

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
FACULTY SENATE
7 APRIL, 2016
3:03 p.m. - 5:13 p.m., Eastern

CHAIRMAN RICH: The April meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. The agenda has been distributed. There are some changes that need to be made, and if there's no objection, I'll just state them. If there's any objection, please express it.

The item II, the adoption of the minutes, should be the minutes for the October, not the February meeting. The February meeting minutes have not been distributed. In addition, the President informed me about an hour ago that he will not be present at the meeting, so there are no remarks from the President.

Also, we need to add a report of the Academic Policies Committee, which met the day before yesterday. I distributed a brief written report to you from them yesterday evening by e-mail. And I understand there's also to be a report of the Athletics Committee. I do not believe there is a report of the Computing & Communications Technologies Committee. Can anybody confirm or deny? Well, I'll call it out when we get to it and we'll see if there is a report. Are there any objections to those changes? If not, is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed with the changes just agreed to. That's moved by Senator (R.M.) Schwartz, seconded by Senator Landis.

Any other changes anyone wishes to propose to the agenda?

If not, all those in favor of adoption of the agenda, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.) Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted without dissent.

Next is the adoption of the minutes of the October meeting. Is there a motion to adopt those minutes as distributed? Senator Clark moves. Is there a second? Senator Landis seconds. Are there any corrections to those minutes? If not, all in favor of adopting the minutes of the October meeting, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.) Opposed by opposite sign. The motion -- the minutes are adopted without dissent.

Next is the remarks of the Chairman.

Among the items on today's agenda are the approval of curriculum changes reported by the Curriculum Committee; a report from the Academic Policies Committee recommending suspension of the Student Success Division's block cohort enrollment and preregistration initiatives; and a report from Carolyn Behrman, Faculty Director of Collaboration for the Center for Experiential Learning, Entrepreneurship, and Civic Engagement.

As we will hear from the Academic Policies Committee later in the meeting, members of the Fall 2016 entering undergraduate class are being assigned to cohorts by the Division

of Student Success, which then chooses the courses and sections thereof to be taken by each student. The members of each cohort are enrolled together in the same section of every course. Each student's class schedule is determined by the Student Success Division without so much as consulting the student to ascertain his or her interests, preferences, or schedule constraints. Students are precluded from changing their assigned schedules without the approval of an academic adviser. The student success division apparently has determined that it is in the best academic interests of the students to make these decisions for them.

There is no doubt that undergraduate students benefit from academic advice and guidance, but this initiative goes well beyond providing advice and guidance into the realm of paternalistic authoritarianism. This is a university, not a high school. Within reasonable limits, students should be free to choose which subjects to study, whether, for example, to take introductory sociology rather than introductory psychology -- apologies to the psychology faculty present -- based on their academic interests. These -- they should also be free, again, within reasonable limits, to schedule their classes around their work schedules or other personal needs.

It would not be at all surprising if, upon learning that their courses and class schedules will be chosen for them by the university, many incoming students were to decide to attend another university that allows them to make those decisions for themselves. I know I would never have attended a university that insisted on making such decisions for me. At a time when confirmed admissions are down one-third from the same time last year, we can ill afford to risk driving more students away in this fashion.

This initiative was undertaken for its supposed academic benefits. Unfathomably, the decision to undertake it was made without consulting the faculty. Let me say this as plainly as I can: The authority on academic matters in a university is its faculty. It disservices the interests of our students and, ultimately, the university as a whole when the faculty's role in making decisions on academic matters is usurped by nonacademic administrators.

This ill-advised initiative must be stopped immediately. If not, in the interests of truth in advertising, perhaps the university's tag line should be changed to "Ohio's authoritarian university."

This concludes my remarks.

SENATOR STERNS: Great response.

CHAIRMAN RICH: There are no special announcements. I'm pleased to report that I at least know of no deaths to report.

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

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Since the Faculty Senate last met on March 3rd, the Executive Committee met twice by itself and once with the Interim President -- Interim Provost and President. Sorry. It skipped ahead on me. The Executive Committee met on March 3rd -- I'm sorry. The Executive Committee met on March 17th for regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the President and Interim Provost. We discussed the Computing & Communication Technology Committee's plan to form a subcommittee to choose a new curriculum proposal system. We also discussed questions regarding the EXL Center's unclasses.

Later that day we met with President Scarborough and Interim Provost Ramsier. We discussed the Trust Navigator success coaches and whether their contract will be renewed for the next academic year; the learning communities and cohort block experience plans to build a Stark State campus in Akron; the EXL Center unclasses; and we asked whether Carolyn Behrman could address the Senate; and the GenEd Core 13. Currently the APC subcommittee is looking at outcomes data on that initiative.

The EC was updated on discussion with higher education partners, which was described to us as still in waiting mode; a Bill introduced that was supported by the governor allowing the Western Governors Association and to the state the search for the Associate Provost For Assessment, otherwise referred to as the Assessment Coordinator; meetings with deans regarding the implementation of college strategic plans and allocation of additional full-time faculty positions; the strategic planning process for BCAS, University Libraries, the Graduate School, and the Williams Honors College; the status of the process of reactivating suspended and revised theater baccalaureate program; the dean of the University Libraries search. We were told there is not time for a search to hire a new dean for the upcoming fall semester and an interim dean will need to be appointed. We were updated on Zook Hall renovation and the Center For Data Science and Information Technology, the EXL Center, and the Corps of Cadets.

The EC next met on March 31st for regular Senate business and to prepare the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. The Executive Committee certified the elections of Huey-Li Li of the LeBron James Family Foundation College of Education and Dana Cole of the School of Law. The EC discussed the part-time faculty salary increase proposal that was passed in Senate and the need to get that proposal moving along through University Council's Talent Development and Human Resources and the Budget and Finance Committee. We discussed Senator Miller's request to create an ad hoc committee to develop an institutional repository for faculty and student work, such as honors projects. He intends to propose this at the upcoming Senate meeting, today. This concludes the Executive Committee's report.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there any questions for the Secretary about the Executive Committee report? I understand that Senator Miller does not intend to make this proposal today, but rather a month from now. But that's --

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Oh.

SENATOR MILLER: Next time.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Unless you'd like to.

SENATOR MILLER: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The information in the Executive Committee report in that respect has been overtaken by them. Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Yes, thank you. I was just wondering what the update on the Corps of Cadets was, what the response, what is the update?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: They -- I don't have those notes with me, but they updated us on the number of students who are interested in it, but I don't remember a specific number.

SENATOR KLEIN: So they're continuing?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: It's continuing. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN RICH: My imprecise recollection is that there's been relatively, relatively few students interested, but I don't remember the number. Are there other questions from the secretary? Senator Gatzia.

SENATOR GATZIA: I had a similar question about the Trust Navigators. What was their response? Are they planning on renewing their contract or --

SECRETARY SCHULZE: We asked that and I don't recall getting -- we are waiting. There were discussions about it, but I don't, I didn't --

CHAIRMAN RICH: I think we were informed that a decision had not yet been made.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Right.

SENATOR GATZIA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Other questions? Thank you. The next item on the agenda is the remarks of the Interim Provost.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. I'd like to talk about a couple of, a couple of items. Updating on processes of hiring for next fall and beyond. The Assessment, Associate Provost For Assessment Committee did not have a

successful process. The pool was weak. So they have come to me with a recommendation for sort of a plan B, and I intend to meet with them as soon as I can to try to implement that plan. I think it's a good plan, but I want to talk to them first, because we still need assessment to be coordinated on campus and so forth.

Engineering dean search committee brought forward four names of people that were interviewed and I have been given the authority, as of today, to begin to make an offer letter, or to make an offer to one of the candidates, and I'm working on that now.

That'll be probably -- hopefully I can get something ready for the Board meeting next Wednesday. That's my target. I will do my best to make sure that that happens. If it has to be the June 4 meeting because the negotiations sometimes take longer than others, I'll let you know. Everyone will be aware that we're working on it.

As some of you may know or recall, I have been interviewing all the faculty candidates that have been coming to campus, and, of course, school directors and department chair candidates as well. Again, I think I mentioned this last time, I am very impressed with the groups of people we are bringing in. I think every offer that we have made to the first candidate in each of the searches has been successful, as far as I know. I actually have to leave early today to do another interview, so if I leave at 4:30, please don't take it personally. It's not the topic of discussion, it's other duties.

Some concerns have been raised about timelines for some of these searches. For example, some search committees aren't even formed yet, or they formed yesterday and they are working on an ad. What's the likelihood of hiring a full-time tenure-track or nontenure-track person for fall? Probably pretty close to zero, in my estimation. Don't be concerned. Let's do it right. If we need to, if our visiting people need to be renewed for another six months through December, that's an option. For another year if we --

(Telephone rings.)

VOICE: That's a visitor.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Hello.

VOICE: Did you get an offer?

VOICE: Your number is up.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: My number is up? You should have said, "Dave ain't here." That would be a good response.

So timelines. Do not be concerned that the approved positions are going to disappear if we don't fill them. We're not looking for warm bodies, we're looking for good hires. Again, if it makes good sense to try to finish searches that are already in process, we're interviewing, I think they'll be fine. Positions that are not even yet posted, I think we're pretty much way behind the eight ball. We are in the wrong part of the cycle. We should rethink that.

Visiting positions can be renewed because that's a good reason to renew them, if there's work to be done, until we fill those positions. So I have advised, I will let the deans know this at the Council of Deans meeting next Tuesday, that there is no plan to, if positions are not filled, to take them back. So do not have that concern. We made these approvals based on the fact we need these colleagues. So do your best in each

unit that has an opening to do what's best for your discipline. Okay? And the deans will be informed, again, you are hearing it before they are, so if there's some miscommunication, you blame me, but at the same time, we're going to try to do what's right. So that's on hiring.

Enrollment, of course, still continues to be a challenge. This week was a little better than last, not that it means a whole lot, but we're only down by 30 percent, instead of 33, for the incoming freshmen confirmed students. We still have a lot of work to go, and we all have to work together. There was an editorial or something I saw today about working for a common goal. I think that's a really reasonable way to think about this. And we're all in the same boat. Students are why we're here. We need to work, you know, collectively to try to make that happen.

