

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MAY 1, 2003

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Thursday, May 1, 2003, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Chair Dan Sheffer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Forty-nine of the sixty-two Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Carri, Drew, Graham, Harp, Schmith, Spiker, and Yousey were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Crain, Sehn, Svehla, Trotter, and Wyszynski were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

*** POSTPONED WELL-BEING COMMITTEE-S DOMESTIC PARTNER RECOMMENDATION UNTIL THE OCT. 2003 FACULTY SENATE MEETING.**

*** APPROVED APCC-S RECOMMENDATION FOR A NEW CALENDAR FORMAT.**

*** APPROVED CFPC RESOLUTIONS REGARDING:**

- 1.) ASSIGNMENT OF 5,000 SQ. FT. ON THE FIFTH FLOOR OF THE POLSKY BUILDING FOR THE TAYLOR INSTITUTE OF DIRECT MARKETING.**
- 2.) MOVING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAMS FROM GALLUCCI HALL TO SPACE ON THE THIRD FLOOR OF AYER HALL.**
- 3.) ALLOCATION OF SPACE ON THE THIRD FLOOR OF THE POLSKY BUILDING FOR THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT.**
- 4.) ASSIGNMENT OF ROOMS 324 AND 318 OF THE POLSKY BUILDING ON A TEMPORARY BASIS FOR THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT.**
- 5.) THE PERPETUATION OF THE GARDNER AND SIMMONS NAMES ON TWO CAMPUS BUILDINGS.**

*** APPROVED PBC RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING:**

- 1.) ACCEPTANCE IN PRINCIPLE OF THE ROI QUALITY MEASURES, CHARGING PBC WORKING GROUP TO DEVELOP IMPROVEMENTS AND ASSESSMENT MEASURES OVER THE SUMMER & TO REPORT BACK TO THE FACULTY SENATE SO THAT IMPLEMENTATION CAN BEGIN IN THE FALL.**
- 2.) PBC-S REQUEST THAT THE ADMINISTRATION WORK WITH PBC OVER THE SUMMER IN REGARD TO THE BUDGET.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA B Senator Wilkinson moved that the agenda be approved; Senator Hebert seconded the motion. The body then voted its approval of the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 20 AND APRIL 3, 2003 B Secretary Kennedy reported that she had not received any corrections to either set of minutes. No corrections forthcoming from the floor, the body then voted its approval of the March 20 and April 3, 2003, minutes.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR B Chair Sheffer addressed the Senate by stating that we had made it to May; it had been a very long year. Senate had dealt with a lot of very hard issues this year, and he was really very grateful to all for their help throughout this entire year. There would be some comments today about the budget and what had been sent to the Board of Trustees at its April meeting. Questions surrounding this issue, which were raised in both the PBC and with President Proenza, the Provost, and Vice President Ray, would be addressed in the report of the Executive Committee later in our meeting.

At this time Chair Sheffer wished to offer his thanks to Vice President Roney and Provost Hickey for the leadership and service they had given at the University in the past two years. One to Vice President Roney for her guidance in addressing our issues with student services and enrollment management; things are indeed turning and are looking bright. And Provost Hickey for the fine advice given us, the battles - we had not always agreed but he had been very forthright with us - and he certainly appreciated everything the Provost had done for us. The Senate then responded with a strong round of applause.

The Chair continued. Speaking of the Provost, there had been a request from the President that individuals around the campus - both bodies of individuals, such as committees of chairs, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and other individuals on this campus - provide him with input regarding possible individuals to serve as interim provost. The chairs had sent a list; the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had prepared a list, and would send it to the President. The Chair would share that with all Senators later today via email. He believed it would be proper if Senators had suggestions, after reviewing what the Executive Committee had sent, to email those to President Proenza.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Senate was then asked to approve the Summer 2003 commencement candidates. Mrs. Quillin had the list of those candidates with her today. Senator Witt made a motion to approve the list; Senator Steiner seconded the motion. No discussion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the Summer 2003 commencement candidates.

Chair Sheffer continued by asking that committee chairs of the Senate who had not presented a report this year (orally or in written form) to please send a written status report to the Faculty Senate office to Marilyn Quillin's attention by May 15. This was the requirement of Senate bylaws, and we would appreciate it if final reports were made to the Senate office.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met several times since the last regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting. On April 18 we met and addressed the following: First, regarding PBC's recommendation #2, the Executive Committee wished to convey its willingness and desire to participate in the budget process during the summer months; we were willing to work on the budget as well. We also discussed the curriculum proposal process. Issues had arisen regarding the curriculum development and approval process, and the Executive Committee felt that this needed to be reviewed and recommendations for improving the process be made. As such, the Executive Committee would create a task force designed to standardize the process for curriculum development and approval, to both streamline and make more efficient the process in regard to when these were put into the system.

The Executive Committee also met on April 25 and April 30, twice with committee members only and once with President Proenza and Provost Hickey. At those meetings the following was addressed: As Chair Sheffer mentioned, we discussed the role of the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate in the selection of the permanent and interim provost positions. President Proenza also affirmed that a similar

process would be implemented when addressing VP Roney's position. We also discussed diversity scholarships. The Executive Committee was briefed by the President about recent developments in this area.

As related to the budget as Chair Sheffer mentioned, the budget that was taken to the Board of Trustees at their April meeting consisted of budgets only for auxiliary units. The Executive Committee had questions regarding that, considering that PBC had recommended and Senate had passed a full budget previously. President Proenza had invited VP Roy Ray to join the discussion, and Vice President Ray indicated that due to the situation in Columbus, it did not appear prudent at this time to present the entire budget as had been passed. Therefore, the decision was made to forward the auxiliary budgets because those needed immediate action as most of those involved fees, and so forth. Also, we addressed the discrepancy between the Senate's version of the auxiliary budgets and that which was presented to the Board. The difference between the two budgets amounted to roughly 1.4 million, and the Executive Committee inquired as to how that additional amount would be covered. Vice President Ray then stated that there were several plans under consideration involving tuition and fees. At that point again, the Executive Committee expressed to the President and Provost our desire to be included as the Faculty Senate representative and work on the budget over the summer, as mentioned earlier.

The last thing we addressed at that meeting had to do with the parking fee increase. The faculty and staff parking permits were to increase to \$100 next year, and the Executive Committee raised concerns about the relative impact this might have on faculty and staff. We proposed the idea that the increase be made proportionate to income. Vice President Ray indicated that he would look into that idea. **(See Appendix A for Faculty Senate 2002-03 attendance record, and budget report.)**

Chair Sheffer then invited President Proenza to address the Senate.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your having indeed recognized our two very fine colleagues, and let me add my word of appreciation for Dr. Hickey's and Dr. Roney's contributions. Thank you, colleagues, and there will be many other opportunities for us to express our appreciation.

The most important comments I want to make today relate to the recent NCA site team visit, and while I'm sure you were generally informed of the result, let me share some details of their remarks to us in the event you have some questions. I'd like to preface and end those comments in the following way: Thank you, and congratulations, because their recommendations are going to be very simply that The University of Akron be afforded a full 10-year accreditation as it has satisfied all of the major criteria.

