

## **MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF OCTOBER 4, 2001**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 4, 2001, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-nine of the sixty-eight Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Garn-Nunn, Li, Schmith, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Anderson, Calvo, Carri, S. Clark, Conrad, Holz, Louscher, Lyons, Mothes, Riley, and Turning were absent without notice.

### **SENATE ACTIONS**

**\* APPROVED MOTION TO APPOINT DR. CHAND MIDHA TO SERVE AS THE LIAISON FROM THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON EQUITY TO THE FACULTY SENATE, THE PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE, AND THE UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE.**

**\* APPROVED RESOLUTION FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCERNING LACK OF DUE PROCESS REGARDING BUDGET DECISIONS SENT TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES BY THE ADMINISTRATION IN AUGUST 2001.**

**\* APPROVED CFPC RESOLUTION REGARDING ROOM ASSIGNMENTS IN JAMES A. RHODES BUILDING.**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA-** Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Qammar made the motion; Senator Sterns seconded it. The agenda was then approved by the body.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 6 AND 20TH, 2001-** The minutes were not available for consideration and, therefore, not approved at this time.

**III. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS-** The Chair began his remarks by stating that due to a lot of fast changing policies and concerns here with the Senate and with our constituencies, there had been voiced a need for a more rapid form of communication on campus for the faculty and the staff. So as soon as he was able, he was going to change the subscribers' list of the Senate L - that was the Senate discussion list, (it was actually senate-L@list.uakron.edu), and would send that to Senators because their names were available at this point and would include all members of the University community who were represented by the Faculty Senate. We could use this form then as a locus for rapid dissemination of Senate activities and also as a place for concerns to be aired and discussed prior to Executive Committee meetings and prior to Senate meetings. The list would continue to be owned by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, but it would be on a discussion basis, not just a broadcast basis. So issues could be discussed at that point, concerns, rumors and so forth. So we could get material back and forth a little more quickly. Secondly, on the table in front of Senators were copies of a memo that was sent to the IUC members regarding some state funding issues. President Proenza might be referring, or would be referring to this document in his comments.

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - The Chair then introduced new Senators and asked each to please stand as called. Rudy Fenwick from Arts and Sciences, Lance Brouthers from the College of Business Administration, Paul John, and Patricia Wallace from the Community and Technical College, Barbara Trotter representing the part-time faculty. Student representatives were Elliott Anderson, the ASG President, and Daniel Chafing. From the School of Law, William Jordan III, and from the Fine and Applied Arts, Kathleen Clark. He welcomed all.

Secondly, he needed to note several deaths that had occurred among our University family - the first was Ned Gold. Dr. Ned Gold died on September the 4th. Dr. Gold was a graduate of the Ohio State University College of Medicine, and served his residency in pediatrics at Children's Hospital Medical Center of Akron. He was a practicing pediatrician for 42 years and he was director of the student health services at The University of Akron for the last eight years of his career. Secondly, was Nancy J. Noonan Oliver, who died September 13th. Nancy received her Bachelors degree at the University of Dayton in 1970. After teaching she attended The Ohio State University and earned a Master's degree in Home Economics. She taught Home Economics in the Cleveland School System for seven years before joining Ohio Bell Telephone Company from which she retired. She then began working for Maureen O'Connor, the Summit County Prosecutor, and later as Lieutenant Governor O'Connor's executive assistant. Nancy left the Lieutenant Governor's office and became Executive Assistant to the President of The University of Akron, Dr. Luis Proenza. Senators then rose for a moment of silence. The Chair thanked all.

#### **V. REPORTS**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** - Secretary Kennedy began her report by presenting to Senate a motion from the Executive Committee. The motion was as follows: **The Executive Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the appointment of Dr. Chand Midha to serve as the liaison from the President's Commission on Equity to the Faculty Senate, the Planning and Budgeting Committee, and the University Well-Being Committee.** She stated that Dr. Midha was currently serving on the President's Commission on Equity, and that Commission was beginning phase II of the faculty salary study. One of the tasks of that group was to develop valid comparisons for use in the analysis of salary. So the motion to appoint Dr. Midha was to serve as liaison from the Commission on Equity to the Faculty Senate, PBC, and the University Well-Being Committee. The Senate voted its approval of the motion.

Secretary Kennedy continued her report, stating that the Executive Committee had met twice since our last regular Faculty Senate meeting, once as a committee on September 17th and again with President Proenza and Provost Hickey on September 28th. At the September 17th meeting, there was some serious discussion centered on the four strategies that had been proposed by the administration and sent to the Board of Trustees at their August meeting. As Senators would recall, those strategies concerned the budget and the projected \$7.8 million deficit. The main point of contention on the part of the Executive Committee was that due process had not been followed. To that issue we, the committee, drafted the following resolution which we put forth today for Senate consideration. The resolution stated that: **The Faculty Senate views with serious concern the violations of the Faculty Senate Bylaws and the spirit of shared leadership evident in the 2001-2002 budget decisions sent to the Board of Trustees. Neither the PBC nor the Executive Committee acting on behalf of the PBC were involved in the planning or in the evaluation of those strategies presented to the Board. Given the concern of the N.A. with the planning and budgeting process, we recommend that the Executive Committee create an ad hoc committee to review the operation of that process including lines of communication with PBC as well as the operation of PBC and**

**to report back to Senate at the next meeting.**

The Senate then voted its approval of the resolution.

Secretary Kennedy continued by reporting on the September 28th meeting of the Executive Committee with the President and Provost. A question had been raised regarding faculty promotions and the salary increases associated with such promotions from last year. The Provost assured the Executive Committee that those increases had been in the full amount and the money for those increases have been authorized. However, they had been postponed until the regular salary increases were given. The Provost mentioned that all the deans had this information and he would email them all and ask them to notify their respective faculty members.

A second issue discussed concerned the tuition plateau problem which had occurred primarily affecting students in the C & T College who also took courses within the main campus or other four-year colleges. Currently, the credit hour tuition within the C & T College was less than that of the University.

A previous plateau existed for all students regardless of the college they were enrolled in. That was, if a student took between 12 and 15 hours of credit, one tuition applied. However, the plateau had been eliminated, meaning if a student were to take 9 credits at the main campus and 4 credits at the C & T, he or she would be charged separate tuition. Since approximately 98% of all C & T students had to take courses at the main campus, this had resulted in some cases a tuition increase of approximately 39% over spring of 2001. Secretary Kennedy was sure all Senators could appreciate the seriousness of this problem and the potential for negatively affecting the enrollment of the C & T as well as many certificate programs. In response, the Provost had stated that currently work was being done in altering the calculations to deal with these problems. He hoped that it would be successfully resolved by spring 2002, but did warn that it might not happen.