This bears, you know, heavily on the recommendation that was surmised by you, Mr. Chairman, from the Academic Policies Committee. You should know that this block scheduling, as of today, has been stopped. It will not continue further. The good thing about this current situation, besides all the downsides, is you may or may not recognize that John Messina is now in charge of what we used to call Student Affairs. He has the title of Vice Provost. Not Vice President. He works with me. He wants faculty involved. Not just me, he wants faculty involved. We need help to understand why our new student orientation isn't doing what we want it to do. If students come here, we need to keep them here. We need to convince them to come back as real students. He is going to be reaching out, so basically you can assume, and the fact that APC has come forward with this gives us every right to take this action. So block scheduling has ceased. He is going to be asking Faculty Senate, faculty in particular that are interested, to help, to help us with this new student orientation process, to help us understand more about what we do in advising, to help us decide what to do about coaching for students. Okay? This is all in OAA now.

Other things that he's interested in having done with faculty help, and if he hasn't thought of it, I'm going to interject it here, I would like to see some faculty get involved in looking at what this Akron Experience course is doing for our students. In addition to GenEd Core and the College Credit Plus, we have an obligation to make sure that everything our students take as far as credit-bearing courses in this campus is helpful to them. So please take it upon yourselves to find an area where you think you can contribute, and when you hear this request coming from Student Affairs, Student Life, from John Messina's group, please be responsive. Again, he works in our office now, so we have a chance to really make a difference.

Now, I agree that block scheduling eliminates all flexibility, and some students may need more prescriptive help than others. What we really need, I'd like to see a real faculty emphasis on placement of students. Where is the student really going to -- where should we start the student, right? Not just take a test. What do they really want to do for a living? And do they have the skills? Sometimes you have to have a little bit of

tough love when it comes to advising students, you are just not going to be a whatever, because you don't have the skill set.

So please help us with this. Because, again, we're all in the same boat. The university will survive in better or worse shape depending on what we do with our students. And you can count on me to make sure that we'll do everything we can to work with you. And what else? Budget. That's on everybody's mind. Of course, if enrollment is off, budget will be off. This is a serious issue. We are attentive to it. We're on it every day. As you know, Nathan Mortimer, CFO now, and I are working, you know, hand in hand to try to figure out what we are going to do about next year's budget. You should know that the deans have been told, and they will be told again Tuesday, the summer part-time pay, summer pay for faculty, the budgets are the same, budgets for GAs for next year are the same, their operating budgets are the same, personnel budgets are the same for fiscal '17. We are on the assumption that everything from this year is mapped to next year. Okay? Until we are told otherwise, until we are told to make a change, if we do, that's the situation. So everyone should know there are no discussions about any cuts yet. There may be, but we can't -- we won't know until we get there. So it's a serious matter, but we're working on it.

University Council Budget and Finance Committee is going to be tasked this year in a significant way to help with the budget development. More than last year, maybe more than they want. Okay? We're going to be reaching out to that group to have them help us figure out what to do, given the realities.

As far as for the faculty in the room, merit reviews, as you know, thankfully, we ratified a new faculty AAUP contract, we will be doing merit reviews. Again, the deans will find out Tuesday, we need the reviews to be done so raises can go into paychecks effective fall, and effective July 1 for the 12-month faculty in the room. So let's be prepared to get your materials ready to submit so we can get the process finished so we can get everything finalized and to HR and payroll so that people don't have -- we don't have to do retroactive pay to make up because we missed the September pay. Okay? So, again, the deans don't know about this yet, but we need to make that process roll out now. Okay?

So those are the main things I wanted to cover. Again, I'd be happy to answer any questions that anybody may have. And I'll be quiet.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Except when answering. Questions for the Provost? Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: I'm wondering if there is any consideration for re-establishing small course formulas for summer teaching as well as last year rather than canceling courses that fall below cap, certain minimal caps.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yes, small class formula is still in effect. There needs to be a rationale to run a class small, and I can't recall any good rationale from the last couple

summers that was turned down. If the students need to graduate, I'm going to say, okay, go ahead and do that, but please look at your course cycling, because every summer we have three students who need to graduate. We probably could figure out a way to not have that happen routinely. Yeah, anytime there needs to be an exception, that's perfectly fine, as long as there's a good reason for it, and the reasons can be pretty simple, but at the same time, we need some kind of basis upon which to make that decision. You know, if I see multiple sections of the same course in the same session being taught all with 12, I'm going to ask why. Why can't we have a larger section where these students are combined? You might argue, well, if you don't offer it all different times of the day, they won't all come. That may be true, but you have no evidence of that. Right? It may be that they are all coming just because we offer the same thing three times in the same day. So we have to be mindful of that. We're not going to waste money. But at the same time, we do know that flexibility is important. Generally if there's two sections offered in the summer, one in the day, one in the evening, even if one of them is small, we usually let it go, because it offers that flexibility for students.

But please be thoughtful about the resource allocation. We are going to have a difficult time on this campus, and especially this next year, with the enrollment still looking like it's going to be down, as far as the finances, so be frugal, be thoughtful, and do what you think makes the most sense and we'll try to support that.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I'd like to just ask the Provost this question: We have for many years had a two-year entity on our campus. And recently we have been hearing about all the different encroachments by other two-year entities coming into the Akron area. The one thing I have been surprised at is that the University of Akron has not made any type of a public response to the fact that we have had a community and technical college since the 1960s, the fact that we offer our whole set of programming in that arena, and I just don't understand why we haven't at least publicly answered that issue.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, Senator Sterns asks a very good question or makes a very reasonable statement. He doesn't understand why we haven't. Neither do I. I was acting or interim dean in CAST, College of Applied Science & Technology. When I left there, I was under the impression that everybody was pretty much on board. Anybody who is in the room correct me if I'm wrong, we had a plan to make that the case, to remind people we have these programs, and even though we can't -- we charge more than these competitors, so-called competitors, we have a quality, a value added, in that we have a degree from the University of Akron, and we have tenured faculty in these programs. That was going to be our selling point. We may not have won everybody. We certainly aren't going to win anybody if we don't advertise. So this is high on my priority list. Obviously the new recent announcements have rekindled that. I have tasked Dean Rickel, in writing, I need a plan, and we need a plan now to try to

show an expansion of our CAST programs throughout Summit County in order to offset this imminent competition. CAST college makes a large net revenue for this campus. We cannot afford to have that damaged. Because that revenue goes to pay for other things. Okay? Like engineering and polymer science and others. And we cannot afford to not serve the local community, which is what we do in all of our units. CAST has a very big emphasis on serving the local community for career and technical jobs, and it's a shame if we let that slide. So that my position has been focus on the home turf first, take care of your home business, then you can think about other things, is the way I approach it. So that's -- something is going to happen soon. I guarantee you.

SENATOR STERNS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chair Rich. Rex, I -- this was intended for the President, so I'm not sure if this is something that you can answer or not, but I think we have all been seeing in the news how ITT Tech is being investigated for -- well, there's a lawsuit against ITT Tech for fraud and mismanagement, and, of course, we all want the University of Akron to have national press maybe in a good way, and so -- and not in a bad way, which would probably occur should we acquire or have any kind of -- any affiliation with ITT Tech, not to mention liability for the pending lawsuit. Having said that, what are the plans, if there are any, to acquire or otherwise have some relationship with ITT Tech?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: That's a very good question, Mr. Chairman, a question I probably should not answer.

VOICE: Go for it.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Now let's see if he does.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Your concerns, I think, are well placed. We're all reasonable-minded people and we understand what, what this sort of a issue could mean in many different -- from many different perspectives. So I think what the best thing that can be said now is that the institution will do what's best for the institution. Those of us who work here, we're dedicated to this institution. I don't know if that answers your question. It doesn't?

SENATOR KLEIN: No.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: But it's probably best I don't say much more. Okay? At this time.

SENATOR KLEIN: I guess it's a yes or a no question.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: If life were that simple, yeah.

SENATOR KLEIN: Are we acquiring ITT Tech in any way, shape or form, or not?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I can't answer that.

SENATOR KLEIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there other questions for the Provost? Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Provost Ramsier, thank you for being here and for being so forthright with your comments in your initial comments. So I also had a question that I would have addressed to the President, were he here, but I'll address it to you as well. Can you update us, in light of the previous question, with respect to what might be, what might be the progress of the points of concern of the no-confidence vote of the Faculty Senate now two months ago, not only in terms of ITT Tech and outsourcing of university responsibilities, but also shared governance, hiring and so on? Are you able to address any of those points that the President may have made progress on?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I will try. All of the points I think have been taken very seriously by everyone concerned, including, I will say, the Board members. As you know, or many of you know, I understand where your concerns are coming from. Again, I am one of the people that are here to serve the institution. We will address these concerns. They can't be done overnight.

As you know, when things are -- when damage has been done, it takes time to repair. And this is more than repairing of, you know, a broken widget. This is repairing relationships. This is rebuilding trust. I don't know how better to do that than to lead by example. With every single thing that happens, there should be a valid, reasonable-minded explanation for why. With plenty of opportunity to discuss it before it happens. I mean unless it's an emergency situation where something has to be done immediately, like digging up, you know, the steam pipe, most everything else there's plenty of time for discussion.

As long as I'm involved, that's the way we're going to handle it, and hopefully you will see a change in the way the institution runs. Again, I don't think it can be overnight. These changes -- and the issues didn't arise overnight. This has been some time it's taken to get to the point where this body would vote no confidence. That's a serious, a serious action that deserves serious attention.

So, if anything, know that it has made a change, has made a difference, and it's affecting the way we do business going forward. Similar to this issue with the block scheduling. It never should have happened, in my opinion, without some consultation, probably

should have never happened at all, no matter how much consultation, but it's worthy of discussion, so we're going to stop until we regroup.

Again, it doesn't answer your question maybe directly or in enough detail, but you should know that we're serious about making this place whole again.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you. Other questions for the Provost? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes, thank you. Yeah, Rex, I wanted to ask you about GenEd Core 13, and I very much appreciated your comments on the block scheduling, that faculty should have been involved in something that affects our students, and the GenEd Core 13 is the same thing. It was put into place originally without any meaningful faculty input and it has now, after having been in place for this academic year, the results are starting to come out, I'm sure you saw the initial report, which I saw, and it's pretty clear it's not working. That is that by far the majority of the people taking these GenEd Core courses were not the new students that it was billed as luring to campus. It was just our own students. So what we have been doing is cannibalizing arts and sciences for online courses through Wayne.

It was advertised as a blended approach, where students would have, I don't know, field trips or something, none of which has happened. And in the fall, the day before classes started, the President was talking about the blended experience, none of which happened. I asked him about it in Senate I believe at the October meeting and he was saying, oh, yes, second semester, blended as can be, which, of course, didn't happen. I was looking at the schedule this morning, and they there again with no time, no date, no place, which means, again, that it's not going to be possible to get everybody together. People can't sign up for a course where they might suddenly have to drive to Wayne at the same time as one of their other courses is meeting. So, again, it's not going to happen.