Let me go into it because obviously while we have a tremendous reason to be thankful and to congratulate all of the University for, there are a few things we are going to be looking at and which they recognize are still in progress. If you may recall, there are five basic criteria that the NCA looks at, and it has a number of elements they examine. Fundamentally, they found complete satisfaction in three of the criteria with no suggestions for us to pay any additional diligence or any additional review by them in any of them.

Among the things they noted in the first three criteria is certainly consistency in the description of the University - its processes and procedures, etc. Particularly also, they highlighted the very great leadership on the part of the Board and others in the development of the new Landscape for Learning and their complete confidence that that was really very much in keeping with what the institution needed to do to in fact satisfactorily address the enrollment decline which they noted also that we had reversed.

They were very positive about the focus on student facilities and classroom facilities, as well as those that are supporting the scholarly activities. But the emphasis on students in the student services building and the student union and the recreation center was noted. Equally, the focus on enhancing the green space on the campus by closing the two streets, by removing surface parking to decks was noted as consistent with that focus on students and what they would expect to continue to be a successful strategy for the campus. So that was again a very important element.

They noted many other aspects in discussions with all groups - Trustees, administrators, faculty, support staff, a broad sense that they support the goals and purposes of the mission of the institution as cited in the University's role. They cited many other aspects of progress involving great attainments in the area of information technology and the area of budgeting and the ROI process. Obviously, they were extremely pleased and delighted with the emphasis that we have on the scholarship of teaching, and the recognition recently with regard to the Carnegie Cluster Leader was very evident in scanning through these brief and confidential notes, which they expected to be fleshed out in greater detail.

In the last two criteria, they had a couple of things to suggest that we continue to focus on and we reflected with them on that. Again, on the whole they found that we were meeting the criteria. They suggested that we continue to pay attention to two areas - one in regard to initiatives such as the ROI, Charting the Course, and the Balanced Scorecard. They felt that we needed to press on broad internal communication and I shared with them the things we are doing. One thing you may be unaware of is that we have asked for a communications audit which will include and you should be seeing that in your mailboxes in the next few days, a survey that will ask your impression so that we can begin to home in on key areas. Of course, you're aware of the task force on internal decision structures and so forth that we've begun, obviously in full collaboration with the Senate and with the Provost's office.

The second piece they felt strongly about is that we needed to continue to develop a consistent campus-wide system for the evaluation of teaching, so I want to underscore that. Related to that, they did ask for a focus to site-visit five years out with regard to student outcome assessment and our progress in moving towards a satisfactory framework in that area to include such things as skills and concepts that are to be mastered. Secondly, the assessment of the methods employed; thirdly, the results of the assessment; and fourth, how the assessment results begin to impact our own assessment and development of programs, a program review framework based in and around a student outcome assessment.

Finally, criterion five again indicated overall satisfaction for them. They had two elements - one that they asked us to focus on and one which will be obvious to you that they will ask the site visit team to review with us. The first relates to the overall campus climate and our processes and procedures for evaluation of each other and for communication of supervisory issues relating to litigation that may ensue from absences of satisfactory measures in this area. The other obviously relates to the fact that our faculty recently voted to ask the AAUP to be their sole bargaining representative and obviously that means that there will be a change in the governance structure of the institution, and that not being settled they'll want to review that with us at the end. So again in that regard, first, thank you. Secondly and most importantly, congratulations because this was a campus-wide effort.

Let me share just a couple of other highlights and then I would entertain any questions that you may have. As the chair indicated, tomorrow's the last day of classes and next week is exams. Saturday the 11th and Sunday the 12th is commencement and I hope to see all of you there.

I wish I had more news with regard to the state budget. Very briefly, the Senate is beginning its deliberations. We are hearing that the Senate will certainly make more positive recommendations than the House did, but in the end result I do need to let you know in the spirit of full disclosure, the Senate,

just as the House, will propose a budget. They will then have to be reconciled in what is referred to as a conferencing process. Clearly, there will be movement up from the House side in a positive direction.

Whether it will get to where the Governor wants it to be in his own proposal and whether even the Senate will get to the Governor's proposed levels, I'm obviously not in a position to see into that crystal ball. But we are hearing that the Senate will almost surely recommend a much better set of numbers than the House did.

Let me just pause for a moment, as I see that Ken Stapleton has come in and I don't know whether all of you have met Ken. Ken Stapleton is Director of our Knight Foundation University Park Alliance Project. Congratulations on a superb article in Inside Business; it was a special thing. Thank you, Ken. Please welcome Ken to our community and get to know him.

In regard to the budget, that's where we are. When all of this will come down into something we can hang our hat on only somebody knows, and it's certainly not me. Today's Buchtelite has a note that our forensics team placed third in the nation in a competition of 111. You may want to also be aware that our entrepreneurship program was ranked among the top 25 programs within an entrepreneurship emphasis. That was very nicely received, and it happened to put us in a same group of institutions as Arizona State, Boston, Georgetown, Nebraska, Purdue, Rochester, Texas A&M, as well as Yale. There's a separate ranking for those programs that have a dedicated and focused program on entrepreneurship but obviously didn't include those institutions either, so we're in very good company in our emphasis there.

Also, you may want to know that Professor Philip Allen, Professor of Psychology, has recently been selected by the National Institute of Health to serve on their study section on biobehavior on behavioral processes. Please convey our congratulations, Harvey, and others in psychology to Phil Allen. Likewise, you may want to know that a student, Matthew Shepard, who's majoring in physics and applied mathematics, has been named 2003 Scholar in the highly prestigious Goldwater Scholarship competition.

Finally, let me encourage you to attend Founders Day celebrations tomorrow at the Martin Center, and I want to congratulate in advance those members of our faculty and staff who are retiring from the University, obviously recognize our founders, and honor our colleagues who have been nominated by their peers this past year for outstanding work in teaching and research as well as service through the shared leadership awards. So please, if you can, come by. That concludes my report and I'll entertain any questions that you may have."

Chair Sheffer called for questions of the President. Senator Gerlach then spoke. He wondered whether the President could tell the body what the disposition had been of the Senate's proposal of one of the Association of Retirees being elected to the Well-Being Committee, as the last he knew it was still in the process of going forward somewhere.

President Proenza replied that there was a review of the language and it was reviewed with Chair Sheffer. The question was distinguishing exactly what was meant by retiree, which was ambiguous in that language. That being settled, it was going forward with full approval.

Chair Sheffer then invited Provost Hickey to address the Senate.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST

"I want to extend my appreciation and congratulations too, for all that you did to make a very successful NCA accreditation site visit. I really need to thank Associate Provost Nancy Stokes who took the lead

in this effort and all of you who worked with her. You have performed a tremendous service to the institution, and I think you can be very proud and even breathe a sigh of relief over the fact that the recommendation is for a 10-year reaccreditation, which is a very good thing. I feel like a slight cloud has been blown away now from what the past accreditation situation was.

