



SENATE ACTIONS

- Approved in principle the further exploration of University Council system page 2
- Provided the University Council Exploratory Committee with information on sections of the proposal the Senate determined to need modification page 2
- Requested written progress report from the University Council Exploratory Committee by one week prior to the March 2008 meeting of the Faculty Senate page 23

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle* may be directed to the Secretary, Richard Stratton (x7440).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of the Special Faculty Senate Meeting held November 8, 2007 3

Appendices to Minutes of the Special Faculty Senate Meeting of November 8, 2007

 A. Powerpoint Presentation by Joe Wilder 22

Minutes of the Special Faculty Senate Meeting of November 8, 2007

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, November 8, 2007, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-five Senators, 33 were present for this meeting. Senators Arter, Carroll, Gamble, Gerber, Gurnak, Hallett, Hamed, Kelly, Keltyka, Lyons, Ofobike, Sotnak, Toliver, Vollmer and Williams were absent with notice. Senators Bohland, Elliott, Halter, Maringer, Sadler, Sancaktar and Zingale were absent without notice.

Chair Sterns, after determining that a quorum was present, called the meeting to order. “This is a special meeting of the Faculty Senate called for the purpose of discussing the University Council Exploratory Committee’s deliberations and their report as well as a discussion of the document that was circulated.” The agenda was approved. After obtaining the permission of the Senate for Associate Provost Rex Ramsier to address the Senate, Chair Sterns asked the co-chairs (Senator Lillie and Provost Rex Ramsier) of the University Council Exploratory Committee to report to the body.

Senator Lillie addressed the Senate. “At this point we have tried to expend as much effort as we could in order to ensure the Senate had the opportunity to do two things; one is to hear we hope a definitive explanation of the University Council proposal and we do have someone from the committee who is here to help us do that that would be Joe Wilder, the Chair of Theoretical and Applied Math. So after we say just a word or two we’re going to ask him address the proposal. Second, we are asking that a motion be put on the floor that the Senate provide feedback to the University Council Exploratory Committee on the proposal for a University Council and that this feedback be recorded and communicated to the University Council Exploratory Committee by the Secretary of the Senate for the University Council Exploratory Committee consideration.

Senator Rich made the motion:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate shall provide feedback to the University Council Exploratory Committee on the proposal for a University Council and that this feedback shall be recorded and communicated to the University Council Exploratory Committee by the Secretary of the Senate for the University Council Exploratory Committee consideration

(second provide by Senator Erickson).

Chair Sterns, recognizing the motion, obtained permission for Joe Wilder to address the Senate for the purpose of presenting and explaining the proposal.

The following is Dr. Wilder's narrative that accompanied the PowerPoint presentation of the structure and functioning of the proposed University Council.

Dr. Wilder: "First from the committee, thank you for this opportunity to come and talk to you and try and clear up any concerns or thoughts that you had on the concept of the University Council. History of the effort, timeline, and accomplishments to date, you've heard about those in the past so we're not going to be talking about them today. What we are going to be looking at is understanding the December 2006 proposal that you all received. In doing that we'll talk about the constituency and the structure of University Council. We set out in that document five different models on how representation could be constructed. We will also talk about decision-making and in order to set a context for it we'll talk a little bit about how decision making goes on without University Council and then how University Council would impact that. And then of course down to the part about what this would mean to Faculty Senate and then just finish up with what's next in the process of trying to move through this.

And so one of the important parts of University Council of course is that there are a number of different constituencies, some of them administration, some faculty, some staff, contract professionals, students, all of them interacting. One thing missing from this diagram that was in the original one is that there should be outer connections connecting all those groups as well, but University Council is the hub of the wheel but there is a rim around the outside for communication amongst those groups. University Council is similar to just about any other body, in that it would be made up of an executive committee that would look at different issues that would come before University Council; underneath that executive committee there would be standing committees that will address specific issues We'll talk about those that were in the document that you've seen. We recognize that there would also be a need for ad hoc committees for things that come up that are not part of those core missions that we'll be talking about today; just the standard type structure that you would expect. An important thing is, under all of this how will representation be made up? Who will be there, who will they be representing, and how many from each constituency? And so coming up with that, we first thought it very important that we recognize that those who are representing the constituencies are elected members of those constituencies. We asked for input on three different models for coming up with representatives on University Council. There were five different realizations but three conceptually different models and I'll just walk you through those.

The first one was that there be equal representation from all of them and there were two realizations: one where there'd be three from each group another one with four from each group. And you have to realize when we were going through this we spent a lot of time in discussing the size that University Council needed to be. It needed to be large enough to function at a certain level but also small enough that there was real trust that developed and an ability to communicate effectively. And so you'll see as we get towards the bottom of this slide that we recognized that the number of people that were talking about here which is somewhere in the twenties, would not be enough to do everything and have all the expertise we'd need. So there is a part on the bottom where we'll talk about how we'll address that.

The second basic model was that we would classify the constituencies as small, medium or large. And then depending on which one they fell into they would get a different number of representatives. For example students, faculty would be part of the large group and have four each, while Department Chairs which are somewhere in the middle between let's say Deans and faculty in terms of numbers, we had a little bit of a quandary of whether we should call them small or medium and that's why two different realizations for this model: one where they were considered small and got two representatives and one where they were deemed to similar to medium and they got three. The last model that we had was that we would group these constituencies by function. Faculty, staff and contract professionals, administrators and students in each of those four groups would have an equal number of representatives: six each for a total of twenty-four. So those were the three basic models that we came up with.

As I mentioned previously we realized that there may be other expertise that we would need on certain issues there may be other times that there are other needs, people from outside University Council and so we wanted to allow for the fact that executive committee of the University Council would be able to tap into that expertise that doesn't lie within it's own members and so would be able to invite non-voting members to come provide information and other types of support that might be needed.

So with that idea of how we would get people onto University Council and representing the constituencies I want to talk a little now about the decision making on campus. First we'll start out with what it looks like without University Council. I'll try and just walk you through a little bit of what this diagram is trying to show. The real part to focus on is that if you look at the administrative side there's a lot of communication at all the various levels. And it's fairly effective at working in terms of communication, getting feedback and working out issues. On the right hand side however, which are all the other groups that don't involve administration, while there are direct lines from those groups to let's say the President and Provost level, there's not a very effective means for them to communicate, to come together on issues and to be able to speak with one voice. And so that's something that University Council is hoping to address. So while there are pathways of reporting lines, ways of getting information and feedback, there is not a truly representative body that can speak with one voice for the university community.

So how are key issues currently handled? One way of thinking about it: an issue comes up, it's hard to think of issues that would not fall under some Vice President's prevue, so they would be typically assigned a task of looking into the issue or trying to come up with a plan to address the issue. They often form teams where they invite individuals to come onto the team to help them look at the issue. Now at the same, time separate from the team that the vice president may have, there may be a committee within Faculty Senate (I'm going to try and draw my example from Faculty Senate since we're speaking here but the same thing holds for all of the constituencies) that addresses that issue or if not they may feel the need to form one so that they have good representation and input on it. And the key question though is not whether or not they have a committee looking at the same issue, but how effective or influential the communication is between let's say a Faculty Senate committee on an issue and the team that's been formed on the administrative side under the prevue of the vice president to directly address it. And the net result of all of this is that the input of Faculty Senate (or

you can replace Faculty Senate with the name of any of the other constituencies) on some key issues is not as strong and as vocal or as well known as would be desired. It's not at the level that would be desired by let's say Faculty Senate's side nor on the administration's side. Both sides are feeling, I believe, that the input is not as good as it could be, there's not as effective communication as there could be if we had something like Faculty Senate that gave the proper forum for that communication. And so that's pretty much what were about now is trying to look at what are the roles and what process would the University Council play in trying to change that picture of how decision making takes place.

So first let's talk about the proposed roles. As we saw it there were two primary roles that University Council would play. The first one as I mentioned before was this forum for interaction, feedback, provide information on emerging issues. I've only been on campus for a little under two years now but I've heard repeatedly over and over from people at every level that there a lot of things going on that people don't feel that they really know all the thinks about that they'd like to. That maybe they don't have an opportunity to be heard, to get their point of view expressed. And that forum is exactly what we're looking for University Council to do; to provide a forum for that voice to be heard, to get consensus across groups and then to be able to speak with one voice to what the university community wants and what it feels would be best for the university.

The second part of it is University Council to have a formal and substantive shared governance role. We focused in all of our discussions on trying to come up with what were those broad issues, issues that impact the entire university community not that focus on just one or two constituencies. What issues were so broad that they impact the entire university community in which University Council could have this very formal role? We came up with these six different areas that were in that document that you saw from December 2006 [Strategic Planning; University Benefits and Wellbeing; Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation; Information Technology; Financial and Budgeting; Campus Facilities Planning and Equipment; Communications]. I'm not going to spend a lot of time talking about those individual areas, I'm going to talk in general how the process would work with respect to any one of them. So as we're going through this we're going to be talking about how would University Council impact shared governance for any one of these six; the basic structure carries over to the different ones. So back to our picture that we had before because it's members come from all these different constituencies University Council is going to naturally represent a forum as we want it. What is key to the substantive part, the substantive interaction is communication and feedback going both directions. So in everything we're talking about here, it's key to remember that we are focusing on there being feedback from all the constituencies to University Council forward to the administration and back constantly a back and forth dialogue that allows for real participation of all the groups. I almost forgot to mention, those reporting lines that I had before, University Council will not remove nor change any of the existing reporting lines or authorities of those constituencies. The purpose of University Council is not to take anything away from any constituency but to add to their influence and an additional forum for viewpoints to be shared and from one voice a grassroots movement, if you will, one voice on issues to rise upwards. So we're not about taking anything away from any group, we're merely attempting to add to what is already in place.

And now the two-way interaction that we talked about, let's get into the details of how that would happen in a specific example. So part of the document that you got in December were those six areas that were on the previous slide. For each of those areas we need to envision there being a long range planning committee that would look at those key issues and try to come up with a long range plan for how the university will meet it's needs and the needs of its constituencies in those areas. The way we're envisioning it Faculty Senate, if they so desired and personally I would think they would want to, they would still have committees related to those same topics because your committees within Faculty Senate would be solely dealing with what is the faculty input on this issue? That input would then be brought to University Council and into that planning committee by your representatives who serve on University Council. This long range planning committee would then be communicating with the appropriate Vice President on whatever the issue may be; they would have to clarify what the issue is as well as input from all the different groups in terms of what they thought options were and try to get as much input as possible as we saw from Faculty Senate from all of the other constituencies as well. After that, this long range planning committee would make a report to University Council, the body of the whole, with a recommendation on what University Council thought should be done to address this area, this need; whatever it is that the committee is looking at. University Council would then make their recommendation up to the President/Provost level. At that point and as we saw on the previous slide without University Council when issues come to the President/Provost level they normally are delegated to the appropriate Vice President who would look into the issue. And so at this point this would again happen with the input and recommendation of University Council, a Vice President with the President and the Provost would construct what they thought how they would address this issue that's been brought forward from University Council. They will then report back to University Council and in the case of there being any departure from what University Council proposes there would have to be a written discussion of the reasons for that. So it's not just: a you recommended this, we're going to do that. It's a reasoned document that discusses the rationale behind it; so getting feedback from the administration on the proposal, real feedback. Once that's taken place and you have a long range plan of course you have to implement that plan for something to happen and so there would be team that would be generated that would be made up of people from University Council as well as others that would perhaps not be part of University Council that might be chosen by the vice president but the key thing is that the part of that implementation team will be representatives from University Council. They will be part of the process to implement the long range plan.

Now once that team has implemented the plan on an annual basis University Council should receive back a joint report from the vice president and the long range planning committee as to what was done during the past year to try and address that issue. And as part of this University Council will be looking at: were the objectives met, how effective is the plan and is there anything that needs to be done in terms of changing the plan going forward in the future. And so University Council once it receives that report could make recommendations again to the Provost and President's level indicating: we think this is going well but this is not working out quite so much, maybe we need a course correction, whatever it may be again feedback from University Council to the President and Provost level on where were going to meeting this long range plan. So in terms of being an effective member in the shared governance decision making some of the key things are that University Council would be engaged in long range planning, alright they would be an intimate

partner in that long range planning. They would be making recommendations, giving feedback to and from the highest levels; the President's and the Provost's office. They would be participating directly in the short term implementation of those plans. And then finally they would be part of the annual assessment progress how are we doing towards reaching those goals? So that is what we were proposing as a formal shared governance role on those six issues that are listed in the document.

Alright so what does this mean for Faculty Senate's role? First, as I stated towards the beginning, we're looking at having representatives from each constituency that are elected in some manner so on our very lowest level Faculty Senate would have to amend it's by laws to somehow include elections to get representatives for University Council. As would the other constituencies. In my mind it's key to focus on the fact that Faculty Senate retains its current rights, responsibilities and reporting lines. There is nothing that stops Faculty Senate from reporting directly on any issue as it does now. University Council adds to does not take away from. If Faculty Senate wants to you could change to eliminate some committees that are things reflected in University Council but you also certainly would have the choice of keeping them because you want a directed discussion within the Faculty Senate on an issue that may make a recommendation that then goes forward to University Council. There is no implication here that if University Council has a committee no other constituency like Faculty Senate could have a group that looks at it from their unique perspective. In fact that's I would think a good place to get input for University Council is from each constituency having a group dedicated to looking at it from their own unique perspective. Again I think it's somewhat of a consensus among the committee that Faculty Senate would gain influence into decision making, something that I think is important to all the constituencies and this provides a forum to get one voice, speaking as a university community, people from all the different parts of that university speaking with one voice saying this is what we think The University of Akron should do. There may be issues that are of specific interest to faculty that perhaps under the current system you would not be listened to as much because you are one voice. Being able to bring it forward so that it is all those constituencies speaking with that one voice may make it easier and I think more influential when it comes to trying to have things addressed. And so that's one of the things that we think is an important role for University Council.

And then a final thought on this, our collective goal as a community on campus shouldn't be to try to maintain the status quo and bring things backward to what they may have been in some previous state. Our goal needs to be to move forward towards a real shared governance process and you have to realize this will be an evolution. There's no way this committee can construct the perfect answer that would be implemented and there we'd never need to change it or try and make it something a little bit different. What we're trying to do is move forward with a first step towards real shared governance that will evolve as we've learned from that process and I hope we can all keep that in mind in our discussions.

Last thing, what's next. We are currently [the diagram displayed was sent out with the original proposal back in December] at the point where we are getting feedback from all the constituencies and so what we are looking for, as that motion that was put on the floor, feedback from Faculty Senate on the proposal. At the point where we have feedback from all the constituencies the com-

mittee will again look at the proposal as it was given, the feedback we've gotten and try to come up with a consensus that represents the concerns and ideas of all constituencies once we have that feedback and at that point we will come up with a revised proposal that can again be shared with constituencies. And I believe that is the end of what I have. So thank you for your attention."

Senator Lillie thanked Joe and indicate "some members of the committee are here, if you have questions and need feedback from other members of the committee."

Chair Sterns asked Senator Lillie to introduce the members of the committee.

Senator Lillie introduced the members of the University Council Exploratory Committee who were present. "We have Kent Marsden representing CPAC, Joe Wilder of course representing Chairs, Ginny Gund who is the person who started all this several years ago as the Chair of the decision making task force, Joey LaCause she's representing the Staff Employees Advisory Committee, Rex Ramsier of course representing Vice Presidents. Cerysse Lanns and Alyison Leigh representing the Graduate Student Council and Senator Bowman representing ASG. Finally, Liz Erickson a senator and I are also members of this committee on behalf of the senate."

Chair Sterns: "I serve ex-officio. So I've been to what three meetings now? Okay, questions?"

Senator Hajjafar asked if "this a legislative body or executive body or what do we call it?"

Joe Wilder responded that "this is a body that would be making recommendations to the President level."

Senator Hajjafar then asked: "After the recommendations are made it comes back to who? It comes back to vice president, provost, deans, chairs is that right? What should be executed it goes back into the other column that you show."

Joe Wilder agreed that as he understands the process, "After the decision is made it would go through the deans and vice presidents [for implementation]."

Senator Hajjafar: "So here we are a group in the University Council who knows that the outcome comes from their hand. So here I have problem with independence issue. The legislative body and the executive body they have to be independent from each other. See here, in the council there are four deans, two vice presidents, there are quite a few number of those who knows what's the outcome of this council comes back to them. They are those who have to execute the decisions and if we don't like something they will do their best to prevent it and they may have something in mind that like to do it, they will do their best to go for it. So here I have problem. I'm a mathematician when we have a fundamental set the members have to be independent from each other. Here I don't see independence."

Joe Wilder: “The problem with the logic of that though is it says that anyone who has a part in the construction of a decision can never be a part of implementing it. And really I think about once the decision is made if you’re following the path that’s been set, what is wrong with having some of those who are part of making the decision also responsible for implementing it?”

Senator Hajjafar: “Well here is the independence because if there was one person that representing for the executive part you know like United States House of Representatives there was one representative from administration and that is Vice President. The other members are independent and are from different work or they have no connection for executive and legislative. Now here we are mixing legislative and executive body together and I see problem with that.”

Senator Erickson: “Just one simple answer to just what you were saying there. In a parliamentary system you have that mix certainly, do you not? You see so it’s not the only model where you get the separation of those two kinds of systems and I think that is what Joe is saying, because as I said in a parliamentary system the ministers are going to be elected. They are not voting from outside. They are interested servers as well. So I think it’s a different model that he’s talking about.”

Senator Hajjafar: “But they don’t decide what they have to execute.”

Senator Broadway: “To some degree I want to open up the discussion. One of the problems I have with the document is the use of the word democratic. This is not by any chance in my imagination using the definition of democratic, a democratic system. I would like that word to be struck from the preamble. I think it’s really clear. I think some of the confusion is the perception that this is democratic process and it is not.”

Senator Hajjafar: “One other problem I read from the document on the 2006 document at the end it said “President, or designee, shall bring proposals of plans affecting the entire University community to University Council to be reviewed or evaluated.” That includes decisions in the Senate also. So whatever is the outcome of this Senate, President can bring it to the Council for evaluation. That means the Senate can have no say on the university affairs. See it says any decision can be brought by President to University Council so here I don’t see independence of Faculty Senate also, because President can ask for evaluation of what the outcome of Senate business to go to the council.”

Senator Lillie: “It may be that some clarification might be needed there. But I can tell you what the intent is. The language may need to be, as I say, may need to be revised which is part of the reason why we’re here. The independence of the Faculty Senate it’s academic mission would not be under the jurisdiction of the University Council whatsoever. So that if the Faculty Senate under this new model had an academic point to make it would not go through the University Council it would go directly to the President. The purpose of the University Council is to consider proposals or situations that may have an impact across the University not to any one particular constituency. And the mechanism would be a way to restrict what the University Council considers to things that

are deemed to have an impact across the University, not on any one particular constituency. That's the intent, so this kind of oversight role that I'm hearing you talk about for University Council is not what we intended."

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman I have a number of questions and I hardly know where to begin. But I was amazed to hear that this council scheme would not interfere with any existing part of the Senate. However I get the impression that with all these other constituencies playing into a council that there's no need for anyone to be in this Senate except faculty. No students, no CPAC, etcetera, just faculty. I don't know whether that's correct or not. But this is going to be terribly complicated because the present by the action of the trustees the Senate is designated as a legislative body of the University empowered to do certain things. Now the Trustees took away various of our committee functions, long range planning, budget, what else? Campus facilities planning, the Senate instituted a variety of ad hoc committees to limp along. Now under this council proposal, are we going to be able to reestablish with the Trustees approval, because they'll have to approve the council too, are we going to be able to reestablish these old committees and their functions that we once had? I wonder about that, so I suggest that if the Senate is to be a faculty body then the faculty indeed is entitled to its exclusive function in this council system. Let student government have its approach to council, the CPAC have their approach to the council, I think that the Senate of faculty members only should have their approach to this council too. However, I'm impressed too by this explanation, but how complicated this is going to be. It's not simple, and you're going to have all these communications with all these different groups, when will we ever get any other work done except communicating back and forth? I wish you would consider is there any way you can simplify.

I'd like to ask too about this representation you said it still has to be established, equal representation from each constituency to the council or some form of proportional arrangement. It makes me think of the struggle in the formation of the United States government that under the days of continental congress every state was strictly the equal of every other state, no matter how many representatives they might send they had one vote. And I think that's a mistake to establish strictly equal. I think you have to drive for something that's akin to proportional representation a la the House of Representatives and equal representation a la the [US] Senate where again all the states have equal representation. I think you better look at the possibility of making it a combination of those two rather than strictly equal. I would like to lend my hand for editorial purposes of this document. I said this once before I hate that word "input" all I can ever think is enema. Input is one of those inelegant intrusions from the computer age. Why can't we say as educated people what we're after is advice and information? I know input is shorter and probably covers them but it's not very nice I think. Also, since your committee is collecting reactions from various of these constituencies can you tell us here what the Vice Presidents have said so far about this? What have the Deans said to you about this? What have the Department Chairmen said and you know what the Trustees might think about this? I don't know but can you tell us anything that they have responded to you as you're trying to get us to respond here today?"

Senator Lillie: "The answer is that yes, we can tell you some things. We do have fairly extensive written feedback from the Deans and Vice Presidents that was alluded to in the report that Rex and I wrote and presented I think last month. And the feedback of the Deans and Vice Presidents in my

mind if I may summarize it boils down to that they saw the role of this body as more advisory than legislative or executive body, the University Council Exploratory Committee still does feel pretty strongly that it ought have a substantive role and not simply an advisory role so that's one of the areas in which there was some feedback from the Vice Presidents. The CPAC has discussed the issue and has voted to approve the mission statement as I recall, did not provide specific feedback to the rest of the document that I'm aware of. SEAC has approved the document as it stands. The Associated Student Government has reviewed the document formally once, informally once we were told this morning and has provided some general feedback but we have no specific, formal vote if you will. And Graduate Student Government I don't think we've received anything formal yet I think that might be in a rubric of the ASG cause there's some cooperation going on there. And we are now in the process of trying to gather specific feedback of just the kind you're talking about now in this body.

The Chairs did do a survey and came up with some feedback that was basically mixed on the prospect of the University Council as it was presented last December. So that would be a very quick summary of where I understand it to be subject to the better memories of people who may be Chairs, SEAC or CPAC."

Chair Sterns: "Do any of the representatives from any of those groups want to speak?"

Joe Wilder: "I would just say concerning the Chairs responses, they had no problems with the concept, they just wanted to make sure that if we went through the effort of University Council, as you say it will be a great effort, that it had a true substantive role. I guess that's what we're trying to address here in the presentation is how we believe that it would be a clear and substantive role."

Senator Erickson: "If I could just add a little to that. I had spoken with Senator Lillie, not in his role as Chair but in his role as representing the Faculty Senate in this group. We think that the principle involved here is really significant and important. And we do think that there are really important issues that we think are there but certainly that need to be maintained and anything that goes on later on and in fact would need to be strengthened. The first one is the one that Joe first mentioned. If it's not substantive, if there's not going to be a substantive role in decision making then we would not recommend it to this body for acceptance. We would just say don't, walk away from it. It's got to be a substantive role. It has to have a principle of election. We've said it again and again I think all last year in Senate the difference between elected and appointed. I'm not suggesting we have it sorted out completely at this level yet. That the committee structure is effective, that it works from the right kind of input. That there is a reporting line to the President and that there is written feedback, just as it is here in the Senate that the very least that is necessary. Now can we make ourselves the decision makers? No we know we can't. And it is your estimate as to whether or not we can get what is really substantive: and say no or yes to that. But it is one of our major goals. The fifth one is maintenance of an effective Senate with our own lines of communication to the President. That has got to stay. And there's got to be strong lines of communication from the UC committees to the UC and to the Senate. Those are the things that are there right now.

Apart from that when it comes to the numbers of representatives and how many we should have, then I'm going to speak as a faculty senator, not as member of the group that came up with this joint product. I think the Senate should consider recommending higher representation of faculty on the UC because of the primacy of the academic mission of the university. The students are absolutely essential, but the students come for the faculty. But I think it is important, that this has some real merit to it. The idea that these issues, the substantive role, of election, effective committees, reporting directly to the President, written feedback, maintenance of an effective Senate with its own role as well. We think those are essential and we think that what we need is what you think of to make that better. Or if you feel that isn't right as representing you in trying to push these things please let us know that because that's what we have thought we were doing on your behalf."

Senator Gehani: "When I look at this issue I mainly struggle with two things, one this equity and equality issue and the second is will this improve transparency and accountability. Now based on my interactions so far I assume that in the past accountability has been ordered in certain ways. We as faculty members don't hear as much about allocation of resources or what came out of those allocations of resources. Now in terms of equity and equality, I think it seems very attractive to dilute the effect of any single constituency by including everybody. But then what is the image of our organization, are we the McDonald's serving fast food or are we a professional enterprise like that of lawyers, where the tenured lawyers are the partners of the entity. Considering the Ph.D. of education and everything, if we are more towards the legal profession then I think the shared governance should mean participation in decision making and execution. So I think we're all saying that we need a higher representation and whereas we attract students, where as students are important to pay for the bills and as our customers and as our clients, I think faculty need to be respected and regarded more as part of the people who run the enterprise. I love the fact that you've done so much analysis, because in addition to having this layer I think you thought through the entire processes, that the university functioning. I think all that effort if increases transparency and accountability for resource allocations then I think it would benefit all of us."

Senator Gerlach: "May I come back to a question that I asked but did not get an answer to, or didn't peruse? Is it conceivable that with the retention of this Senate that our membership could be altered or should be altered to make this an exclusive faculty body?"

Senator Lillie: "I would say that in the view, at least my view of I think the committee itself although we haven't talked about this formally because it's a Senate thing but I think the sense would be that yes indeed there would have to be a change in the role and function of the Senate if this were to go forward. Because the Faculty Senate right now is the one place on campus that can argue that it does have representatives of wide variety of people from across the campus. And part of the role of the University Council would be to take over that sort of university wide function of the Senate, but not to add to or to supplant the academic production of the Senate. So there would be some potential changes. We aren't recommending any or suggesting any but I think that what you said is something that could that the Senate might want to consider should I come to that."

Senator Gerlach: "One other comment I would like to make just crossed my mind listening to various comments here today that this council idea does not seem to be so far out of the left field as

I once thought it was. It also occurred to me that given the explanations that we have here the Senate could become a reformed body become a true Faculty Senate the way it was intended to become and other constituencies at the university have their voices through this council in which case the Senate then being a pure faculty body would not need even to participate in this council. It could say you have given us the lines of communication that would continue to flow between us and the administrative officers and if that is so why should we as faculty members in the Senate want to be bothered with the council? Let these other people have their voices that way, we have our voices and they go right to the President and the Provost the way our by laws have always said they were. In any case, consider that. It would make me much more pleasant to the idea of council.”

Chair Sterns asked Vice Chair Rich to assume the Chairmanship for a moment, as the Chair wanted to step out of his role as Chair and respond to the senator.

Senator Rich assumed the Chair and recognized Senator Sterns.

Chair Sterns: “I have one concern about your remarks. If the Faculty Senate truly discharged the academic issues of the university then I personally feel it’s absolutely essential that there be student representation as an example. I think the issue of who that this really is not today’s topic per say about the constituency but it would seem to me that we want to have to the same input into academic issues that we’ve always had that whatever our people that relevant to decision making regarding academic issues need to be present in the chamber. So I don’t know if it would be exclusively senators. But that’s my comment.”

Chair Sterns returned to the Chair.

Senator Huff: “I just wanted to speak in support of the work of all the people who have put this report together. And I’d also like to respond in a positive way to the document we were just given by Senator Erickson. I agree with the points that have been made and emphasized and the thing that occurs to me as I hear some of the comments, I agree with a lot of the questions that have been raised and a lot of the criticisms. But it seems to me that it’s important to keep in perspective the changes that have occurred in the role of the Senate over the past five or six years. What I’ve perceived happening is that some of our most important committees no longer exist. The ad hoc committees have tried to fill in that gap have only been able to partially function. And there continues to be the formation of task force and special committees, what were referred to as teams that were formed by the vice president or provost across campus, the decisions that used to be considered from the Faculty Senate are being considered by those groups. This has already occurred, we don’t have a University Council we have an ad hoc University Council that’s formed for every problem and every question that comes up. So I look at this whole thing as a way of formalizing and trying to make sure that we do have adequate participation in a formalized system so we’re not constantly reinventing a way to bring together some people to make some decision. It is probably going to be imperfect and I’m sure there’s going to be a number of problems. The one thing that’s been brought up that seems to be almost unavoidable is the sense of people feeling they’re left out not being part of the conversation and the time and effort that’s involved in communications to keep everyone informed. And I don’t know how you can solve both of those things at the same time.”

Senator Ash: “Being a new senator let me say first I’m hesitant because honestly I had a hard time figuring out what the purpose of the Senate is, at this point. I’m very serious about that. But just a couple things. The first is as has been pointed out this is not a democracy, this is an organization and as an organization we have a management structure that’s in place in this organization. A chain of command already exists. Referring to an earlier comment by Senator Hajjafar, it’s a bit odd to have this organization that we’re trying to bring together the disparate pieces to talk about the similarities, the communalities, the areas where we can agree and move forward and yet also include all elements of the chain of command. And that doesn’t exist normally in typical organizations, you don’t have the first line supervisor and the upper manager and the second line manager getting together to discuss jointly what might happen. This is a slightly odd situation to have that in this structure. The other pieces I think really make a lot of sense to bring together the bodies for purpose of discussion of those areas of common interest. And especially if it’s just a recommendation that we can provide is all. And I guess the other question that I would have is if this is a shared governance model is there a role in this for the AAUP? Does this fit in this here model at all, this union structure we have in place that represents faculty?”

Senator Lillie: “The answer with regard to our particular committee is that we specifically did not consider that. We just didn’t even bring that into the discussion at all, because that was considered to be outside the competence of this particular committee. Whether there ought to be role for the AAUP is good question but that’s not one we took on.”

Senator Gerlach: “Just two comments Mr. Chairman. With regard to the question of what the purpose of the Senate is I would advise our colleague to read the by-laws. The purpose is there and duties and responsibilities are outlined and as to Senator Huff’s comment all I can say is that since the word go when I came to this university in 1962 right down to the present, it has been an observable phenomenon that whatever established committees there may be whether it’s the old University Council or the now current Senate, anytime the administration wants a special thing done they’ll put up a separate committee, they will not use established committee that they could, because it doesn’t suit their purposes. And that has always made me feel basically hostile to administration and always on the side of the faculty. It’s our interest to be pressed through here and then we have established vehicles for operation the administration ought to use them, have the courtesy to bring us into the act. But as I said it will happen again. You set up this University Council with it’s committees and so on, if it doesn’t suit administration they’ll do it another way if they can.”

Senator Broadway: “Chair stop me if I become argumentative. Compared to Senator Gerlach I have been here relatively no time but in the time I have been here I have served the old Faculty Senate budget committee, I do think that we were an integral part of that committee and that budget committee did bring forth a document to the whole Senate so I think it would be a misrepresentation to say that Faculty Senate committees have not been in the past part of this process of having the administration I would use this word use us to get documents through including the one which brought us to being paid for our benefits.”

Chair Sterns: “Just a comment from the Chair, there is difference to choose to be used as opposed to just being used.”

Senator Hajjafar: “One other thing I really don’t understand how if a person has the power of veto on a decision making can be part of the concept. See, vice presidents the provost can be a member of this council and she is the chief or he is whoever it is in the future, is the chief operating person of the university, she or he has the power of veto to decide if they want to go with the decision or not. And then that person is a member of the council, so if we look at it, not that I want to say I’m extremely against that, but there should be some level of administration that they should not be part of this council, here if for example we are discussing one plan and then if it goes alright according to what the vice president wants and the president wants that is fine and if not, they veto it. There are some problems with all levels, when we want to be legislative part the decision making part there should be at least those who have the power of veto should not be part of that.”

Dr. Ramsier: “I don’t believe that we are considering the Provost as being part of the council. And if you ask the VPs their opinion is they only have recommendation power to the President.”

Senator Lillie: “I was just going to say that the Provost and the President are members of the Senate. I think the by-laws call them members of the Senate, I could be wrong in that but I think that’s correct. Nonvoting but their still members. And so it’s quite possible to say that the same concern you had is one that we have in our normal meeting and yet the intent of this is to provide in terms of the details of the committee structure specific areas in which the University Council would have substantive delegated authority to make decisions. Now in the end you’re right they would have to, it would have to be in the nature of recommendations but in the one sense everything that happens at The University of Akron is a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The issue of what kind of authority would be delegated to this body is a very important issue and I think you’ve touched on at least one aspect of that.”

Joe Wilder: “Just one thing, personally I think it’s important for different levels of the administration to be part of it because I would like to see one voice... Imagine if there’s an issue where this University Council unanimously decides this is the right thing to do and part of that decision has been faculty, staff, contract professionals, students, chairs, deans, vice presidents. What kind of weight does that have when it goes forward as opposed to if there are no administrators involved, then it’s everyone else except us. And that’s personally why I felt it’s so important that they be there, part of the community and having a recommendation that goes forward with that one voice. Thank you.”

Senator Lenavitt: “I concur with that in the Executive Committee when this was brought up. One of the things that I drilled about was the whole idea of the vote and what veracity that the vote would have. Then coming back and studying when we talked about that studying that a little bit more one part of this that we’re forgetting and myself being in my eighth five-year plan for the institution, the ultimate caretakers of the interest of the state of Ohio is the Board of Trustees. The President and the Provost are at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees. The university lawyer makes sure that the interest of the state is performed by the president and the faculty and basically the Board of Trustees is the lawyer’s client. So the ultimate veto power regardless of what we do is with the Board of Trustees and not the President and the Provost because they are part of the process. And I concur if they’re not part of the process then strength of the collective voice to the

Board of Trustees will not be heard. Another component of this is, and Dr. Gerlach spoke to it, is what do the Board of Trustees think? I think the new addition of the operational advisory committee and if we were to look at it's make up it's pretty much an approval of the process that we seem to be talking about and seem to my mind, and this is all personal, seems to be an attempt to say we understand that we need to in order for the upcoming reevaluation of the university in governance that we need to do something and they need to be sitting fairly tight about that process that they have something in motion so the new advisory committee is just about a carbon copy of what was proposed back in December it just has a different flavor. And so that to me that says that the administration is willing to discuss this at length and so we cannot forget what the role of the Board of Trustees they ultimately run the university and they are politically placed, paid for, signed sealed and prior to any decision we make."

Senator Lillie: "I think I would just want to add it one thing that I said last time that we, the University Council Exploratory Committee, do believe that there has been serious consideration of this proposal from the vice presidents and deans and we've been assured that the Provost and the President as well. Now that's not very specific, but it's meant to sort of follow up on your point that I think that there is the intent to move forward with this in a way that can come about in terms of the best for all people concerned, at least at present."

Senator Gehani: "So if decisions are all centralized in the Board of Trustees will you help improve the transference and accountability of those decisions?"

Senator Lillie: "Sure. I don't know what else to say, I mean once again the transparency and so forth of these kinds of decisions is a two way kind of thing. Stand behind a one-way mirror and looks like a mirror on one side and people can see out on the other, I'm not sure where I'm going with this but.... I sometimes do feel like I'm on the wrong side of the mirror if that's what you're talking about. So transparency is something that really does go both ways you have to have cooperation and I think that one of the things that we need to do is to make it clear is that we hope this to be substantive thing. It should not be window dressing if it is window dressing we should say sorry. And that's part of what I sensed in my reading of what the Senate has said over the last few months is very important. At this point I'm speaking as a senator that's how I would feel. I'm going to forward with whatever the University Council committee wants to do. I've got that role as well so I just want you to be aware of that."

Senator Matney asked if there was a motion currently on the floor. He was assured there was, so he asked that it be read.

Senator Stratton read the motion.

"The Senate shall provide feedback to the University Council Exploratory Committee on the proposal for a university council and that this feedback shall be recorded and communicated to the University Council Exploratory Committee by the Secretary of the Senate for the University Council Exploratory Committee's consideration."

Senator Matney offered the following amendment.

The Senate accepts in principle the proposal for formation of a University Council as a basic framework to achieve substantive participation in decision making by elected representatives of all constituency groups on major issues of planning and policy.

The Senate shall provide the following feedback to the University Council Exploratory Committee. We request the University Council Exploratory Committee ensure that the following be maintained or strengthened in the proposal.

- 1. Ensure a substantive role for the body [University Council] in university decision making**
- 2. Ensure election for members of University Council**
- 3. Ensure effective [University Council] committee structure and formation**
- 4. Ensure [University Council] reporting line to the President and written feedback**
- 5. Ensure maintenance of an effective [Faculty] Senate with its own lines of communications to the President**
- 6. Ensure strong communications lines to University Council committees and the University Council as a whole**
- 7. Ensure a greater representation for faculty on the University Council**

The Senate further requests the University Council Exploratory Committee provide evidence of substantive progress to the Faculty Senate by the week prior to the March Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Rich provided the second.

Senator Gerlach: “I rise to support the amendment but I want it to be understood that all that has been said here today by several of us was to be recorded and referred to the Exploratory Committee so that Senator Matney’s motion does not exclude the other material in our record for the day, right?”

Chair Sterns concurred in that interpretation of the motion.

Senator Broadway: “Question to the Chair, if I understand in the beginning of this motion, the motion we are going to accept the report in principle?”

Senator Matney: “It was the intention of the motion to accept the idea of forming a University Council not necessarily accepting any of the specific models that were put forth in the original document from December 2006.”

There was some discussion on whether the University Council Exploratory Committee was a Senate committee or a University committee. Senator Rich moved the original motion on the floor to avoid any parliamentary issues related to the motion by having it presented by a senator (Senator Rich). The Senate continued discussion on the motion to amend.

Senator Bowman asked for clarification on whether the amendment intended to increase representation for all constituency groups or just for the faculty.

Senator Matney replied the intent was to increase the percentage of faculty on the University Council, thus only increasing the representation of faculty on the University Council.

There being no further discussion, the motion was called and Senator Matney restated the motion again.

Chair Sterns called for a vote and the **motion to amend passed**. The Senate returned to consideration of the main motion.

Senator Gerlach: “Mr. Chairman, just a reminder to the exploratory committee, something that I’m sure they won’t forget, but in part A of your mission statement I think at least before part B you will there have to include some decision about how big this council is going to be; how many members and who they are and where do they come from. I also think you’ve got to clarify the wording on the executive committee. You’ve got one member from each of the constituency body; is that elected from that body by that body or elected by the membership of the council provided that it runs from each constituency? I think that we need to clarify that. And likewise down under committee structure you might want to consider saying something more specific about the size of your committees. Since you’re going to maintain standing committees as deemed appropriate, you might use similar language for appropriate size or I think indicate the size of the committee, actual numbers. If you want to keep things small and fast moving consider that please.”

Senator Hajjafar: “And also I would like mention that the UCEC consider there are many places in this document that refers to academic matters and I want them to make sure that that does not take away any right from the Senate.”

Chair Sterns seeing no further discussion asked if the Senate was ready for a vote on the main motion. The question was called the **motion passed**. Chair Sterns acknowledged the Senate had completed all the items on the agenda and asked if anyone had comments for the good of the order.

Good of the Order

Senator Bowman: “I want to let you all know that you’re all cordially formally invited to ASG State of the ASG event today at Starbucks. There is going to be a presentation by us and all the committees will have a table set up. All the college senators will be there; there’s free food, Starbuck’s coupons, and it’s going to be a good time.”

Chair Sterns: “Thank you very much. Let me just say in closing that I think I really appreciate everyone’s cooperation today in being here, I think we’ve made a major step, I want to say, forward and that’s hopefully correct.”

Senator Gehani made the motion for adjournment and Senator Gandee provided the second.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

*Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,
Secretary of the Senate*

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

SPECIAL FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF
NOVEMBER 8, 2007