The courses are being taught, not by regular faculty, except in a very few circumstances, but by people hired by Wayne, and I know in at least some departments, such as sociology, the department never heard of the person who was hired to teach the course, so there's certainly no meaningful faculty oversight. And the results are not good. So not only is faculty not involved, we have a really clear sense of crummy results. That is the report that I saw was absolutely clear that the students taking these courses were flunking at a higher rate than regular in-person courses or even online courses on campus. Which faculty could have told people.

It was also clear, one of the most striking stats I saw on that, is that only 16 percent, 16 percent of the students that had taken one of these GenEd courses in the fall came back to take one in the spring. Students are voting with their feet. They don't want it. So it's not luring new students. The students don't like it. The students are flunking. It's not too late to cancel it for fall. Hardly anybody signed up yet. I looked this morning,

English Comp II has one student registered. I mean we cancel classes all the time. Let's cancel this one now. Okay?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I think the Senator's statements are well taken. I saw the same report. Again, it's only based on one semester, the inaugural semester of a pilot program, but the data were not very convincing, except all negative.

Yes, we have another semester in play that's almost over, we'll have another set of data from that. As you know, we have a subcommittee, an Academic Policies Committee looking at the data. I asked many of the questions that generated that data, so we could really get a good assessment of what's the impact of this program. Again, as a program, it's really a program, if you will, it needs to be evaluated that way, and then, of course, at the individual course level.

So I do not disagree with the Senator that the data we have currently do not demonstrate that this has been a success. We will look at the data hard as soon as the spring data come in, because then you have a full calendar year, or academic year, and we'll make a decision, and that'll be based on the evidence, and it'll be Academic Policies Committee and that subcommittee in particular that I'll be asking to give us a recommendation.

So we can't pull the trigger too soon without data. I think I know what I would do, but I'm going to wait until we have the conversation with the people that have actually looked at the data and then we'll make a decision.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I have a follow-up.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes, it's just a follow-up. I was thinking it makes sense, it sounds like you are actually on the same wavelength as I am on this, it makes sense to cancel it now. I find it wildly unlikely a second semester data will show us anything different, and it's not fair to the students. Because there are some students who are thinking, oh, boy, I can take this online class, I mean like six of them or whatever it is, and we should tell them earlier, rather than later, that this course is not going to be offered. There are perfectly good online courses, many blended, offered through main campus, some actually also offered through Wayne. And so I see no reason to wait.

When I was talking -- when the President was still talking to me, which was last fall, he said -- he and I had a very nice chat and he said that if this did not prove to be a good idea in terms of luring students and making them have an exciting, good learning experience that we would, quote, turn on a dime and do it. So I think the dime has showed up.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Understood.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I do have a question. If it were to take, let's say, another month for the APC subcommittee to finish gathering and analyzing the data, would it still be possible, if the results are convincingly negative, to cancel those classes for this fall?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: It's certainly possible. It would really depend on how many students were in them and what we could do to get them in other -- to get similarly situated students to take things that they also would benefit from. You wouldn't want to just cancel out on hundreds of students.

At the same time, I think if that was the decision that was made and there was good basis for it, we would make due and try to find the students another course to take. I mean, again, as has been mentioned, this wasn't a group of incoming freshmen, at least not last fall, there was really a mixture of students, primarily current students. Those current students could have just as well taken something else. And they would have, probably, unless they saw this as an opportunity for either online versus some other mode, or just simply cheaper.

But we would have to make that decision, and it would have to be made once we have some data. Again, if we wait on the spring data, it delays things even more. So this is certainly on my radar and, you know, we will be talking to APC in particular to see if there's any other -- again, I don't disagree with the Senator that the likelihood of some kind of rapid turnaround in performance is probably not there, not very high. Then again, anytime you launch something, usually you have a lot of rough kinks to work out, in the beginning. We have to realize that, too, that when you try something, sometimes you have to work it out. Unfortunately, if it's at the expense of the students, that's not good. I would be the first to say that.

So let's work together on it. That's, I guess, the best way to answer it, is let's make sure that we collectively understand what we're trying to do with this and whether or not it's something we want to continue.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The reason I ask the question is I was trying to figure out whether, you know, if the concern is about the fall classes, whether there is time to finish analyzing the data and base the decision on that or whether it's essentially now or not till next spring. That's what I was trying to figure out.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: That's a very good rationale for the question. I think if we wait too long, we're going to have so many students that we are going to make them upset if we cancel on them. If we cancel too soon, we may have pulled the trigger too prematurely.

Let me think about it. Thanks for bringing it up, and, again, I'll need to talk to the faculty on the committee to make sure that we based -- we have to have some evidence to

base decisions on. I've always believed that, so -- and we have some, and it's not positive. To date.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Let me just add that one of the things that the subcommittee is looking at, and I don't yet -- I don't know whether the data had yet been acquired and analyzed, is not just the outcomes in the courses versus grades, but also the entering credentials of the students.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Sure. Of course.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Because, to make a fair comparison, you would want to control for levels of preparation, differences in levels of preparation --

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Right.

CHAIRMAN RICH: -- between those classes and other classes. Now, if students are failing at high rates, there are still issues to address, obviously, but it means something different if the students in those classes are unusually ill prepared or --

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Right.

CHAIRMAN RICH: -- if their level of preparation is similar to those in other classes.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Absolutely. I mean if we would predict that they would not do well, regardless of what mode they took a course in, that's a different -- the data we have seen to this point can be interpreted differently than if there was, you know, a regular distribution of students that took those courses and the performance overall is much less. So, yeah, we have to look at that. That's part of the work that's going on now, so --

CHAIRMAN RICH: Okay. Senator Howley, were you seeking the floor?

SENATOR HALLETT: I just wanted to clarify something -- thank you for recognizing me, Chair Rich -- is that the spring semester courses are actually not the same as the fall semester courses, so the data from this spring semester I don't think will bring any additional clarity because they are different courses.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: That's a very good point, they are different courses, but the program as a whole includes the courses from both semesters, and if the programmatic performance looks like it's better in the spring than the fall, knowing there's differences because they're different courses, we still would want to know that.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Right. Figure out what to make of it.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Right.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there any other questions? Senator Feltey.

SENATOR FELTEY: Thank you, Chair Rich.

My question is about House Bill 48, which is the gun bill that would allow carrying weapons on campus, and I hear from colleagues at Kent that their President and Board have been asked to weigh in on the university's position because it will be -- if it, in fact, passes in Columbus, it'll be up to individual universities then to pass a policy about what will be permitted at individual campuses.

I personally -- I teach in a lecture hall much larger than this, and I don't relish the thought of walking in and imagining guns in handbags and pockets, but there's always online, so I'll hide there safely. But part of my concern is, and I'm sure some of my colleagues share this, is there's evidence in states where it's been passed that faculty are being advised to be less controversial in their classes, to kind of address students in a way that'll be not upsetting, in one workshop there was actually a PowerPoint that was then distributed pretty widely and these points were the exact points that were made, so I raise that as a point of concern for our campus and hoping that we're not going to have our students packing heat while we're trying to teach them.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, the Senator's comments are certainly well placed. Just so everyone knows, my understanding is that this bill would permit individual boards of trustees at individual universities in the State of Ohio to decide whether or not they wanted to allow such activity to occur.

SENATOR FELTEY: Right.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I can tell you if I was asked, it would be absolutely the most unreasonable thing, in my opinion, to permit such activity on campus. We have a very good -- our UAPD is a very good police force, they are professional, we live in -- our institution is in a city, but we have a very well-controlled campus, and even off-campus environment. I see no -- I see no value added to our students in the learning process to have people have firearms on campus. And I'm not opposed to firearms, but I am on campus. If I were asked. So that would be my position from an academic perspective. It serves no useful purpose on a campus like this.

SENATOR FELTEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I wonder whether Senator Feltey might have meant to inquire about whether the administration is communicating its views on this subject to the legislature either directly or through the Inter-University Council.

SENATOR FELTEY: Thank you, Chair Rich.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This was discussed at the IUC Provost meeting I attended, the one prior to the last. I missed the last one because I had some other duties. Basically all the provosts agreed with basically what I just said. There was no one in the room that thought that their boards would ever go that direction, and none of them would recommend and they would fight against such direction.

I do not know whether our institution is talking with the legislation about this issue or not. That's not -- I don't know that. But, again, if the Bill is passed and each Board has its own autonomy to decide what to do, obviously that's when we would want to be bringing our voice forward saying, you know, we don't know that this is a very good idea.

Again, I can't speak for the Board, but, you know, we can speak for ourselves. And I think that, again, faculty and student voice carries a lot of weight. Maybe the response time isn't as immediate as we would hope, but response time aside; it carries a lot of weight.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there other questions for the Provost? Thank you, Mr. Provost.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The next item on the agenda is the approval of the commencement list for spring 2016. Is there a motion to approve that list, subject, of course, to successful completion of any outstanding requirements? It's been moved by Senator Allen. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Saliga. Any debate on the motion? All in favor, signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.) Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent.

Next are the committee reports. First, the Curriculum Review Committee. I should have just suggested that you stay put.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Curriculum Review Committee brings forward a two-page list of curriculum proposals that have come through without any pending issues or concerns. We would like to make a motion from committee that these be approved by this body.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The committee's -- the approval of this is moved by the committee. It does not require a second. Is there any debate on the motion to approve these curriculum changes? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.) Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you. The next item is the report of the Academic Policies Committee. The chairman of the committee is Liz Kennedy.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: I feel a little pre-empted.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Yeah, sorry about that.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: That's okay. Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I just couldn't stop myself.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: I know. This is a moment we have all been waiting for, the report from the Academic Policies Committee.

On Tuesday April 5th, the Academic Policies Committee discussed the block cohort enrollment and preregistration initiative utilized primarily by the Center for Academic Advising and Student Success. On the day of new student orientation, incoming freshmen are preregistered in courses, including specific sections and day/time combinations, prior to advising and without student input. Registration holds are also applied which prohibit students from altering the fall schedule without adviser consent. From the student perspective, these practices constitute the wholesale elimination of choice inherent in the transition to college from the institutional perspective, these initiatives fundamentally alter enrollment patterns, arbitrarily boosting enrollment in specific sections and departments by limiting access to others. Further, thoughtful input in the development and implementation of these course blocks from chairs, directors and faculty, those individuals who develop class schedules based upon student need and demand, has been minimal, at best. For these reasons, among others, the Academic Policies Committee recommends suspension of these practices.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you. The motion is on the floor. It is to recommend suspension of the practices just described, which we have been informed have actually been suspended as of today. As of today?