About three years ago I appeared before you and my remarks were very brief then; nothing's changed as these are going to be very brief as well. I do want to thank you for all that you've done over the last three years. I think that there have been some significant accomplishments made and I hope you feel the same way. I have enjoyed working with you, not necessarily every minute of every meeting, but most of the time I have very much enjoyed working with you. I look forward to hearing about and reading about the tremendous gains that The University of Akron will make over the next few years and on into the future. So thank you very much, and I too will be happy to take any questions you might have."

Senator Erickson then addressed the Provost with a question regarding parking. A number of the part-time faculty in her college have spoken with real concern about paying a \$100 fee given their part-time status. The Executive Committee had met with the Provost on this issue too, and she wanted to make sure that that was passed on to the appropriate people. She was hoping that the Provost was proceeding with this and it was being discussed in PBC. Provost Hickey replied that he did not think it had been discussed in PBC.

Senator Sterns then offered some clarification on this issue, as he had had a conversation with Jim Stafford about an hour ago following up on what Senator Erickson pointed out, the notion of tying salary to charges was being considered. Currently, the way part-time faculty were charged was they were asked to pay \$50 per semester. If they taught in the summer they had to pay in addition. We only pay \$100 for the whole year, so he did not see why part-time faculty should have to pay more. We perhaps needed to develop an approach so that people who were doing a lot of work on not a whole salary were not charged to the same extent.

FACULTY RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE - (Appendix B)

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson began her report by stating that the Well-Being Committee had met several times. One result of those meetings was the recommendation relating to domestic partner benefits (**Appendix C-1**). The rest of the report related to the summary of what the committee was doing (**Appendix C-2**). Health bidding was in process; bids had gone out. We were working along an appropriate time line. The decisions would be made by the subcommittee by mid-July. We had had a subcommittee on wellness; she urged all to read in the report the issues related to wellness because they were quite exciting. In regard to the sick leave policy, the committee had compared what had been done elsewhere in the state; that process would continue. With respect to child care, there was a joint subcommittee of the chairs on this issue and that subcommittee was still collecting documents with the hope of having a report in the fall. Which left us with the recommendations regarding benefits for domestic partners. The committee was bringing back to the Senate as we were directed at the March meeting 2001, to answer questions, definitions, recalculations and legal input. This had gotten sidetracked by all of the health issues the committee had had to deal with, but at the beginning of this calendar year we reconstituted the subcommittee. Their report gave the committee material to form these recommendations which were now being brought to the Senate and urged to be adopted.

Senator Erickson then directed Senators' attention to the definitions. The committee now had spelled out a very specific definition under recommendation 1. As far as recalculations were concerned with respect to costs, there were practically no increases in cost. As far as the legal input was concerned, there were already three state universities in Ohio that offered benefits for domestic partners - Cleveland

State, Ohio State, and Wright State, who all acknowledged domestic partners. These were presented as individual recommendations. Chair Sheffer then reaffirmed that recommendation 1 concerned the recognition of domestic partners, and coming from committee, it did not need a second. Senate was ready to discuss this recommendation. Senator Norfolk then asked whether the Senate had not actually passed that five years ago. Senator Erickson replied that it had not.

Senator Soucek asked how much it was going to cost. This was going to go within our health care, right? Senator Erickson stated that if the Senator read the original he would see it stated that expanded benefits to domestic partnerships and incorporating them into health benefits typically increased cost. We were not at this stage in recommendation 6 doing that. What the committee was asking here was the kind of benefits that essentially were very limited to the faculty. If faculty could take sick leave for sickness of a family member, it should be for a domestic partner also. We assumed that the cost of that was very little because that was not where the major sick leave benefits came from.

Senator Soucek then asked whether it was about a 2% increase overall. Senator Erickson replied only that we were reviewing the health benefits which we were asked to bring back with the possibility of not voting on it at this time.

Secretary Kennedy then raised a couple of concerns. First, she knew that this had come to the Senate before but that had been a couple of years ago. The makeup of the Senate today was significantly different than it was back then. Also, she had difficulty accepting this in that it came to Senators at 5:39 last night. Neither she nor her constituents had had much of a chance to look at it. She believed that Senate had passed a bylaw change that required major motions to be presented with more advance time. Therefore, she made a motion that this issue be postponed until the next Senate meeting in the Fall 2003 semester. Senator Steiner seconded her motion.

Chair Sheffer then called for further discussion of the motion. Senator Broadway asked Senator Erickson if this issue was postponed, what effect that would have on things that were happening over the summer, especially in terms of health benefits that were bid during the summer?

Senator Erickson replied that in recommendation 6 it stated that we were charged with identifying effective means of extending group health insurance to domestic partners.

Senator Broadway then asked whether that meant it would not go into effect until the next bidding cycle.

Senator Erickson replied that, at this stage probably not, but we asked the potential carrier with today's standards what their position would be on this, and it sounded as though they weren't going to make any difference in their quotes. She suspected that it may be possible for it to be instituted at the end of the first year but she did not know.

Senator Kahl then asked that the next time it came back, that the committee had some better numbers on what it would cost.

Secretary Kennedy stated that perhaps it would make sense to postpone this to the second regular meeting of the Fall semester. She offered this as a friendly amendment. Senator Fenwick seconded her amendment. No further discussion forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote on the motion to postpone the recommendation until the Oct. Senate meeting. The body then voted its approval of the motion.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE B Associate Provost Stokes stated that the committee brought to the Senate in the form of a motion a **recommendation for the general**

format of the academic calendar to include two 15-week instructional semesters in fall and spring, and one 15-week instructional session in summer, a 4-week break for winter, a 1-week spring break, and 1 noninstructional week between spring and summer with another 1 noninstructional week as break between summer and fall. Assessment of student performance will be conducted during the instructional semester or session.

Associate Provost Stokes stated that she would like to thank the calendar task force of Faculty Senate chaired by Jan Yoder as a member of the Executive Committee, Julie Drew from APCC, Don Fox, the Registrar, Debra Johanyak from APCC, Dudley Turner from First Year Experience, and Jason Smith, a student representative, for working very hard this year in presenting the format of the calendar. When the task force presented the format of the calendar, they recommended three 15-week instructional semesters. When APCC reviewed that recommendation, we checked with the Ohio Board of Regents who defined a semester as 15 instructional weeks that requires 750 minutes of instructional time per credit hr. So it was the task force's recommendation to adjust to the Ohio Board of Regents' language.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the recommendation (**Appendix D**). Senator Hebert then offered a substitute motion at this time. His was a minor adjustment based on what he understood the committee's recommendation to be. The alternative would simply have a 3-week break at Christmas time over the holidays and include a 2-day October break taking Wed. off for Thanksgiving. This would make each semester have 14 weeks and 4 days. During the fall semester only Labor Day for one day during 15 weeks, during spring Martin Luther King would be one day, and actually during the summer unless there were Memorial Day and 4th of July, there would be 14 weeks and 4 days also.

Provost Hickey had a question referring back to the original proposal. For clarification, the 15-week summer session did allow for 5-week sessions as well as the 8-week sessions? Associate Provost Stokes replied that it did, as well as for the 10-week session.