A third issue the committee discussed with the President and Provost centered on the recommendations recently sent by the Well Being Committee. As the President was going to address this in his remarks, Secretary Kennedy did not wish to steal his thunder. She did want to provide some clarification on the issue of elimination of open positions. Senators would recall this issue was whether or not open faculty positions would truly be eliminated if unallocated salary dollars for those positions were used elsewhere, as in salary increases or in recovering health care costs. To clarify, those positions would be eliminated; the positions would go back to the Provost to be reallocated when the dollars were available.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT- Chair Sheffer then invited the President to address the body.

"Good afternoon, colleagues. Let me compliment the Senate on the efforts in enhancing communication and in proposing that we continue to review our processes in light of the rather hurried and emergency fact in which we have to propose a balanced budget. It is not our intention to eliminate the due process that's required, but at times there are external requirements that come forward that indeed in those circumstances we can always do better. Let me also thank your Executive Committee and all of its members. The candor of the discussion last week continues to be one of the most valued aspects of that discussion. Your colleagues are very forthright, and they are willing to ask questions which in every case allow us to clarify points despite what some may perceive to be difficult issues to raise. And I again thank all of you for your willingness to address those issues.

Now as I contemplated the remarks that I wanted to make today, I was reminded of a title of a book by a former university president. Some of you may have seen that book, and the title of the book is 'Is My Armor On Straight?' It reflected on an occasion in which that president had to go into a rather

contentious meeting of yes, a Faculty Senate, and having heard from your Executive Committee and others the intensity of some of your concerns I debated as to whether I needed to go to the Lower House and borrow that nice suit of armor that is over there. The Provost assures me that he has a nice bull's-eye in the back of his suit, but frankly, since most of you still waved at me with all five fingers, perhaps this is not as bad as I thought.

Seriously, in the spirit of enhancing the consultative processes of our University which I value and to which I am committed and wish to build upon as we continue to enhance not only the processes of this Senate but of shared leadership campus-wide, I have considered your suggestions regarding salaries and health costs as well as many other things. And I intend to make several very positive recommendations to our Board of Trustees. Already, I had had the opportunity to discuss some of these ideas with several members of the Trustees informally and I believe whatever recommendations I am able to make as we approach that next meeting and I will elaborate on those in a moment, will be well supported particularly given our recent success with enrollment issues. We must and the Trustees have specifically asked that we continue to monitor relevant external conditions, which as your chairman has noted and the memo from the IUC indicates, are rapidly changing.

Before I do elaborate on what I hope we can come to, I want to most emphatically thank you, all members of the University community for the very hard work on making enrollment job one, beginning the long task of strengthening our enrollment and retention of students. This truly was a campus-wide effort which included faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, students, and many friends of the University. It was indeed a concrete example of shared leadership and I am delighted with that initial success that all of us have achieved. Now we'll come back to that in just a moment because I am not sure that all of us truly appreciate just how exceptional that is.

First, I want to dispel some rumors and your Executive Committee has already taken care of the promotional stipend, but there are two other issues that I wish to address. Perhaps because the Board of Trustees acted six months late on my own evaluation and salary review, many people have assumed that other vice presidents and perhaps other administrators received salary increases on July 1st. Let me assure you that this was not the case. There have been only three salary increases made for vice presidents since July 2000. In January of this year Mr. Curtis and Dr. Gaylord received merit increases for their exceptional performances in regard to two of the University's strategic initiatives. Last spring the Board effected a promotion and subsequent salary increase for Mr. Sibert, who is an employee of the Board of Trustees.

Next, contrary to what some of you may have heard and what perhaps some of you may wish, I am not leaving The University of Akron nor am I seeking another presidency. I have been flattered by the suggestions that our colleagues in Cleveland have made advocating me for the presidency at Case Western Reserve University. I'm neither seeking that appointment nor have I been contacted in that regard and I assure you that I would let you know if I had been. So, sorry to some of you.

First, the good news part of all of this equation. Let me speak in greater detail about our recent success, because the recommendations that I will carry forward to the Board and the overall context in which we do find ourselves having achieved a great success and simultaneously facing several formidable challenges are simple realities that we must be aware of. So, first the good news - over these past 2-? years we have created sort of a buzz - people are talking about The University of Akron. They are saying that something very important is happening at The University of Akron. Places and venues in which we were previously excluded now invite The University of Akron to the table as a

serious partner, and all of that portends good things for our future. Quite simply, we are not being taken lightly; we are not being taken as just another cry in the wilderness, to be ignored and forgotten. It shows. It shows in our results, particularly in the increased enrollment, in head count and credit hour production for both undergraduates and graduate students. Simply, we should and will continue to celebrate this accomplishment. Because, ladies and gentlemen, quite simply The University of Akron out-performed every other Ohio public university in every indicator of enrollment success and credit hour production. Sure, all universities benefit to some degree by the external factors affecting people wanting to go to college. The downturn in the economy always pushes some people to lose their jobs to seek additional training to enhance their job opportunities. Likewise, the demographics of our U.S. population is showing an echo of the baby boom. In larger percentage, in other words, all high school graduates that enter the time when they graduate from high school therefore increase the numbers applying to college. And yes, the Board of Regents may also be correct that they may have been a trickle-down effect from the fact that Ohio State closed undergraduate admissions at a certain level. But, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you again emphatically that we vastly exceeded every other competitor in improvements on head count, credit hour production in freshman class size, thus demonstrating to me and I hope to you equally strongly that we are on the right path and we are doing the right things to create preference in the minds of our students and potential students for attending The University of Akron, as well as in the minds of those who influence students and their choices.

Head count for the Fall semester at our University is up 6.5%. The next highest increase among our competitors was 4.2% - 4.2 to 6.5. Our credit hour production increased by 7.6% while other state universities have increases ranging up to 6.1%. So everybody did well but we beat those numbers. Our freshman class increased by an astounding 21.2%, and I know of no other state university in Ohio that even entered double digits in the tens. We beat everybody else's number and that should not only be encouraging but a testament that we are on track in what we are doing. This is of course the first indicator that we have in a long-term strategy that we have set in motion. All of the positive indicators that I have listed are simply early indicators of success, and we must now continue to ensure that the necessary ingredients for success are in place and continue to be addressed and I look forward to your suggestions of things that we may have not yet taken into account that we must attend to.

Now in this light of success, we have some challenges. We need to provide better and better service to our students, and all those that The University of Akron serves. We need to continually improve our processes, whether in registration, in financial aid, in check processing and many other areas including the demeanor of each and every one of us as we are faced with a student concern or complaint. We have to be supportive of our students in a positive way. And most importantly, we must keep in mind that enrollment and retention is very much foremost in our agenda. If our strategy is going to have the desired long-term effect, which is to improve our common lot as a university, we cannot continue to depend so heavily upon state funding for economic well-being especially in these times of troubled economy.