SENATOR RAMSIER: (Nodding affirmatively.)

CHAIRMAN RICH: Is there debate on the motion? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.) Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Next is the report of the University Libraries Committee. Senator Miller.

SENATOR MILLER: Is it all right if I stay here?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Yes, you may.

SENATOR MILLER: Next, the University Libraries Committee has been meeting this semester, and one of the things we have discussed in addition, I guess, to the libraries strategic plan is our institutional repository, which is a digital commons product from a company called Be press that we have branded IdeaExchange, and it's one of six digital commons repositories in the state. If you wanted to look at Toledo, Bowling Green, Cleveland State, Kent State, they are also developing institutional repositories under their own sort of goofy names like IdeaExchange, that EngagedScholar I think is the name of one of them, they all sort of look the same. The University Libraries Committee will bridge forth a proposal to the Senate next month for your approval to create a Faculty Senate Committee to provide editorial and operational oversight of policies for starting series in the repository, guidelines, I think there needs to just sort of be general advice, if people want to start journals, there should be questions, such as intellectual property questions and so forth, so then we'd like to propose a creation of a Scholarly Communications Committee, and that would be at the May meeting.

In the meantime, if you are interested in the repository, you could contact me or I can invite you to the University Libraries Committee meeting next week when we sort of hash out the proposal. And I just wanted to give you that heads-up. You can watch for it later this month, it'll come, and it'll be an action item for May.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there any questions for Senator Miller in his capacity as Chair of the University Libraries Committee?

SENATOR MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you. Next is the report of the Athletics Committee. John Nicholas, Chair of the committee.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Mr. Chairman. Faculty Senate Athletics Committee met twice in March. We met on March 8th and on March 28th. I will start with the latter meeting first. In that meeting, it was attended by Faculty Athletic Director to the NCAA Deborah Owens who briefed the committee on initiatives and discussions from recent NCAA meetings. Among the topics discussed were the Mid-American Conference graduation rates versus the federal rate. Also discussed were the graduation rate of the University of Akron athletics versus MAC schools and also the federal rate. Also Athletic Director Larry Williams talked about his dedicated to academics. He mentioned discussions which was a carryover from the previous meeting on changing the incentive for coaches to include academic success, attendance in classes, and graduation rate as opposed to just wins and losses, so we saw that as a positive sign with the athletic director. The budget for the UA Athletics Department was discussed in great detail.

Coincidentally, that same morning The Plain Dealer published a report highlighting the expenditures of academics on all of the state athletics programs. We were the third highest among state athletics. However, some changes in accounting methods were used so the increase in that budget over last year included the debt service for InfoCision Stadium, some other things that were moved over, so I wanted to just say that we have been watching the budget as a committee very closely and don't be fooled by the budget being incredibly higher than last year, it's just a different way of reporting and the way the budgeting is done. I believe that that amount and perhaps, Mr. Provost, you can correct me on this, but I think the debt service on that is about four and a half million dollars a year?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yes.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Which was included in that budget. I don't know that other schools are reporting it that way, so to put us third highest in the state may be a little misleading.

Also worth noting and included in that budget is scholarship money and that money then is returned back to the university in the form of tuition payments and housing and meal plans. So that's also a big chunk of that budget. I think that's roughly about \$9 million of the budget that is sent to them, but then comes right back into the budget that way. I think the total cost to the university this year is about \$19 million. That number is raw, there was some fuzziness in the discussions, but it was roughly \$19 million cost.

We also have a Head Injury Subcommittee that is discussing how, even though we have a very good policy in the Athletics Department for reporting head injuries of athletes, we wondered is that fair that they can then be reported, their head injury reported to their faculty when somebody else who may be in a car accident or injured at work who would have the same cognitive problems related to head injuries cannot report through HIPAA, so the Head Injury Subcommittee is working on getting that information out, letting students know they can go through the Academic -- the Accessibility Committee to report that and also report it to their professors so we can then keep an eye on them in class, if they are displaying any symptoms of head injuries that we think are concerning, we can get involved at that point.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The Office of Accessibility I think is what you are referring to.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: The Office of Accessibility. Excuse me. There was a March 8th meeting. Chair Bill Rich was in attendance to report on his impressions from the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics. COIA is an alliance of faculty senates from the NCAA FBS Division. Its mission is to provide a national faculty voice on intercollegiate sports issues. Their areas of concern include academic integrity, equality, student athlete welfare, campus government, governance of intercollegiate athletics, commercialization and fiscal responsibility.

Two years ago when I came before you, we vote on a temporary membership for two years. I also was voted to be the representative of this body to COIA. However, the first year I had some personal reasons, I couldn't attend. This year Chair Rich attended. He extended the opportunity for me to go. However, our department that Monday was going through accreditation and it made it a little tight for me there, so Chair Rich went. His impressions were very favorable of the committee, and we did not get to vote to recommend permanent membership in that committee on that day because we did not have a quorum so on the March 29th meeting we did have a quorum, and the motion was made by Tim Lillie that the Faculty Senate Athletic Committee recommend to this body that we become a permanent member of COIA, and the motion passed without dissent.

CHAIRMAN RICH: So that recommendation is, that action item is now before the body. I have already -- I talked to you last month a little bit about my experience at the annual meeting of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and I would only add that I concur in the committee's recommendation. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Allen?

SENATOR ALLEN: No, question later.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Any debate on the motion? All in favor signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.) Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted. Thank you.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I did have -- there may be other questions.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN RICH: And I have a question. On I think it was the first point, the budgetary point, the comparison of athletic expenditures to other universities in the state, you said that the University of Akron was the third highest. Is that in absolute dollars or relative to total budget of the University or some other relative measure?

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: That was absolute dollars.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Absolute dollars. Okay.

And the problem that you identified which is different universities have different ways of accounting, have different ways of structuring their budgets, is one that's endemic and it always makes those comparisons fairly dicey, and I don't know how much information the committee was able to obtain about what goes into the Athletics Committee -- the intercollegiate athletics expenditures figure in other universities' budgets. We have made what I would consider to be progress in terms of incorporating into that budget things that really do belong in that budget and were not in it in previous years. Do you have any sense of what other universities' practices are in that regard?

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: No, I don't. The report in The Plain Dealer just talked about the number of teams and the number of undergraduate students, they broke it down per cost that way, but they didn't say how they -- what was included in those budgets at all.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Okay. Thank you. Are there questions for the Chair of the Athletic Committee? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich, if I am figuring this correctly, the number I heard was \$35 million this year. If I divide that by 475 million, I believe that comes out to be close to 7.4 percent of our budget. My understanding is also that the total cost, when you go from deans below, is approximately 15 percent of the total budget. If I understand correctly, then, we are spending almost half as much money on this university for athletics than we are for academics. And that is shocking to me. Particularly when you consider that those other two universities, one is Ohio State, as a percentage of their budget, they actually make money on athletics, and the other one is the University of Cincinnati that has a much, much larger budget. When you compare our athletic budget to other MAC schools, it does seem out of whack, and you can say, well, it's because of debt servicing on a stadium, but it is what it is. And I have a real concern about spending half as much on athletics as, if I understand correctly, as academics.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Your point is duly noted. And one of the reasons why we have been having these discussions with the athletic director. However, it seems to me, and correct me if I'm wrong, that the administration is dedicated to athletics, and the purpose of our –

SENATOR ALLEN: We can tell. Yes.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: The purpose of our committee is to be advisory, at best.

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: And we do our best to make sure we are graduating our athletes and that their academic end of it is good. We can't do much more about the budget from our end.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Allen, I wonder about the calculations that you just offered. I share the concern ultimately. I think our expenditures on intercollegiate athletics, and especially football, are excessive, and I have looked at our expenditures in relation to the MAC universities, particularly in attending a meeting of the faculty senate chairs of the MAC universities, but I do find it hard to actually imagine that we spend half as much on intercollegiate athletics as we do on academics. I do wonder about that assertion.

SENATOR ALLEN: Could you explain where my numbers are wrong?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Well, I think we would have to sit down together and figure out what your numbers are and how you got them.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay. I guess I would ask we do that.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I mean it doesn't change, for me, it doesn't change the bottom line, which is we are spending too much. I just wonder whether that assertion is correct.

SENATOR ALLEN: I think it is.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I actually have numbers, because as part of the AAUP negotiations we were able to get numbers. Approximately 12 percent of the university's operating budget is salary and benefits of full-time faculty, both tenure track, tenured and nontenure track. That does not include a lot of things that are called academics, which includes things like secretaries, Xerox machines, the heating and lighting of offices. So those are all part of the academic budget, but for straight salary and benefits of full-time faculty, yes, it's correct, that actually the amount we spend on athletics is more than half of that amount.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are you saying that the amount that we spend on personnel in athletics is more than half of the amount that we spend on personnel for academics; is that what you are saying?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: No, the 35 million that Senator Allen quoted is more than half of –

CHAIRMAN RICH: Right, but that seems like apples to oranges. Right?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I mean if you are going to include all the intercollegiate athletic expenditures, not just personnel, and compare that to personnel expenditures on the academic side, you are not comparing the same thing.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I just wanted to give an accurate number on faculty salaries.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Clearly what we need here is some analysis of the data. And I really appreciate our representative saying, you know, sort of saying, well it's not this, it's not that, but I think, I would ask, I think it would be legitimate to ask the committee to form a subcommittee to, in fact, come up with what is the amount and also to make

an estimate of how we could indeed reduce the budget. I think that's what is the job of the committee. You shouldn't really expect the director of athletics to do it, it's not in his self-interest, but it is in ours. And I think if we do that, now, you may have to get in touch with the University Council Budget Committee, by all means, I know we know that they have a tremendous amount to do, but you can at least get data from them and you can include subcommittee members that are not on your Senate -- your -- on the -- extra people. You are allowed to get extra people.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The Executive Committee can appoint them.

SENATOR ERICKSON: The Executive Committee can find them for you, and I strongly suggest that you do.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I think that while it may make sense for the Athletics Committee to take a look at the relevant information from the budget and obtain them from the University Council's Budget and Finance Committee, I don't think that the Executive Committee chose the members of the Athletics Committee, and because of their interest and knowledge about matters of budget and finance.