Senator Pinheiro also had a question to clarify from the original motion which was on the table. Christmas vacation was supposed to be 4 weeks, correct? Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was still 4 weeks. Senator Pinheiro then asked whether the recommendation from Senator Hebert was to shorten that to 3 weeks. He was informed that it was.

Senator Erickson stated that there was a real reason for the 4 week break; it allowed faculty to actually get some work done. Senator Pinheiro added that there were also the economics of electricity and heating to consider.

Senator Dalton then spoke on behalf of the student body. Looking at other schools indicated they usually had a 2-day break in the fall. Students would prefer an additional day to get home for Thanksgiving. Often, individuals who had exams at the last minute on Thursday had travel concerns. In all honesty, after 3 weeks students' parents are ready to send them back to school. Usually for work, they're letting us off anyway as they don't need us any longer, so 4 weeks was too long. Students preferred to be out in the good weather anyway. So when he looked at this, this was what was preferred when it went to the committee.

Associate Provost Stokes then pointed out that, should we want to adopt the alternative, we would have to lengthen the class time periods because there still had to be 750 minutes seat time. With having 14 weeks and odd numbers of days the class time periods would have to be lengthened to do that.

Senator Hebert then stated that he had heard two things that were red herrings. One was this business about the heating and electricity, which he did not think was a big deal. He might be incorrect, but his

calculation showed that now in the fall with 14 weeks of 2-1/2 days of instruction, during the spring we had 14 weeks and 4 days not including the final periods. So if we switched to something like this we actually had more instructional days particularly in the fall and exactly the same number in the spring. The one nice thing about it from a teaching standpoint was every term had exactly the same number of instructional days.

Senator J. Yoder then spoke against the alternative. The task force had done a quick survey of faculty; 212 faculty responded to an email survey, and 75% of them felt negatively about shortening the winter break.

Senator Soucek then stated that he had been at a school that had had a short break, and it was wretched. By the time you finished the one, you had Christmas and the very next week you were in total full throttle. It was a treadmill you started in August and you didn't get out until the last final just like in May.

Senator Kahl added that he had had the same experience and had the same feelings about the short break at another school.

Chair Sheffer then asked whether the body was ready to vote on the alternative calendar proposal. Senator Gerlach asked whether the question now before the house was whether we should vote to have a substitute motion. If yes, then the body could proceed to debate it; if no, the original motion was now up for discussion.

Chair Sheffer replied that that was correct; the body now would vote on the alternative proposal. A vote was taken; the chair ruled that the motion failed. Chair Sheffer then directed the body's attention back to the original motion.

Senator Wilkinson then asked about instructional time. If there were not a finals week, were we okay with the number of minutes the classes were currently running.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that it would be the same as a midterm or any other test given in a class.

Senator Witt then stated he was trying to decide how logically this might work if everybody who had a Mon/Wed/Fri class just had their final exam on the last Fri. of the semester. A whole lot of students would have several finals in one day. Was that different from what we had now?

Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was different. Senator Witt offered that we might later want to revisit some kind of counseling sessions.

Senator Hebert then made the observation that he found it interesting that the faculty were putting their own desires ahead of the students. To which Senator J. Yoder replied that there had been students on the task force and those students had agreed with this proposal also.

Senator Wilkinson stated that he had received this from a colleague and felt obligated to read a little bit of it: "It has been a great source of fiscal pride that our University facilities have been in use by students virtually throughout the year with a small exception of around Christmas time. This provides maximum efficient use of facilities. What is the logic other than to provide vacation time for faculty of the proposal? Also, how about short courses and 5 and 8 week sessions and intersessions?@

Senator Dalton then thanked Senator Wilkinson for those comments. He had discussed the issue with a

freshman who was on that committee, who felt we should try to enforce some kind of fall break. In terms of that, adding an additional week in there during summer for a break he thought was most acceptable. We did make a recommendation that we wanted a fall break, so he wanted to see in future considerations that it be considered.

Associate Provost Stokes commented that the weeks between spring and summer and between summer and fall were essentially driven by requirements of non-academic units. Residence Life and Housing needed to get the residence halls cleared; people doing the invoices to the students and people providing financial aid needed that week; people doing the grades needed that week. It was mostly based on non-academic requests.

Senator J. Yoder then added that, from a student perspective, the reason for it was that they were registering for the next semester's classes after grades were due and did not know what their grades were in prerequisites. So students found it also helpful to have that break.

Senator Jordan then asked Associate Provost Stokes for confirmation. The Law School had always had trouble being on exactly the same schedule because of differing accreditation concerns. We would not be able to meet this schedule and had been assuming we would not have to meet this schedule.

Associate Provost Stokes apologized and stated that she had spoken to Assoc. Dean Reilly today about that concern. This was a recommendation only for the format of the academic semester, the dates not being in place yet, and those details would have to be worked out. The real calendar did not come until fall.

No further discussion of the motion forthcoming, the chair called for a vote on the calendar format. The body voted approve the adoption of the calendar format.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - (See Appendix E for curriculum proposals.)

NCAA FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE - (Appendix F)

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE B Senator Sterns began his report (Appendix G) by stating that he had a number of formal resolutions that had been emailed to Senators.

He began with the first resolution: **That the Faculty Senate recommends the assignment of 5,000 sq. ft. on the fifth floor of the Polsky building for the Taylor Institute of Direct Marketing.**

Senator Norfolk inquired as to who was there now, and Senator Sterns replied that it was empty space.

Senator W. Yoder then asked whether Polsky's was going to be used for swing space, and had that been taken into consideration with the allocation of the various levels at Polsky's?

Senator Sterns replied that this area of Polsky's was on the fifth floor and was currently where the Institute for Health in Society was located. There was room for the expansion of Taylor, and there was room for the expansion of the Institute for Health in Society. Would the Senate give permission for Jim Haskell to speak?

Permission granted, VP Haskell then addressed the body. The area that was being proposed was the inactive space on the fifth floor of Polsky's. The area that was called the swing space was on the third floor of Polsky's and was for the summer and fall ROTC swing space, so that would be maintained. This was an addition to the common swing space that we had.

Provost Hickey added that **inactive** was not quite the right term. It was inactive but it was also shell space. There was a private endowment that was coming to the University that would support this program and actually supported the buildup of the space.

Senator Broadway then asked whether Senator Sterns could provide the body with some greater context of the future plans for Polsky's and how this fit into it. He was getting a sense it was very piecemeal, and maybe he had been amiss and there was published a long-term plan on how that building was going to be used. Was it simply going to be parceled out and then we would at some time come back and look at the usage for that building in long-term?

Senator Sterns replied that the Facilities & Planning Committee had had some discussion about Polsky's. The major area that was vacated was the movement of the Psych. Department to the Arts & Sciences College's new building.

VP Haskell then stated that his only remaining comment was that there were always initiatives to complete the shelled out space on the fifth floor, retaining the space on the third floor as the swing space. The concept was that the spaces that were being built on the fifth floor were allowing for future growth for the Institute for Health and Social Policy. It would also allow for future expansion for the Taylor Institute if needed.