You are aware of course that we are facing an economic downtrend that is not just national but in fact is global. It has been exacerbated again, as you well know, by the events of September 11th. In Ohio the state is awaiting further analysis and a strategy to address the final DeRolph III decision of the State Supreme Court, which has been estimated to potentially require an additional \$1.2 billion of state funding beyond the \$1.2 billion that the state provided at the close of the legislative session earlier this year. Last week and hence the IUC memo that your chairman has pointed out to you, Governor Taft announced that in this biennium, and this biennium means the current fiscal year that we are operating in plus the next one, the state may face revenue shortfalls of as much as \$1 billion; namely, \$500 million in

each of the 2 years of the biennium. Hence, the Intrauniversity Council has warned that the state's response to that latest revenue projection will probably, regrettably, include additional budget cuts throughout the state which probably will not exempt higher education. Again, I will address that amendment later in more detail. That cut is estimated to be as much as 5%. Maybe that's conservative, maybe not, but anyway that is the current estimate.

While of course the IUC and all of those in higher education including our friends in the business community are mobilizing to suggest the consideration of more permanent solutions, revenue enhancements they are called euphemistically to mean taxes or to use the so-called rainy-day fund of the state, there regrettably appears to be at this point little support on the part of the legislature for enacting any revenue enhancement or of the Governor for encouraging the use of rainy-day funds. The foremost question at the moment again regrettably is not if, but when, and how much. Again as for how much, the IUC estimates 5% as I indicated, and for us that would translate into annual reductions of \$5 million. That would be in addition to the \$2.6 million that we are in the process of implementing as we speak. So those are the realities.

What are we going to do about this? We must of course exercise caution in how we spend and how we plan together. Until we know the exact amount of any additional cut from the state, I am recommending that we do what we can to reward the faculty and staff for the success in exceeding enrollment goals while taking the necessary steps to minimize negative effects of additional budget cuts to either faculty, staff or student support activities.

As you know, Provost Hickey and Vice President Nettling are working with the deans and every other unit of the University - academic, administrative, support, etc., so that no area is exempted to eliminate proportionately from throughout every unit of the University, \$2.65 million of the continuing funding that is what we said initially would be necessary and will continue on that course. As Senator Kennedy has indicated, please don't assume that those are postponements of hirings, because unless new revenues come forward to replace these revenues that we eliminate we cannot possibly make hires against non-existing monies. So we must be on a track to recuperate those dollars in new revenues before we can consider those positions for reallocation in the future.

Secondly, it is our hope to set aside \$2.2 million as a reserve fund against additional state funds and/or to maintain the institution's fiscal integrity and required reserves. Third, I intend to propose to our Trustees at their next meeting on October 26, that we use all the additional revenues realized by the enrollment increase to fund a salary pool and a one-year delay on health care cost participation by faculty and staff.

Specifically, here is what I trust our recommendations can be and what I hope conditions will allow the Trustees to support. In regard to the salary pool, I intend to recommend that we maintain a 3% merit salary pool effective no later than January 1, 2002, and if further state funding cost cuts do not materialize, that we make that retroactive to July 1, 2001. Please understand if the state decides to cut the current year's budget by \$5 million, the only thing that we gain by delaying salary raises to January 1 is about \$1.6 million. I will recommend that and again, if the cuts do not materialize by the state we will equally recommend that we move that implementation to be retroactive to July 1.

In regard to health costs sharing, I'll recommend that we delay until January 2003, implementation of faculty and staff participation in funding health care cost increases. I too, ladies and gentlemen, have

been concerned that there was not enough time for a thorough and deliberate assessment of the health care cost issues earlier this year. And so I am recommending that the Faculty Senate and its Faculty Well Being Committee be given most of this academic year to work with Provost Hickey, Vice President Netting and our Human Resources staff, together with such expert consultants as we may deem necessary and appropriate to examine health care cost issues, and make recommendations regarding a fair and effective system for cost sharing to begin with the start of 2003.

Caveat - in the event that the state imposes additional cuts which are projected for both biennium, we may need to consider a plan that would begin at the start of the next academic year rather than 2003. I will ask the Faculty Well Being Committee to examine that eventuality. That the recommendation will be for delaying them to 2003 unless conditions change. Ladies and gentlemen, the university currently spends \$17.7 million annually on health care, \$17.7 million annually for an average of \$8,400 per employee paid for by the University. More for some, less for some depending on the plan, but an average of \$8,400 per employee. And again as most of you know, the institutional share of health care cost has been escalating for quite so many years and is simply a trend that cannot continue unabated if the University as an institution is to remain fiscally sound in all of the things that it must do to address all of its obligations. I will ask for recommendations from the Faculty Senate by May 1, 2002, to allow for appropriate review, discussion, and planning for an October 2002 open enrollment period if that becomes necessary.

Third, when I listened to the Faculty Well Being Committee's recommendations at your emergency meeting a couple of weeks ago, I resonated very much to the suggestion that we develop a plan to bring faculty salaries to a better comparative position. Such a plan has been a priority of the Board of Trustees, it has been my priority as well, and it is a strategic necessity as we continue to position your University of Akron to achieve its vision and strategic intent. As many of you are aware, the basic analysis that the President's Commission on Equity has been doing in Phase II were designed to begin such a planning effort. I will therefore support in the strongest of terms the advising and implementing such a plan to begin to position faculty salaries at The University of Akron at no less than the median of our peers in Ohio and comparatively at or above the median in the national peer group that we will determine together and one that must be consistent with our vision of strategic intent.

To put it another way, I do not intend to have us compare ourselves to two-year colleges, for example. This effort will require appropriate statistical comparisons by discipline, years in rank, mutually agreed upon benchmark institutions as I've said, both within Ohio and outside the state which are consistent with that vision of becoming recognized as the public research university for northern Ohio. In other words, ladies and gentlemen, we will need and have been developing, and anything you can bring to the table will be useful, data well beyond the often-cited results which were reported in the 'Chronicle of Higher Education.' Data such as are found in the publications of the Council of University Personnel Administrators, the Oklahoma Study, are good examples of the kinds of more comprehensive studies that we will do. Any meaningful analysis will need to consider discipline, years in rank, program level, Masters versus Ph.D., for example, and type of institution. The President's Commission on Equity, with the assistance of an outside statistical consultant and nationally recognized expert, Dr. George McCabe, have already been on the task of doing a faculty study and I expect that you will then put that into the consideration here. So as that becomes available and as your Executive Committee has asked you to involve Dr. Chand Midha as a liaison to work with the Provost and your other committees, etc., we can begin to reflect on where we are and then begin a formal planning process to develop an appropriate approach that we will then implement. So turn to Dr. Midha please, if you have questions. We hope given what I am told is the current status, to have relevant data by the end of the fall semester, this fall

semester. We are ahead of the game perhaps in that case.

