classes, we absolutely have to have the manpower in computer repair. And we have to have the people to help us create more collaborative online classes. And they are doing a great job, the people we have, but we really need to put money in that if we want to be competitive. There's no other way to do it. That is my only comment.

PRESIDENT WILSON: Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the President? Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. Provost.

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to be brief. A few things that I think are very important for all of us to know. First of all, the GenEd core -- we'll be presenting next week to the board a resolution asking them to cease the program immediately. Based on our conversation at the lesson Senate meeting, we did look at and went to the Chancellor's office and asked is there a process through which we can cease this program and it took a while to get an answer, but the answer is yes. The Board needs to act. We informed the Chancellor's office. They will post that for a two-week public comment, to the state, but assuming that there is no negative reaction the program will be ceased. Based on the last Senate, meeting we froze the enrollment for the spring term, just in case. There are only 14 students enrolled for the GenEd core for spring. Only three of them are actually going to save money, because the rest are in the plateau. Will make sure that those three students do not suffer any adverse financial impact. So that should be the end of that program.

Dean searches: there is currently a dean search in the School of Law. The other dean searches have taken more time to launch than I imagined. We are still waiting on some faculty to vote for the potential committee members for the search committees. So the plan as of now is the first week of February we will launch six internal to the University of Akron dean searches in the six colleges that don't have a current permanent dean, so that process will hopefully take place in February and be done before the end of the spring term. We do not, as mentioned previously, we do not really have the money or the time to search for

external deans, so we're going to look to our own people and hopefully we can find the right people to lead our colleges.

The President mentioned not wanting to spring things on folks. The Ohio Department of Higher Education does not seem to take that attitude. I went to the last IUC Provost meeting; one of the major topics of discussion was the competency-based education. In particular, as mentioned by Senator Coffey, Western Governors University. There's a big push apparently from the legislation to have funding from the state somehow be directed to subsidize competency-based education programs of Western Governors for Ohio students. It's my understanding that the community college group that is sort of like the parallel to the IUC which is for universities signed an agreement with Western Governors to do 3+1 programs. And Western Governors responded with some discount to their students. That they would refer for the fourth year of their education. Two applications: first of all, students would then be eligible to take or would be encouraged to take their senior year from a university outside of Ohio. Second, implied is that the community colleges would begin offering junior level courses. Both of which are not very appealing to the University. So IUC Provosts are working – I am on a task force to try to come up with some rationale to educate, in particular the legislation, about the potential negative impact of this move. Secondly, we had a long discussion of a set of data that was presented to the IUC by the ODAG. The Ohio Department of Higher Education took it upon itself to do a calculation of all of the what they called duplicated programs in every region of the state. Academic programs, we're speaking of. The data set they shared showed in red all of the programs that are duplicated in Northeast Ohio, for example. Among the four universities. And also showed the number of graduates over the last three years and the cost of each degree. To those students. On average. Universities have been tasked to provide a response for every one of these duplicated programs. You have three options: we will take no action and why. We will respond we will pursue collaboration with our neighboring institutions to save money and reduce this supposed redundancy. Or

three, we will eliminate the programs. So it will not be sprung on you. Your deans are receiving this information soon. As soon as we can get it formatted correctly to send out so it is legible. Early spring we have got to have deans talking with chairs and directors, and chairs and directors talking with faculty to provide a university-level response for every single one of these programs on this list. So that is going to involve everybody in this room, presumably. Just so you know in advance, this is coming. We have a response due to the ODAG in March. At least the first response. It seems there are layers of responses that are going to be requested. So just be aware.

Finally: Higher Learning Commission. Today the draft assurance argument has been or will be posted. I'm not sure if it is up yet for public comment. Thanks to everyone who contributed. The window is open until December 12. Please try to read sections that you are interested in and provide comments. There is a Qualtrics survey where you can provide comments and we will collate all of those and try to revise the argument before December 21, which is our target for submission. Only this week did we receive the team assignment. The group that is going to visit us. A seven member team. Very much like the type of team I would have thought the HLC would send, chaired by a CFO. That says something. That they understand and recognize our financial situation. So we'll have more on that. We'll get a set of bio sketches out to the campus as soon as we put them together. ODAG is going to send a representative along with the Higher Learning Commission team. It is within their right and within the rules at HLC, so one of the associate vice chancellors will accompany the site visit team. Actually, I requested that, Mr. Chairman. Because I think it is important that the legislation and the Chancellor's office understand our situation from the ground level rather than from reading what HLC reports after the fact. Hopefully that will encourage more collaborative efforts between the Chancellor's office and the University.

Finally, I did have a chance to look at the Academic Policies Committee recommendation today on the transient student process. I would like to complement the APC and Senator Klein for looking at that rule. I firmly support the suggested change. So unless there are any questions I will be done with my comments.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for the Provost? Thank you.

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You want me to go?

CHAIR RICH: Actually, we did insert the approval of the commencement list but that will be very quick so you might want to just stay. At least I think it will be quick. Always has been. The next item on the agenda is the approval of the December commencement list. Is there a motion to approve that list, subject of course to successful completion of any outstanding requirements. Moved by Senator Allen; seconded by Senator Bouchard. Any debate? All in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. I knew there wasn't going to be debate. The motion is adopted without dissent. Next item on the agenda -- we now come to committee reports -- is the Curriculum Review Committee. Chair of the Committee is Provost Ramsier.

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So once again we present to you a list of curriculum proposals that have come through the system. With no further pending comments or concerns, and we would ask as a committee that you approve these proposals.

CHAIR RICH: The motion comes from committee; it does not require a second. Is there debate on the motion to approve these curriculum changes?

All in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR RICH: The next item is the report of the Academic Policies Committee. Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chair Rich. Before I read this, I think that the credit goes to Joe Minocchi, who brought this to us. So I just want to make that clear.

CHAIR RICH: And I would second that.

SENATOR KLEIN: The Academic Policies Committee proposes that the University regulation 3359 – 60 – 03.1, which was forwarded to you in an email, be amended as indicated in the document that was attached. The reason for this proposal is that under current parameters, transient permission is not required for courses with articulated equivalency. Committee members agreed, without dissent, that written permission ought to be required prior to taking any course at another institution, regardless of established equivalency or particular degree requirement, for reasons including but not limited to the following: suitability of the transient course when evaluated by graduate and professional schools, continuity of curriculum when the course is part of a sequence, and assurance that the course will apply to the degree as intended.

The second item is the Academic Policies Committee's --

CHAIR RICH: Let's take one item at a time.

We have a motion from the Academic Policies Committee that does not require a second. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Randby.

SENATOR RANDBY: I'm not quite sure what we are addressing right now, but I do have a question about this. Proposal. In terms of the Ohio transfer module. It seems to apply to me that students who take maybe a summer course at another institution for the general education that's in the Ohio transfer module would not be able to do that. And bring it back to the University. So I have to wonder about the legality of this motion. I think that's why the equivalency thing is in there.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Chair Rich, I would defer that to Senator Minocchi.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Minocchi.

SENATOR MINOCCHI: APC investigated the legality issue. There is no legality issue. Every university, every public University in Northeast Ohio requires permission. We are not telling students that you can't do it. We just want to one: ensure that the class is going to apply as you intent and have that college that is responsible for conferring that degree be aware that you're doing. None of us in that discussion expressed any intent to deny students access to courses that we know are equivalent. But just to make sure that, on some level, they know what they're getting themselves into. That it's going to count toward what they intend it to count toward. We're not affecting at all transfer equivalency. Those equivalencies have already been decided. That part of the rule has not been touched either. In this edit.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Any other debate? I take it you're ready to vote. All in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: The second item we are proposing -- the Academic Policies Committee proposes that the deans of the academic colleges and the Vice President for Student Success be requested to provide the Academic Policies Committee with copies of their respective policies concerning the dismissal of students for academic deficiency. The purpose of this request is to enable the Academic Policies Committee to assess how similar these policies are from college to college and to consider how these policies affect College Credit Plus students whose overall GPA was sufficient for admission but whose GPA for CCP courses causes them to be on academic probation during their first semester at the University of Akron.

CHAIR RICH: This motion too comes from committee and does not require a second. Is there debate on the motion? I take it you're ready to vote. All in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

Next item is the report of the CCTC. Senator Randby

SENATOR RANDBY: We have a motion -- a laptop resolution motion that we want to present to the Senate for its consideration. Should I read the entire motion?

CHAIR RICH: As I recall it was not so long that it could not bear and oral reading.

SENATOR RANDBY: Whereas we, the members of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate's Computing and Communication Technologies Committee recognize that the maintenance of the University-owned computers and laptops reduces licensing costs and reduces the risk of FERPA violations and other computer information security concerns by better protecting the security of student

information through encryption, and; whereas, we recognize the laptops of full-time faculty are crucial to the teaching mission of the University, and: whereas, we recognize that the laptops of the full-time faculty have now aged to the point of affecting the quality of the teaching which is our central mission, and; whereas, we believe that a sensible plan of regular and ongoing rolling replacement of faculty laptops must be enacted, and; whereas, we recognize that full-time contract professionals and full-time staff also currently need new computers and laptops, and; whereas, we recognize that finding the funds to replace old laptops will be difficult given the poor financial condition of the University; we recommend -- we request 1. that the replacement of laptops, many of which are either dysfunctional or older than five years old, of full-time faculty be considered with the highest priorities perhaps by splitting the initial cost of replacements over the current and next fiscal years, and 2. that a rolling and regular five-year schedule to replace 20% of the laptops/desktops of all full-time faculty each year, 20% of the laptops/desktops of all full-time contract professionals each year, and 20% of the laptops/desktops of all full-time staff each year be placed as a recurring line item in the University's annual budget beginning with the 2017-2018 fiscal year.

CHAIR RICH: That motion comes from committee; it does not require a second. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Osorio.

SENATOR OSORIO: Chairman Rich, can I propose an amendment to that?

CHAIR RICH: You may.

SENATOR OSORIO: If I might read this. I would add line 8, whereas part-time faculty may or may not have office space, may teach on one campus or multiple campuses, are essential to first-year student success, and hence should be supported in providing up-to-date courses as well as secure class management, we request that tech equipment withdrawn from service be evaluated and

rehabilitated as possible by IT. We further request that this evaluated equipment be distributed to part-time faculty promptly.

CHAIR RICH: I'm a little unclear exactly – I'm not looking at it, so I'm a little unclear exactly where these amendments would be inserted in the committee's resolution.

SENATOR OSORIO: There was a list of seven items. This would be number eight, just down at the bottom.

CHAIR RICH: You're talking about the preamble -- the whereas clauses? Or are you talking about the resolving clauses?

SENATOR OSORIO: The resolving.

CHAIR RICH: Okay. Because it sounded like you had a preamble and resolving--

SENATOR OSORIO: They weren't address up above. I didn't divided into two.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Randy.

SENATOR RANDBY: If the amendment is approved, we can put the whereases into item 7 and move the rest into item 8.

CHAIR RICH: The resolved clause. Okay. Is there a second to the motion to amend? Seconded by Senator Nicholas. Is there debate on the motion to amend? This is just on the motion to amend. I take it you're ready to vote. All in favor of the motion to amend please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion to amend is adopted. We are back to the main motion as amended. Any debate on that motion? Senator Randby.

SENATOR RANDBY: I would just like to make one comment that we recognize that this motion is just the first plan and the reason for that is because we have not received from IT a solid plan of action. So our hope is that the administration will have a conversation with us about what to do. I have had some correspondence with Rex about this and we hope to meet next semester with Rex and the CIO so that we can get this done in some way. And it will probably be altered in their various ideas, but this is a start because the start has not occurred before and it should have been done several years ago.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I would like to speak in support of the motion, but I would like to point out that University Council has a committee that is to focus on these issues. And so let's understand that we need to coordinate with that committee as well.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Randy.

SENATOR RANDBY: I'm actually on that committee.

[LAUGHTER]

SENATOR RANDBY: Linda Barrett is the Chair of that committee, so we have been coordinating efforts.

[LAUGHTER]

CHAIR RICH: Any further debate on the motion? All in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

Next item is the report of the ad hoc General Education Implementation Committee. Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: You received from Janet Bean, our general assessment coordinator -- she's the guru now. We are passing the torch. A list of -- well, she gave us three things: a report of where we are with the process. We have followed pretty closely with what the Senate passed in April of -- 2014? Trying to remember. As far as how the implementation was going to go. What we have now in front of us is a list of courses that have gone through their fast-track review from the various committees to see whether or not these courses meet the new learning outcomes that are available and have identified an appropriate artifact to be used for assessment. We request that you approve these as the courses to go for the new Gen Ed program. It is not a complete list yet. In a sense that there are a dozen or so courses still trying to get through the reiterations. That we plan to have placed before you in February was their deadline. If they don't meet that, they are going through the regular curriculum proposals system. We figured that should be enough to get anyone on the ball to get this done.

[LAUGHTER]

In particular the complex systems affecting individuals in society has a rather short list at the moment because they have to get -- there is some tweaking that needs to be done on those. I think there are about another --

SENATOR BARRETT: Eight to 10. Maybe 12 more.

SENATOR SALIGA: Eight to 10 that would be added to that.

CHAIR RICH: For the record, those words were spoken by Senator Barrett. Slightly out of order.

SENATOR SALIGA: Well, I asked her. Sorry.

CHAIR RICH: We have a motion from committee. It does not require a second. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Otterstetter.

SENATOR OTTERSTETTER: Being that this is an initial set of classes, will there be an opportunity for more classes to be added and at what point will that take place?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: Yes. In fact, with this initial set these were courses that went through this fast-track evaluation. Once we get through this it is just a matter of going through the regular curriculum proposals system. In particular, all of these courses were courses already existing and we are hoping, the original GenEd Steering Committee was hoping that these new learning outcomes and philosophy would prompt departments to create new courses to meet some of these. And those new courses, as just a new course, need to go through the system. So in fact, we are willing for people to be putting those into the system now. GEAC has been reconstituted. We are working. We are approving some of the courses as they come through.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Just to clarify, because I'm on the diversity committee that reviews these, so there is still an opportunity to just go straight to TAG, rather than go through the curriculum proposals system for already existing courses?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: Okay, I'm going to need help with this one. I believe that these are just ones that have already been through and we have sent back, we are willing to bring forward but we are not accepting any new courses with that. So anything new now, even if it is an existing course that wants to get billed to GenEd needs to go through the curriculum proposals system. So we're just looking at some of them that need some tweaking. At the moment.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Any further debate on the motion? All in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent. Congratulations. This has been a huge undertaking. As I said in my remarks, we owe a debt of gratitude to the faculty who worked so hard on this. Bringing about this change.

Next item on the agenda is the report from the Graduate Council Representatives. Do Senator Sterns or Senator Allen have a report to make? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: And I have some documents to show you. [Passing out papers.] The first portion of this that says Fall of 2016 Graduate Assistant Funding Analysis is actually the comparison report that President Wilson was referring to. It has the University of Akron, Cleveland State University, Ohio University, University of Cincinnati, and Wright State University. And there are several columns here. But crucial ones are the last three, for GA funding: stipends, tuition awards, and then the approximate average tuition award per average student. And I will wait just a second for this to all – do we have any extra? I brought 30. I didn't want to waste any paper. To cut down any additional trees.

CHAIR RICH: Might I suggest in the future electronic distribution.

SENATOR ALLEN: Unfortunately this is just resolved yesterday. I apologize.

CHAIR RICH: Yesterday would've been fine.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay. I didn't know if we could do it [indiscernible].

CHAIR RICH: Those electrons travel fast.

[LAUGHTER]

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay. It seems to me that Ohio University, and I am talking individually here, not as either the so-called Executive Committee of the Grad Council or the full Grad Council, it seems to me that Ohio University is our closest comparison. Because they are very similar to us in many ways in the sense that they have a graduate and undergraduate program in engineering. A quite large one. And have a very similar number of full-time graduate students compared to us. They do have more halftime students, but about the same full-time. You can see a pattern developing as you look through this. That with regard to tuition awards, we seem to be pretty high compared to other universities. With regard to stipends, it doesn't seem to be as large of a problem. And in fact, if you look at the approximate average tuition awards per person we are \$7083 versus Ohio University 3546 and Cleveland State is 1238 and Wright State University is 2368. I should note though that again OU is probably the better comparison. University of Cincinnati is much larger than us, but Cleveland State and Wright State do not have as many doctoral programs and that is where things get more expensive. So what the Executive Subcommittee of the Grad Council has done, looking to the second page, we have some proposed strategies. Where it says University of Akron Stipends Versus Our In-state Competitors, that is this sheet right here. Then we go on to propose strategies for managing the grad schools budget. Number one should read not providing stipends tuition awards for administrative assistantships. Not administrative assistants. Sorry about that. Number two is proposed to cap the number of credit hours allowed under tuition

awards, and here is a hypothetical case of a degree requires 35 hours of credit, for example, a Master's degree. Cap the number beyond 35 hours that can be covered by a tuition award. That is, you can go longer than 35 hours, but you have no tuition remission for that. And then number three maintain funding for teaching assistants -- assistantships, but not research assistantships unless the RAs or research assistants are funded by extramural sources. Just those three things alone will make a good starting point. I think part of the problem is as we are moving from an old approach in which we wanted to maximize credit hours, particularly at the doctoral level because SSI or subsidy was computed by on a two or three running average on how much you had in credit hour production. It is now switched over to where it is very important the number of students that actually complete your program. So we're going to have some growing pains here, and we have some strategies for this, but probably doctoral students in particular don't need to be taking nearly as many hours as in principle they can and indeed are.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen, was this an informational report only?

SENATOR ALLEN: It is an informational report. My apologies.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I just wanted to add that very point. That this is the beginning of the discussion. The point was we wanted to have the Senate fully aware of the kind of discussion that is taking place within Grad Council, considering various options. And we of course want to have faculty input from across the campus on this because we have a number of different cultures and approaches in different colleges regarding this. So there are some very blatant inequities in some respects, and there also are some ways that we could dramatically improve things.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: I guess I had some questions and I don't know if you have these numbers. Your number two is capping the credit hours. Do you have any data on how many credit hours students are taking beyond that, because as the grad director in my program for five years nobody takes credits beyond what they have to take pretty much. So I don't think that's -- I don't know that would really be a savings.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: We do have those detailed data. Actually the Graduate Dean has them. But I don't think we want to get into them in here. We are substantially over. In many, many programs, for both Master's and doctoral programs.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Hariharan.

SENATOR HARIHARAN: The data that Senator Allen submitted is very, very useful, and the advice on where to cut things [indiscernible]. But I want to make an observation on tuition awards -- why the University of Akron is high. All the colleges that are involved in external funding, federal agencies and submitted by different graduate students. Automatically the University gives tuition. So out of this \$23 million, [indiscernible] these are supported by the University, demanded by the researchers -- not demanded, it is a benefit for the researchers and benefit for the students. So this \$23 million is combined with the research funding, so it has to be taken with a grain of salt.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: When I was on the Graduate Council, one of the things that we discussed was that tuition was always waived at international rates or out-of-state rates. So is that the way it is in this calculation? In other words, I know that some other institutions and I will use Ohio State because I know those numbers, they waive in-state tuition essentially. And so when you look at their numbers they charge themselves in-state tuition and then waive that. So are our numbers different because some of these other institutions are basically charging and waiving in-state tuition?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: We are not sure how these other universities do this, but we actually do charge the full rate because that is something being discussed as well. As a potential modification.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: So I have a few questions so maybe I'll just give them all to you --

CHAIR RICH: You might want to take notes, Senator Allen.

[LAUGHTER]

SENATOR WILLITS: When we talk about stipends, we are generally saying that our graduate student assistants have to be full-time students to get a stipend. So a master's student with thesis -- I will give that example because I know that off the top of my head -- would take two years, approximately, to complete a thesis. They are on two years of assistantship. That would be way more credits than they need if they were taking full-time tuition waivers every semester. Which they have to do to get their stipend. Or they have to pay tuition which then there's no

reason to give them a stipend because that is even less than they would be getting if they left and went into industry. So I wonder if there is a way that you considered actually reducing the required minimum credit hours for graduate assistantships. Again, one more. And then with that, if we are looking at maintaining teaching assistantships, is there any discussion on increasing teaching assistantships and making sure that the money that the University is spending, either on tuition or on stipends, is going to helping the coursework and the academic mission rather than potentially some of the research mission. Has there been not just maintaining what we are talking about as teaching assistantship which President Wilson mentioned is 400, maybe taking a thousand and making them teaching whatever but I think the focus should be academic. Is there talk in that, possibly?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: I'm going to go in reverse order. The answer to two is yes. I think that is a very good idea and we are discussing that. The answer to one, the minimum number of hours, that is probably quite a bit less than some people realize. To receive funding you only need nine hours per semester for fall and for spring, and for summer if you are a master's student, you may not be funded for the summer so you may only need 18 hours a year. You could actually get very close, 36 hours, by taking that minimum. Again this goes back to historical precedent. Where we had -- we tried to maximize the number of credit hours because SSI was based on credit hours, not on degree granting. Now, we are learning. I think we can make this more efficient without hurting. But just as a strategy, what you want to do, and I hope President Wilson is not going to shoot me for saying this, you want to maximize your third to last column. The stipends. And you want to minimize the penultimate column for your tuition grants. If you want to minimize the pain and suffering of students. And we do. There is no contribution that the University of Akron makes to the community that increases the salary and earning potential of students more than graduate programs. So

whatever we do we must find a way, in my opinion, to maintain graduate programs so that students can afford them. So they have a chance in life that we do.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: Thank you. Other questions for Senator Allen. I think I only have two so you're probably okay not writing them down.

[LAUGHTER]

One is, do you consider the state subsidy that we receive because after all let's say we give out \$5000 and we get back \$4000 that is different than giving out 10,000 and getting back 12. So how is a state subsidy incorporated in all these calculations? And then the other question is, is there a breakdown by the different categories in terms of administrative, GA, well I guess RA versus TA, and also I notice that you have full-time and half- time listed in terms of graduate students. What percentage of our resources go to full-time versus what percentage go to half-time? Which would obviously allow us to tailor where we act.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: I will reverse the answer for the same reason. In terms of the breakdown, we have, as President Wilson said, 1273 graduate assistants that are funded. We have 2040 full-time graduate students. In fact, slightly over half of full-time are funded. Very few for stipends of part-time are funded.

For the first answer, this probably surprised me more than anything else in terms of how SSI works for particularly for Master's and doctoral programs. You get a certain amount per year for being alive, essentially. It is something like, my

recollection is, about two or \$3000 for master's and it's about 6 to 8000 a year for PhD or other doctoral. Where you get your real benefit is on degree completion. That I think is approximately -- and I may be off a little here -- about \$30,000 to \$25,000 for PhD students. So the real return on investment is when people graduate now. But the average return per year is not very good for this. It is a tight budget there. Keep in mind that SSI is not the only revenue generated by graduate students. In fact, our earlier comment by an earlier Senator on the teaching assistantships the reason why we want to maximize those is twofold: one, if you learn how to teach and do a good job at that it increases your odds of getting a job. But for our own selfish financial reasons, you generate huge amounts of revenue compared to RAs, that are not funded off of extramural grants, if you have someone teaching. It averages out, including the tuition waiver, at a rate of at least 3 to 1 typically from what I have seen. That is, you are generating three times as much revenue for teaching in terms of tuition, and I'm not counting SSI generated on those courses, than the combined stipend and the tuition waiver. So the financial way to deal with that is to maximize the number of TAs if it fits your educational approach.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: So with that last statement I assume you are implying that the TA is the actual instructor of record, as opposed to just an assistant for one of us that is already teaching a class. And then the second clarification -- so the last column, I assume, is the second to the last column divided by the first column. Or is the average tuition award the average -- is that the average of those who receive tuition awards, or is it the average of -- is it basically tuition dollars awarded divided by all the students.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's all the students, if you do the math.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard, for the record. That was Senator Bouchard just speaking. Out of order.

SENATOR QUINN: So for apple and apple, wouldn't it be better to compare the average award made to those students who do receive tuition awards?

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes. But that might make it worse incidentally. Be careful what you ask for.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I just want to add something that Phil didn't mention. SSI is much more complicated than you may imagine. I think there are at least 22 different reimbursement categories, depending on the degree, and one of the things that we are trying to get a handle on is exactly how that plays out. It is a surprise, but a degree in sociology as a different reimbursement rate from something in polymer science or psychology. Each one of these programs, depending whether they fall under physical sciences or social sciences, get different reimbursement rates. So it really is very interesting because program costs vary then, and the funding to support those programs varies.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: My data may be out of date but back when I was on Grad Council, the way that tuition remission was calculated was based on the assumption that students were going to use the full amount. And the way that TA contracts are drawn up, they can take up to 15 hours both fall and spring and another 15 hours in the summer. So it occurred to me, looking at this current data, if we are counting 45 hours per grad student per year of tuition remission, it should not be a big surprise that we are as high as we are. My impression is, and again my data may be out of date, that some of these other schools only count

tuition remission for the hours the students actually take. Which -- I know in our department they normally take about 20 hours a year, rather than the 45 to which their contract entitles them. So if we are saying we are spending all this money that we are actually not, given that it is funny money anyway, we sort of have a free way to grab something in the budget.

CHAIR RICH: Dean Midha, do you wish to address the Body?

DEAN MIDHA: Thank you. I think I want to thank the President as well as Phil Allen for answering most of the things. I just want to summarize it. As it has been said. The model has changed for the state subsidy for the last four years. Until four years ago, it was only the number of credits that looking at how many we are generating. And the maximum limit they put on it was 174 credit hours for the doctoral programs and at this institution we never capped anyone for their master's program. But some students they were going all the way up to 174 while they were still enrolled in one master's, changing to a second master's, a third master's. What has happened is now 30% of the subsidy is indexed to the course completions there. And in the course completion they are talking the real courses, not independent study, and not doctoral research and master research and so on. And 50% of the subsidy is indexed to [indiscernible] completion. And again this is proportional. It depends how many degrees we are giving in sociology at University of Akron and how many degrees are given at Kent State, how many are given at Ohio State. If we are giving only seven and they are giving 70 others, we are going to get only 10% of that portion of the pie which is set aside there. So if you increase from 7 to 9 one year and others have increased from 70 to 100 we are not going to get more, we're going to get less there and hence it gets complicated. How we address the different levels of subsidy, there are 26 different levels of subsidy for different courses which we have. And this subsidy varies from \$70 per credit hour to \$700 per credit hour depending upon it is in the humanities or it is in the stem and which level course they are. In fact, some members of the Graduate Council are planning to go to

Columbus to have more understanding of it. Not that we'll get the complete understanding but we will try our best to go from there. To answer the Senator's question asking the column on the sheet which Senator Allen circulated. The last column is the result of dividing the [indiscernible] column by the very first column there and just having some rough idea of what we are giving here. The question regarding we are allowing students to have 15, 15, 15 and counting the whole thing and not the actual one. No. These calculations are based on the actual number of credit hours students took during that year. And that is why the number is 31 million. It could be 33 million next year because we don't know how many international students are there. How many out-of-state students are there and so on. As far as comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges, this information was received by the fellow graduate deans from these institutions, so they gave us – we had the retreat and we discussed that thing there. To the best of our knowledge they have given us apples to apples information. But they inserted, every time, that this is approximate information so it is not an exact science because numbers vary from institution to institution. And semester to semester. All these things are on the table and believe me the Graduate Council is involved very heavily analyzing the results. We appreciate all the questions which have been asked today and we will appreciate receiving more questions so we can discuss it as the President said. It is just the beginning of the discussion and see how we can enhance the revenue and at the same time where there is a possibility to cut expenses there. Our goal is not to cut the academic programs or anything, but to try to be more efficient there. For those students, whether they are full-time or half-time, the majority of the graduate assistants are full times. Those who get halftime there even to get the halftime stipend they have to be enrolled for the full-time students there so this year there is -- when we are looking at expenses we have broken it down by full-time students, half-time students, [indiscernible] we are discussing it here. And all these things will be discussed in the Graduate Council. As I said, we appreciate your input as much as we can get it. Thanks for giving me the chance to answer some of your questions.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: One minor clarification. I think Senator Bouchard's point still can be implemented in the sense that you can obtain savings from the tuition grants by going down lower than what they are averaging now because particularly, say, in the fourth and fifth year of a PhD program, you could go to nine, nine, and six and you could then get those savings that you were talking about potentially.

DEAN MIDHA: And if I am allowed to comment on one more thing?

CHAIR RICH: Dean Midha

DEAN MIDHA: The question regarding how many credit hours students are taking -- we have collected that information for the last three years. The students who have graduated from our institution with a master's degree or doctoral degree and we have looked at how many credit hours are required for master's degree varies from 30 to 45, but hardly any student is graduating with 30 credits. Most of them are graduating at 48, 50, 54, 65. Likewise, doctoral degree requires 90 credit hours, but the students who graduated in the last four years most of them are graduating with 120, 130, 140, going all the way to 180+. So the question is, how can we be more efficient. We are not getting the subsidy. But the doctoral subsidy it is a set-aside amount there. If we are graduating 100 doctoral degrees this year, and next year we graduate 105 we are not going to get any more. It is complicated. We look at the average of the last three years there, at what is happening and go with that number. But again, we're looking from every angle. The intent is not to hurt our academic programs. We want to enhance the revenue. Not to cut the revenue there, but try to be more efficient in cutting down some expenses where possible.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the report of the University Council representatives. Is there such report? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Two quick things. And I won't mention anything else because of time. Actually the first one, I think, is a very positive one. And that is that an ad hoc textbook committee was established with five committee members from University Council with a goal of trying to save money for students on textbooks. And secondly, University Council voted in favor of the change of the academic calendar and eliminating summer commencement. A few other structural things on saving money by combining things.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you.

Next is New Business. Is there new business to come before the Body? Anything for the Good of the Order? Senator Feltey.

SENATOR FELTEY: Thank you, Chairman Rich. I have an open letter from the Academic Advisory Committee of the Women's Studies Program that I appreciate everyone's patience in hearing.

We, the Faculty Advisory Committee of the University of Akron Women's Studies Program write this open letter to express our collective concern regarding the election of Donald Trump to the U.S. presidency. As concerned citizens and importantly as faculty who care deeply about the education and well-being of our students, we go on record as speaking out against the misogyny, racism, Islamophobia, homophobia, and xenophobia expressed throughout the Trump campaign.

Donald Trump has spoken in favor of policies that pose an immediate threat to the health and reproductive rights of women, including and especially college-age women and women pursuing higher education. Trump has promised to defund Planned Parenthood, an organization that provides sexual and reproductive health care for 5 million men, women and teens each year. According to a well-documented study, now that young women are able to control their fertility, they comprise "a majority of undergraduate students in America" and have been able to successfully pursue degrees in law, medicine, business and liberal arts. Describing pregnancy as an inconvenience for business, Trump also vowed to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which will result in an end to requiring insurance companies to cover birth control with no co-pay. He has promised to nominate justices to fill openings on the Supreme Court who are anti-choice, putting *Roe v. Wade* at risk of being overturned.

Clearly these policies, if enacted, pose a threat to the autonomy of women including the ability to pursue higher education. Donald Trump has made statements that are misogynist, hateful, and may be seen as fomenting sexual violence against women. The language he uses is a far cry from the goals of higher education to advance public thought, debate and deliberation on issues of equality, democracy and citizenship. In fact, Trump himself, in the widely circulated tape from Access Hollywood, admitted to sexually assaulting women. His casual boasts have been corroborated by many survivors of his assaults, and documented in *New York* magazine.

Clearly these views are incompatible with the intellectual development and growth of all University of Akron students who we, as faculty, seek to guide, teach and support. Donald Trump has spoken in favor of punitive immigration policies that threaten the lives of women and children, especially those traveling from locations such as countries in Latin America where rape and violence against women is rampant.

Donald Trump has called climate change a hoax, in direct contradiction to widely accepted credible scientific evidence that supports the existence of climate change as a pressing global issue. Further, Trump's denial runs counter to the goals of higher education, which seek to advance the well-being of society and the environment.

Trump has re-Tweeted racist posts on Twitter, and has received the endorsement of the Ku Klux Klan. The proposed policies and public statements mentioned above, in addition to numerous others not recounted here, have emboldened hate groups and hate crimes since November 8, 2016. We are deeply concerned as many of these hate crimes have specifically targeted college students. A brief list of college students targeted by hate crimes since November 8, 2016, include SUNY Geneseo, University of Pennsylvania, New York University, San Diego State University, University of Louisiana Lafayette, and San Jose State University, and I would add since the writing of this letter we've had several reports here on our campus as well.

The University of Akron's website states we strive -- "we strive to create a welcoming environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors. We respect and celebrate our differences. We strive to create a framework for excellence that incorporates diversity at its core, while linking the quality of the educational experience". The proposed policies, sentiments, and general social climate fostered by the election of Donald Trump runs counter to the stated goals of the University of Akron. Trump's documented statements and proposed policies are not inclusive. They do not incorporate diversity. And they do not represent quality reasoning. They do not rely on sound evidence and clear argumentation, or critical thought -- all foundations for higher education. Many of us view this election as a call to action. We all agree on the importance of speaking out against misogyny, racism, Islamophobia, homophobia and xenophobia and advocating for the exercise and implementation of policies based on sound reasoning, evidence, equality and respect for diversity. We invite the University of

Akron community and surrounding areas to join us in continued discussion and debate over these issues that deeply affect our students and our communities. Finally, we recommit, with even greater intensity, to teach, conduct research and promote the discipline of women's studies, a key component of academia and education and is integral to the understanding and progress of women worldwide. To support the understanding and advancement of women's concerns, and to cultivate an atmosphere of respect for women at the University of Akron and beyond. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Is there anything else for the Good of the Order? Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Kathy, for that statement. I wanted to add to that that just since the election I've had three students who have been targeted either they or their family members have been targeted. Latinos and one Muslim student. So far. Who have reported it to me. I would also emphasize the importance of having a diverse faculty. Once again. A diverse faculty to help foster this environment that can be supportive to our students as they need to find support as they pursue their education.

CHAIR RICH: Anything else for the Good of the Order? I take it you're ready to adjourn. All in favor of adjournment please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. [gavel] We are adjourned.