SENATOR ERICKSON: No.

CHAIRMAN RICH: And I think it might even stretch the charge of that committee under the Faculty Senate Bylaws to put a lot of that burden on them. But what they could, I think, reasonably do is to ask the University Council Budget and Finance Committee for the relevant information --

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: -- and then offer their own judgment about the appropriateness of the level of spending on intercollegiate athletics. Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: One more followup. My point is not that the evil Athletic Department should be cut. That is not what I am suggesting at all. I am saying you need proportionality.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Well, there are only two ways to achieve proportionality.

SENATOR ALLEN: And my point is that maybe we should consider if we are spending a high enough percentage on academics, not necessarily that athletics is overspending.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Right. So --

SENATOR ALLEN: So let me, let me emphasize, I am not necessarily attacking athletics, I am saying it seems myopic for a university of higher education that claims it emphasizes academics to spend, depending on how you figure it, this sort of ratio.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Yeah. And if we were to conclude --

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: -- that there is a disproportionately there, then the question would be how to make the adjustment.

SENATOR ALLEN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN RICH: And to increase the expenditures on academics, as I'm pretty sure we would conclude is needed, would require moving it from somewhere else or else an increase in revenue. The somewhere else might -- the possible sources could include intercollegiate athletics.
Senator Saunders.

SENATOR SAUNDERS: Yes, I was just curious if you knew the exact financial benefit of winning the Idaho Bowl. And then should that raise the expectation moving forward that athletics could support more of their program financially?

CHAIRMAN RICH: I'm sure the Chairman would be delighted to answer the question of the exact financial benefit of the famous Potato Bowl.
What is that number?

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Well, the exact -- I can say this: That before we went to the Idaho Potato Bowl, they were expecting to lose --

CHAIRMAN RICH: Isn't it the Idaho Famous Potato Bowl?

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Famous Potato Bowl. Yes, the Idaho Famous Potato Bowl. The athletic department was actually expecting to lose about a quarter of a million dollars just sending the football team, not including the band. And the athletic director was very upfront with that in our December meeting.

However, a good thing happened. The way the money is divvied up is the better your conference does, and in this case the Mid-America Conference won a lot of Bowl games, so we moved up in the rankings from 9th to 7th, which means that the pool of money that comes from this football, however they do the magic college football playoff system, some more money came in and we actually broke even on that game. The only one we lost was the choice to send the band to support them. And from that, I think a benefit that we can't directly measure, but there was a band competition before the game that was on national TV, and that the University of Akron band performed very well and they interviewed some of the students afterwards, so we did, in fact, get some free marketing from the band competition before the game. But the actual cost of sending the football team to the bowl game actually turned out to break even.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Other questions for the Chair of the Athletics Department? Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes, thank you, Chair Rich.

So I'm not really a finance person and I'm really quite curious to be schooled or educated with respect to, what recoups the costs of the program? Can you tell me in broad terms what two or three of the major means of recouping the costs might be? And, for example, tickets I would imagine to, you know, to individuals who are attending the game. But what else? Student fees?

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Well, student fees do play a part in it. The two areas that the athletic department has direct control over are ticket sales. Well, if we win and people come, I guess they don't control that. And philanthropy. They have an Office of Development there and they look to area businesses and individuals to donate to offset some of that cost.

I know before Tom Wistrill left, I haven't heard the numbers from this year, but we were getting a little over a million dollars from philanthropy and other folks, and ticket sales were basically hurting us because nobody was going to the football games. The basketball games tend to fill, but it's a small arena, so there's not a lot of profit in that. So the way that -- the best hope the Athletic Department has in those revenue streams is to increase ticket sales to get people into the seats and also to push on their donors to donate more in terms of sponsorship and things like that.

CHAIRMAN RICH: There are also some television revenues.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Yeah. Yeah. The MAC does have television contracts, we do get something in that, but it's not a significant amount of money.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: But the revenues from ticket sales and television and the philanthropy combined don't come anywhere close to covering the cost. Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: I wanted to ask about the first thing that you were talking about Deborah Owens giving a report on the academic performance of -- how are our student athletes doing? How do they stack up compared to the MAC or compared to, you know, the rest of the country, and how do they compare to our own nonathlete students? That's something that I have always kind of wondered about when I start saying, oh, look at that athlete did well or didn't do well.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Actually, compared to our regular students, the graduation rate of our athletics students are very high. It's bolstered by women's golf and men's golf

and the Olympic sports, track and field. Areas where we hurt a little bit are football and basketball, although basketball came up significantly this year. I was informed that after the incident a few years ago with our point guard that Coach Dambrot has gone out of his way to bring in high quality people, he's not so much worried about talent, he would rather have a high quality individual here than somebody that has talent. And so the basketball scores have come up.

The athletic director did say he has been in discussions with the football coach and, again, talking about changing the incentives for the coaches for attendance in class and academics performance.

So we compared favorably, I think we were third in the MAC overall, comparing to other schools. Certain sports did better. Again, women's and men's golf are through the roof. They had an average GPA of like 3.8, 3.9. I think that football, off the top of my head, football was about 2.8, basketball was around 3.0, women's basketball was a little higher, and then the track and field team and the rifle team were all very high. So performing academically, I think our student athletes are doing very well, with the exception of football, and they are working to address that.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Gandee.

SENATOR GANDEE: Previously you have had counseling programs operating for those athletes. Has any research been done over the years on the successes, best practices and so forth in that? Or has that been turned over to success coaches?

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Now, I know Anne Jorgensen is in charge of that. Perhaps I can ask her about that, any research that was done. But I do know, because I do have a lot of athletes in my classes, that they have the GradesFirst program, so that you probably, if you have an athlete in there, they send it out, they keep on top of these athletes pretty well, and I do know they were sending out graduate students to courses where they thought students might be not attending classes to make sure that the students were in the class, and if they are absent, they do get on them and make sure that their attendance is up. So they do a very good job, I think, with their academic advising, but I don't know of any research.

SENATOR GANDEE: Do you know the ratio of athlete to adviser in that program?

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: No. No, I don't know. I can ask Anne that at the next meeting and put it in next month's report, though.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Any other questions for the Chair of the Athletics Committee? Thank you. Oh, Senator Cutright.

SENATOR CUTRIGHT: So I do have one issue. I have had four occurrences personally where I am the direct admin adviser for my department and the athletic adviser has violated prerequisites –

VOICE: Yeah.

SENATOR CUTRIGHT: -- and the student fails. So they need this class first, they put them in this one just to keep them academically eligible moving toward the degree, and then they are surprised when they fail because they haven't had this class. So in that aspect, athletics is not doing a good job.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: I agree with that. I have found out through similar fashion that athletic advising has the ability to override a lot of things that perhaps other students do, and since you brought that up, and I'm glad that you did, we will put that on the agenda as a point of discussion for next month's meeting and we can talk to Anne Jorgensen about that and get some answers.

SENATOR CUTRIGHT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Athletic advisers have the authority to –

SENATOR CUTRIGHT: Yes, they can put them in any class they want.

CHAIRMAN RICH: -- disregard prerequisites? I learned something today. Any other questions for the Chair of the Athletics Committee? Thank you.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The next item on the agenda is the report from Carolyn Behrman, Faculty Director of Collaboration of the EXL Center. Come on down. Thank you for joining us.

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: Thanks. I appreciate the offer this afternoon. Stand there? All right. Hi. How much time do you want me to spend explaining?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Well, let's negotiate. How much time do you need?

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: I can talk for a long time

CHAIRMAN RICH: Well, the goal is not to talk for a long time, but on the other hand, we do want to be well informed.

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: Okay. So for those of you who are not familiar with what has evolved in terms of the EXL Center, sometime last summer, prior to the firing of 216 people, the President of the University identified two strategic initiatives, one of which

was the Big Data Center with Dr. Mario Garzia and the other one was Jeff Hoffman's attachment which is something we were developing to the Experiential Learning Center. When Hoffman, who is not faculty -- do I need to explain who he is?

CHAIRMAN RICH: I think people are generally aware.

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: Okay. Not faculty, arrived on campus, he decided to, appealingly, visit with people on campus who are engaged in experiential learning and asked them three questions: What do they do that's experiential learning? What do they need to do what they are doing or do it better? And what would they like to see happen at the University of Akron in terms of experiential learning? And they really, many of you were probably in those small meetings with them, they went to groups of two or three faculty at a time and they asked. And then sometime in the middle of the fall they invited the faculty who they had talked to to come, if they felt like it, to a table, and that evolved into a Faculty Advisory Council to what became the Experiential Learning Center.

The reason why I'm telling you all of this is actually because this process is the reason why I went to the table and became part of the Faculty Advisory Council, because they actually asked us what we did and asked us how we would do it better, but then I also agreed in January to leave that Advisory Council and join Hoffman and his resource director, Ian Schwarber, as the faculty collaboration director.

Just so you know, my position with the center is a short-term position, so it's two or possibly three, depending on evaluation, years, after which, assuming the center is still here, it would move on to a new faculty member, ideally from another part of the university, so that the effort to encourage experiential learning as a component of academic learning on campus would be distributed more effectively.

The center does not deal with the part of experiential learning that happens when students are presidents of clubs or other sorts of things, but the whole title of the center is the Experiential Learning Center For Entrepreneurship and Civic Engagement. And the goal of the center is to support and enhance activities that are already taking place by faculty within courses or within independent studies or to support the efforts that already exist on campus in terms of internships and co-ops. That internships and co-ops component is largely housed in the Career Services Unit which was already here, it used to be called Career Center, now it's called Career Services. So my job with the center is to work with faculty to increase experiential learning.

For those of you who know Theresa Beyerle, I hope you're thinking that's her job. And she did a really good job and they, for a variety of reasons that I am not privy to, did not retain her in that position and she is not really replaceable, so as a faculty member who is engaged in the faculty activities, I'm doing a slightly different thing, but the EXL Center generated resources from a number of sources, the initial funding for Hoffman's position I believe comes through that \$10 million –

CHAIRMAN RICH: New initiatives, yes.

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: -- new initiatives, but Schwarber's resources came from a donation to the University of Akron Research Foundation and the money for my position is part of a budget that was given to the EXL Center which I don't actually know the source of. I could guess. But anyway, the arrangement is that I am continuing in my salary, but the money that the EXL Center is given is equivalent to my salary to my department to replace me for the duration of the time that I am with the center. So that's the structure, and then the content, what we are doing, and it's available on our website, but I don't think this is as clear as it could be, which is why I am very grateful to be able to come and talk to you, is trying to support faculty-driven initiatives in experiential learning and help people, faculty, who would like to overcome barriers to combining experiential learning with coursework.

I personally see this as a way of standing, and I apologize to all of you who are not in opposition to this, but standing in opposition to the trend toward online courses, because I think you can do experiential learning online, and if the next person follows me or the administration feels differently, it might look differently, but right now what we're supporting with my efforts is initiatives by faculty to embed experiences that are relevant to their course content, so curricularly relevant experiences into their classes or into embedded studies.

I can give you the three examples of the faculty-driven initiatives demonstration projects that Hoffman approved. They are in white paper form, which is a single sheet, double-sided, in PDF on our website, if you want more detail, but in short form, the first of them is an effort to demonstrate that we can do experiential learning in the service of scholarship for faculty who are in the tenure track, and so Hazel Barton from biology stepped up and she has a proposal that the EXL Center is finding as one of these three faculty-driven initiatives to embed experiential learning in almost a yearlong process so that she can then generate a really impressive broader impacts component of her NSF proposal for her research on Pine Ridge Reservation in the Wind Caves.

I would love to give you more detail on that. You can ask me questions on it afterwards if you want more detail.

The second one is two faculty members from sociology who have a long, deep, rich research project connecting services for victims and witnesses of violent crimes and the Cleveland Police Department as first responders, they would like to model it, now that they have been studying it for a number of years, they would like to model it for the City of Akron, and they are stretched because they are teaching a heavy load and they have intro level classes that are essentially doing different things that demand different parts of their heads and they would like to build curriculum that reaches and stretches between -- so that sort of stretches across that gap connecting the graduate students to those courses in ways that make it more experiential for the undergrads, not that the

undergrad intro students would be all out in the field, but that they would get an experience and an exposure. And it would be intelligently curricularly connected. And then the final one, which has caused a lot of confusion, is the unclasses concept, and the unclasses concept is basically a small scale effort to take on the challenge of trying to develop innovative classes in departments -- well, actually I should say in disciplines, that get canceled because they are too small. So canceling small format classes makes it very hard for us to innovate new and interesting classes and so we combined that with the idea of experiential learning and came up with a, granted slightly out there, idea that we could create teams of students across disciplines to address a community-based research question and the students would get this experiential learning team-based opportunity, the faculty member could explore upper division content in their own field through that course, and the experience would address a community concern.

So to get there, we tossed out an idea, a challenge, we asked people to spit out ideas they have about community climate change, and people gave us about 140 or so suggestions, and those were the ones that were usable, we had a lot of silly suggestions, but the 140ish suggestions then were shared with anyone who would come and look at them, and we asked students to vote on things they actually thought they found compelling. We asked faculty members to look at them and think, is there any way that I connect with these concerns? And in the end, three faculty groups have stepped up and said that they want to try this and they actually, I have to say, combined a lot of the ideas from 140 into smaller packets, and so we are asking John Green to work with those three groups of faculty, one person will be the faculty member of record, the other faculty members involved are simply interested in this process and have agreed to support the faculty members choosing to do this in a variety of ways.

If this works, the dean is going to wait until the chair and the faculty members in the given departments agree that this is a good idea for their department, so if the department really doesn't wish to engage their faculty in that way, obviously it can't happen, but if the faculty members and the department agree, the chair, the dean and the faculty members will sit down and the EXL Center will pay to give the department resources to pay someone else to take over a class from the faculty member of record for the semester in question and allow that faculty member to not hurt their department by losing student credit hours, but run a small format class, Green has agreed there could be seven or eight students, and then further agreed, and Dr. Ramsier also was involved in the conversation, that they won't cancel the classes if some of the students are enrolled and some of the -- in the class, which would be a special topics class, and some of the students are independent study students from other disciplines -- other departments, I should say. It's complicated. I'm sorry.

We have, like I said, three groups that have step forward with interest for this fall and possibly an additional two for next spring. We never envisioned this as being something other than a small action on campus that gives people a chance to experiment and sort

of feel a little more enthusiastic about the interaction, the interdisciplinary interactions we can generate here on campus, but it's an experiment.

So that's the third of these, and the other resource that the EXL Center is attempting to use to generate stronger experiential learning is exactly what Theresa Beyerle did, but without her strong network, unfortunately, that is to use smaller amounts of money for people who are doing community-based research, service learning, et cetera, in classes who need small amounts of money to move students from one place to another or support with their community partner. So if that was not too unclear. Is that good enough?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Yes. Will you take questions?

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: Yes, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there questions for Professor Behrman? Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chair Rich, and thank you, Carolyn, for coming to tell us about this. I just had a couple questions, one of which you personally addressed in the small class formula. From what you said, I understand that to be only if it's a team? But I'm wondering about, for future proposals, if there could be a smaller class formula just by a single professor in a single department -- a single course in a single department? And, second, you know, for me, one of the very best experiential learning opportunities is study abroad, and if there were a course that could either, maybe perhaps the entire course isn't taught abroad, but a component of it involves travel, what kinds of resources does the University or the EXL Center would they possibly provide for that very important learning experience?

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: Yeah, so you -- those are both -- the former, the first question is a great question, and the Faculty Advisory Council for the EXL Center meets once a -- actually, we were down to once every two weeks, but we're going to try and spread it back to once a month. Please come to the May meeting, if you're interested. It was open door to begin with. The Advisory Council, which is literally just faculty members who came to the table, is going to reorganize itself a little bit to be a little bit more functional. They advised Hoffman and me on what they think should happen next and that question is this experiment is just an experiment and if it looks like an interesting one, then the next question might be how else could it look? And maybe it should be within departments.

We initially started with interdisciplinary departments because the people around that table were interdisciplinary and were finding it inspiring to be working with each other, so I'm sure that'll stay a component, if it survives, but I don't see a reason why it couldn't also take the format of being experiential learning experiment within a department. It just didn't start that way. So I don't see why it couldn't. Come suggest it.

SENATOR KLEIN: When is the meeting?

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: The meetings, the next meeting is the first Wednesday in May, 8:30 to 10. I'm not positive, I think that's the 4th. I think.

CHAIRMAN RICH: It would be the day of the Faculty, the morning of the Faculty Senate.

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: And the second question you asked is really important because I don't -- there is not a good answer to that right now. We killed international student programs, we have reduced resources all over the place. A gentleman I don't know named Dave Black is all alone in an office trying to manage a huge number of things and they have -- modern languages people, if they are here, will tell us just exactly how crazy it got in terms of canceling study abroad and then reinstating some.

We -- right now, on those three faculty-driven initiatives, for the entire process, assuming we can pull it off, we're spending about \$62,000. So that doesn't go very far for study abroad.

I think study abroad is vital. And I don't know where they are going to put it and I don't know how we are going to resource it, and we are clearly not rich enough as a site to resource it right now. I will, in this time period that I am here, I will do everything I can to influence Hoffman on the topic, but I think he's pretty convinced that it's vital, and not necessarily that it belongs in the EXL Center, but maybe where it should be, which is in an actually study abroad office of some sort that's parallel that we could partner with. That's what I got.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there other questions for Professor Behrman? Thank you.

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: Wait.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Oh. Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes. The issue I think that -- we don't have our member of the Executive Committee who had brought up this issue here, so I'm going to bring it up in actual fact, but I think the issue, it's not the exploratory nature of it, it's the fact that if you are going one step further, you absolutely have to deal with a whole lot of barriers on getting interdisciplinary anything working on this campus, and I would urge your Advisory Committee to be involved in that whole discussion, which has got a history that goes back to the '70s, which is no, no, no, no, no.

On occasion, yes, but if you try to make it so that you, as you said, you have got one faculty members that's getting the okay on this, the others are involved, but what's the SCH for them? What about the students who are involved? Where does the credits count? There's a whole lot of institutional issues which our college has discussed on occasion, which have come up again, we had an ad hoc committee from this body looking into interdisciplinary issues, a number of us were on it, and nothing has

happened. And I think we really need to have a set of groups. I know I suspect this will come out also of our own college strategic planning, but it's also from your Advisory Committee to try and finally do something about it, to make this work more effectively if, as I expect, it will show some real promise because, as you said, once you had a group of interdisciplinary faculty together, they had great ideas that could make a difference to the quality of the degrees of our students.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you.

PROFESSOR BEHRMAN: Thank you. All right?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you. Next item on the agenda is a report from the Graduate Council representatives. I believe Senator Sterns has a report.

SENATOR STERNS: Well, good afternoon, everyone. I have asked Heather to share with you a one-page document which was shared with the Graduate Council. Does everybody have that?

Let me start by saying that one of the things that has been accomplished between the Faculty Senate and the Grad Council, I can say, and I hope you will agree with me, that there has been a full integration now. The representatives from the Faculty Senate have full commitment and authority in the committee, they are taking on assignments, they are involved in decision making, and for a number of years we had a major issue of the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Graduate School. And I just wanted to say that I am pleased about that, and if you -- what I'm really talking about is the fact that when Graduate Council passes various pieces of legislation, or recommendations, they come to the Faculty Senate for final approval. In an earlier period of time there was a denial that that was the case. We have overcome that.

What you have in this document, and I asked Dean Midha if I could share this with everyone, because it was just presented to the committee earlier this week, on Monday, if I'm still remembering correctly, and what we have here is the strategic initiatives that are currently being promulgated by the Graduate School. The Grad Council has discussed them. I can't say that we have had an inordinate amount of input into them, but the opportunity to build off of them is certainly there. So I don't think you want me to enthusiastically read this to you, but I think the important thing is the communication.

I think it's interesting, in view of our recent discussion, encourage the development of interdisciplinary graduate programs within/between colleges should be noted. As a institute director of an interdisciplinary center that just celebrated its 40th anniversary, I can tell you that it has been an ongoing challenge all of this time, and I'm ashamed to say that the one group that I did not join yet, even though we have had practica in our institute since 1977, I'm embarrassed that we're not part of the initiative,

so please pull me into that, and our faculty, because we have had various interdisciplinary experiences.

What I think is important here is, of course, the discussion of the support and graduate assistantships. We know that that has been held at basically the same levels, but -- and obviously we are interested, one of the issues is a formula on how to change the out-of-state tuition. That has not been finalized. It is under discussion. Another thing is continuous review of graduate admissions standards and processes. Those are things we need to keep monitoring closely. And this one is very important: Establish minimum discipline-specific stipend levels for teaching, research, and administrative graduate assistants.

We know, by the way, that our assistantships in many respects are not as competitive as they need to be, and that's an understatement. But my job is not to comment on each item here personally, so I just wanted just to highlight a few. One of the things, of course, that has been initiated is creating new masters programs that will allow for credit, for monetary generation, and would not be supported. And I believe, Phil, you are chairing a task force to look at those also, masters programs that are --

SENATOR ALLEN: Actually, Shiva and I are part of a subcommittee on something else that I would like to follow up on in just a second.

SENATOR STERNS: Yeah, please do. The other thing that I think is very important, what I meant to say, was develop new master's-level non-thesis professional programs marketed to self-paying graduate students.

The other thing, of course, is ongoing issues of equality within the graduate faculty and maintaining guidelines. As you know, many departments have additional requirements above those at the Graduate School, so that's an ongoing issue as well. So all I can say is here's what's in movement. If you think there are other priorities that should be here, I know that the Grad Council is very happy to accept them, and so please share your concerns with us.

Our graduate programs on this campus, we have worked very hard over the last 40 years or so to get them to be strong, and many of them are nationally ranked. I think what we have to really pay attention to is how we maintain the quality of these programs and not let them get eroded. Enough said.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Are there questions for Senator Sterns? And I understand that Senator Allen also wishes to report, but I was going to ask whether there are any questions for Senator Sterns in his capacity as Faculty Senate representative to the Graduate Council before Senator Allen reports.

SENATOR ALLEN: I think mine is just a clarification that someone may have a question if they look at this. I know I would. It's the 12-12-6 part, and people look at that and at

first they have a heart attack saying, oh, you are cutting back funding for graduate students. That was done after a very careful analysis of what departments were actually doing, and that exceeds what departments are actually having students enroll in. So this is not a cutback in coverage of tuition, but it is designed as a mechanism that will make the official cost of that go way down, which is actually the cost that is being spent now and may give a mechanism for funding higher stipend.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you. Senator Sterns?

SENATOR STERNS: And if I may make additional comment. This issue of what out-of-state tuition would be, I think the Board of Regents will allow a minimum of at least a dollar differential between in-state and out-of-state. But the fact of the matter is we have been paying, and the budgets have reflected, very full out-of-state tuition costs which basically we charge to ourselves. And so in the budget process, how we factor in these, the cost of these out-of-state stipends is really an important topic. Because it means that we may be able to fund more students if we calculated our budgets differently.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I had two questions, one for Senator Sterns and one for Senator Allen, Mr. Chair, and the first one, the interdisciplinary program -- I'm sorry, the development of interdisciplinary graduate programs within/between colleges, did you also include within that discussion five-year programs so that you are looking at going from the undergraduates taking that extra year and getting a graduate degree in another department? Because that's a really important idea, and also has potential revenue availabilities. I don't know if you discussed it or not. That was my question.

SENATOR STERNS: Well, frankly, I think that's an excellent point. I would be happy to discuss it. The discussion of all of these items has just begun.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Okay.

SENATOR STERNS: These were brought to Grad Council on Monday. We are in the process of further refining them and discussing them.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Okay. So what you're saying is it's a top-down version, as many of us got our strategic plans, then this is the Graduate School's response to try and do something about it?

SENATOR STERNS: Well, I think the judicious answer would be the Graduate School wanted to get at least the initiatives, strategic initiatives in place enough so they could receive a budget.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Okay.

SENATOR STERNS: But have there been the full extensive discussion that you and I would see as the standard? I can't say that that's happened yet. But in discussing with Dean Midha, he is very open to further discussion.

SENATOR ERICKSON: The other question I had was for Senator Allen. I thought I heard him saying that he is not working on what we are going to do after this next following -- this coming year about graduate assistantships that don't fit into either doctoral programs at one end and nonacademic and are involved in teaching. I thought that was a role that the subcommittee was, in fact, working out what the criteria were and what's to be done about that. Is that not true anymore?

SENATOR ALLEN: It is delayed, yes. It is delayed because everything was funded at the same level for next year as this year. That commitment was made. Next year they will begin that discussion. But it's been delayed for one year.

SENATOR ERICKSON: So you will be starting that discussion in the fall?

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: So my question, Senator Allen, is why -- I understand that there isn't the same urgency if these changes are not to be made for next year, but why can't the discussion proceed starting now?

SENATOR ALLEN: It is --

CHAIRMAN RICH: The history in this area, and in other areas as well, is we wait to have the discussions, and then by the time we start the discussions, it becomes rushed, at best, and sometimes too late.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Exactly.

SENATOR ALLEN: In fairness to the person that is chairing this committee, he has been wearing three hats. Not two, not one, three. Dean Amis. And as soon as he's done being Interim Dean of Engineering and Vice President For Research and Dean of Polymer Science, he's going to stay as Dean of Polymer Science, he intends on discussing this, but there is a temporary delay because he had to step in and do some more stuff. My understanding is that this process will begin soon once we have time.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you.

SENATOR ALLEN: I hope that helps.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you.

SENATOR ERICKSON: No. Makes me even more worried.

CHAIRMAN RICH: I don't see a name tag.

PROFESSOR BENEKE: I'm a guest. May I make a point of clarification?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Would you please identify yourself?

PROFESSOR BENEKE: Yeah. My name is Charles Beneke, I'm Associate Dean for Academics in the Graduate School.

CHAIRMAN RICH: If there's no objection, the Chair recognizes Professor Beneke.

PROFESSOR BENEKE: I just wanted to clarify and say that we began the discussion about a month and a half ago. We had two members of the Graduate Council working, we met weekly, and we have collaboratively formed this strategic plan, and the point of this and getting it going now is so that our discussions begin now as we prepare ourselves and move into next year.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you.
Senator Sterns?

SENATOR STERNS: I just think that one of the things that we should all remember is that Dean Midha has just moved over there, Charles has just joined the staff, so that we are really kind of rebuilding the enterprise. So I think that if people have concerns or specific topics, this is the time to really speak up and to provide input so we can move ahead constructively together.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Anything further in the way of questions for the representatives for the Graduate Council? If not, then next is the report for the University Council representatives. Is there a report? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Senator Lillie is not here today, so -- I'm sorry, I have to let people through.

VOICE: I'm sorry.

SENATOR ERICKSON: No problem. I just have to lift this. I will call also on Senator Sterns because he chairs the University Council Steering Committee, and I will report, however, that we had a meeting of -- the last meeting of University Council came after this, the meeting of this body, and there was not a quorum. And Senator Sterns took the position that you can in emergency, under Robert's Rules, and form -- we formed a subcommittee to look at the report which we gave to you last time about the set of bylaws that came from the consultants from the Associated Board of Governors and we formed a subcommittee that looked at those,

looked at ours, came up with, in fact, a way of integrating from them, but doing an awful lot, 98 percent of what was put in was from ours, plus some more ideas we had, and that was done over spring break with a group that included, was chaired by Senator Lillie, and had Tom Calderone representing chairs and we had a representative of CPAC and SEAC, and Isaac Blattner who represented students, so we had that group -- no, I have got one more, too, and we had, actually, we had two faculty members, doesn't matter who the names are at this point in time, but we formed and sent back a set of bylaws and a letter that represented the reasons we gave for this, even though the Associated Board of Governors did not give reasons for their bylaws, we mirrored the behavior we wanted and presented our reasons, and that has gone to University Council Steering Committee and will be presented at University Council for discussion on Tuesday. Until then, until we have actually done that, I can't really report on anything more.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Sterns, did you wish to say anything?

SENATOR STERNS: Just to add to that, the recommended revisions of the Bylaws have been received. We are treating it as though it's a Bylaws revision of existing Bylaws that we had, so the meeting next week will be the first reading, and there will be the opportunity for further processing and discussion, and then the final vote will take place in May. And then this, of course, will go back to the Board of Trustees for approval. And hopefully after these many years of waiting, we have been in a state of gestation for way longer than we should have been, we would hope that we would have an ultimate birth.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you.

Next, new business. Is there new business to come before the body? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes. I'd like to propose that we end GenEd Core 13 right now. And I actually wrote a resolution. Would this be an appropriate time to read my resolution?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Yes. Yes, it would. Even though I don't think we can end it.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: We can, we can talk.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Well, we can talk. We can certainly talk. Some of us can talk more than others.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. Whereas, the GenEd Core 13 was put into place without meaningful faculty input; and, whereas, the results from the first year have shown it to fail at attracting or retaining or educating our students to a high standards; and, whereas, delays in making decisions about next fall's classes would only hurt our students; therefore, be it resolved that the program should be immediately suspended.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Is there a second?

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes (indicating).

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Klein seconds.

We have a motion and a second. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Gatzia.

SENATOR GATZIA: I actually wanted to object to the Senator Bouchard's point about the program having been implemented without faculty input. I was one of the people who actually was involved in creating a course and it was generated by faculty. Yes, it's true that initially the decision for these courses to be offered was an administration decision, but the faculty actually were engaged in this decision quite extensively.

And I also want to point out that these are online courses. I think what has happened is that the administration miscommunicated how these courses are supposed to be used. So, for example, Senator Bouchard said several times in these meetings that these courses were supposed to be blended, and so I don't think that that was the idea. I think the administration conveyed that information to appease the faculty. These are online courses, they have experiential components in them, and you do meet with the students via WebEx, but there are no requirements to meet physically with students. So technically they are online courses. And as online courses, they actually have gone through, all of these courses have gone through Quality Matters certification, and that is really important because most of the online courses that are offered in the University have not gone through Quality Matters certifications, and many of them that I have seen would not pass Quality Matters certification.

So I think the quality of the courses are really high, the faculty input has been immense, and I think that these courses should at least be continued to be offered. We haven't done any data, we haven't collected any data on alternative online courses, so if we want to compare and make decisions, informed decisions about whether we should cancel this pilot or not, we would need to collect information about all other online courses.

So instead of making decisions, uninformed decisions, I don't think we are in a position to make -- to vote right now. Nor are we in a position to make an informed decision about whether these courses are effective or not, given the minuscule data that we collected. I think there are problems with the way that the courses are implemented. For example, any student can take them. We tried to keep the number of students small, 25 students in each class, but they are very difficult courses. And students have been told that they are very difficult courses, but they prefer online courses to traditional classes, in many cases, and I think these classes are not for all students. I

wouldn't disagree with that. But I don't think that the problems are, in fact, the classes or that the classes haven't received faculty input. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yeah, let me just respond to a couple of those things. What I said was "meaningful faculty input." And certainly in setting it up, there was certainly no consultation with faculty. And, yes, it wasn't just that it implied blended, it said blend, and, in fact, until last week on the website there was a little scene with a happy student sitting in a classroom with one of those little, you know, tablet chairs taking a GenEd Core 13 course. So certainly the implication was that there would be face to face. And a discussion Board is not a face-to-face experiential learning blended course. I have no doubt that some of these are perfectly good courses as created. My concern is that these courses are being offered through Wayne, often by people who have never been vetted by the regular faculty, who developed the courses, that they have little, if any, control over who actually teaches them.

One of the very interesting pieces of data in the report was that the students did worse in these GenEd Core 13 courses than they did in the comparable on-campus, online version of the same course. So I do think that there is a very clear indication there it's not just online.

And I think the whole basic premise of this, I didn't even put this in my resolution, is false. In that the idea was that we could lure freshmen, freshmen who we know, from every study that's ever been done, freshmen are least capable of doing well in an online course. If you have an advanced student who is very motivated, sure, they can learn things in an online course, but a confused student taking their first university courses, every study shows they just don't do as well.

So what we're doing is trying to lure students. It isn't working. Something like two-thirds of the students were our own students already. We promised them cut rate, that was what was supposed to lure them. And so either it was cut rate and we're losing money at a time when the University keeps crying poor now that it can't waste a penny, or, alternately, we aren't actually saving them money. Because if a student takes five courses, it's the same tuition as if they took four courses anyway. And so a full-time student is not saving any money on this.

So I think it was an interesting experiment. I wish that the President had spoken with faculty before announcing this. I think it's time, from what Provost Ramsier was saying, to just stop this program right now, before, rather than after, there are so many students registered that it is essentially impossible, from a practical point of view, to end what is clearly not working either to attract students or to maintain them. The fact that only 16 percent having taken one class in it decided to come back second semester shows that they were not thrilled.

This is not an attack on online courses, even though they are not my favorite. This is an attack on trying to have courses on the cheap as a theoretic way of luring new students when it clearly isn't working and is only hurting them.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Is there further debate on the motion? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I would like to point out that there's a part of me, because I'm not a statistician, I'm an economist, but we use data, and I think that we do need to use data. And that is what we are going to have after this semester. One semester's data on anything would be -- I mean if this was something that I loved and it was doing well, I would still say, oops, we have got too small a data set, and we do need to have that extra semester of data. And I really do think that if this is a little premature, that we need to wait until the end of the semester, which is only a month away, essentially, to get that data and to make that decision. I would feel much happier if it was based on a stronger data set.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: What about the idea of, you know, approving Connie's proposal, we still will have a full year of data, that'll come in, because we're not talking about like stopping the classes right now that are in progress, or are we?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: No.

SENATOR HUSS: No. We're talking about having a full year of data. So we suspend it, it's not offered in the fall, we have time, or people who are responsible for doing this have time to analyze a year's data. It turns out, let's say, that the spring semester courses, there was something that really clicked about those, they were really great, it was the particular courses offered, the mode of delivery, the particular preparation of those students, because they might have one semester under their belt, or whatever, and then, lo and behold, we reinstate it for the spring semester of next year, after it's been properly studied, and it turns out that some of the kinks have been worked out and so forth, I mean that is a possibility as well. It's not necessarily killing the program, it's suspending it until the first year's data have been studied with the possibility that it could be reinstated.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Gatzia.

SENATOR GATZIA: I just wanted to remind everyone that this is a two-year pilot, so as far as the program is concerned right now, it's only for two years. And then we are going to make a decision whether to continue it or not. So I don't see the benefit of not scheduling classes or not collecting additional data for two years. I mean how many classes are we canceling if we're adopting this kind of mentality where, you know, faculty either didn't receive meaningful, you know -- what was the wording?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Input.

SENATOR GATZIA: Input.

And I think I actually wanted to say something to that effect. So, yes, it may be that the Faculty Senate or other faculty members didn't receive anything input on the program, but since the program was initiated at Wayne, the Wayne faculty were actually well informed and part of the decision making. And to a certain extent I see a bias towards the Wayne faculty in the way that the argument is made, that they are not good enough to make decisions, so they are not offering good classes and so on, and I think, you know, making decisions in terms of biases has never been a very good idea, so I say, you know, let the program be for two years, let's collect the data, and then we can make decisions about it. That's all.

CHAIRMAN RICH: If there's no objection, the Chair recognizes Professor Kennedy.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Associate Dean Kennedy, I should say.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: That's okay.

Yes, because actually our college is one of the largest colleges with the GenEd Core population and I feel compelled to share with you a concern that our faculty have had, not in relation to the Wayne faculty, but more in terms of our courses. The students who are in our applied and technical programs should be taking our Gen Ed. But they are being put into an English sequence which prohibits them from completing our technical report writing with the appropriate skills. So instead of taking our English 121, which actually has more argumentation than 111, when they enter our technical report writing, they are not as prepared. And that has been shared with me.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you. Other debate on the motion?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Can I just raise one point?

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Schulze.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: I'll just sit. Every time we have talked to the President about this program, in Senate and Faculty Senate EC, he brings up how wonderful blended learning and that this is part of the reason we are doing it, because it's blended and blended is best and that's what he likes the best. And I always bring up the webpage, and I note there that it still says courses will be blended learning, including online classroom and experiential learning elements. And I brought up to him more than once that that is not the case. That we are saying it here, but we are not doing it. And that's, that's bad. And he said, yeah, you're right, we should do it if we say we are going to do it. I say yeah. But that nothing ever changes. And that's a frustration for me personally that we can't just do what -- we can't just do what we say we are going to -- if we can't even

follow through on things that we have advertised, and once this is pointed out, the advertisement doesn't even change, it doesn't seem to bother anybody that we're lying. Publicly. For an extended period of time. And I just wanted to -- I just had to say that. So --

CHAIRMAN RICH: Senator Howley.

SENATOR HOWLEY: I'd like to make a couple of comments, and I think that -- I'm also a representative from Wayne College, and I think that some in ways both Senator Bouchard and Senator Gatzia are representing faculty input. I think the problem is governance.

So select and excellent faculty from Wayne have participated in creating these courses, along with select and excellent faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, and those faculty have worked together, they have worked very hard on these courses, and I truly think they should be commended for being asked to do something, doing it in a timely manner, and doing it to the best of their ability. But neither of these programs were discussed at the college level, nor were they adequately discussed in this body, and so this represents a problem with governance that we have seen in this administration that picks faculty to do things or certain projects without any sort of global vision. And so I would ask that we can really consider this motion, that we would table it for today, take it back. As a representative of Wayne, it would be very, very difficult for me to vote on this motion without first assessing the people that I am trying to represent, and I think we should discuss this as a body. And we should discuss it with maybe the GenEd Implementation Committee that's been working so hard on the GenEd implementation, but we need to not attack faculty in any respect to either object to this or support it. Everybody has been working hard to do their jobs.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Is the Senator moving to postpone further consideration of the resolution?

SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes, I would make that motion.

CHAIRMAN RICH: And for until a time certain or indefinitely?

SENATOR HOWLEY: I would like to have it discussed in our assessment committee or at least -- yes, have it discussed in our assessment committee that's looking at the data and perhaps we could make a recommendation at the May meeting as to how we should proceed as a body.

CHAIRMAN RICH: So by assessment committee, I take it you are referring to the subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee that's looking at the data?

SENATOR HOWLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Is that correct? So now I'm wondering whether perhaps your motion isn't to refer to the Academic Policies Committee, which is the parent committee of the subcommittee. I'm just trying to figure out what it is you would like to accomplish here so I can –

SENATOR HOWLEY: As am I. So I –

-

VOICE: Well said.

CHAIRMAN RICH: The basic options are to postpone it until the May Senate meeting or a subsequent meeting or indefinitely, or to refer to committee and have the committee report back to us.

SENATOR HOWLEY: I think it would be best, let's have that committee that's looking at that data continue their work and report at the May meeting and make a recommendation as to this motion.

CHAIRMAN RICH: All right. You have heard the motion, which is to refer to committee with a request, with the direction that the committee, that is at the Academic Policies Committee, the parent of the subcommittee, report back on this resolution in the May Faculty Senate meeting. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Franks.

Debate on the motion, which is to refer to committee? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I'll take that as a friendly amendment. I was worried that if we wait too long. But I would have rather have this –

CHAIRMAN RICH: I take it the Senator is speaking in favor of the motion to refer to committee?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Is there any further debate on the motion to refer?

All those in favor of referring this matter to the Academic Policies Committee with the direction to report back on the resolution in the May Faculty Senate meeting, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.) Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you. Is there any other new business to come before the body? Is there anything for the good of the order? Senator Scotto.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Thank you for your indulgence. I just want to say that several months ago I read in the Akron Beacon Journal the assertion by the Board of Trustees and President Scott Scarborough that they had no plans to change the name of our university. And I was not surprised by that, because clearly the name had already been changed, and OPU is on every paper and computer screen and wall here at the university. It's kind of an emperor's new clothes phenomenon in reverse. We can all see it, but we pretend we don't.

Now, in my case, I admit, it's a matter of choosing my battles. And I don't get out much. But today, when I saw this, I got a little nauseated. I haven't had to really work that hard to pretend not to see the emperor's -- this is like the emperor's new prom dress. I can't not see this. Okay? And it has a little hashtag now, too, which is equally unilluminating about what we do here. And so, for the good of the order, I want to say I see OPU.

CHAIRMAN RICH: For the record, I believe the Senator is referring to the stationery on which the Graduate School's strategic plan is printed; is that correct?

SENATOR SCOTTO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RICH: For the record, so that we can be understood.

Is there anything else for the good of the order? Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Just real quickly, I mentioned this last month and coming up in now less than two weeks is a student event in memory of Zak Husein, a student who was killed in the pizza shop. I have left some fliers out on the table with the table tents. Just a quick update, the students are about 60 percent of the way towards their fundraising that they are hoping to pack and ship 50,000 meals in Zak's honor, and I appreciate some of our colleagues here and across campus have contributed already to the effort, and please come, send your students, we're having a very mixed group who are going to be present that evening from across campus and across the community and I think it's a really good event, and I'm acting as their faculty adviser. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICH: Thank you.

Anything else for the good of the order? If not, I take it you are ready to adjourn. I hereby declare the meeting adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 5:13 p.m.)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Transcript provided by:

Premier Visual Voice, LLC
216-246-9477 www.premiervisualvoice.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