From this we can begin to develop a plan and a timeline for simultaneously enhancing revenues and realizing the salary goals in a set period of years. Again, ladies and gentlemen, of course I state the obvious and you've said it yourselves - these things are tradeoffs, but the plan must recognize external realities if the state makes some cuts. If we all of a sudden get a wonderful windfall that we can count on, equally that's a positive trend that might be able to accelerate how we do. But let us be attendant to that as well as to long-neglected important investments in both academic and academic-support areas throughout the University that include \$50 million in deferred maintenance, institutional support for student services business and finance, and many other areas, as well as be attendant to special areas of academic opportunities that can significantly be seen as good investments to leverage yet additional revenues.

We will be exploring that and I plan to maybe address some of that later but I have about six slides I'd like to illuminate and show you in a moment. So we'll come back to kind of a sense of where might we get some leverage, some foothold in programs that we can sell more easily both to our potential student clientele and just as we're facing this economic downturn are times to look for new sources of opportunity for students to come, for companies to ask us to come and do some training for them or some special educational services. We need to be attendant in other words to where else we may have some opportunities to bring forward the needed revenues that can support such a plan. Now while we are facing difficult decisions about our use of resources, let me state unequivocally that we cannot and will not compromise our institution's recent progress towards addressing the lack of resources and years of under-funded and under-addressed institutional needs. To do so would simply throw us back into an area of woeful neglect and it would be remiss in our diligence and approach to proper stewardship of this institution.

In a positive and proactive manner we can and must address not only the current realities but the associated opportunities that these current realities bring forward. You may be aware of a little book that is rather popular today, 'Who Moved My Cheese?' It is trite at one level, but ladies and gentlemen, cheese is moved and we might as well go find where it is now.

Now I've talked about a number of things; I want to show you just a couple of charts. You've heard me talk about this, but this is what the legislature did to higher education this year. If you look up there, you can very quickly discern that the only entity and I reemphasize the only entity of the state of Ohio that received effectively a negative appropriation this past summer is higher education. Now those numbers are not particularly big in some areas - job and family services is a pretty good jump. I think that included the Medicaid shortfall and a couple of things in there. I'm sorry this is pretty complex and I don't know where all the dollars went. But the long and short of it is that they took money from higher education to the tune of about a million dollars plus from our University alone and the cut was made early and then that just continued and we didn't get an increase.

Now what does that say? It says what I've said to you often, that somehow or other at least as long as we want to continue to receive about 47% of our budget from the state of Ohio, all of us have got to work hard to convince the Governor and the state legislature that higher education should not be at the bottom; it should be at or near the top. How do we do that? Write to your legislators as a private citizen. The minute you write to them on your University stationery they will discount you as having a self-interest. Write to them about all of those things that you know to be true, about how higher education impacts the well-being of the state of Ohio, its economy, its way of life, its quality of life, etc.



Write passionately, write often, get your friends, get your sons and your daughters - write. That is the reality; I cannot sugarcoat that.

I also cannot sugarcoat this, and let me tell you what's up there - names of the primary public universities are on the left, their current tuition, their current fees, and their percent increase over this last year are shown there. For example, you say we did 9.3 increase in tuition fees, so why is 9.65 over there? Remember that 3 years ago we had gone to the Board of Regents and said we want to do a special plan to enhance our facilities outside of operating funds. These are dollars we can't use for operating, but they grant you an exception to charge a fee above the recognized cap that was in place. So this year we had a small additional fee kick in and so that is the difference between the 9.3 that we authorized and supported through our Board of Trustees for tuition and fees and the total that included that additional kick-in of the facilities fee.

But notice then, and by the way, these are rank ordered with regard to total fees which is shown in this column here and you notice we are just a little bit below the middle of the pack. At the top is Miami that annually charges \$6,900.00 between fees and tuition. At the bottom is Shawnee State, which actually isn't even on here because these are the four-year institutions fundamentally, and Shawnee State is a very different kind of institution. But anyway, at the bottom is Youngstown State with \$4,200.00. There is a difference in other words of nearly \$2,000.00 for Miami University and a negative 726 for Youngstown State.

Why am I showing you this you might ask? Well, why is it that Miami isn't particularly complaining but, however, they have a partial freeze? Why is it that the University of Cincinnati maybe isn't complaining particularly? They too have some problems. Why is it that Ohio State University which is actually below us and is supposed to be our 'flagship?' It tends to be prerogative in a field in which I've often said there is no monopoly on green grass or weeds. The bottom line of this picture is the following: Let's just take Akron, Kent State, and Bowling Green as an example. For what we did as individual institutions this year in tuition and fees, Kent State will have in their budget this year an additional \$10 million, and Bowling Green an additional \$10.1 million. Miami is going to have, and I'm looking for the proper adjective - obscene; I mean to tell you this is not good public policy.

Frankly, the state of Ohio promised and I know you've heard this from me over and over again, 30 years ago that no student would ever have to pay more than 30% of the cost of their higher education and not even the students at Youngstown State are paying 30% at those low rates. The state should do something about it, but this is criminal, and indefensible and obscene. Why is it obscene? There is no way that you can tell me that Kent State or Bowling Green or even Miami is worth that much more as a public institution. Now you may like the setting at Oxford in Athens, Ohio."

Senator Norfolk then pointed out that it was Ohio University that was in Athens, Ohio. The President continued.

"This is public higher education, ladies and gentlemen. I would suggest to you that not only is this indefensible just on the surface, but the analysis that we have done of our documented excellence suggest that if anybody ought to be charging at least as much as Bowling Green, it's us. Now look at the differences there in tuition and fees and you recognize very quickly that we can probably move up in tuition fairly quickly but we are separated a little bit more in fees - we are currently charging \$580 where at some they are charging as much as \$1,290.00. But remember, as we develop the plan that would allow us to address the differences here at least in our favor, the only dollars that we could use for basic

operational support are tuition dollars. The fee dollars are dedicated to other purposes. So we may be able to use some fee increases over the next two or three years as we develop a plan, to strategically address things like deferred maintenance and other support elements, but we have a smaller range in which to build a natural at least comparative equivalency in cost structure to our nearest competitors.

Our data, our studies conducted by an independent firm, show that typically students want to go to Ohio State. That's their preference, and you read it on the front page of the Beacon Journal on the sports page. Your hometown paper prefers to tell you about Ohio State than about The University of Akron - that's another problem. But our data shows that students want to go first to Ohio State and if they can't get in there they look at Bowling Green, Kent State, Ohio University, and Akron and Toledo more or less at the same level, though that's changing very rapidly and Akron is moving up on that very quickly. This last year after only one year of our strong 'Telling the Story' promotional campaign, our visibility and preference have shot up dramatically. We're going to repeat that study when, Paul?" (The President had referred to Mr. Paul Herold, who replied that the study would be repeated next summer.)

The President continued.