Senator Sterns added that it would be important for the CFPC to track each move and that each unit had appropriate permission and assignment. We already had had some discussion regarding the assignment of additional space in Polsky's for swing units. However, he pointed out that for instance, in the Schrank renovation, we were able to resolve that so that people did not have to move and had been able to save money on moving expenses. So in reality we did not take action until a proposal came forward. If Senators would remember, our process started with initiating a document from a unit, which then went to the Provost's office, and then was referred to the Planning Dept. and then to Facilities Planning.

Senator Gerlach asked whether this was considered to be a long-term kind of proposal. That both of these institutes were intended to remain there without any intention of moving them in the near future?

Senator Sterns replied that he was not aware of any plans for movement.

Senator Broadway stated that he felt his question had not been answered or, perhaps, he should interpret the response as indicating there was no long-term plan for Polsky's that had been put forth?

Provost Hickey replied that he felt Senator Broadway was correct on the latter point. The Provost also pointed out that, assuming the plans to develop a Summit College which he was sure would be debated throughout the summer and into the fall, went forward, there was going to need to be a complete space utilization plan for Polsky's as that would likely be the home of Summit College. Then the question became what did Summit College entail, and would it all fit in that space? In many ways the fifth floor of Polsky's had been treated as separate from the rest of the building starting with the Institute for Health and Social Policy. At one there were discussions about training facilities going in the fifth floor in partnership with Goodyear, but the Taylor Institute was an activity that was consistent with what the fifth floor had been viewed as. Particularly if we went forward with Summit College, a complete coordinated space utilization plan for the building was needed.

Senator Sterns replied that, since that information had not been officially brought forward nor an official request made, it was difficult to respond. In terms of future planning, we had been trying to have long-range planning for many years. The committee had worked to that point, fallen back from it and worked toward it again. It was a good comment; he wished he could be more definitive.

Senator Dalton then wondered what the status was for the Global Institute for Business and Taylor

Institute.

Provost Hickey replied that there was no plan to move the Taylor Institute into the Global Institute for Business. Right now the Global Institute for Business was moving slowly primarily because of the downturn in the economy and the fact that it had been difficult to raise the remaining funds that were necessary in order to build the Global Institute for Business.

No further discussion forthcoming, the chair called for a vote on the resolution. The body voted its approval.

Senator Sterns then moved on the next resolution which was that **Faculty Senate recommends the move of academic achievement programs from Gallucci Hall to space on the third floor of Ayer Hall vacated by the move of theoretical and applied mathematics.**

Senator Steiner then asked whether the department of physics had had any input on that since they were the primary tenant of Ayer Hall, as setting the potential need for that space.

Senator Sterns replied that as far as he knew, we were talking here of space that was not part of the physics department plan. We had had already almost two years ago allocated space in physics.

Chair Sheffer called for further discussion. None forthcoming, the body voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns continued with the third resolution: **Faculty Senate recommends the assignment of eight offices and a conference room on the third floor of the Polsky building for the Emergency Management and Homeland Security grant. This assignment is for the duration of the grant.**

Senator Sterns stated that he believed they had one year funding at this point. To which Provost Hickey replied that that was correct, but that there might be a renewal clause in there.

Senator Sterns stated that in the committee's discussion, the feeling was that this was a temporary assignment. We had tied that notion to some time frame. Obviously the grant made the most sense.

No further discussion forthcoming, Chair Sheffer called for a vote on the resolution. The body voted its approval.

Senator Sterns continued with the fourth resolution which was: **The Faculty Senate recommends the assignment of rooms 324 and 318 on a temporary basis for the Human Resources Dept. These rooms are located in Polsky's and approximate to the existing Human Resources offices.**

No discussion forthcoming on this resolution, the Senate then voted to approve it.

Senator Sterns then presented the final resolution which was: **The Faculty Senate recommends the perpetuation of the Gardner and Simmons names on two campus buildings. The name Gardner should be used to name either the new student union or the future Student Affairs building. The name Simmons should be used to name either the College of Arts & Sciences building or the future Student Affairs building.**

No discussion forthcoming, the body then approved this resolution.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - (Appendix H, Guidelines for Faculty Research Proposals)

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE B Senator Fenwick began his report by stating that what the PBC had been doing since it had gotten the budget through the Senate was to look at ROI on the quality side (**Appendix I**). We had had a subcommittee that we charged last fall with developing quality measures. PBC had developed a template, and that came as the first motion from PBC. In what he had sent out earlier this week there was some feedback about what PBC was proposing and what we wanted the Senate to accept. So today in PBC we amended that motion, copies of which are available and which Marilyn will send out on the listserv also. The amended motion read: **PBC recommends to the Senate acceptance in principle of the ROI quality measures (see attachment), and to charge the working group of PBC to develop improvements and assessment measures over the summer and to report back to the Faculty Senate so that implementation of the process can begin in the fall.**

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. Senator Wilkinson stated that he was against this. Quality measures were determined by college and by department. So for example, things like peer reviewed articles that would count for him very important. Books in the Business School were not so important. Similarly, a more obvious example, if you were a violin instructor at The University of Akron, you did not write books or articles; you held concerts and recitals. He did not think we could come up with any kind of universal quality measure that would work in this way. The other thing he would point out was that there was no measure of quality in the scholarship and grant section. What was there was the number of peer reviewed conference presentations, number of published papers. That would create a real race to the bottom as everybody would try to create more conference papers, more articles, rather than focusing on quality which was a really different objective. He did not think this approach was workable even if passed, because we lived in disciplines and we were governed by disciplines and that was what was ultimately going to motivate outcome.

Senator Dechambeau replied that what was presented could be improved upon with the discipline. So the discipline had selected maybe a top 10 list of places to publish, so that was what it was measured against within the discipline, not across departments in the University. So that would be what we meant by making improvements and assessment measures.

Senator Calvo stated that he did not understand what the template was really doing. It stated targets for fiscal year and it had these objective measures, but who set these targets?

Senator Dechambeau responded to Senator Calvo's request. The idea again was to get some ideas for measures to work with now. Once Senate decided it was okay to move forward then we would figure out what the targets were. It might be this committee or another subcommittee of PBC, but we had to at least establish what we were going to look at first.

Without such approval, it would have been a waste of time. So it was an ongoing process and the targets were not developed.

Senator Calvo then followed up his question by asking whether the measures were at least right now some indication of the direction in which the committee wanted to go in terms of what they want to measure?

Senator Dechambeau replied yes, and this was after much discussion by members of the committee. We had had long lists and then we had had short lists. We went back and forth with PBC a couple of times, and this was what we finally came up with which was the list of things that were most globally

identifiable and measurable, and measurable without creating a survey instrument for every single quality thing possible. According to the literature, at many other places of business that have created quality measures, they relied almost entirely on survey instruments. We could charge institutional planning or whoever to spend the rest of their days developing and sending out survey instruments, but we wanted to try to avoid that with the items we came up with on this list.

Senator Wilkinson stated that he thought everybody was concerned about quality - deans were concerned, colleges were concerned about quality. In his department they ranked journals A,B,and C, and probably what we were going to do, if we were doing well, was to hit B's. That was what we were shooting for. Maybe if we were lucky, some of us would get an A now and then. This was just simply not going to work. You could throw a lot of effort in it but it was not going to work because this was discipline specific and it was on a microlevel.

Senator Barrett then had a question about what these targets were or how PBC was envisioning they would work. Assume that we agreed or disagreed that retention rate by cohort was one of the quality measures wanted. The target would be uniform across the University college- by-college? Was it similar to our 1.7 number for the other part of ROI? What was the target and were we then judged in proportion to whether we were meeting that target?

Senator Dechambeau replied that she thought the idea was, if we were to decide that retention by cohort was a good measure, then we would have to figure that out, which would take quite a bit of time. So if you decided that retention by cohort was just a bad idea then you could take it off the table and work on something more important. All those issues had come up - issues about whether or not it was going to be too precise, too departmentalized that we could not globalize any of these things. So any one of those scenarios would be discussed in the discussion of targets. Also, once people tried to develop targets for these they were not even going to know whether the targets were going to work until they put in whatever their values happen to be. So it might be that you tried one way and it did not work, so you had to try a different way. Was it relative to your past performance or within units or colleges? Those were all things that would be discussed if in fact that was something people would want to look at as a potential quality measure.

Secretary Kennedy then had a question about the objectives. There were 7 objectives listed, and were these of equal weight? She understood Senator Dechambeau's comment about not being able to have quality measures for each department. However, in the Community & Technical College research was not a priority. It was teaching, so we did not publish or write books. That was almost a whole category that we would be losing out on.

Senator Dechambeau replied that that part had not even been worked on yet. We thought when we first started to look at quality measures that we would be able to come up with lists and weigh things in different ways and figure out fairly easily how things were going to fall together. Then it turned out that it took much longer just to develop this list than anybody would've expected.

Secretary Kennedy then stated that, if she were understanding Senator Dechambeau correctly, these were just suggestions. If a particular objective did not fit a particular college it would not be considered part of these quality measures?

Senator Dechambeau replied that it could or it could not; the implementation had not been worked out yet, but just the idea that these items were possibly useful as measures that fit more units than not.

Senator Fenwick then added that basically in principle, these were the objectives that we should look at and would deal with, the weighting of the objectives and exactly how measurable they were during the

summer. Actually what we were asking for was an acceptance of what we had done so far. That was probably the wrong term, but kind of endorsing the idea that we should be moving to quality ROI.

Senator Hoo Fatt then stated that she had always thought the quality measures were supposed to help the schools with the low ROI, the ones that had problems. So with respect to teaching, you had a high ROI so it would all balance out. The normalization scheme here obviously you could not do because we could not compare different schools or disciplines. But she thought it was to be done nationwide to measure quality with respect to other universities.

Senator Witt added that it was to be similar units within a unit.

Senator Hoo Fatt agreed with Senator Witt and questioned whether that was what the normalization scheme was.

Senator Dechambeau replied that we just never got that far, but that was one idea.

Senator Hoo Fatt then asked about the last column, initiatives, and what that meant.

Senator Clark stated that she had wanted to talk about the targets as related to initiatives. Some of those categories were trying to mesh with the Balanced Scorecard work that the colleges, then the schools and departments would be doing, so to some extent that was what the targets would be. Once you had gotten the various categories in your unit you were going to be obviously trying to figure out how to do that. Again, the idea with the ROI was something that was being implemented over time so part of what we had here was a first step in trying to accomplish something that was related to quality. Some of the measures we already had involved benchmarking, the ones that were based on the Delaware Study, so this was a place to begin.

Senator Witt asked what in principle Senate was adopting here. Senator Clark mentioned the objectives were pretty much where you wanted to go but maybe the rest of the form could change?

Senator Clark replied that yes, the objectives were "firm-ish;" they were kind of jelly. They seemed logical based on the Balanced Scorecard seemed to be very widely applicable kinds of measures that we either already had or ones that we could simply measure that were broadly acceptable.

Senator Witt stated that the targets were really foggy out there.

Senator Clark replied that, coming from the college and the school again, we were trying to coordinate those with other things, and this was a first attempt to try to do that with something tangible.

Senator Witt then asked whether it were the case that the committee was nowhere near targets other than to say that that was an idea. Senator Clark replied that, yes, that was the case.

Senator Sterns added that his concern was that after they work all summer making their refinements, were they coming back to the Senate?

Senator Fenwick replied that that was part of the motion.

Senator Steiner then asked for a technical clarification under scholarship and grants where you mentioned grants awarded for tenure-track faculty by discipline. This was measured by the Delaware Study indicator. He was not familiar with that measure, and could that be clarified?

Senator Dechambeau answered that it was referred to in the study, but she could not remember what the acronym stood for.

Senator Steiner then followed up by stating that this was just referencing what had already been stated, and it was not an additional expansion of what that measure actually was? Senator Clark stated that, yes, it was referencing the measure in the Delaware Study.

Senator Steiner asked then whether the measure in the Delaware Study was grants and awards per tenure-track faculty member, and Senator Clark replied that it was on their benchmarks.

Senator Steiner stated that he thought the subcommittee had succeeded in coming up with a broadly applicable set of things as a good starting point. Clearly, there was more to be done regarding how it was going to be refined and how the targets were implemented, but he definitely spoke in favor of approving of these in principle.

Senator Soucek then stated that, as he had also served on the committee off and on he was now willing to take some of the heat. Bringing this to the full Senate to a lot of professors who would be totally incredulous as to what was presented to them was something that had run through his mind constantly as he had sat there wallowing his hours with these brave souls on occasion. There was no way we were going to come up with something that was going to be very pleasing to almost anybody, except for Senator Steiner. So this was not a surprise. What he wanted Senators to do was really think about it and not say that it could not be done, but how could it be done better? He had thought Senators would see the reasoning of how the subcommittee had come up with all of these categories and why, but since it was new, Senators had the right to be incredulous.

Senator Matney then stated that he wanted to speak against the motion, to say it could not be done and that it was not new to all of us. He was in a new department, the Department of Classical Studies, Anthropology and Archaeology. They had one faculty member in each of those departments, and, in writing their new bylaws for their department we spent hours and hours trying to come up with RTP guidelines on exactly these same sort of measures. Within what was supposed to be one department and in trying to apply that university-wide was mind boggling. We would spend every meeting in the fall term trying to do that. It seemed to him instead that in principle we were going at this in the wrong way. Rather than having a measure of quality from inside, we really should be looking to have a group from outside to assess the quality of the departments. One possibility we might consider would be to have departments identify outside departments that would be willing to do some sort of review of the quality within a department based on standards that were applicable across the country rather than having us try to come up with these sorts of criteria for our own purposes which we were going to be fighting about from now until the end of time.

Senator Fenwick then added that he thought there was a misperception that these would be reduced to RTP measures. They were not intended to be reduced to RTP measures for the different colleges. These were not supposed to be something that you could cherry pick as a particular department. As it stood now, the basis of ROI was half of ROI monies to be redistributed were based on that quantitative formula. The other half was assigned to the Provost for distribution or redistribution based on quality. He asked PBC and the Senate to help develop guidelines to make this process transparent. What we were also mandated to do was make it consistent and fit in with the Balanced Scorecard. That was part of the process of why these particular dimensions came up. Again, this was not a finished document. What PBC was asking

Senators to do today was to endorse our movement toward some kind of quantifying qualitative data. That was what we were doing. The subcommittee deserved a lot of credit whether we passed or did not pass this measure today because they had worked very hard throughout the year and it was a very

hard process.

Senator Conrad then offered two comments. The qualitative measures for academic units already existed in the form of the Balanced Scorecard. He was unconvinced as to why competing quality measures, although they be so-called universal put forward by PBC, should be given the light of day. To him it was confusing, as Balanced Scorecard quality measures were out there for the units to be measured by units, benchmarked against other units. We had agreed that benchmarking should take place with the quantitative side of the ROI, so he had a problem with universal measures. The second observation was the entire concept of ROI he found to be bothersome. We had yet to tackle and apparently were never going to tackle administrative quality and quantity measures of performance and efficiency. So you sided there with that 1.7 target and you said, I've got to make my overhead, and he did not believe that that overhead was necessarily the number. So until we answered the administrative side of the equation, what we had focused on here again was the academic side.

Secretary Kennedy then offered a few comments. First, Senator Hoo Fatt had said that ROI quality measures for colleges making the 1.7 didn't really matter because those colleges were making the ROI quantitative requirement. Secretary Kennedy stated that she must be greedy because she did make the 1.7 in her college and she also believed she could make a case for equally strong qualitative measures as well, and she wanted to have the same opportunity to do so as any other college. Further, she noticed that the subcommittee did not include a member of her college. She would argue that her college had by virtue of its mission different measures and would ask in the spirit of moving this forward that someone from the C&T College be put on that subcommittee.

Senator Kreidler then stated that what had happened today was what PBC had hoped would happen, which was that there would be dialogue and input from the Senate, to give us advice and approval that we could continue to dialogue. They did the same back and forth at every PBC meeting, so they had said they would take it to Senate. It was the qualitative measures in principle that they wished Senate to give the go-ahead to work all summer on. To really say, Look at it, put some time into it, take back what has been stated and then come back before us in September and see what the committee would present was all PBC was asking.

Senator Norfolk then stated that he believed, based on all the comments, that what we had was something called multiobjective optimization. It was a well known technique in operations research, in all kinds of different directions. The easiest way to achieve it was to come up with numbers for each of these criteria and then decide on the basis of the Balanced Scorecard or the bylaw or whatever else you wanted to use, individual weights by colleges, by departments, the way you weight a teaching college as teaching being more important than research. That way you addressed the contention on both sides.

Senator Hebert then spoke in favor of the motion. The folks on the committee had done a lot of work, and it would be a mistake on our part not to let them, in the context of the comments the body had given, to finish that.

Senator Sterns stated again that he wanted to understand that, at the end of the summer, PBC would bring back their proposal to the full Senate for discussion and review. Was that correct?

Senator Fenwick replied that they would report back. PBC might not have a proposal to bring back but would report back in the fall on what assessment tools were going to be used to measure the quality measures.

Senator Barrett then had two questions. The amended motion reads to report back to Faculty Senate so that implementation of the process could begin in the fall. That meant that they reported and we had

a chance to reject it at that point?

Senator Fenwick replied that that was correct, but it did not specify which Fall. We attempted to get an amendment to do that and it failed.

Senator Barrett's second question was, what was the effect of defeating this today? That we stopped work on it? Chair Sheffer replied that that was correct.

Senator Jimenez then wish to respond to Secretary Kennedy's comments. He stated that PBC had a representative from the Community & Technical College, but it was his choice whether or not he chose to sit on the committee.

Senator Clark also wanted to address that, which was to say that this subcommittee was created on a volunteer basis. The working committee was going to reconstitute their charge over the summer and was open to others' participation. So we would welcome it, assuming Senate gave us work for the summer.

Senator Gerlach then added that listening to the various comments made him glad he was retired. Someone had asked what Senate would be adopting here. What the body was adopting was a lot of busy work and witchcraft, to his way of thinking. But it must go forward because this was what the university community was bent on these days. He wondered what Cambridge and Oxford and Harvard and Yale and even his own alma mater, the University of Nebraska, ever did to get along without such business. But with that in mind he thought the body had talked about it enough and moved the previous question so as to vote on the issue.

The motion was seconded and a vote taken to move the question. The requisite two-thirds so approved and the motion passed.

Senator Fenwick then addressed the body's attention to motion #2 which constituted the legitimacy for PBC to meet over the summer. Motion 2 was: **PBC respectfully requests that the administration work with the PBC over the summer to deal with changes that may need to be made in the budget, and that PBC receive timely feedback before and after the budget is adopted by the Board of Trustees.**

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The Senate approved motion #2 from PBC.

Senator Fenwick then thanked the body for providing summer work for the committee. He also thanked Senators Dechambeau and Clark and the other members of the subcommittee who worked so hard on the ROI quality measures. He also expressed his deep appreciation to Marilyn Quillin, and to Jean Garcia of his department, for serving as note-takers and secretaries during the meetings. And finally, for those people who would not be on PBC next year, thank you for your contribution, and especially to Provost Hickey who he had deeply enjoyed working with and would miss next year because he would have to break in a new Provost on the committee. Good luck to all; have a very good summer.

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE - Senator Norfolk stated that he had a very brief report from the CCTC (**Appendix J**). The committee had met several times over the year and had a number of recommendations, none of which were specific action items. The first recommendation was we did meet for Dr. Gaylord's proposed budget, which was a project budget. Included in that were estimates to the cost of moving to version 8 of Peoplesoft. The

committee recommended to the PBC and Faculty Senate that these budget requests be honored. Item 2 was the laptop program.

Chair Sheffer then asked whether these were not action items. To which Senator Norfolk replied that, as Senate had already passed the budget, it was rather defunct. The laptop program was more an information piece for Senators. The student laptop program would expire summer of 2004. The faculty laptop program would expire in December of 2004. As of right now, there were no plans to continue. What the committee recommended was that the money be found in the VP-CIO budget to purchase those machines for the faculty who currently used them, that they nurse them for one extra year and then we try to start another program in December of 2005, possibly using a vendor other than IBM. The third item was on the technology fees. After we had had this debate we could talk about Senator Witt's question from the last two meetings. It would appear there was approximately \$800,000 per year of technology fees from student credit hr. production being distributed to the colleges. We simply recommended that the Provost and the Council of Deans make sure that they did indeed spend \$800,000 per year on appropriate technology.

Senator Dalton then asked about Senator Norfolk's comments regarding the student laptop program running out in the summer of 2004. Students had been told that that was what we needed to rely upon in terms of our computers because the labs had been taken away and replaced with laptops. So what was going to be the result in about a year when we did not have laptops anymore?

Senator Norfolk replied that we did not know. The cost to the students was a nominal cost. There was a \$1 cost for the student laptops, to purchase the ones that were here. In terms of labs, there were labs on campus but they were going away. We did not know because there was no money to do that extension right now. It simply was not there.

Senator Witt added that the University could purchase the student laptops for not much money, \$1. They then stayed in circulation and students did not lose anything, and they would not be taken away. Any number of things could happen to the faculty laptops. If faculty did not want them, the University could purchase them. He asked whether it was for the current resale value.

Senate Norfolk replied that that was correct. It was a very reasonable market value, between \$200-300 each.

Senator Witt then added that either departments could buy them for their faculty or we could move those into student use if faculty did not want them.

Senator Broadway then referred to Senator Norfolk's comment of \$800,000 of technology fees going to the Provost and to the deans. That was out of what total amount of technology fees that were collected?

Senator Norfolk replied that he believed it would be approximately \$9 million.

Senator Broadway then asked that out of the \$9 million, would only \$800,000 be involved?

Senator Norfolk replied that several years ago Senate had passed a dedicated 2% tuition increase for technology, which was approximately \$2 million a year. There were now undergraduates - except for freshmen - who paid \$12 per credit hr. Graduate student amount was \$14.75 a credit hr., so it was about half a million in student credit hrs. a year.

Provost Hickey then added for clarification so whoever came after him was not confused, that \$800,000 went directly to the colleges, and none of the remaining technology money comes to the Provost's office.

Senator Norfolk apologized stating that he had not meant that.

Senator Broadway stated that in light of those numbers and not having had time to digest or reflect on those numbers, he really wished the committee would come back to the Faculty Senate with a report on the total amount of monies collected and where that total amount was being distributed throughout the University. He thought it was \$9 million and he heard \$800,000, roughly less than 10%, being distributed back to departments and students. He would like to know the accountability of the remaining money.

Senator Norfolk stated that he could give a simple answer to the remaining money. It was going into the VP-CIO's budget project total. But we would take that and he was sure the committee would have fun.

Senator Broadway then added that while he did not mean to be argumentative, if we looked at the total budget for that particular vice president's office, there was a great amount of that budget that was in addition from other sources. The Planning and Budgeting Committee had not looked at those line items for that vice president in terms of information. Knowing that technology fees was a separate line than that office's operation line, he did want to question how much money that particular office gets as part of the overall budget of the University.

Senator Dalton asked how much Peoplesoft 8.0 was going to cost. Senator Norfolk stated that the University already owned it. The implementation would be training, so to speak, and some other materials of several million dollars over the next few years.

GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - (Appendix K)

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS B Chair Sheffer stated that there was an item from the last meeting at which time Senator J. Yoder had introduced a Senate bylaw change regarding the co-chair of the APCC. Specifically, the bylaw change reads that: **The Senior Vice President and Provost or said designee shall serve as co-chair of the committee. A Senatorial co-chair shall be elected for a 2-year term by the full Senate at its September meeting from a slate of candidates who are either Senators or Senate-eligible designees. The Senatorial chair is eligible for a course reduction similar to that of the Senate chair. A meeting of the committee shall be called at the request of either co-chair. The Senatorial co-chair of the committee shall report to the Senate at regularly scheduled Senate meetings. The Senatorial co-chair will also regularly report to the full committee on the actions and comments of the Senate.**

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. Senator Pope, speaking as a member of that committee, stated she wished to speak to the efficiency of the committee, and she believed that the current organization of the committee was appropriate. She was, therefore, speaking against the motion.

No further discussion forthcoming, Chair Sheffer called for a vote on the proposed bylaw change. The vote was 17 for the motion; 15 opposed. Not achieving the requisite 60% approval, the motion failed.

VII. NEW BUSINESS B Senator Dalton then introduced a motion to change the UA policy of makeup work due to University-sponsored activities (**Appendix L**). Here at The University of Akron

there were a myriad of university-sponsored student organizations. Many of these said organizations were very active both in the local community and within the organization of their state and national affiliations. As such, the student members of these organizations served as ambassadors under the flag of The University of Akron, providing a positive impression of our great institution. As a result, oftentimes student leaders serving in the aforementioned capacity of ambassadors of The University of Akron were forced to miss classes due to their respective university-sponsored activity. Presently there was no policy to insure that the student would be permitted to make up class work that was missed as a result of their membership and participation in the said university-sponsored activities. The instructor had the right to deny the student of making up work missed based on the individual professor's discretion. Most instructors were very understanding and allowed for work to be made up. However, there were those instances where professors refused to grant such an option because of their personal beliefs or opinions. Consequently, we were proposing a change to the University's policy that would require instructors to allow make up work for university-sponsored absences only, provided the student made a reasonable effort to contact them and to inquire about missed assignments. It was important to point out that several comparable schools to The University of Akron, such as Kent State and Marshall Universities, had recently passed similar legislation. He had worked in cooperation on this with Brady Steineck, who was President of the Student-Athlete Advisory Council. The motion read: **Students are frequently asked to represent the University in authorized events and activities. In some cases, this participation conflicts with the students' course assignments and requirements. We propose that: It is university policy that faculty members shall offer a reasonable opportunity for such students to complete missed classroom assignments, including written or oral examinations, term papers, or other assignments. The same grading scale shall apply to all class members, and no penalty may be applied to these makeup assignments. Students chosen to participate in university-sponsored, authorized activities by program directors shall provide each student with a copy of this form. It is the student's responsibility to present a copy of this form to the faculty members responsible for the class which will be missed. This verification is to be provided prior to the missed class, or no later than the first class period following the event.**

Senator Sterns seconded the motion.

Senator Dalton then led the discussion of this motion. One of the reasons that students had drafted this was because of situations baseball players often faced. Brady is a member of the baseball team. He might get a call the night before asking him to go play in a baseball tournament that his coach just scheduled for the next four days. So if he would refuse, it would impinge his scholarship and responsibility to appear for The University of Akron. So that was actually what had come up when he had talked to Brady about this issue. The team had had rainouts and they needed to play games. He had received a phone call that Wed. night that he would have to leave Wed. through Sunday. So in that instance he, Senator Dalton, had understood that if students were just asked to leave, it was sometimes difficult to make arrangements.

Provost Hickey then asked about a concern he had. How did students define a University-sponsored event? Given the number of students who ended up in his office or on his email wanting him to intervene because a faculty member had not allowed them to make up a class or assignment that they had missed, he knew that the range of excuses was enormous. While he did not have a problem with what he thought they were trying to accomplish here, he thought they needed to very clearly define what a University-sponsored event was and what levels of organization were capable of having that ability to declare themselves a University-sponsored event.

Secretary Kennedy then stated, to dovetail what the Provost had just said, the Executive Committee discussed this policy at our last meeting and our **recommendation was that we refer this to the**

Academic Policies & Calendar Committee to work on.

Senator Norfolk seconded this motion. Senator Dalton, stating that this was his last Senate meeting, asked that he be kept in the loop regarding this motion. Senator John then offered a friendly amendment, stating that Senate request that APCC report back to the full Senate at the Oct. meeting, so as not to drag this out the entire year. This was accepted and seconded.

Senator Jordan then stated that he was a little concerned about how often this could happen, as surely there was some limit that was not tolerable academically. The reviewers and thinkers on this subject should be taking that into account.

Chair Sheffer called for further discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The motion was passed.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT B Chair Sheffer called for a motion to adjourn. This was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin