CHAIR RICH: The December meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Welcome to the meat locker!

(Laughter).

CHAIR RICH: Is there a motion to adopt the Agenda as distributed?

Moved by Senator Raber, seconded by Senator Gatzia.

A report was distributed from the Committee, this is the longest Committee name on record I believe, this is the Committee of the Chairs of the General Education Learning Outcomes Committees.

Is there any objection to adding that report to under item 9, Committee reports as sub item E? Any objection to doing that?

The Agenda to be yet to be adopted includes 9E, the Gen Ed Chairman's report.

Anything else? All those in favor of adopting the Agenda as amended, signify by saying aye.

The Agenda is adopted.

Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the September meeting as distributed?

Moved by Senator Schaeffer, a second by Senator Clark.

Are there any corrections to those minutes?

Everyone in favor of adopting the minutes?

Minutes are adopted.

Next on the Agenda is my remarks.

Among the items on today's Agenda are curriculum proposals from the Curriculum Review Meeting for the approval; a proposal from the ad hoc Committee of Chairs of the General Outcome Committees to amend the General Education Implementation Plan; a proposal from the Part-time Faculty Committee to establish benefits for retired part-time faculty member; and a report from the Academic Policy Committee on the problem of late book orders.

As SECRETARY SCHULZE Schulze will report, the Executive Committee appointed seven members to the ad hoc committee to consider proposing a resolution expressing a lack of confidence in President Scarborough. Soon I will convene the first meeting of that committee to elect a chairperson to begin its work.

As you may imagine, I have been given a great deal of thought lately to the University's current predicament, and I wish to have the following observations and comments:

First, we tend to think of the University as a sturdy institution, relatively immune to buffeting winds. I believe it is more fragile than we sometimes recognize. It has sustained much damage in the last several months, the effects of which are likely to last much longer than it took to incur them. It is incumbent on all that care about the institution, administrators and faculty included, to take care not to inflict further damage, however well-intentioned their
actions may be.

Second, in his State of the University address and in speeches in other venues, the president has said that the University of Akron is poised to be, this is a quote “a national University of international reach” and has spoken of his desire to make this a great University. At the same time he's argued that the economics of public higher education require the University to invest less in tenured-track faculty position and more in non-tenured positions.

Let's be clear: A University does not become great by hiring fewer tenured-track faculty and relying heavily on non-tenure track faculty and thereby moves away rather than towards greatness.

The great universities of this country are great because they have great faculties, and great faculties are overwhelming tenure track.

There is, however, a truth underlying the argument about the economics of higher education. With the state legislature gradually disinvesting in public higher education, while law prohibiting the state universities for making up for the loss of state funding by raising undergraduate tuition charges, the University is forced to find more economical ways of teaching its undergraduate students while minimizing the loss of quality of education. Traditional tenured-track faculty, especially those teaching at the Graduate and especially at the Doctoral level, devote significant time to research and graduate instruction and consequently tend to do less teaching at the undergraduate level. The lower the undergraduate teaching loads the less economical undergraduate teaching is. This resulted in increased reliance on part-time faculty for undergraduates, and because they’re paid so little and often must teach at more than one University in order to cobble together a meager living the quality suffers. The President’s solution is to hire more full-time, non-tenure track faculty who have relatively heavy teaching loads and little or no research responsibilities. Although this is less economical than relying heavily on part-time faculty, it is also less likely to compromise the quality of undergraduate instruction and is more economical than relying heavily on traditional tenure track faculty.

This solution has drawbacks however: First, to the extent that the greatness of a University is determined by its contribution to the advancement of knowledge, increased reliance on full-time non-tenure track faculty doesn’t move a University in the direction of greatness. As long as state support continues to decline and caps continue to be placed on undergraduate tuition increases, the state universities sadly may be unable to move towards greatness.

Second, the strongest protection for academic freedom by far is tenure. Non-tenure track faculty are in insecure positions. The highest quality of instruction generally occurs when students are taught by relatively independent professionals that are well respected and secure in their positions.

Third, other things being equal, a University would have to pay higher salaries to hire high-quality faculty in non-tenure positions than to hire faculty of equivalent quality in tenure-track positions. As long as the tenured-track positions that the University creates are likely to be needed through the careers of those appointed to fill them, tenured-track positions are more economical than non-tenure track positions assuming equivalent quality again.

For these reasons I believe it is worth considering an alternative to hiring non-tenure track faculty in order to achieve more economical, high-quality undergraduate instruction.
Teaching and research loads already vary from University to University, college to college, department to department and to some extent even within departments. Why can't the need for economical but still high-quality undergraduate instruction be filled by tenure-track faculty who are hired and choose to teach extensively, do enough research to stay current and engaged -- current and engaged by academic disciplines, taking special responsibility for ensuring high quality instruction and the advancement of teaching methods and technologies and contribute to the scholarship of teaching? Can there not be more than one tenure-track model, each with different requirements and expectations concerning the balance between teaching and research responsibilities?

I propose that the faculty and administration of this University begin to explore these possibilities together instead of continuing the unproductive, even destructive, misconceived conflict sometimes over whether the University can afford to hire more tenure-track faculty.

This concludes my remarks. I wish you a happy, restorative holiday season.

Next, we have no special announcements today. This is a blessing given the nature of those announcements.

The next Agenda item is the report of the Executive Committee. SECRETARY Schulze.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Thank you. Since the Faculty Senate last met on November 5th the Executive Committee met twice by itself, once with the president. The Executive Committee met on November 19th for regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the president. They made appointments to one University Council Committee, Scott Randby was appointed to the Information Technology Committee.

The EC notified the dean of the University Libraries that she needs to conduct an election to fill the UL seat that will be vacant at the end of the semester.

The EC certified the elections of Senator Rob Schwartz in the College of Health Professions and appointed John Zipp to the APC Admissions Committee and they discussed possible candidates for the ad hoc committee to consider a vote of no confidence in President Scarborough.

Later that day we met with the president. We were updated on the following topics: the Gen Ed Core 13, the general education coordinator position, the search for an assessment director, which is scheduled to begin in December with a Committee that includes members of the faculty, progress on decisions regarding allocation of graduate assistantship for fiscal year 2017, documentation from academic rank from the University of Toledo, the process for reactivating suspended and revised degree programs.

The EC next met on November 24th, regular Senate business and to discuss the Agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. We discussed whether “TBA” can be used for the location of classes that are not online, for example, independent investigations. The EC decided to ask the APC to look into it.

We discussed recent discussions the President has had with the Graduate Council regarding funding for graduate assistantships.

The EC discussed appointments to the ad hoc Committee to consider a vote of no confidence in the president. We appointed seven faculty senators to that Committee contingent on their willingness to serve. Of the seven, four subsequently accepted the appointments and three declined by e-mail. The EC agreed unanimously on three additional appointments, all three subsequently agreed to serve. The ad hoc Committee consists of the
following senators: Senator Coffey, Mitchell, Feltey and Quinn.

That concludes my report.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for SECRETARY SCHULZE Schulze about the Executive Committee report?

Thank you.

Next are the remarks of the president, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you.

It is good to be with the Senate today. I thought I would give you an update on the things that we have been working on, retrospectively, prospectively, and I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

As I look back on the beginning of this particular academic year, the fiscal year that began July 1, we were consumed a lot with the implementation of the new budget, the very difficult decisions that we made during that time period. Also the implementation of the new initiatives that were funded in the new budget, that being the new Center for Experiential Learning, Entrepreneurship, the Center for Data Science Analytics and Information Technology, the new Center for Dance Choreography, the new Corps of Cadets, Leadership Academy and the continuing work on the Gen Ed initiative out of Wayne College.

Also during that period of time we hired a new director of athletics, Larry Williams, we launched the new marketing campaign with the new videos including the new LeBron James marketing video. We concluded a process that we can call a faculty hiring phase 1 which approved moving forward with 55 faculty searches, and initiated a number of community meetings to try to describe to the community the necessity for some of the budget changes.

Also recently we have submitted to the state our state capital requests for the next biennium, and currently we continue to work on with the new appointed Honors College Advisory Council, work on the Honors College strategic plan. We have also begun working with the Graduate Council on their strategic plan. Yesterday we worked with the libraries on their strategic plan, and we continue to meet with the colleges as recently as this morning with the College of Engineering on the faculty hiring phase 2, and hope to have that process completed by December 15th.

We got the question yesterday in meetings had we approved additional faculty hirings. We're doing so as we work through the process with each of the colleges, and I assume at the end of the process we'll report the total number of additional faculty hires at that time.

We continue also to work on an international strategic plan that the board has requested. We continue to evaluate and look for opportunities to strengthen our satellite campus structure where we have five satellite campuses, the only one that's really functioning at a high level right now I would say is our Wayne college in Orrville, Ohio.

Additionally we’re spending time preparing for a number of searches for positions. I think of great interest, particularly to this group, the Provost search, the Engineering Deans search, the Director of Facilities search, the Director of Development search, the General Counsel search and I believe those are probably the ones most important to this particular group. A number of kind of important initiatives ongoing and it is consuming really most of our time at this point.

My hope is that something in this particular list may generate a question, or I would be happy to entertain questions that pertain to other topics as well.
CHAIR RICH: Thank you, Mr. President. Are there questions for the president? Senator McCullough.

SENATOR McCULLOUGH: Are there plans to search for a new permanent Dean of Libraries?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: We’re trying to determine whether our interim dean actually plans to retire. As soon as that issue has been resolved you can add that to the list of the ones I mentioned.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the president? Senator Klein.

This is part of the new austerity plan.

(Laughter).

SENATOR KLEIN: Yet my office is so hot I have to open the window.

CHAIR RICH: It is not a perfect plan.

SENATOR KLEIN: I was wondering about the Business People Advisory Committee that was advertised in the newspaper, and I was wondering if they’re going to be paid by the University, and if so how much?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: No. They’re not going to be paid by the University. They’re all volunteer.

This was an offer by Chuck Jones, CEO of First Energy to pull together that advisory council. He came to us with the idea. It was a great idea. The people he had in mind are people we want to connect with in a strong way and leverage the opportunities, having the CEO of Goodyear, First Merit Bank, others, the hospitals in the room at the same time, it is a great opportunity for I think the University to create some new relationships with those that want to be supportive.

I think the base salary of Chuck Jones is 10 million a year. I don't -- he's not looking for compensation. I don't think any of these people would be. That's not something that we would do.

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

SENATOR ERICKSON: I request this question as senator and as a faculty senator that represents Faculty Senate on University Council, and as I can ask this question to you in this body but will not be -- it was brought up, the capital request, I know the capital request went through the University Council Budget Committee -- sorry, the Planning Committee, as it should, but the way -- the bylaws are set up, this is supposed to come to University Council and then to you and, oh, yeah, it will come up at the next meeting which is next Tuesday which is after, after the Board meeting, and unfortunately that is not an appropriate way for our recommendation to have any meaning at all. So I'm concerned, and I want to make sure that it does not happen again that the system works as it unfortunately has worked in a number of times before when oh, my gosh, you meet the, what, the letter of the law, but not the spirit at all because I don't feel that you're recommending anything if in fact it is not going to the Council, and then to you so that you can advise -- now you can -- we know -- not to take it into account, but it is pointless if I may say so after it has gone to -- after it has gone to the Board.

I’m sorry, but it will have to get listed as one of the matters of concern that as members
of the Faculty Senate on the University Council, that we would have to note when we go back to good shared governance. This is not an appropriate way for it to go.

Can you comment on it, please.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. I think when you understand how the process actually works, you'll conclude otherwise.

The Committee was the list -- the listing was developed, it went to University Council Committee and received a favorable response. There was a deadline for an initial submission to the state.

SENATOR ERICKSON: We know that.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: We submitted -- it has still not gone to the board. We have an opportunity to amend that all the way through April when the state will ultimately make a recommendation. We had a deadline to meet.

My assumption is the Committee recommendation, which was favorable, will go to University Council. That will give the University Council an opportunity to advise the president's office as to what the plan is. We'll have an opportunity to take that, and if we feel the need to amend the list we'll have the opportunity to amend it before we take it to the board before we have to do our final submission in April which is when the state plans to act on the capital bill.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Can I ask when you'll take it to the Board?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Probably sometime just before the April deadline with the state.

I would work backwards from that date to when the first board meeting would be, and then work it back to the date then when the first committee would be, that would be the targeted date.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Any other questions for the President?

Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: I'm on the Assessment Committee.

I had a meeting this morning -- you mentioned a number of centers, the directors of which were hired quickly in some searches that are underway. As of this morning, we still have not heard anything, and our input has not been requested. Can you bring me up to date on where that is?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I don't know if anyone kind of had the opportunity to attend the meeting today, for example on the new Center for Experiential Learning, if you had, I think that you would be pleased to know that they have numerous faculty present. Some of those faculty stood and said positive things on how the center is being put together, including a Faculty Advisory Council, including plans for a faculty director, including plans for Student Advisory Council, including plans for a Community Council and likely targeted members I think of each of the councils were all in attendance today at noon, from noon to 2:00 to kind of celebrate the coming together of that center.

I think it was actually even pointed out, I think by Bill Lyons this is a prototypical example of how things should be put together with faculty, community, student and administrative input.

I would encourage you, in fact, be happy to provide you a listing of faculty that were present, and would encourage you to reach out to your colleagues to confirm my impression of
the meeting today. I walked away from it thinking there's a good momentum behind what's created here and a good level of excitement.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Maybe I wasn't clear. I was asking about the position of the Assessment Director. That HLC thing.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The only thing I know about the Assessment Director is the paperwork has been submitted. The decision was made to start the search process. It is recently as of this morning someone sent an e-mail saying which account code should this be charged to. I haven't responded to that. I'm assuming based on that e-mail it is moving forward and should be more public very soon.

CHAIR RICH: Questions for the president?

Senator Minocchi.

SENATOR MINOCCHI: We saw it referenced in the Provost written comments an allusion to recruiting data for the fall of 2016 class. I regularly attend those meetings of the Recruitment Council, and the most data as of yesterday reflects a decline in applications of 3.4% and a decline in matriculated or confirmed students of 23.3%. Year-over-year relative to last year, admittedly this is a small dataset, early in the recruiting process, I know it is not necessarily a call for arms or call to alarm. I wondered if the president had a comment on the status of that situation, and if there is any plan going forward to address that troubling trend?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: First I need to correct the data.

What I was provided at 9:14 this morning shows that our applications this year are 11,514, 3% down from 2014, 11% up from 2013 just to give it a historical perspective.

Our admit offers are 5861, 4% down from last year this time, 23% up from this time two years ago.

The trying to get a sense -- I heard this number or something approximating the number, a percentage that you alluded to just a moment ago, I heard that mentioned yesterday, and it turns out that number comes from the fact that if we go back to this time last year they weren't counting the applications that had not yet paid the $45 application fee which is something in early January we essentially ignore from that point on.

For example, in last year's freshman class, we enrolled and students came and registered for courses, there were 180 of those students that never paid their $45 application fee.

We began counting them in the data last year in January. Okay. This year they began counting those same students in the data in not early January but early December. Okay. With that piece of information, the number is not 19%, the number 14%. If one then takes out of this year's data everyone who has not yet paid the application fee that we will and did take out in January 1, the number is like 18, 19% down. That's the -- that's the confusion about when do you begin to ignore the application fee? Last year they did that January 1. This year for some reason they began to do it in December 1. I think they were trying to be transparent about saying there is a slight anomaly but then one has to judge, okay, how significant is that? If one takes that out of the equation we're down 3%, 4%, still up significantly from where we were two years ago. That's not surprising. That's about the effect that I would expect to have having gone through the budget cuts and some of the negative PR that's been the offshoot of that. I would expect us at this point in the process to be, that's why I didn't chose to do it in July, to
give us a benefit of a full recruiting cycle to kind of work through the ebb and flow of that beginning -- in fact, it already began. We’re taking more extraordinary efforts to meet with high school counselors and to reassure them that by virtue of making these decisions our finances are much stronger than, say, a University that’s not yet worked through some of the financial challenges that we know that the other universities have.

Tomorrow I meet with another 100 high school counselors, two weeks ago it was another 100 counselors. All the way through this recruiting cycle we’ll be out in greater numbers at all levels of the organization to kind of work back to where we would hope to be last year.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the president?

Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: Following up on that, do you have data that’s current about retaining students, particularly into spring semester? I have heard the possibility that students are saying they’re not returning who are current students.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I don’t have it with me because I haven’t heard anything to suggest that the numbers had deteriorated. I can find out and I would be happy to share that with you. I mean, I understand why you’re asking. Actually I haven’t heard anything, I consider that good news at least to this point.

I would expect next year’s retention numbers to be better, and if for no other reason, that’s because our entering freshman class continues to get a little bit stronger with greater number of honor college students that should persist. Our graduation rates, especially we just -- we went away from open admission in, what, 2011? We're still working through a pipeline where we’re both a combination of traditional admissions University versus open enrollment, we’re still a mixture that has as we have students working their way through the pipeline. What I have said to others, if we do nothing but enjoy the benefit of being more selective, our six-year graduation rate should continue to improve. That's not good enough. Still, even if we get to the national average, which I think we will by virtue of this one decision on the front end, we’ll get to the 41% national six-year graduation rate. The real question is can -- are the extraordinary things we’re doing beyond simply being more selective, will that help our numbers improve beyond what’s predicted at the national level?

If not, then what we’re doing, all that we’re spending money on is being revisited and maybe new things ought to be tried.

Our numbers should get better just by virtue of being more selective.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the president?

Senator Hallett.

SENATOR HALLETT: I noticed yesterday there was a woman attacked in Akron -- this is an odd question -- whenever there is a crime in Akron on the channel 8 news, the newscaster comes on saying we’re reporting from the University of Akron and they’re reporting about a crime and it kind of paints a negative image. In light of the fact that we’re trying to recruit students, I don’t know if there anything we can do about that? I was thinking maybe if the news is brought to you by the University of Akron, but it really does paint a negative image for us. I was wondering if there is anything -- I don’t know if there is anything you can do about that. It seems like it really makes us -- puts us in a bad light.

PRESIDENT: Our media relations folks noticed the same thing you did. There was a
conversation that actually did include me and so they're trying to work with media outlets to suggest that just because it happened in Akron didn't mean it happened near the University of Akron. We would like for them to be a little more precise in their description of those -- it does hurt us. An urban University, that's always an issue that we are sensitive to and really are working hard to make sure that we portray a safe campus and, in fact, earn that recognition. We're sensitive to that.

    SENATOR HALLETT: It wasn't near the University. It was one of those things.
    CHAIR RICH: Near my house.
    Was this the station that's actually had the Akron office here on campus?
    Yeah, they were right behind me.
    CHAIR RICH: Senator Clark.
    SENATOR CLARK: I'm not sure all senators realize that local Fox is in Colby Hall. It is literally on campus.
    CHAIR RICH: There is a draw back to that.
    PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes.
    CHAIR RICH: Any other questions for the president?
    SECRETARY Schulze.
    SECRETARY SCHULZE: In the EC's report I just reported that you had discussed with us documentation regarding Dean Ransom's academic rank at the University of Toledo. At that time you told us that you shared that documentation with Chris Horn of the Devil Strip. Chris Horn has never done anything with that information. I don't know if he plans to. I think it may be good for the faculty to know what that documentation is, and it may also be useful to share that documentation with the search committee just so that they know what the true state of affairs really was.
    PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. I think that's a great point.
    Yeah. We did -- there was an open records request, we did provide the data to the Devil Strip, and Wayne, I don't think we have seen anything posted by the Devil Strip. We would be happy to provide that same data to the Faculty Senate, and I think we would be happy if the Faculty Senate shared it broadly, including the search Committee.
    A short description of what we provided was e-mail documentation with attachments that showed that her offer was with associate professor without tenure, which is what she noted on her CV, and in the University of Toledo's investigation when they did a record search they found an e-mail from the Provost's office indicating that what went to the board was in error and needed to be corrected. That was from when she was initially appointed. Those documentation were I believe provided to Chris Horn of the Devil Strip. We'll be happy to provide that same set of materials to the Faculty Senate.
    CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the president?
    Senator Saunders.
    SENATOR SAUNDERS: I wanted to say thank you for your efforts for working with the faculty on the carry over costs and the start-ups and helping the faculty to spend the money that they have been promised. Thank you for that.
    PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I appreciate that comment.
    We're trying to live up to every promise made even though that promise may have exceeded our capability at the time, and I very much appreciate the faculty working to help us
make good on all of those promises. They have had to agree to extend the period of time perhaps when they would have liked to have had the money so it is a nice compromise, I think solving an issue that was probably no fault of anyone trying to work it out at the moment but it is nice that we have come together to do that.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions?
Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Chair, along the same line, Mr. President, we have been told that in order to reach our spend down accounts that we have to go through our current budgets to zero, which seems to me like a poor management approach, especially if you have appropriate items to request or you plan for. Could you mention what you are thinking about that?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: One of the reasons -- maybe I should back up further.

One of the things that I think that I admitted to your chair and to faculty union president and to Chair Matt Lee, what I discovered when I came, I discovered a budget that wasn't complete. It didn't include everything that you normally would expect to see in the budget and some of the things we found in the budget were placeholders that were never -- that were never meaningful. In a lot of ways, what took so long, what stressed the shared governance process, particularly as it contained to the University Council Budget and Finance Committee, is we essentially had to rebuild the budget from scratch. We couldn't tell which numbers always were real or placeholders. That took a long time to do that. That's point one.

One of the things that contributed to the budget not being real is the ability of anyone to carry forward unspent budgeted balances from the past or unbudgeted start-up moneys or accounts because people -- it essentially works its way in people's mind that I don't really need to get the budget right because even if the budget is not right, still have this account over here I can tap. Okay. It reinforced sort of bad budgeting practices and also created the reality that these balances that were, quote, “off budget”, were growing so significant that when they're totaled they are a large percentage of the university's total cash balances. It is a huge risk, especially as we were starting to tighten our belt that people would -- if we didn't change somehow the policy in terms of access to all of these cash balances, we could cut the budget but people say that's no big deal, I'll spend it out of the cash account when in reality it is the University's cash. We had to simultaneously not only rebuild the budget from scratch but we had to deal with the reality of whatever these cash balances were, we need to encourage their inclusion in the University's budget, and if they're not in the budget they won't go anywhere but they shouldn't be spent until there is a process to put them in to the budget. Otherwise you can't work our way out of this financial challenge, it could actually get much worse than better.

What should have been communicated is, yes, you have the balances, but unless they're in the University-approved budget, it is best first for you to spend your budget amount. Then in fact if you still need access to these accounts then let's work with you on an exceptional basis. More importantly, for future purposes let's try to get what's really necessary to spend out of those off-budget into next year's budget so that we know that we can afford in the year where we're going to end if we live according to that budget. That's the general principle that we're trying to employ. That's the issues we're trying to resolve. Yet, at the same time, live up to all of the promises. Not sweep any account. A lot of universities, they have done, they one day sweep accounts. We have tried not do that.
In doing so, it still requires as in start-up funds kind of a systematic working together to say, okay, how can we both live up to these promises and not jeopardize the University's finances as we move forward.

That's what should have been communicated. Sometimes it gets garbled a bit.

We ran into one this morning, if you find yourself in an extraordinarily difficult position, I know that they have tried to take some pressure off the system by taking some amount of the new initiative pool and making available a modest amount of money to a large number -- this was your idea by the way, a good one -- a modest amount of money to a larger set of people so that they have at least 1, 2 thought out unbudgeted accounts to take care of things. Although they have done that, there still seems to be some extraordinary exceptional issues that need to be handled and we have been referring those to either Nathan, the University CFO, or to Rex Ramsier, to try to work through the exceptional circumstances, the Vice Provost. They're trying to reduce the exceptions that they're having to deal with at the moment by encouraging people to first to say have you -- can this be accommodated in your budgeted funds for your department? If so, work through that while we work through some of these other exceptions. That's what I'm guessing is happening.

In all of these cases, probably the best thing I can do is help explain the big picture but then refer you to either Nathan or to Rex to handle extraordinary circumstances.

CHAIR RICH: Are there other questions for the President?

Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: As you know, I think it is the Associated Governing Board representatives coming next week. This is in response to the HLC accreditors concerned about your governance. I just had two questions: one of the things that the HLC said in a most recent report is that they wanted to establish embedded monitoring, I would like you to sort of explain to all of us exactly what this embedded monitoring is going to involve in the next year or year and a half. Secondly, I just ask which groups were considered to be appropriate constituency groups to meet with the HGB? I mean, in the Akron leadership, I know that our group, it is one of those, I would like to hear what are the other ones and is this all of the embedded monitoring? What other events will take place?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I'll tell you what I know.

That is that actually the decision to bring in the consultant from the HGB had nothing to do with the HLC visit. It actually had -- it was actually triggered by the submission of the University Council bylaws to the Board for approval. It just so happened when you asked me to submit that to the board and I did, they had just gotten back from an AGB conference where they had just heard a presentation about best practices in governance, and they wanted before approving the University Council bylaws to have the benefit of an AGB consultant's view of does that meet best practice? They then instructed the board Secretary to -- who also happened to be the General Council of the University, to engage an AGB consultant, the SECRETARY SCHULZE/council engaged a consultant who through not the best of timing I may add, you would add that if I didn't -- is scheduled to be here I believe on December 7th, 8th, 9th, something like that and I found out like you did. I didn't even know he was planning to meet broadly. I thought perhaps he was simply going to work with the Board and the draft UC. When I heard he planned to meet I would think it would be viewed favorably, I'm not sure how they then decided who to meet with. There is one conversation I'm trying to recall but I can't at
the moment where the -- someone was asked well, are we going to meet with the consultant and the response was yes, they do plan to meet with you. I can't even recall who that group was. The point you made, in response to our report, we included the fact that this guy was coming. It really wasn't as a result of the HLC report, we simply listed it as an action that the University was taking in the pursuit of best practices pertaining to shared governance.

Seemed like you had another part.
CHAIR RICH: The embedded -- before you do that, I can add some information.
PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: You can?
CHAIR RICH: It is that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is meeting with the consultant, and I'm all but certain that the University Council Steering Committee is as well.
PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Okay. I did not know that.
I'm not familiar with the element or even the principle of -- what did you call it, embedded --
CHAIR RICH: Embedded monitoring
PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: What I thought, the way that it was explained to me is they essentially deferred the issue until the next accreditation visit is what I was told. You may know more than I do about this particular issue.
I'll ask though. I'll find out.
CHAIR RICH: I do recall seeing the language of embedded monitoring
PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Has anyone heard of that term or know what it is?
VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: I can shed light on this.
What the President said is completely accurate. What we have done since we knew that the consultant was coming, I organized the visit in the context of since we included his visit in the response to the HLC actions we invited all of the formal governance groups on campus to meet with the visitors-- so the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, University Council I think itself passed a resolution that the whole council wanted to visit, not just the Steering Committee, leadership of the AUP, CPAC, grad student government, undergrad, American Bar Association student group, deans, chairs, basically anyone with a seat is seated on the University Council, because this is where this issue came up in the beginning, so they will be meeting for two full days with all of these different groups, and it is a process like for an HLC visit we generally the campus proposes who you would like to meet with, there is back and forth so they have asked, they wanted to meet with distinguished faculty, so we had the distinguished professor group as well, which is not a former governance body but a formal body in the sense that there is a special subset of our faculty that are distinguished professors. That was how it was organized, the itinerary.

Is that -- everybody understand that part of the answer to Senator Bouchard's question? The second piece, embedded monitoring, that's just a phrase that HLC uses to do exactly what the President said. We do not have to submit any additional documentation on assessment or shared governance at all that they have embedded it in the next visit report. What usually happens is that any time a team comes to visit a campus, they always look at the previous issues and focus usually more attention on areas where there were issues in the past. Embedded monitoring draws a circle around those two topics. When the team comes for the regular four-year review they will be told that there is a specific -- two specific things that they really have to pay attention to, shared governance and assessment, we'll submit with our
report what's called an embedded monitoring report. It is a special report like our focus visit report on these two topics. We'll specifically take extra time to make sure we address in greater detail than you would every single thing about the campus. That's what the embedded monitoring means. We'll emphasize these two topics in our report for the regular visit.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you.

Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Would you please ask Vice Provost Ramsier when the members of these constituency groups that are going to be visited will know what the schedule is? A number of us are on those groups and have not yet heard.

CHAIR RICH: I can answer part of that myself.

That is that when you check your e-mail you will see that yesterday I sent the information about the meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and asked each of the members of the Executive Committee to let me know as soon as possible whether you would be attending so I could give that information to the Provost office and I am still awaiting replies from everyone but Senator Hausknecht

SENATOR ERICKSON: I sent mine in.

CHAIR RICH: As to other groups, I can't answer.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: The invitations went out as soon as we had the itinerary relatively stabilized which was pretty much the beginning of this week. Not a lot of lead time. We apologize for that.

One of the visitors is coming from D.C., another from the State of Maine and his schedule being a well-sought after consultant, is pretty tight. We did our best to try to get all of the groups organized in basically a two-day whirlwind visit.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes.

If I can ask Vice Provost Ramsier, yeah, I have got my request as being a member of the Faculty Senate, but as you pointed out, at University Council we had a resolution that the review was with the council members and the chairs of the Committees, I haven't heard anything in that request and as I understand it, is that not correct, Senator Sterns, the Steering Committee hasn't for University Council hasn't because he's -- when he asked that question -- those are the serious bodies that are really involved as you say with this situation.

I would have thought -- we got our requests, meeting of the University council is next Tuesday, maybe it will turn up then, we haven't heard anything --

CHAIR RAMSIER: The invitations were sent to the leaders of each of the formal groups. Whoever is the president or chairman of the University Council should have received that information. We scheduled it specifically to be during the time of the regular meeting so that everybody would have it already on their calendar, same with council of Deans, visitors will be at the regular Council of Dean’s meeting, et cetera, so we did our best to not call special meetings of the large groups but to try to organize it around the schedules that were already there. Whoever is in charge of University Council, I'm asking, I don't know who that is

SENATOR STERNS: Moore.

SENATOR ERICKSON: She's not told anyone.

Or this week.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you.
Are there any other questions for the President?
Thank you, Mr. President.
The next item on the Agenda is the remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost. He was unable to attend this meeting. I forwarded to you the remarks that he submitted to me in writing so you have those. They'll be appended to the minutes of this meeting.
The next item on the Agenda is the approval of the commencement list for fall, 2015. Is there a motion to approve that list?
Senator Nofziger, Bouchard seconds.
Any debate?
All those in favor of the motion? Opposed, by opposite sign.
The motion is adopted without dissent.
Next we have committee reports, first the Academic Policies Committee.
Chairman Ramsier.
CHAIR RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Academic Policy Committee has submitted a written report for information only about the ordering of textbooks and we certainly would request that everybody on the Senate read this informational report, share with your colleagues and have a discussion about how we may do better at each unit in getting textbooks ordered in a timely manner. It is in the best interest of all of us, including especially the students.
I would be happy to entertain any questions if there are any about that report?
CHAIR RICH: As member of APC myself, it is the Committee's fond hope that you will all have read or will read that report and give it some thought, and if there are questions, this would be a good time to raise them. Senator Bouchard?
SENATOR BOUCHARD: I finally got my book order in last week!
CHAIR RICH: Congratulations!
SENATOR BOUCHARD: A tiny bit late.
What's happened since going to electronic ordering we never get the initial request for book orders. The first time that most of us hear about it is a desperate e-mail from the bookstore saying it is wildly late, here is the link. None of us can find the link from last semester. If they sent out the link like around October 1st then we would have it, and we would do it. I actually due to an epic quest found the link last week which is why I was able to get it in, but I still haven't gotten my desperate last-minute request. It is not even a link that you can write down, it is the word faculty underlined in blue, you have to find the right e-mail, it is not even a URL that you can store on the computer. I think it would be easier for those of us that mean well and are easily confused if we were just told here is the URL, put it in the bookmarks, remember it in your brain, not have to wait and get the earlier reminder days coming up soon.
VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a good suggestion.
CHAIR RICH: The deadline is October 1st. That reminder should come sometime before
SENATOR BOUCHARD: It comes around January 1st.
CHAIR RICH: And I think that the Committee found that that's one of the problems. That we don't have a mechanism in place to remind people -- I don't think it focuses so much on the issue of making sure that people have a link, but that's important. We heard that a lot of faculty don't actually do the orders online themselves and in some instances that may be just
unfamiliarity with the system and that others do it for them, administrative assistant, something like that. It is clear that -- you know, with the -- with the change in the technology of the book ordering, the University as a whole has not adapted well to it. We need to adapt to it.

There really does need to be a mechanism whereby every faculty member routinely gets a reminder at the right time with a link to the online system. That's clear.

CHAIR RAMSIER: I agree, with my role as whatever it is right now. I would certainly make sure that happens.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich, I was having problem with my link -- I think it was a couple of years ago when that first started. I then got in touch with I believe her name is -- is it Friend or Friendly --

SECRETARY SCHULZE: It is Friend

SENATOR ALLEN: That doesn't -- I won't even make a comment on that.

She said e-mail me. I started to e-mail her. This year I e-mailed her and she confirmed the e-mail and never ordered the book. What I guess I would say, is that this system has some real issues and they're not just on the faculty side necessarily. These are complicated things, the link doesn't always work, you can then e-mail it and get a confirmation and then the book isn't necessarily ordered properly.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: I actually managed to read it quickly, one of the things mentioned, a lot are still listed to be TBA because sometimes we don't know who we're going to hire to fill those classes yet and it seems like a total violation of academic freedom to tell them this is the book you're using. I don't know how we address that unless we have actually faculty members teaching the courses rather than adjuncts.

CHAIR RICH: That's something that was discussed as well in the Academic Policy Committee. In many instances apparently the courses that are listed -- it is not TBA but staff, that's usually the listing, the courses listed as staff in many, but not all instances, they're sections of courses where all the sections use the same book and so what the Committee concluded, and this is reflected in the report, is that whoever is in charge of that course, it is obviously not a large number of part-time faculty, but a full- time faculty member that's really in charge of the course needs to be in a position to place the book orders for all of those sections. That doesn't solve the problem of, you know, where -- it is not a course, where all of the sections use the same materials. There isn't really a solution. I mean, other than, you know, those faculty members should be engaged sooner rather than later to teach the courses.

You know, if there really are -- if there is really not determined who will teach the course and whoever it is is choosing their own materials then that's going to have to be an instance in which we can't really comply.

CHAIR RICH: Yes, Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: I have a comment here too.

I desperately try to get my book orders in very early. I follow all the rules, yet every semester students don't have enough books in the bookstore. I don't see why I need to get them in so early if they won't have enough books when the student -- I mean, the students have ordered the books, they have their little order form that they did when they registered, and they still don't have a book. The -- I don't understand where it is falling apart but we -- with
an online system it should be fully straightforward to see how many books you need, and yet it is still not happening. Maybe you can comment on where it falls apart.

CHAIR RICH: I think I have a partial answer.

Not all of our students are buying their books from the University bookstore. The University bookstore knows that. They're not going to order a number of books that's equal to the enrollment in the course. It is going to be a smaller number than that. They're guessing, of course, about how many students will end up buying from the bookstore as opposed to buying them from Amazon.com or some other source.

Now, it may that be they're systematically underestimating, which in that case perhaps they need to rethink their method of estimation.

I think that probably goes at least part of the way towards explaining why it is that sometimes they don't have enough books. They can't assume every single student will buy a book at the bookstore.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: I must respectfully inquire as to why it was stated that way from the bookstore? About how we could be having a catastrophic harm to students when, in fact, it turns out that they are not even ordering as many as there are in the class, as the request is? My understanding was that they were saying that could cause great alarm to students if the orders are not in time and yet they're not ordering enough for the class, that seems like having one's cake and eating it too, if I might add.

CHAIR RICH: Well, it's the difference between the bookstore not ordering any books for that course and the bookstore ordering an adequate number of books perhaps. Senator Klein

SENATOR KLEIN: I was present at the Academic Policy meeting, one -- I agree with your question, and we discussed -- we had a lot of these questions ourselves.

One thing I didn't know about that was new to me, so this is just to clarify perhaps what they meant by this catastrophic harm is that it is linked to student financial aid. Apparently when a student’s fees and everything is assessed for financial aid, the book, the amount that they need for books is also pulled into this assessment, and so this is one reason why they need the book orders in earlier so whether they get the books or not this is the budget that they need for financial aid.

I just wanted to clarify that element of the great harm.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you, Senator Klein. That's consistent with my recollection as well.

SENATOR MCCOLLOUGH: We invite you to put textbooks on reserve if we have them. If you're reviewing your syllabus and we have it in our inventory it will be gone, it is like survivor. They're all after the textbooks, they ask us frequently for ones from Ohio Link. If it is in the stacks, you want them to have access to it, you have to put it on reserve before you tell them what the book is because the first thing they do is get it out of the library for free, and they can only have it for a couple of weeks so if it is not on reserve they'll be fighting over it for the entire semester. You can also put personal copies if you have an extra on reserve. We have a system for that. If you have a copy of the textbook and in case they don't have those copies at the beginning of the semester that are adequate we might be able to put a personal copy on reserve as stop gap.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson

SENATOR ERICKSON: I was biting my tongue, but we have had a long discussion, I can't
not say, my --

CHAIR RICH: Can't make it longer

SENATOR ERICKSON: Two simple sentences. One, it is still true that the University bookstore, one of the reasons it seems to me for their lack of providing these inputs is that it is indeed a monopoly, it is a monopoly called around the corners at the moment, it is a monopoly and it was set up to be a monopoly by the contract that they signed, that the University allowed them to sign.

Can I suggest, please, please guys, when the -- the world has changed, as you have said Vice Provost Ramsier and could we not next time think through carefully what, in fact, needs to be done? As you just said, I didn't know about financial aid being -- that essentially for me is an economist is appalling in the sense that now the faculty to consider at all how much that text may cost because it just got thrown into financial aid, but that's my tax money. I have spent my time in my class telling students that they should find the text, the cheapest way possible, the cheapest way possible and I'm not allowed -- see what I'm saying? That's allowed under the contract. I'm sorry, but I do find that of deep concern. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Sometimes the contracting entity has difficulty disciplining its employees.

CHAIR RAMSIER: Especially when they're not actively pursuing such discipline. I may add, this is a good discussion, I appreciate it. I'll take action as best I can to clear up some of this stuff. I can't get rid of the contract. Yet.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I understand.

CHAIR RAMSIER: The federal part of this, you should understand, is about the total cost of attendance, that's where the federal government may weigh in to a single end-point server the deadlines, students are supposed to know what it will cost to attend every semester, every school that they want to go to. That's a part of it. You're right, the financial aid piece does come from federal Title 4 monies.

CHAIR RICH: The book order essentially performs two functions, that don't necessarily have to be performed together. You know, one is notifying the students of what the books are and what the costs will be so that they can determine the total cost of attendance and the other is the bookstore to some extent orders the books mostly except in certain circumstances.

CHAIR RAMSIER: I would like it make one comment that's related to this issue

CHAIR RICH: If I can just finish the point.

Even if the bookstore went away and we were just having our students order the books wherever they wanted, we would still need to put that list out there.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I understand.

CHAIR RICH: We wouldn't call them orders, I guess, but book lists or something.

CHAIR RAMSIER: The federal government requires that that list be public. Something connected to this is I would ask the Faculty Senate and their colleagues to carefully consider the adoption of customized textbooks. There are many times when students -- we do those -- I have -- I did one. We do those thinking we're doing the students a favor by customizing a book by say taking out chapters we are not going to use, whatever. Oftentimes the students end up paying more because you look at the contract with the bookstore, there is a different -- there is a different pricing structure for standard and customized textbooks, they're happy to do them but question why. Students can buy books, rent books, sell back books, but many times the customized books they cannot rent or sell back. The total cost out-of-pocket can actually go up
for a student even though faculty thought they were doing the right thing by saving the student money by having a lower cost book sticker price. Be very careful with that. I have seen some examples where people did the right thing, but it turned out it backfired and the students ended up worse off in the long run. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I wanted to add another point.

I also thought that a reason why we wanted these lists to be out there ahead of time is a number of years ago there was an issue about competitive bookstores able to have access to our list so that it is a free market issue. I understand that's also under state law, is it not?

CHAIR RAMSIER: I know it is a federal requirement that we have this be made public for the total cost of attendance. If it helps competition, so be it.

CHAIR RICH: Senator McCullough.

SENATOR McCULLOUGH: As somebody that's worked in a college bookstore, used bookstore and is now a librarian, textbooks have what are called a short margin book, they make 20% on each book. That's why they're never going to want to order a lot of them. The automatic pricing algorithms on the used market, when that book goes public, people start to buy it and all of the other copies shoot up in price, you see a low price early in the summer and high prices later starting in September. You can sit there, you can plan it out, you can look at Amazon, wow, these kids will pay $30 a book, as soon as September hits it is $10 less than new. You can't -- that's the free market at work. It is dark. Don't count on the free market to help anybody. As a used book seller I was not there to help students, I'll tell you that.

CHAIR RICH: Thank goodness you're in a different role now.

SENATOR McCULLOUGH: I changed sides now.

CHAIR RAMSIER: Me too.

CHAIR RICH: I think we should wrap up this session.

I do think it was a valuable exchange. Thank you.

CHAIR RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR RICH: Curriculum Review Committee report

CHAIR RAMSIER: We bring forward a short list of proposals coming through the system, no further objections or open comments, we bring it to you as a motion from Committee to approve these so we can get them on the books.

CHAIR RICH: Motion is from the Committee. Does not require a second.

Any debate on the motion to approve the curriculum change proposals?

All those in favor of approving them?

Opposed by opposite sign.

Motion is adopted.

CHAIR RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR RICH: Next we have --Senator Otterstetter.

SENATOR OTTERSTETTER: Just out of curiosity I had a curriculum proposal approved by the Senate in October and it is still in the Provost’s office to be approved with the Board of Trustees this coming meeting. Now it has been sitting there for two months, my question is for future reference, at about what point should I start making some calls to see, to get it approved earlier. And I called to check to see what the status was, I was told we approved it in early October, there was one Board of Trustee meeting within two weeks of that point and it didn't
go to the Board at that point. They couldn't tell me why it didn't go to the Board but was going to the next one, October 7th. What's the best way to keep track of this so in the future I can get them moving longer so it doesn't take so long? The one I'm sending will have to be reviewed by OBR which slows down the process even more. I'm just wanting to get some enlightenment?

CHAIR RAMSIER: I can answer. You would be speaking of a proposal that's about a program change, just a change of the name of the degree. When we went from one college to another, we want to take the word education off of our degree. I know the exact proposal you're speaking of.

Anything that requires Board of Trustees' approval, simply a change of the name of a course, it would already be done. The Senate approved it, the Provost's office wouldn't be inclined to change that recommendation. To change the name of a degree, that's a formal thing, the Board had to approve the degree program with the name, therefore to change it, the Board has to approve to change the name and we have to send that to the Board of Regents, now the Ohio Board of Higher education. We don't control when the Board meets, they pick their calendar annually, and it is never necessarily the same times every year. The problem that you run into here, the board, for example, the Board Committees met this past Monday. The Board book had to be done several weeks in advance of the Board Committees so your proposal presumably came in October, a week or two before the board was ready to meet but the board book had been put together weeks in advance of that. That's the lag time. You have to sort of back calculate a month from the actual board meeting when all materials need to be ready.

SENATOR OTTERSTETTER: This is the Board of Trustees?
CHAIR RAMSIER: Board of Trustees. That's the issue. Should be approved Wednesday. It is on the Agenda.

SENATOR OTTERSTETTER: I saw that. Thank you.
CHAIR RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: This has to do with the course proposal -- curriculum proposal system: Shannon Whalen, who was in charge of the technical aspects, she's no longer working at the University apparently. For those of us that are trying to put through course proposals, this is -- this has caused quite a nightmare. Perhaps I should have asked when the President was here, not sure, is there -- do you know if anything is going to be done about this? Is anyone going to replace her? To help with this? It is really -- it is very difficult when -- there are technical glitches all the time in the system. There is no one to call for help.

CHAIR RAMSIER: Yes. This is -- I'm aware of this issue.

The only backup we have in IT right now is Matt. As you know, Laura in our office, she's heavily involved, she just this week was working with two of the people in IR to try to train them to give us more assistance, that's about all the people we have to rely on right now. The system itself is probably going to be more and more unstable without Shannon's attention to try to keep it cleaned up. This may -- it may be a point that we have to rethink the use of this system versus maybe something that we can buy, rent, purchase, et cetera. I know the institutional -- the Inter University Council has been discussing this very issue for maybe as having some kind of a statewide curriculum system or at least some kind of, you know, buying power to pull together our resources from the institutions to try to get something more robust...
that's serviced by some vendor. I'm not sure where that will go. You're right, without her help, if will become a little more difficult, we're doing our best by back filling but I'm very much aware of it. Don't think we're not trying to do everything we can.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: A quick question, can you repeat the name of the person you said, in BCC, we were told you're going to have to send everything to the help desk. We all kind of shouldered, this is all we do on BCC is approve, that's all we do. We have approved 85 of these this semester. We would like a name.

CHAIR RAMSIER: I suggest that you send -- if you need help, send a note to myself and copy Laurel Brooks in our office. An IT related issue she'll get help from IT. Some of the people in IR may be the right place to go or Registrar’s Office sometimes, they're able to assist. We'll do what we can to help everybody, the committees, get this -- get things through.

I think make our office the focal point for questions and I just volunteered more people to do more work. I know it is important and it is frustrating when you want to get things done. We'll do what we can to support you as best we can. We find out it is impossible, we'll ask for potentially some more resources.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Next item on the Agenda is the report of the faculty -- of the Part-time Faculty Committee. Chair Osorio.

CHAIR OSORIO: Would you like me to read the resolution? I have a resolution for the Faculty Senate.

CHAIR RICH: It was distributed by e-mail.

CHAIR OSORIO: It is fairly long.

CHAIR RICH: I'm thinking that maybe --

CHAIR OSORIO: I could do a brief summary.

CHAIR RICH: That would be preferable.

CHAIR OSORIO: Okay. What we're looking at for the Part-time Faculty Committee would like to recommend that there be a written into the rules a status retirement for part time faculty who have taught at the University of Akron for ten years or more. You can see the actual details of what the criteria would be for retirement, but since there is a fairly high number. Part-time faculty that have taught here for ten years or more, we think it would be fair and reasonable to allow part time faculty to have at least some of the benefits of faculty retirement. We did use the rules for faculty retirement when we looked at what to include here. There is a list of -- I have 13 items which I don't know if you want me to -- I'm not going to go overall 13. If someone has a question, I would be happy--

CHAIR RICH: We have a motion from the Part-Time Faculty Committee which does not require a second to recommend amending the University rules to provide for benefits, certain specified benefits for retired part-time faculty.

Are there questions for Chair Osorio or debate on the motion?

Are you ready to vote?

All those in favor of the motion?

Opposed by opposite sign?

Motion is adopted without dissent.

Next item -- we do have an informational report from the CCTC, the Communications Technology Committee. There is no action item in it. I think unless there are questions for the
chair I will just proceed to the next item on the agenda. The report of the Committee of Chairs of the General Education Learning Outcomes Committee, this report is proposing a change to the new general education requirement. Chair Saliga is the chair of chairs. It is a crazy titled with all of this. The change --

SENAOTR SALIGA: We apologize for you for the lateness of this recommendation coming to you when we met with EC last week we didn't even have our Chair's meeting scheduled at that point. All of this came about very quickly. Which is rather amazing. That anything can come about quickly.

The change here, you saw it this morning, it is -- it comes in the implementation of it to summarize with some of this what we have is an academic foundations which has math, speaking, written communication, we have previously amended those to talk about higher level math courses, counting for Gen Ed, basically a course with a Gen Ed math course as a prerequisite, same with writing, now we're in the disciplinary and want to continue the practices with the current practice that we now have for natural sciences.

For the natural sciences disciplinary area requirement is two courses with one lab thinking a minimum of 7 hours, meaning three credit courses and one credit lab is the numbers that we're thinking.

We want to amend with that that a majors track course in the natural sciences can substitute for a general education natural science course. If you're taking a higher level course, a Principles in Biology, you wouldn't need to take a Biology For Everyone type course. That's the essence of what we would like to propose to the implement of -- to the implementation plan

CHAIR RICH: Is there question or debate on this? It comes from the Committee and does not require a second.

Ready to vote? You're cold, aren't you? All those in favor of the motion? Opposed by opposite sign? Motion is adopted without debate. Thank you.

Next is the report from the Graduate Council representatives. I don't know whether both of you wish to report or just one of you? I'm starting to suspect neither of you.

Senator Sterns or Allen, the Executive Committee was given to believe by Senator Sterns himself that there will be a report, which is why it is on the agenda.

SENIOR STERNS: Professional Masters and Doctoral -- I said a separate bin for doctoral professional, right?

SENIOR ERICKSON: What about instructional?

SENIOR ALLEN: Those were the only four categories given to us

These are the programs, not the --

SENIOR ALLEN: That's how the President is categorizing them. You could have many other ways of doing it, that's how we were presented with it. He gave us the definite
impression that this was driven by the Trustees as well. I never heard him say that before. He said the real concern was are we giving too many tuition waivers for professional master programs. The subcommittee's job is to address that we think. It is being convened by Eric Amos, the Vice Provost for Research and the Dean of Polymer Sciences.

We have not yet met, but my recommendation is that we also take a careful look at their estimated cost for tuition waivers as well. They're listing that as over $17,000 a student even though on our research site if we write that into grants and if we inflate it by 3% for this year, it is with $10,000 for 12 months.

I think they're charging 25% for all faculty for a research charge, yet I believe over 100 of our bargaining unit faculty are lecturers that are not even allowed to do research, if I'm not mistaken.

We need some information and we're going to look at this and make our recommendation and I don't know what will happen.

I think another very important issue here, and I don't know if the other Committee members will agree with this or not, but market niche. In these programs, if your competitors are offering a similar thing, I think we have to consider that as well if we want to maintain enrollment.

That's what we're planning on looking at. Hopefully we'll have a head this time next semester.

CHAIR RICH: I would encourage the members of the Committee to look at everything they think they ought to be looking at and if they think that categories need to be redefined or reconceived that they consider recommending that as well. The Committee's recommendations will go ultimately next to the Graduate Council and then they'll come to this body.

SENATOR ALLEN: That's a very good point. We're not necessarily the most creative people on earth, so please get in touch with me or someone else on the subcommittee if you have suggestions for alternative classification schemes, that's a good point. Maybe there is a better way of thinking of that. Other issues that you think are pertinent that were not mentioned as well.

CHAIR RICH: Yeah. I would just add, of course, the Committee needs to be responsive to the charge but the advice could take a different turn if that's the Committee's view.

Senator Sastry has a question. I gave you the opportunity to give the report officially. I'll get back to you in a moment. Let me allow Senator Sastry to raise his question

SENATOR SASTRY: I don't have a question. I wanted to add to what Senator Allen said. I'm also on the subcommittee.

The four categories were traditional PHD programs, professional doctoral programs, research focused master programs and professional masters programs.

Of the four things President Scarborough was clear they're not expecting changing for the traditional PHD programs whatsoever. There is no change to the tuition reimbursement for that, nothing -- they're not expecting anything to change there.

He had some suggestions on the professional doctoral programs which we'll probably talk about when the charge to discuss this.

I think the main issue under discussion for the subcommittee is going to be what does research focused master’s programs really mean on this campus? What cases will it be
meaningful to continue the tuition reimbursement and the way he put it was he would like our programs to be both academically and economically sustainable for the long-term. That's what it is. Our Committee has not met, we don't have a charge. The council is scheduled to meet on Monday and this item is the only item for discussion so there will be a formal charge and we'll have a better understanding of what it is that we understand, what we need to do as a subcommittee

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: The thing, the overall issue which needs to be considered is this there is now a new book of how we're handling our graduate programs. We have to really consider as a group whether or not these changes fit with our academic missions, whether or not this is part of what we think is the right way to run graduate education, one could see this as a dramatic opportunity for mischief. That's all I can come up with, mischief. I feel strongly that we better monitor the hell out of this.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Makki.

SENATOR MAKKI: I'm not on the subcommittee, but I'm on the Graduate Council. One of the issues that came up during that charge is to examine whether we should be granting graduate assistantship for students who can pay for their tuition. That's a valid concern. The other one that came up too, is that several people on that committee mentioned that we use graduate assistantships for teaching or lab assistantships and the proposal that I heard was that we would hire part-time people. I think that should be something -- what?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson, come to order.

SEANTOR MAKKI: We would have to think of that carefully, maybe it is not best practice to hire graduate assistants to serve food in the student union, that's a valid concern, we do hire graduate assistants to work in the union and that's very legitimate to question that, but the proposal to replace graduate assistantship who is are teaching assistantships with part-time faculty I think is something we should be very careful about examining and looking at the consequences of that.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich, I think that that's a very important issue, and I think that's why it is so crucial that we look carefully at the true cost of tuition, to look at the real cost of the difference between how much revenue is being generated from that as well as the subsidy component thrown in there versus hiring an adjunct faculty member. It isn't a non-tenure track faculty but an adjunct faculty member to make it even cheaper. Somehow that is supposed to increase University quality as well.

What we need to do, I think, is to really look at the net difference and to consider the responsibility to train the next generation of teachers, I think I'm confident that will work itself out.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Swift, did you still wish to address the body?

SENATOR SWIFT: I have been extensively following that for two and a half weeks now and I have met with Graduate Student Government. As an undergraduate student representing all of the students on campus, this is the number one concern for both undergraduates and graduates because students are very concerned about the overall experience, that all of the cuts that have been made, everything that we already know, I don't want to waste your time anymore, it is cold.
It is so critically important to understand that there are so many other universities around us, 10, 20 minutes away offering assistantships with healthcare, Kent State on average, $16,000 plus healthcare for a graduate assistantship, me being a senior, just using myself as an example, would I rather come to a University that’s questioning cutting these kind of things and then helping the football team raise their budget or would I rather go to a University like Kent that potentially could have a better program, just saying what I would have studied, and potentially get healthcare for an assistantship? When talking about retention, drawing in the quality of students that the administration have been talking about for months and months now, this is it just a very -- we have all been talking about it, I just want to reiterate from the student aspect that this is extremely important when looking at gaining students and keeping them.

[Applause].

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson

SENATOR ERICKSON: It is a question that I wanted to ask.

When EC met with the President last week and asked about when assistantships would be decided on in that middle ground, not doctoral, but the others, that was supposed to be -- it was originally meant to be coming up as Chairman Rich pointed out, it was supposed to be done by now, the President said that because it had gone to your committee that that committee would be reporting a couple of weeks after the beginning of this semester, next semester, so that the decisions could be made on the '16/'17 assistantships. Is that something -- now, I hadn't heard anything that you have been saying that suggested that timeline and so I’m asking about it.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich, that’s not a viable timeline, no. But maybe two, four more weeks for that. I would also like to comment on what Senator Swift said and tell you that if you have ever seen the Tasmanian Devil cartoon before, that’s the faculty side to this too. We have your back

SENATOR SWIFT: I understand that, thank you.

SENATOR ALLEN: We also ask something of you, don't forget about us in these tough times, we know you have other options. Don't forget about the University of Akron because we do have something to contribute, and we will work our problems out.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: Yes. Thank you, Chair Rich.

I wanted to share a little more information about this, what I know about this and tell you what else is going on in the Budget and Finance Committee. I have raised this year. In response to Senator Swift, I assure you, there are a tremendous number of apprenticeships on campus, as far as the assistantships with external funding, nothing has changed. The tuition reimbursement continues, that was a memo that was sent out by Dean Amos, and I encourage you to read it and it is a very assuring text.

As far as the discussion about the tuition reimbursement, I would assure you that the issue is one of trying to debate it and rationalize and understand what's going on rather than an arbitrary chopping, we'll debate it, look at all sides of this thing. And to Senator Allen and Senator Sterns, I want to say on the University Council Budget and Finance Committee one of the -- the highest priority item for this year's discussion is the cost, revenues, including some
ventured, some donations, research awards, everything, for graduate education on UA campus. We agree that we'll look at this very closely, he's been more than open about sharing what -- expressing the willingness to do this, we're in the process of exchanging the budget for 2016 and he's expressed support that we would be participating in the 2017 budget planning process actively with him.

This is something that I want everybody to know. I don't think we are in a situation where we all need to panic. We'll look at this. We do have the students' back and your interest in mind, we also have an eye on quality and what has to happen to make our University obtain a better reputation.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Feltey

SENATOR FELTEY: Thank you.

I would also ask the Committee to consider inequities across disciplines in terms of stipend and especially for instructional graduate assistantships. Students that are teaching in a class, if it is a 3-credit class across, they're making very differential stipend levels and are generating the same revenue through the teaching activity, for example on the long time, very long time interim director of the Women's Study Program, and they have made the same stipend for the five years I have been in this position, I understand for years prior to that. So for nine years their stipend is $8,000 a year. That's much lower than in Sociology which is still significantly lower than what I made in 1987 as a graduate student at Ohio State.

I think we're talking about -- I know we're concerned about the economics of the situation, but we're really talking about the exploitation of student labor and I'm very concerned about that. I would like for the Committee to look at those inequities across the board.

CHAIR RICH: I would add my own encouragement to the members of the Committee, that look at the issues of both equity and competitiveness in these graduate assistantships to the extent that money can be saved by eliminating some graduate assistantships for good reason if there is good reason. One of the thing that the can he should I think consider is whether that money that's been saved should be invested back into the graduate -- the remaining graduate assistantships to make them more competitive than they are right now and to reduce or ideally eliminate some of the inequities we just spoke of.

Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: In a way, it is too bad that the President left before this discussion. I think at this point we're looking at the deadline for graduate applications in less than two months. A month from this will be break.

I think the only rational way to proceed given that the Committee has a fairly major charge and doesn't even have the data yet that's supposed to be used to look at things and then reporting to Council and then Grad Council will bring it back to Senate.

I would urge you, Chair, if you have any weight with the President to just declare that we're not going to do anything this semester. We're not going to do anything for Fall 2016, that we're going to say things exactly as they are. If we're making a major change in grad funding we should make them rationally, not in a hurry-up scuttle about sort of way. At the moment, as we have heard the students are in a complete panic and hearing no, no, we're not changing anything yet, and when we are, it will be in a while, not until a year from fall at the earliest, that would be enormously reassuring. We have heard that freshman applications are down, it has
been explained away that it is not that bad, if our grad applications drop we’re not going to have as many grad students but a number of programs going to be become unviable the two year programs, if they only have second year students left in them, no first year student, the grad classes will be canceled which means the second year students won’t get classes. I could see in the Fall of 2016 our grad program being gutted just basically because of random rumors and terror and saying, okay, we will do this right and we’re not going to do it now would help with the fear and horror.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I'm happy to respond. I have already had that conversation with the President

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Has it sunk in?

SENATOR STERNS: That's a different issue.

The EC, we have communicated to him we have to get our graduate assistantship offers out. We have -- we don’t want it wait on admissions, especially those, all of us with quality programs, we want the best graduate students and if we didn't make offers early we won’t have the student body that is optimized in our programs. I have made that point. I will continue to make that point. I think the problem is, you know, it was once said that sometimes things need to be said over and over because the first time no one was listening.

CHAIR RICH: I would add that I have pressed this point repeatedly over a period of months. More than a few months. I will tell you, however, I think that the real issue is that the budget was predicated on a cut of a certain magnitude in the graduate assistantships. It is from that point of view a problem to say we'll do nothing this year in the way of a cut. I think that's the real problem.

Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: I don't want to contradict what's been said, but my impression is that the mail that went out, it was in fact intended to allow people that are trying to bring in students based on external funding to move forward. The only issues right now they're trying to decide what to do and I think that those decisions are -- the Committee is meeting Monday. I think that the decisions are intended to be coming up before January, what to do with -- what to do with students that are funded with the graduate school dollars.

CHAIR RICH: Anything further? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: One more, I promise.

I think that the real problem here is we keep talking about the cost side only. We want to keep cutting our budget to do this but our University cannot survive unless it increases revenues as well on the fund-raising side. I would implore us as a group in Senate to start pushing that. Our upper administration, half of their job probably at least is fundraising. We need to start doing it better. We keep having the cost side cut, and we're told we have to cut these programs, but we can fix some of this by making it up on the fund-raising side. Until that's done, we can't fix this problem.

CHAIR RICH: I mean, it is always a problem for public universities to raise enough money to subsidize ongoing academic problems. I think we shouldn't underestimate the difficulty of doing that. I'm not sure exactly what you mean by upper administration, but they certainly do have other responsibilities, it may amount to more than 50% of their jobs outside, of course, of the development area.
I think -- 

SENATOR ALLEN: I made my point 

CHAIR RICH: Do we have a report from representatives of the University council? 

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes, Senator Lillie is not with us today. He asked us to report and I will report and I hope Senator Sterns will fill in where I'm not able to. It will be very quick. 

We met on November 10th. Out of what's happening we have already talked about this meeting with the representative of the boards, the fact that we don't know anything in the University Council about when we're meeting with this person, people, we -- I hope it is at University Council but we haven't been told about it, and that's a considerable concern as I'm sure -- as it was to Senator Sterns. 

At the meeting on the 10th we had supposedly -- I guess it was called an in-depth discussion of the institutional Committee, each meeting we have an in-depth discussion of the work of the Committee. In this case it was a description by Vice President Burns of the major general activities of his office. This meeting of the Committee of University Council on the agenda is the presentation of goals for this year by all the Committees. I'm hoping that in this case that each of those Committees will provide some useful information during this month, the faculty senators on University council either as members or as Committee members, a number of them, those available met with Chair Rich and we discussed quite -- what we would suggest to the committees for their goals. I think this is a really important and both Senator Lillie and I emphasize that the faculty members of University Council are really, really important in this regard because we're the only ones with tenure. We're the only ones that can get up and say what we think is correct without the feeling that maybe we're going to be punished for that which can happen even if it is only in people's heads, very difficult in some committees for people to recognize that they can be critical in a situation where their boss is actually on the Committee. 

It is the role of the Senate, of the senators on the committees to do those kinds of things. I hope that they have those in the goals and we'll report on it next time. 

That's all we can report. Thank you. 

SENATOR STERNS: I can add more to that. 

Vice President Burns talked a bit about his background, the fact that he had 35 years of integrated marketing, had the major responsibilities with the Medical College of Toledo and so showed why he was chosen. Some of the things that you should know is that the U of A Foundation, the key person will be Kim Cole, the Associate Vice President of Development of Education and also have a role as a Development Officer, the government relations will be Matt who is in Washington and Columbus, he's also had the role of access at that point Director of Institutes, in terms of alumni affairs these days, it is William Coleman, who is in charge of alumni issues and also Michael Strong is now the Associate Dean of Students and there's also now a Sexual Response Team coming under this, the Title 9, there are -- there are many new people. I think one of our issues really is that some of the new people may be fine, but we lost some older people that had many years of relationship with the community especially the area of development. I think we lost some key people who had long-term relationships with our community and somehow I wish we had been more -- had more finesse in our transition so that we didn't create as much ill-will. 

CHAIR RICH: I would add not all of the people you mentioned are new, Kim Cole for
example have worked with the University for quite a few years.
  SENATOR STERNS: It is a -- a new position I think.
  CHAIR RICH: She was promoted in a new position.
  Any new business to come before the body? Any new business? Anything for the good
  of the order? Secretary Schulze.
  SECRETARY SCHULZE: The Faculty First Friday is tomorrow at 5:00 at Lockview. All
  bargaining unit faculty, whether you're a member or not, you're invited to attend. We will have
  membership forms there, and the first beer is on them.
  CHAIR RICH: Anything else for the good of the order?
  I take if you're ready to adjourn and warm up? I hereby declare this meeting adjourned.
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