"Next summer - I predict that those data will start to show up very strongly. I don't want to belabor this point here but I hope I have shown you two bits of information that will at least allow you to understand the situation at other institutions. I just want to say something - I'm glad Dan decided to go to his son. I don't know if all of you are aware but Dan's son was taken to the emergency room at the hospital and they are very concerned about him, so please contact him as appropriate.

I think the point that I would leave you with is the state of Ohio is not doing right by higher education in Ohio. And secondly, as a matter of public policy, Ohio has developed a tuition deferential that is grossly unfair on the surface of it and frankly which I've argued with the help of our General Council and others is equivalent in higher education to the condition that brought about the DeRolph suit for K-12. Why? Because inherently Miami, Cincinnati, Bowling Green, and Kent State are advantaged in any one year more than we are, particularly when tuition caps were in place, and clearly if we all of a sudden did a 15% tuition increase, that would be difficult not only on our students but it would be a difficult public statement to make and it would not service the University well. I mentioned opportunities and I beg your indulgence in my not addressing those today as it would take us too long, but in the absence of your Chair I would simply ask the interim Chair and the Secretary to indicate to you and make time for discussion of this perhaps as early as our next meeting if you would permit.

We do need and I am coming to a close now, to build upon the successes and the documented excellence that I have referred to and that we have indeed documented. We do need during this year to move to the next stage in our strategic thinking now with the framework of Charting The Course. We need to provide some depth, detail, and indeed supporting elements to that. The Provost will be telling you over the next few weeks and months of the process that we are starting. He is developing a process by which solid and specific initiatives with clear goals and measurements towards those goals can be developed jointly and I look forward to that.

Let me just end in a slightly different way than perhaps I had meant to. As you've recognized by the new process of communication and expanding your list to the whole campus, we need to do a better job of that. We need to develop a sense of commonality in language and articulate some of those common elements frequently and strongly. I've shared some of that with you that we developed to summarize Charting The Course, to summarize some enthusiasm - we've used the 'land of the bullish

kangaroo' and the 'packs quite a punch, puts quite a zip' to recognize some enthusiasm, but we developed the other 5 lines that talk about what it is that we are. And please indulge me by joining me in reciting those 5 lines. Maybe by reciting them it will put them into your mind a little bit and then you can think about them and what they mean to you, how they can be meaningful to the institution and to developing not only the pride that we should have but our future actions. So here goes - would you please repeat after me: Our expertise creates the materials for the new economy and shapes the communities that we serve. We are the University in, of, and for Akron - the public research university for Northern Ohio. We are you; you are it. Thank you."

Due to a family emergency, Chair Sheffer excused himself from the meeting, and Vice-Chair Erickson assumed the duties of the Chair. Vice-Chair Erickson asked the President whether he would take questions from the body at this time. He consented.

Senator Qammar then stated that, given the things the President had said, she was actually quite pleased to hear about the things he was going to plan. Senators had the new memo for IUC and had been expecting things like this to come our way. We talked about and this body had already approved the resolution from the Executive Committee talking about shared leadership and the need for being able to make sure that we were not a victim of emergency plans. As the President had stated before, there was a need for them sometimes. It sounded like we were heading on a train crash for another emergency plan. What was the plan, so that we did not get into that scenario again when we really needed shared leadership this time?

The President then replied.

"Some very good questions, Senator Qammar. Frankly, it is a plan that we will have to develop. Already of course the Provost has begun to work with each of your units with regard to the elimination of the current \$2.6+, 2.64, 2.65 million deficit. That's a plan that you will develop together with your deans, your chairs, etc., and the Provost in regard to and for other members of the University community with their respective areas because no area is exempt. Should we face an additional \$1, 2, 3, 4, 5 million cut we will have to do the same. In the absence of and let me put it another way - we have in the last 2" years developed a framework which we call Charting the Course. It provides necessary competencies, the foundation of core competencies or enabling competencies providing a vision, areas of clusters of excellence two priorities and five strategies. We have embarked on using that to help our thinking and that certainly should guide that. But we do not have at this point a more detailed plan that says in the long term we will do x and not y. We do not have that. In the absence of that, it has to be that we come together. We're guided with where we are in our stage of thinking and analyzing the comparative and competitive situation and determining the course of action jointly, recognizing that somehow or other x amount of money has to come out of the budget other than saying whatever it is that we are told. They don't ask me whether I can accept this or whether I want to participate in how the state does this, so please be assured that you're not alone. That's about the best I can do."

Senator Norfolk then asked the President for his opinion. When he had looked at the first slide, the amount cut out of the University's budget was chump change; it was peanuts. Not for us, but for the state. Why, why did they bother cutting it at all? President Proenza replied with the following.

"I will be happy to tell you what I think is going on in the land of the legislature. Ladies and gentlemen, I don't know how to paint this picture any more clearly than that slide designates. It tells you that higher

education is not something that is in the public consciousness as something that they want to invest in above these other things. Legislators and I think I mentioned at one of our last meetings having been in a meeting with Senator Finan, President of the Senate, as well as the new chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Doug White, I will tell you one very positive aspect of that. Fundamentally, they said nobody calls us about higher education except presidents.

I think I also mentioned some of the general perceptions which, like it or not, are parts of what it is. But for better or for ill, at the moment our United States of America has made a commitment to public education K-12 and a partial commitment to public higher education; by partial I mean precisely that. It's never all there. It has been a dialogue in our nation as to whether higher education is a private or public good. So far it has tended to be largely a private good, so the state helps a little bit to bring up those it can't but it simply has not made the commitment that it did when it made secondary education a national mandate, if you will. The closest thing that our nation has come to that is the GI Bill and it may be coming again.

Earlier on in 1862 the Land Grant Bill and then the other bills that followed on that created agricultural experiment stations and what have been referred to as the traditional black institutions. Now in that conversation something was revealed that we need to put into our minds as to how we think about it. They still use the word subsidy and I told you I have been trying to get them to change that word because as long as the operative word is subsidy, what's going to happen is it's going to be an afterthought, a gratuitous gesture and not something that the state thinks consciously as an investment. They said we like the word subsidy. Look how good it has done with the money, that we have put \$60 million a year to Ohio State for agricultural support. And I said, Senator, agriculture is the second largest industry in Ohio; the polymer industry is now number one. I'll come see you because the polymer industry needs \$60 million and it gets \$1 million.

Now my point there is not to emphasize the polymer industry but, ladies and gentlemen, look around you in northeast Ohio and look at every institution including our own and see how many of the major industries are being served by a major program that interfaces with that industry. The answer is just one, and it is the polymer industry. Metalworking industry is not, instruments and controls is not, aerospace is not, financial services is not. You can argue that they've got a wonderful business school here and at Case Western but a dedicated program that focuses on comparative, competitive advantages of R & D in those areas - there isn't any, not a dedicated program, certainly not in any organized way. Those are opportunities and believe me those colleagues out there will help build a program in those areas if we can find a program."

Senator Yoder then asked a question about the idea of proportional cuts. On the face of it they seemed very equitable but again, one of the things the Executive Committee knew from having talked last Friday was that she had a very myopic faculty member's view of the world. But one of the things she had noticed in a Board of Trustees report was that the growth of the last year on the side of the administrative costs had been at the rate of 19%, while the rate of growth on academic costs had been more around the neighborhood of 4%. So if we were looking at proportional cuts given that difference in growth, it did not seem as equitable or proportional on the face of it. She knew that we had some decision making in terms of exactly what cuts were to be made within our proportion, within our unit. But it also seemed that a global decision had been made about proportional cuts that we had not been involved in.

President Proenza replied with the following:

"Senator Yoder, thank you for that question and also for your forthrightness with which you asked some of your questions last week. It helped tremendously to clarify some issues. Senator Yoder refers to the fact that indeed we were sharing issues about faculty concerns and I reflected with your Executive Committee as I would with you that yes, without the faculty it would not be a university but I have to remind you that without students that would also be the case. Much as we might want to think otherwise, there are a few universities that manage to exist almost exclusively on grants and contracts and a few graduate students, but that's not us. I don't think any of you anymore than any of our students would want to volunteer for yard duty and volunteer for sweeping the halls duties, although some of us do that in our own offices. I dust my shelves and a few other things of that nature. So my point in that regard before I come to the specifics of your question is that I would ask that as we move forward we think of the University as a community that is larger than ourselves. That indeed it would not be a university but for that interaction of all of the elements of that community and it helps us little to try to talk about academic and administrative because that leads mainly to finger pointing and wishing that we could do without one or the other.

Maybe you have in mind a more balanced approach and frankly that is what the process that the Provost is starting with this planning is intended to do. It is intended to use a methodology which asks us to very carefully balance all of the components of an entity and specifically develop measures that allow you to then make the hard judgments as to whether those increases are justified or not. Do they bring the kind of returns on investments that we want or not? I don't have all of the data that leads to that particular comparison, but I could begin with a simple fact that indeed the academic component, and I don't know where you get the 19% - is it 19% you developed, Tim?"

(The President referred to Senator Norfolk who replied that he had not been the one to come up with that figure.) The President continued.

"Anyway, I will be happy to look at it. At the time that you raised a similar question at the Executive Committee I responded to your Executive Committee as I would today, because something I think I am is consistent. Let me try to reconstruct part of that and elaborate. Your University suffered two other major cycles of budget cuts approximately 10 and 20 years ago. Recessions in this country are about 10 years apart for the last many years. I can tell you from experience elsewhere that this University then as other universities have tended to do that don't have the kinds of plans we must develop and the kinds of analysis that had led us to that framework of Charting the Course do the easy thing - they cut maintenance first. What happens ten years later? You're facing a \$50 million deficit in deferred maintenance. What else do they do - they cut administrative functions that are perceived to be nonessential. For for 10 years as a result of some of that, what you have seen as a university is a straight line down in enrollment. Why? Because somebody had decided that enrollment management was superfluous, not only superfluous but it wasn't even in the consciousness of this institution. We cannot have that anymore. It also had decided many other things like that that in good conscience, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot allow to happen as a group that is responsible and I mean you and I, for the welfare of this institution. New faculty as well as new administrative hires are costing more than they did 3 or 4 or 5 years ago, but I can assure you that this morning's 'Crain's Cleveland Business Daily' has a wonderful editorial about our hiring Byron Pipes recently as the Goodyear Chair. We've had 2 very positive editorials in Crain's Cleveland in the past year alone and that is worth a lot in terms of the future of the institution. You may debate that as well but let me assure you that it is. It raises the perception of your institution, it raises the influence and so forth. In the cases of some of the hires we've made, Dr. Newkome, for example, replaced 2 people. In other areas of course they were either unsupported or shall we say not earning their keep, but enough said on that.

We will examine that, Senator Yoder, in the sense that the Provost and I recognize that as we work with each of your immediate colleagues, faculty and deans and the chairs, as well as other elements, that there are some areas that we will have to make some adjustments from other places and go ahead with a hire that is going to have to teach 3 sections of English 101 for example. We will have to make some adjustments and we will work with you on that. But some of those cases will follow as strongly a consultative process as possible, but obviously we cannot bring every small element to some kind of vote. We'll have to move forward as best we can until we have a more fundamental, measurable, and implementable plan that has measurable goals and outcomes, the approach that is beginning on a return on investment. If we already had that in place, we would immediately be able to make more cuts in the unproductive areas than in the more productive areas. What this should do in the future is that that should be basically a self-adjusting process. Perhaps enough said - thank you for your question."

Senator Yoder replied to the President's comments by stating that this was a small issue in terms of amounts of money, but she thought it addressed the morale issues that were very important. She appreciated today that the President had taken the opportunity to clarify some questions about administrative salaries. But she was still confused, because she knew that in October of this year she was making what she was making in October of last year. Was that also true for the Vice Presidents and President?

President Proenza replied with the following.

"With the exceptions that I mentioned, the Board was supposed to make an assessment of me and some recommendation in January. They made no such recommendation until July. I am now making more than I did in October. The only other adjustments were the three that I mentioned - one person that works for the Board of Trustees, and two vice presidents who had a merit increase proposed in December and implemented in January - Mr. Curtis and Mr. Gaylord - that's it. Dr. Hickey who came in May of last year has not had a single penny added to his salary; neither has Dr. Newkome nor Dr. Roney, neither has Mr. Mallo since last July, or Mr. Nettling since last July. Those are the only ones, and to my knowledge no other administrator has had an adjustment in salary. And please, again, your colleague was I think sensitive about broaching that initially. I encourage you to ask even the most difficult of questions. I have no reason to not give you an answer."

President Proenza then asked whether Mr. Mallo might be given permission to speak. Vice Chair Erickson then asked the body whether it would grant Mr. Mallo permission. It agreed to do so. Mr. Mallo stated that some Senators might not know that the President's contract was not on an academic year. His contract was a calendar year contract and ran from January to December. That was why the cycle for him is different.

Vice Chair Erickson then asked a question of the President in her role as chair of the Well-Being Committee. Had she understood it correctly that if there was a huge problem with cuts by the state, that the President was talking about the health care cost sharing to be implemented by July 1st of the year? The President replied that he would be charging her committee to explore that option in the event of another financial crisis. Vice Chair Erickson replied that when this was suggested by the PBC chair at the meeting of the Well-Being Committee, it was pointed out by Human Resources that, given enrollment for the year began this October, no one would be able to make a legitimate judgment on which plan to choose if in fact no one knew whether cost would be a factor.

The President replied with the following.

"Senator Erickson, your point is very well taken and I would simply ask the Well-Being Committee to explore that eventuality. I want to be candid; my intention in coming here today was to accept the recommendations that you set forward two weeks ago. However, as your President facing the possibility of an additional \$5 million in cuts, I cannot with a straight face go the Trustees and say implement all of this, defer this, and by the way, we have to cut not just 2.6 but 7.6 million out of the budget. So as we speak we're going to go forward with a recommendation that asks you, the Faculty Well-Being Committee, to come back with a recommendation if you can cut costs and the state doesn't cut us further, we may not need to go forward next year. I can assure you that if cuts continue to go forward, the Trustees I've spoken to have said very emphatically that they will not continue an option other than cost sharing, and I think you would agree that is just unrealistic.

Secondly, I was prepared to go forward and say salary raises to be retroactive to July 1. In the absence of \$5 million, we already said we'd do 2.6; we'll swallow hard and will do that. With a \$5 million cut in front of us, that's another 100 positions or more. That begins to impact how we do what we do and it could potentially impact our ability to serve those extra students that we currently need to have the extra revenue. Thirdly, I fully support the development of a plan to carefully and constructively analyze how The University of Akron is positioned relative to its competition in faculty salaries, and frankly all other salaries. We did that through Mercer for the staff as there's a company that does that; there's no company that does that for faculty. But that is something that I am very strongly supportive of. We will go forward with those caveats."

Senator Lee then stated that he very much appreciated the way the President had presented here today. He asked that on the idea that the raise could be retroactive to July if there are no further budget cuts and wondering about the mechanics, since last year our budget cuts came at the very end of the year, if there were some date when that decision had to be made. The President replied that he would hope we could have an indication from the state by January. He then asked Mr. Hank Nettling as to how late we had implemented retroactive increases in the past. Mr. Nettling replied that we had had some in January.

Senator Gunn stated that, coming from the College of Fine & Applied Arts, had the President considered what our proportion was of the current \$2.6 million cuts. Looking at faculty, part-time faculty and operating costs, just to make the current cut was going to have impact on how we served the University.

President Proenza stated that he agreed with Senator Gunn. The IUC had asked Mr. Nettling to provide an analysis of the kinds of services that would be lost. He pointed out Boeing - how many jobs had Boeing eliminated two weeks ago - 30,000 out of 800,000 may not have been a very large proportion, but most of the airlines eliminated 12-15,000 jobs. The legislature would say, "Get real, guys," and in part that was what we ought to examine. Remember, the state fund was a fraction. We were not having to cut the parts of our revenues that we were in control of. What he was trying to say with what he would be coming back to delineate in more detail for all later was that there were many opportunities that we did have control of. Our distance learning hours were up by quite a factor; our honors students were up by quite a factor; the Provost had been working both in Medina and Cuyahoga Counties to create a pipeline that should bring additional revenues to us. The President simply asked

each and every one of you to explore what other opportunities you might see. There were going to be lots of opportunities out there with people being displaced, with companies looking for universities to do things that they could do with us at a rate they could not do internally which would benefit us and them simultaneously - good synergism. He asked that we simply explore; he could not agree more with Senator Gunn in that context.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Vice Chair Erickson then invited the Provost to address the body.

"Let me give you some numbers here to drive home the impact because as you said we all know, but this is a very sobering way of looking at this. Regarding the cuts coming out of the colleges, certainly it's up to the deans working with the administrative groups to determine where they're going to come. Obviously, open positions are the easiest place - not necessarily the best, but the easiest place. Let's just say that all of the reductions in our budget were going to be covered by eliminating positions, faculty/staff positions in the academic units and staff positions in the administrative units. The \$2.65 million cut that we're absorbing now translates into approximately 50 faculty/staff vacancies throughout the University. It could be 47, could be 52 depending on which ones go, because different ones have different amounts of money in the salary line. So that's 50 positions, 5 million if we have to absorb that, approximately 100 additional positions. So you add those two together and you have 150 positions. When we started this a week ago there were only 200 vacant positions throughout the University, so 150 of those 200 would be gone if in fact we would get this second \$5 million cut and if it's all taken out of open positions. So there's a lot of frustration being shared by a lot of people.

Let me just touch on one issue since it was brought up earlier and that is the plateau issue, because that has been resolved since last week's Executive Committee meeting and I can give you some final words on that. Hank, if they would allow me to have you jump in and correct me if I say something wrong here I would appreciate it. First of all, there are two issues - general service fees and tuition. Let's take the general service fees first. The issue there was in just talking about C & T and University of Akron main campus today, not talking about Wayne with regard to fees. When credit hours taken at C & T and The University of Akron were taken away so a student in order to reach the plateau would have to take 12 credits at either C & T or The University of Akron, you couldn't add them together. When that was taken away, it also had an impact on the general service fees. So some students were charged a general service fee for more than 12 credits. That is being resolved as of this semester."

The Provost then asked Mr. Hank Nettling for clarification in that it was both the C & T and Wayne regarding the general service fees. Mr. Nettling replied that it was only at the C & T. The Provost continued.

"So we're only talking about C & T today. We'll try to deal with Wayne at a later time. The biggest impact was at C & T and The University of Akron. That is being reversed and students will have their accounts credited for the difference. They will not have to pay more than 12 credits worth of general service fees. So as of this semester if they have a balance greater than what they're due, we'll simply credit their account; if they don't have a balance owed we'll send them a check for the difference."

Mr. Nettling then added that the primary criteria was that students were enrolled in the C & T program. If they were enrolled in the Akron program there was no adjustment.

The Provost resumed his remarks.



"That's right. If they're enrolled in the C & T program, they get the adjustment on the fees. Now the issue of tuition was the one that wasn't resolved when we talked last week and is now resolved. The problem with the tuition, the original idea of keeping the rollups to the plateau separate, was that the tuition at C & T is in fact less than at the University and therefore was treated as a separate institution in the same way that Wayne is treated as a separate institution in that regard. What we did not realize at the time and have subsequently learned is that many programs within C & T require students to take courses at The University of Akron campus in order to earn the degree in C & T. So the program itself dictates that they take courses at The University of Akron. Therefore, starting the spring semester the students in C & T will have the courses they take at C & T and the courses they take on the main campus roll up in effect to reach the plateau. Once they reach the plateau they get the same free credit hours that the other students do. So we will fix that as of spring semester. It won't be fixed retroactive to fall, but it will be fixed as of spring semester. The vast majority of the concerns that have been expressed to us have been about that relationship - C & T students taking courses at Akron and not having those courses count toward the plateau."

The President then stated that he would be remiss if he did not ask this question - since C & T was in effect purchasing University of Akron courses at a discounted rate, he would suggest there was a revenue opportunity that needed to be adjusted. The Provost replied that that had been discussed and that he supposed they might go back to the drawing board. It had been discussed that there would be actual revenue losses to the institution. However, since he had no doubt that no good deed went unpunished, he was sure this in turn would create some other ripple effect that had not been anticipated. We would have to determine what that was and deal with it as it came along. He then stated that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Sterns then stated that some were aware that a number of major transitions had been announced regarding the Community & Technical College. As someone who had been on this campus now for over 30 years, he remembered when it was a good thing to have the Community & Technical College as part of the University. There were many arguments about the integration of 2-4 year programs fully understanding both the transfer function as well as the certification of a 2-year degree from the C & T College. What he did not understand was why there had not been more open deliberation and input from the faculty regarding the transition. The Provost had some decisions that had not been discussed with this body nor fully discussed with the faculty.

Provost Hickey asked Senator Sterns whether he was talking about the proposed reorganization of C & T. Senator Sterns stated that he was. The Provost replied with the following.

"No decisions have been made whatsoever and I presented it in a 2-1/2 hr. meeting with the entire faculty or at least all of those who wanted to attend of C & T. I asked them to begin discussions of this and we would go ahead and discuss this throughout the fall semester to arrive at some agreement of what would be a good idea. Now if I understand the process right, I am starting where I should start. I am starting the discussion with the faculty as a whole. If there has been a recommendation that comes forward later, then my understanding is it comes to the APCC at that point in time.

Now is it being portrayed as I have made up my mind? I'm sure it is because there are some people at C & T who think this is absolutely the wrong thing to do. I will tell you there are other people in C & T who think this is the best thing since sliced bread. So it depends on who you talk to. The proposal I have in my mind at least is to bring C & T more central, particularly Associate Studies aspects of C & T

bringing it very much central to some of the functions of the University as a whole including the retention of students. It has the Associate Studies people playing a very prominent role in those efforts to retain students, not only new freshmen but students who come here as transfer students or students who come to the University after being out of education for many years. So I tried to present it as a very positive.

I have also tried to present it as an opportunity for me to focus investments in that activity, the activity we're talking about being Summit College, which would be basically a merger of the University College and at least the Associate Studies components of C & T, if not some additional components. Another part of that is the possibility of actually creating a college of technology which would concentrate on baccalaureate level technology, and I've tried to explain to many of those who will listen why I think that is a good idea.

One of the reasons is, as I have looked at technical program facilities all around us at the community college virtually every community and technical college in northern Ohio has better facilities than does C & T. The University doesn't have the resources to provide those kinds of facilities so we have to come up with some creative way to teach technical programs using other people's facilities. What we do have is the ability to offer baccalaureate programs in technology. That's what the community colleges don't have and that's a market niche for us that would actually allow us to concentrate some of our technical training in those areas and doing it collaboratively with some of the community colleges and actually use their facilities - teach the programs on their campus. So it's a way to create new revenues in a niche where we have a chance to compete. We're having consultation with the faculty; some of them don't like what I've proposed and am sure they're describing it otherwise, but once that process is done I'll be more than happy to follow the process of the Senate and bring this to the Senate for further debate."

Senator Sterns then thanked the Provost for his response.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - (See **Appendix A** for full report.) Senator Sterns had one particular issue to bring forward regarding room assignments in the James A. Rhodes building. He introduced the resolution that: **Faculty Senate supports that JAR 151 be made available as additional study space for student-athletes and that Admissions have partial use of JAR 48 and Tommy Evans Lounge, with the stipulation that JAR 151 return to classroom utilization, as previously agreed, after Admissions moves to its new building.**

With no discussion on the resolution coming from the body, a vote was taken. The Senate approved the resolution.

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE- Dr. Mike Cheung began his report by stating that the committee was assembling its agenda for the year. He stated he was here in part to solicit input, concerns, questions, issues, etc., polite and pertinent comments which could be sent to him at cheung@uakron.edu, or to the committee as a whole. The committee had a list-serve list and it was cctc-L@lists.uakron.edu. Please send whatever was on your mind that you felt may fall under the domain of the Computing & Communications Technologies Committee.

Second, he had taken the liberty of asking Mr. Herb Matheny and Sue McKibben to join the body today and with its indulgence to update us briefly on the status of the faculty laptop rollout. The body then gave permission for Mr. Matheny and Ms. McKibben to speak.

Mr. Matheny began by stating that we did have laptops on campus. We had started the rollout this

morning in the University Library, and they were not part of the substantive thing, but we wanted to rollout there first so we could get our processes and procedures worked out to hopefully go smoothly. The way the system would work was we wanted to have an orientation session for all departments and colleges where Ms. McKibben came out and made a presentation about the program and the laptops in general. She could talk more about the orientation sessions. Then after that we would have a signup and a dedicated time period. In your time slot a technician would come to you and bring your laptop to you, would give you a one-on-one session on care of your laptop. We would move all of your documents from your existing computer over to the laptop to make it as fully functional as we could for you and similar to what you had on your existing machine. We wanted you to use the laptop, so our goal was to make it as much like the other machine as possible. The technician would be there to answer any questions for you. Senators were asked to sign up for a slot. We could move your data and answer questions to help you out. In addition he had also drafted a lot of the colleges' technicians - CBA, Arts & Sciences and Law - some of those colleges and schools were going to do their own setups. So a training session would start on Oct. 11 in the morning for these technicians to show them how to set these up, going through the same processes that we would do. Then we would deliver to them the laptops for their area so they would be responsible for rolling out the laptops for faculty they were accountable for. The idea there was that the more people we had doing it, the quicker we could get them out. So within the next couple of weeks you would see laptops in your area and we would be making appointments. Ms. McKibben would try to set up orientation sessions to speak and tell you what was going to happen.

Ms. McKibben stated that the presentation was about an hour long. She would come to departments and do a couple presentations within your departments so everyone could attend. Basically, she would go over your hardware and software, tell you about the wireless network so you were familiar with that and could use that in your office. She would talk about using a port replicator, help you understand how the support worked for your laptop. We had plenty of support on campus. She would spend a few minutes and go over some training if you were interested in web ct or some word or office or outlook training. We had all kinds of training available that you could take advantage of if you like and just familiarize you with the laptop so you understood how the rollout was going to work. That way if you had any questions you could come and ask her and be prepared for when the technician came to your office.

President Proenza then wanted to extend a compliment, having exchanged some emails and observing these two colleagues who were working very hard to do just what they had said and provide a smooth transition. He complimented Sue also for pursuing a dream of establishing a strong set of opportunities for faculty and staff in a variety of areas. She had one of those great ideas that got implemented.

**VI. UNEFINISHED BUSINESS** - There was none.

**VII. OLD BUSINESS** - There was none.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS** - There was none.

**IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - There was none.

**X. ADJOURNMENT** - Vice Chair Erickson then asked for a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

**Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin**