Faculty Senate meeting March 5, 2015

Chair Rich - The March meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Lazar, seconded by Senator Clark. There are some amendments that are needed to the agenda. First of all we don’t yet have the minutes of the December meeting to approve, just November, and second there is no report from our representative to the Ohio Faculty Council, that’s item F under Committee Reports. And third we do have a report of the Academic Policies Committee. I distributed a document earlier today with a brief explanation. It will be explained in full, and it will be up to the body whether to approve it today. But I think you’ll find that it’s an easy one, and there’s good reason to approve it today. So for Vice Provost Ramsier’s sake I would ask that that would be put just before item 8-C so that he doesn’t have to walk too much back and forth from the back of the room to the front. Is there any objection to those amendments? If not, any other amendments to the agenda? All those in favor of adopting the agenda as amended please signify by saying aye, opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted.

Next, the adoption of the minutes of November 2014 meeting, is there a motion to adopt those minutes? Senator Clark moves, Senator Hajjafar seconds. Are there any corrections to those minutes? All those in favor of adopting the minutes please signify by saying aye, opposed by opposite sign. The minutes are adopted.

Next is the Remarks of the Chairman. The action items on today’s agenda are curriculum change proposals reported out by the Curriculum Review Committee, changes to the University Rule concerning the part-time faculty proposed by the Part-time Faculty Committee, a proposal to amend certain provisions of the new Gened Learning Outcomes and Implementation Plan recommended by the Senate’s ad hoc Chairs of the General Education Learning Outcome Committees and amendments to the direct admission criteria proposed by the Academic Policies Committee. As your Chair I’ve been participating in frequent, informal meetings about the university’s budget with President Scarborough, the university’s budget director, Amy Gilliland and two other faculty representatives Steve Weeks the president of the Akron chapter of the AAUP and Matt Lee chair of the Sociology Department and representative of department chairs and school directors on the University Council’s Budget and Finance Committee. For the last several weeks we’ve been meeting twice weekly along with professors Lee and Weeks I have been also been attending the formal budget hearings in which heads of the various units of the university present their proposed budgets for fiscal year 2016 which begins this coming July 1st. As of today all the budget hearings for the auxiliary units have occurred. All but one of the units for the central administrative units have occurred, and six of the colleges have occurred with the remainder scheduled for next week. The University Council’s Budget and Finance committee also is being provided with all the information that is being presented in the budget hearings so that it has the opportunity to offer its advice before proposed university-wide budget is prepared. Once such a budget has been prepared the UC Budget and Finance committee will have an opportunity to review it. I expect that during his remarks President Scarborough will update us on the status of the college strategic planning process. I know that some of the colleges have completed the process while others have yet to do so. For the benefit of the faculty of those colleges that have yet to complete the process, I would emphasize what the President has said repeatedly during the budgeting process resource allocation decisions will
be made on the basis of the priorities set in the college strategic plans. My advice to the faculty in each of the colleges that have yet to complete the college strategic planning process is to take this process seriously and to bear in mind what the President has said. Any programs, projects or activities that the faculty believe warrant significant resource allocations should be specified as priorities in its college strategic plan and the faculty should not assent to any plan which does not in the faculty’s view serve the needs of the college, its students and the university as a whole. I want to thank some of the members of this body and some other faculty members for bringing to my attention the announcement that was made last week about the allocation of funds for graduate assistantships for the next academic year. This announcement raised several significant concerns which I discussed with the President last week. He readily understood these concerns. Yesterday he informed me that in addition to those allocations that were announced last week effective today graduate assistantships supporting teaching and research in all other doctoral programs are to be funded for the 2015-2016 academic year at the same level at which they were funded for the current academic year. All graduate assistantships supporting teaching in master’s degree programs will be funded at the same level at which they were funded in the current academic year and decisions about allocation for all other graduate assistantships will be made by March 16th. President Scarborough has also readily agreed that graduate assistantships allocations for the 2015-2016 academic year should be made during the current budget cycle so that as graduate students are being recruited next year departments will not have to wait until the spring semester to find out how many graduate assistantships they can offer, instead they will know before the fall semester begins. To my knowledge this will be a first for this university and it is long overdue. I want to thank President Scarborough for making this change. This concludes my remarks.

Next is Special Announcements. Dr. Linda Moore, Dean Emeritus of the College of Fine and Applied Arts and Professor Emeritus of Education died March 1st of this year at the age of 71. Dean Moore earned her Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in Communication at Bradley University and her PhD in Speech Communication at Kent State University. She joined the faculty of The University of Akron’s School of Communication in 1978, eventually becoming Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts. In 1998 she left the university to become the Dean at Wayne State’s College of Fine Performing and Communication Arts. In 2003 she became the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Emerson College in Boston. She retired in 2013. Dean Moore served as President of the Central States Communication Association and as Executive Director of the International Council of Fine Arts Deans. She was a Ford Foundation Fellow and an American Council on Education Fellow. The Chair now recognizes Senator Quinn to announce the death of Professor Fred Choi.

Senator Quinn- Thank you. I’d like to acknowledge the passing of Fred (inaudible) Choi. He was a professor of Mechanical Engineering. Fred started in 1983 at The University of Akron and was promoted to full professor in 1994. He was an expert in dynamics and diversion, particularly the emphasis on the dynamics of rotating machinery. He was well regarded as a colleague and friend and a dedicated member of the university community. He is survived by his wife Christina and his son Jeremy and he will be missed. Thank you.

Chair Rich- Will you all please rise for a moment of silence in memory of our deceased colleagues. Thank you.
The next item is the report of the Executive Committee. Vice Chair Miller is filing for Secretary Schulze who is home with an ill child.

Vice-Chair Miller – Since we last met on February 5th, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met two times as a committee and once with the President and Provost.

The Executive Committee first met on February 12th for regular senate business. We discussed the audio and transcription problem that occurred at the last faculty senate meeting. We appointed Claire Tessier (chemistry) to replace David Perry on the Natural Science General Ed Learning Outcome Committee. We appointed Ed Conrad (CBA) to the UC Budget & Finance Committee. We discussed John Zipp’s proposed changes to the Gen Ed requirements for humanities. We also discussed the Higher Learning Commission Visit.

The Executive Committee next met on February 19th to prepare for the meeting with the President and Provost. Later that afternoon, the EC met with the President, Provost, and Vice Provost. The EC discussed the strategic plan for College of Arts and Sciences.

The EC met on February 26th for regular Senate business and to prepare the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. Chair Rich updated us on the informal budget meetings with the President. A Report from Committee of Chairs – amendments to general education learning outcomes and recommendation that we push to get person appointed to be the coordinator. We also discussed hiring a new transcriptionist to attend Faculty Senate meetings, upcoming senate elections, graduate assistant allocation, summer teaching, and the proposed “gen ed 13” to be taught through Wayne College.

Chair Rich – Thank you, are there any questions for Vice-Chair Miller about the Executive Committee report? Thank you. Next item is the remarks of the president. Mr. President.

President Scarborough – Good afternoon everyone, thank you Chairman Rich, senators thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I’d like to begin by commenting the Chairman’s report was so excellent. He covered most of what I had planned to talk about today, so perhaps we’ll take much of our time to answer your particular questions, but let me just mention a few things provide a context of where I’m spending most of my time at the moment. Again, for most of you who are working with me closely, you kind of know that I plan the year into four quadrants of activity: first quarter was kind of get the lay of the land, second quarter was really begin working with each of the colleges and the college strategic planning process, we’re already amazingly in the third quarter where the budget development becomes a top top priority, so let me speak to the college strategic planning process. As Chairman Rich reported of the eleven colleges that we have plus the division of libraries, we’ve had three colleges that have completed that process. First the College of Business, second the College of Health Professions and then third, the College of Applied Science and Technology. Those processes went extraordinarily well, amazingly well, and to my great surprise I kind of received a unanimous faculty support at the all-faculty meetings that we had in each of the colleges. That can’t possibly continue, I understand that, but on the other hand it’s a marvelous start. However, to put it into context, these colleges to some extent were more familiar with these types of activities, so it was an easier process to engage with some of these processes. These colleges were more homogeneous than any of our other colleges, so there
was a more singularity of perspective that perhaps were brought to their issues. So, it’s not surprising to me that the remaining colleges are moving through a pace that is more unpredictable. Arts and Sciences is a large college with many perspectives, it’s going to take longer. Some of the other colleges have very complex issues that they need to kind of work through and it’s not the path to the solutions to deal with their particular challenges aren’t as straight forward. But in all cases I would characterize the conversations as positive, and hopefully your colleagues are carrying those same thoughts with you and if you attend the all-faculty meetings hopefully you will agree with me that the conversations are healthy and should continue until we get to a level of consensus that people can get excited about or minimally very comfortable with. The only thing that would add to the nice characterization of the budget process is that I’m happy with how that is proceeding with one exception, and that is it’s going a little bit more slowly than I had hoped. And I’m a little concerned that what I hope would complete in April may now take till May, and I think that all of us that are working on it, our prediction would be that the best guess is that the process is likely to continue till May at this point, but I have got to find a way to alter my calendar to spend more time kind of working with all of the various parties on moving the budget process forward. It would be very nice to be able to cancel meetings for the next three weeks and work exclusively on this, I have actually considered that until you look at the calendar and realize what you would be canceling, and so you can’t really do that, but that’s the one minor adjustment that I’ve got to make in the next few weeks is spend more time working with all the parties in the development of the budget process.

Just to close, we had a very interesting event last night. We celebrated the 212th birthday of the State of Ohio with our Ohio congressional delegation in the Library of Congress last night. That’s not something that certainly I have ever done before. It was attended by at least 300 congressional staffers and lobbyists in Washington, all connected somehow to the State of Ohio. It’s jointly sponsored by about 30 different organizations, but we’re the lead institution, and we were allowed to be the MC of the event, and had a great time creating the relationships that hopefully we’ll be able to enjoy and hopefully that will lead to great support for all that we do here down the road. So at this point, I’ll stop and ask for any questions that you might have. So thank you again for the opportunity, Chair Rich, to be here.

Chair Rich – are there questions for the President? Senator Lazar.

Senator Lazar – Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. I had a question. I’m from the University Libraries, and I think it’s a good plan to shape the budget in accordance to the strategic plans of the college. However, we have not yet had a faculty meeting with you. It’s not gone beyond the department head level, of which there were three or four, and it concerns me that I mean, I’m aware of what was presented to you as the building blocks, but, other than that I, and to my knowledge none of the other members of the library, whether faculty or staff, are aware of what it looks like. So I have some concern about creating our budget based on a strategic plan that really none of the faculty or staff in the library has seen.

President Scarborough – Yes and I certainly understand that, and I think the only reason that we haven’t gotten to the all-faculty meeting in the library is just a scheduling challenge. But it will occur, so have no fear that whatever has been drafted to this point will be brought to the full faculty of the library, and
we’ll go through the same process as we have engaged in all the other colleges to get to a level of consensus that people can be excited about or at least minimally comfortable. And at this point our track record is good, and I’m hopeful that we’ll continue that track record. Again, because the budget is going more slowly than I had hoped, it’s actually taking a little of the pressure off of the strategic planning process for the colleges, because again ideally those sync in some productive and helpful ways. So it means we have a little bit more time also to take to get through all the faculty meetings we have to at the college level, so we’ll be there. Just focus on other things, we’ll eventually knock on your door.

Senator Lazar – So you do anticipate that we’ll be able to see it prior to the creation of firm budget for the library?

President Scarborough – Absolutely.

Senator Lazar – Thank you very much.

Chair Rich – Are there other questions for the President? Senator Clark.

Senator Clark – I wonder if you could say just a little bit more about how the strategic plan, which is fairly conceptual, how you see that working with the budgeting process, which I think is being rather precise?

President Scarborough – That’s good. That’s a very good question. So you’re right, if you think about what ultimately is coming out of the college strategic planning level process it is primarily listing a strategic direction for the college at a high level, intentionally so, because the thought is the college needs to do the due diligence, the more detailed planning and analysis and ultimately to determine what resources are necessary to work down these directions to move towards these particular goals. And so the budget process ideally involves a conversation that begins with a budget hearing and whatever follow up conversations are necessary to say okay, we understand what your budget is, we’ve agreed that these are directions we want to follow, now let me see what your resource request and how to pursue these. For those colleges that have done the next level of work, that are kind of ready to commit resource requests, they can be examining the budgeting process. For those who haven’t, that work simply continues. Chairman Rich and others know that my hope is that in the budget process we’ll actually have a pool of money that is set aside for future budget requests that come in relative to our moving the strategic plan forward. Now that’s easy to say, that’s harder to do. But that is certainly my goal going into the process, and then there’s a question, if you get it in the budget at what level of resource do you get it in the budget? It’s never enough, so what that really means is when colleges have done the due diligence and are ready to step forward and say ‘here are the resources we need’. If you look at, okay, what money is available, and if there isn’t money available to do everything a college is asking for then there’s a conversation about okay, ‘what piece of this is it important to do first?’ Could we have three directions that we’re pursuing? Three of them have resource requirements beyond what we’re capable of, which of the three might be most important to begin with in terms of the probability of success, return on investment that then might help fund the other initiatives that the college is interested in, and then that’s the way it works out. It’s an interactive process, and planning plans are living documents, and good plans are constantly being revisited based on new information that is
learned, and new experiences that we enjoy, so hopefully that kind of gives you a flavor of what we’re looking for.

Chair Rich – Senator Clark.

Senator Clark – Just to follow up, you refer to what the due diligence of the college is, are you leaving it up to the colleges to do it as they have done or usually do it, or do you have some guidance for deans to guide the process in a particular way that will dovetail well?

President Scarborough – I’m always kept caught between the tendency to want to prescribe an approach to the college that has worked well that you have seen work well in the past, but I’m always careful to not to try to be too prescriptive because the culture of every college is a little different. The leadership styles, the historical baggage of each college is a little bit different, and a good leader will take that into account in terms of how they choose to engage the due diligence that occurs within the college. Some colleges are very comfortable with what I would call a leadership driven model that the faculty reacts to. Other college cultures are offended by that, or are a very much more of a let the faculty take the first crack and then let the leadership team critique and add value in ways hopefully that everyone believes there is value. And, for all of those reasons, being prescriptive at mine or even the Provost’s level can be counterproductive. On the other hand, there’s also the side that you’re not prescriptive, someone messes it up in the college, and then people assume that must be happening throughout the university. And why didn’t the leadership provide better guidance in terms of how to do this the right way. So you’re always kind of caught between those two tensions. So what you’re trying to do is keep the conversation alive with the president, the provost, the deans, the associate deans and say ‘how’s it going?’ so you can try to identify if there’s any problems, and you can provide suggestions, and, you know, this college has done this, have you thought about doing this this way and kind of make it work that way. And ultimately you need leaders that know how to do this the right way. But, you know, for many deans they don’t have extensive backgrounds in doing this, they were faculty members before or they became department chairs, so you kind of work with them in a developmental way to try to get this done the right way.

Chair Rich- Senator Sterns.

Senator Sterns – Mr. Chair, Mr. President, one of the things that I think many of us in this room are concerned about is what is our thinking regarding the process for the funding of graduate assistantships, and we certainly have had a departure from what has been the usual procedure, I think all of us would like to understand the philosophy, the approach, the priority setting, and what you and the Provost are thinking about because it came as a surprise to everybody else.

President Scarborough – So here was the thinking that went with the steps that have been taken, and that is, you know, many times in the best case scenario the budget for graduate assistantships is being decided now for graduate assistantships for next year. Now we don’t have that best case history, so to some extent we’re behind the eight ball a little bit because that wasn’t done. We’re trying to fix that going forward, which I think is the most hopeful part of all of this. The second thing was we were trying to avoid what so many universities say, and that is, well, we haven’t really gotten around to thinking
about it, so let’s just give everyone 90% of what they had last year, which puts everyone in kind of an unusual and difficult position because 80% of the money goes to continuing graduate assistantships and then you’re left with half of what you had last year for new graduate assistantships, so then you start the process maybe to get the good student not knowing if you’ll have the other money, and then you lose out ‘cause you don’t hear that decision until later on. So we we’re trying to get to a process where we could say as quickly as possible you’re getting 100% of what you were getting last year and oh by the way is there a conversation we need to have about why it needs to be more than 100%? So we were trying to, I think, Mike and everyone, is that we were trying to identify areas where we could most quickly say you’re getting 100% rather than 90%, believing that that would be a better outcome, Also knowing that we were still two weeks ahead of where we were last year, and that we had a little time to kind of think through each step of this. And so they’ve incrementally tried to give more people 100% answers to avoid this tendency of 90%, so what I think has been done. Bill summarized perfectly, you know, 100% on the doctoral programs, 100% on the master’s level program where there were clear teaching connection, that made absolute sense. And then take a little bit more time since we need to look at all the other graduate assistantships, because one of the problems we have is that with pressure on undergraduate enrollments and tuition, we really do need to find a way to grow our tuition paying master’s programs, cause master’s degrees are actually going to be growing faster than undergraduate degrees for the for the next several years. But the problem is, we give away so much of our tuition at the graduate level with full tuition rides, stipends and etc etc. We also tend to, like a lot of places, use graduate assistantships not for academic purposes, but to fill administrative services, okay, and we need to take a little bit of a look at that, and just from an economy standpoint, but that’s just hiring people is what it’s really doing, and so that’s the reason we’re taking this phased approach trying to get to smart answers rather than just easy answers, knowing that the better long-term approach is to make next year’s decisions right now as part of this budget process.

Chair Rich – Are there other questions for the President, Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – Obviously, President Scarborough, you have a lot on your plate, but there is one other thing I wanted to ask about, and that is that perhaps this addressed elsewhere, I can find it somewhere, I’m curious about the summer teaching budget and funding for that. I know that you did some work on that, I haven’t heard anything in my department, but again there are a lot of things going on, so I wondered if you could address that.

President Scarborough – Well, I don’t normally pass the buck, but since I don’t have any current information or really a good answer to your question, I think I’m going to pass the buck to the Provost for when he gives his remarks in this case. I think Mike will have better information than I will.

Senator Lillie – Thank you.

President Scarborough – Thank you.

Chair Rich – Senator Howley.
Senator Howley – Chairman Rich, President Scarborough, you’ve used this term all-faculty meeting to describe your strategic planning meetings, yet I know at Wayne College you have an all-college meeting scheduled instead of a faculty meeting. Could you explain that a little bit?

President Scarborough – Well I’m assuming although I’ve never gotten that question so I’ll have to, I’m assuming that the difference between an all-faculty meeting and an all-college meeting is that all staff would also be invited to attend the all-faculty meeting, making it an all-college meeting, and I’ve never thought about before, I think you’re right, I think other colleges have invited all faculty and staff and maybe all of the ones we’ve had for that matter. But the reason that I call them all-faculty meetings is because we’ve got to make sure the faculty are in support of the plan, and it’s great, and I know the staff want to be there, but we have other opportunities to engage the staff in the normal organizational structure for one thing. We have lots of structured meetings for that purpose, so the reason I think I call it an all-faculty meeting is just to signify the importance of getting that constituency onboard and I’m delighted if all of the college is invited to attend I think that’s healthy. I think the faculty are fine with that as well.

Senator Howley – Okay, thank you.

President Scarborough – You bet.

Chair Rich – Are there other questions for the President? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – I am curious to if there’s any update on the Higher Learning Commission’s visit, and if there’s anything to report from that?

President Scarborough – I’ll share what I know, and Chairman Rich and Provost Sherman probably can add to that. But from my perspective we created a very, very good document, self-assessment, self-report that we sent to Higher Learning Commission. We got positive feedback. We had two experienced visitors that were part of the HLC team that came in for what felt like for the most part two days, maybe a day and a half. Having done their homework and were kind of ready to hit the ground running when they arrived. The feedback that I received is that they were a little disappointed in the attendance at some meetings, and so we tried to explain that in a way that was appropriate. The feedback that we got was that I think we’ve have made progress, I think one of the reviewers, not the lead reviewer but the second person on the team had a particular issue with the Board on a particular aspect on shared governance. Namely, the position of having a faculty member on the Board in some capacity and that conversation got a little bit uncomfortable for those who were a part of that conversation. But other than that, I predict that we’ll have a good report, I think the draft is probably due any day now. No? When is the draft due Rex?

Chair Rich – the Chair recognizes Associate Provost Ramsier.

Associate Provost Ramsier – Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Generally the draft report is due the month after the visit. But final action probably will be, probably won’t hear till July because there’s another level after the team submits its final report. So probably will be July before we have a decision.
President Scarborough – But I’m looking forward to seeing what that draft report says. Because that will give us some early indication as to their real, true feeling about what progress we have made. And we’re only, I am told, two years away from our regularly scheduled visit. So if I had to predict what will happen, which I shouldn’t do, but I’ll do anyway, I think that they’ll note the progress that we’ve made, they’ll still identify work that we need to do, and they will still call it out for the next team that will be here in two years to take another look at those same two areas that’s my guess.

Chair Rich – Are there any other questions for the President? Thank you Mr. President.

President Scarborough – Thank you.

Chair Rich – Next on the agenda is the remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost. Mr. Provost.

Provost Sherman – Thank you Chair Rich, good afternoon everybody. My comments will be especially brief since just about everything I had to comment on has been addressed. However, let me do say remember this weekend to spring ahead. I only mention that because it suggests that spring is around the corner and I mention that because I think it’s appropriate to acknowledge the faculty, the staff and the students for accommodating the fairly difficult decisions we have to make when we consider the health, safety and wellbeing of the campus when there are adverse weather conditions. You do need to know that we spent a fair amount of time the evening predicted bad weather, and certainly beginning at midnight until about 3 or 4 in the morning to make decisions, the police department consults and lots of many ways about the condition of the campus, the condition of the county, the condition of the state. And again, just thank you for being accommodating in your interaction with each other and your students in classes to help make the academic calendar have a high level of integrity for our academic offerings. I would be remiss if I didn’t thank those who help make those decisions, but importantly I think our grounds crew under the circumstances that exist for a number of individuals that we have and the issues with getting salt from all over the region, and our salt runs out, and everybody else is looking for salt because theirs has run out. They’ve done a pretty nice and remarkable job for keeping the campuses as well cleared as possible.

I think graduate resource allocations has been mentioned a number of times in a very informative way. Higher Learning Commission comments and questions have been addressed. Budget hearings and strategic planning for colleges have been commented upon from the perspective of the budget hearing there quite insightful with regard to the purposes and intent, specifically on the academic support side for the uses of those resources I think you can count on for actually the entire process. The University Council Budget & Finance Committee plays an important role in providing recommendations to the institution for the use of resources, particularly as they relate to supporting and stimulating academic excellence, so we’ll continue to assure that those resources are invested with the highest degree of potential for effectiveness in supporting our academic success. With regard to summer, we asked for input and clarification on proposed summer course offerings, interacted with the department heads to the rationales for those proposed offerings. I think largely what was proposed made a lot of sense with regard to offering courses that needed to be offered that allowed students to make progress towards degrees that link to accreditation or teaching about plans or new programs that sort of thing, I think the
intent is to be as responsive to creating the opportunity for faculty to teach and students to have course
but also to make the whole process more playful so as opposed to canceling right before classes start,
let’s see how we might be able to offer minimized section sizes and earlier rather than later assure that
faculty know what it is that will be taught and students know what it is that will be offered. So we’re
moving in that sort of direction. And clearly, I’ll just cycle it back to the GA allocations, having the future
allocations in advance of the next budget process as a part of the budget planning process is really what
we’ve tried to move towards. And that’s really great that in this budget process we’ll be able to adapt to
that outcome so Mr. Chair with that, those are my comments. Thank you very much.

Chair Rich – Thank you, are there questions for the Provost? Okay, thank you very much.

Provost Sherman – Thank you very much, I appreciate it.

Chair Rich – Next we have committee reports. There’s a written, informational report from the Athletics
Committee. There’s no action item in it so unless there’s someone who wishes to speak about it I’ll
proceed to the next item which is the Computing and Communications Technology Committee. That too
is a written, informational report. So unless anyone wishes to discuss that extremely brief report, we’ll
proceed to the next item which is the report of the Academic Policies Committee, Vice Provost Ramsier.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I’d like to thank the Chair and Faculty Senate for
entertaining a motion from committee that comes only from our meeting this morning. This concerns
the direct admit criteria that the Senate was asked to and did approve last April or May of the academic
year. The basic premise is, and the spreadsheet that was sent out just early today by Mr. Chairman,
during the process last year of going to the departments and asking do you wish revise your direct admit
criteria for undergraduate students only. We were using at the time a default of the high school GPA of
3.0 and an ACT score of 21 as being the working definition of “college ready” status. Because at the
time we had just recently approved the new admission rule that has a formula that predicts the success
of a student in the first year here at the university. So we were using these numbers as a placeholder if
you will, many of the departments that eventually were approved to have these numerical values really
meant they would accept a student as a direct admit if there were deemed “college ready” by the
university rule that this body approved and sent forward. So these are the departments that currently
have a 3.0 and a 21 ACT required for direct admit that actually meant to default to the college ready
status driven by the rule and the directed format. So the request of the body is to approve these so they
can be implemented. The reason being there are many students who are “college ready” who want to
come into these units, want to be a major in Communication for example, that are prohibited from
being a major. They are then pre-majors, they are college ready but they are not allowed to come into
the degree granting program because of these numbers. And the faculty didn’t actually mean to use it
that way. They actually were looking for if you’re college ready, and declare us as a major, we will
accept you. So that’s the motion from the committee in verbally because we don’t have a written
resolution. We’d ask that you’d consider this as a motion from Academic Policies Committee.

Chair Rich – Two things: first of all would you explain the urgency of it, why we didn’t just choose to
delay it.
Vice Provost Ramsier – Well the urgency is that currently we have 1,190 students that are in this pre-major limbo for next Fall’s admission class. So if this is approved, Arts and Sciences will have 1,109 majors directly admitted that they won’t have under the current guidelines, College of Applied Science and Technology has 144 so in some we have 1300 students who got an admissions letter saying you’re admitted to The University of Akron as college ready intending to major in Communication rather than majoring in Communication for example. There’s a subtle difference in the two admission letters, but we can get rid of the two letters for these departments only if this is approved. The urgency of it is the likelihood of attracting a student admitted to their major is probably higher than admitted to the university wishing to be a Communications major. So the sense of urgency is really to get a better handle on how many students we really think we can attract, and I apologize for using communication as my example.

Chair Rich - So in every instance, and I want to because everyone may not have seen this document, just went out a few hours ago, I’m going to ask you in a moment to just read the list of the departments in every instance this change really reflects the will of the faculty in that department. That was inadvertently stated incorrectly when previously approved the direct admit criteria. And you’ll recall the reason we approved all those direct admit criteria last spring was that under the university rule they needed to be approved by the Faculty Senate, and they hadn’t been approved for years at least by the Faculty Senate. So this is really very simply correcting some mistakes that occurred that arose from essentially miscommunication. But Vice Provost Ramsier would please just read so everyone knows what they are, if they haven’t already seen the document, read the list of departments that are by this document we would be changing them from requiring for direct admission a 3.0 high school grade point average and a 21 ACT score, simply being they have to be college ready under the university standard.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Affected departments would be Art, the undecided or exploratory category in Arts and Sciences, Communications, Dance Theatre and Arts Administration, Economics, English, Family & Consumer Sciences, Geosciences, History, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology in the Arts & Sciences College and the entire College of Applied Science and Technology-every department had the same criteria intended to really default to the university admissions rule.

Chair Rich – Thank you. Is there any discussion on the motion? Senator Clark.

Senator Clark – I wonder if you could speak just a little explain a little further about in terms of actual quality. Going just with the new formulation. Does it basically recreate the same students will come in just changing a procedure, so it’s the same quality of students? Or because you have these other categories here, and I know within our school we’ve got in recent year raised our GPA, and some things become major, so I wonder if you could just speak to how all these colleges work together and what the actual effect will be.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Well, the effect on the units receiving these college ready students, the college ready category in admissions under the rule is based on a predicted GPA at The University of Akron after a year being with us. So it’s a combination of the high school GPA and the ACT score upon entrance that used to predict whether or not a student will attain a certain minimal GPA once they’re our student. So
we have these students that I mentioned, in Arts & Sciences, 1,190, are predicted to perform at college level based on the University of Akron GPA that they’re predicted to earn.

Chair Rich – That was a 3.0 right? Predicted, was 3.0 right?

Vice Provost Ramsier – 3.5. The college ready is predicted to earn a 3.5 or above at the university after taking a year’s worth of courses here, that’s what the rule is intended. The next category is the 2.0 to 2.49 so these students are all predicted to earn at 2.5 or better at The University of Akron based on previous year’s data. So, in essence, you could have the way this reads now, and again we’ll go to the School of Communication, you could have a student based on these current guidelines who has a 32 ACT and 2.95 high school GPA, and they’re not allowed to be admitted to your program. And vice versa, you can have a valedictorian, a 4.0 student with a 20 ACT that is not permitted by current criteria to be admitted to your program. Few of us would think that’s reasonable. But that’s what’s happening. We’re excluding students who have a high probability of being successful based on the predictive formula and common sense, and they’re being excluded from being your major from day one. And they don’t necessarily feel part of anything because their letter says they’re a student, but they’re not really in the major that they wanted. And that’s coming back at orientation and from parents ‘why do you keep calling my kid a pre-major? Are they a major or are they not a major?’ So we have this limbo category for students that we’ve kind of generated on our own. It was just literally a clerical error. This was never made clear to the Senate, to ourselves at APC, until the issue came up of why do we have thousands of pre-majors? And this is why. So we can self-correct in real time hopefully today.

Chair Rich – I would add that what the new basis for determining college readiness does is it allows a high GPA to offset a low ACT and vice versa, although there’s a great deal more weight on GPA than on ACT. Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson – Just a point of clarification. Given what you’ve just said, when it comes to CAST, college-ready as I understand it here is just a GPA of 2.0, that’s what it says.

(Unknown senator) – That’s direct admit.

Senator Erickson – Oh, I see. Well it just says college-ready, which means the same thing as with the others?

Vice Provost Ramsier – CAST will have the same direct admit criteria as...

Senator Erickson – Except that it has a 2.0 average which no one else has. I don’t know why.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Inter-college transfer is not the issue being discussed today.

Senator Erickson – No, I understand, but I’m just saying that I wasn’t looking at transfer, I was looking at, I know, I’m looking at college-ready, but this is not the only one.

Chair Rich – This is not a change.

Senator Erickson – So the 2.0 is what it always has been.
Vice Provost Ramsier – If you’re looking at the ICT column, that’s not what’s being discussed here, and the 2.0 GPA is not uncommon.

Senator Erickson – I’m sorry, I couldn’t find any GPA listed for any of the others, that’s why I was asking.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Okay, but that’s not being discussed here.

Senator Erickson – So even though it doesn’t have the statement with it, that’s all the others, that’s just it is in fact just the same. Is that correct?

Vice Provost Ramsier – Yes, college-ready by university rule.

Senator Erickson – Upper 50%?

Vice Provost Ramsier – Those other qualifiers ...

Senator Erickson – Is as is predicted using your prediction model? Thank you, that’s what I wanted to know.

Chair Rich – Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – Thank you for the discussion so far. So I wanted to clarify a couple of things. And first of all, it appears that all we’re being asked to act on today is what’s in the direct admit column, is that correct?

Vice Provost Ramsier – Yes, that is correct.

Senator Lillie – So that’s helpful. Second, how are the exceptions in the direct admit area going to be dealt with, for instance, you say here that completion of high school core curriculum and 50% of high school graduating class. What about people who, perhaps they graduated from high school some time ago, or they may have been home schooled, or some of other kind of way? Right now we have had the ACT, as poor as that may be for some circumstances, it certainly does provide that kind of assurance that the individual has met this particular criterion. So while I’m not opposed to the idea of having more people in a particular major, I’m just wondering how do you deal with some of these issues, and then in line with that, whose high school curricula? Ohio’s? What if there’s a different high school curricula for someone out of state? These are the questions that are rising about the exceptions, not for most people, but sometimes exceptions can take more time dealing with then they should.

Vice Provost Ramsier – I don’t disagree, but let’s note that the only this body is being asked to weigh in on today are the stricken numbers in the direct admit columns and the addition of the dark bolded college ready language. We did not ask the College of Arts & Sciences to go back and revisit what, who’s high school curriculum work and which ones didn’t, that’s not at issue today. Currently that’s the way it stands, except for the bold and strike out language.

Chair Rich – Everything that’s not bolded and stricken out we approved last May.
Vice Provost Ramsier – Last May. This body approved, and then it was implemented. Now again, you raise a good point and actually the rule provides for exceptions, and the rule provides for an alternative to the way adult students are entered. Homeschooled students, homeschooled students don’t have high school GPAs, for example. So the rule does have extra sections for the non-traditional students who apply as freshmen, for adult students those who have been out of school for a while, homeschooled students, transfer students, etc. So there are other mechanisms where students get admitted, but this is the primary way that provisional age freshmen come to The University of Akron. It is through these direct admit criteria.

Chair Rich – Other discussion? I take it you’re ready to vote. All those in favor of the proposed changes to the direct admit criteria please signify by saying aye. (aye) Oppose by opposite sign. (none) Motion carries without dissent.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Thank you, Mr. Chair. Now I do have an informational report only from Academic Policies Committee. It came to our attention, actually I should remind people that we did revise based on input to the APC last year, we did revise the final exam schedule for the fall 2014 and now spring 2015. After that first experience, there were some issues. The reason we revised it was to try to have 15 minutes between exams rather than 10. So we did that, it looked like it was going to work but then we heard that there were some issues with overlap. So Academic Policies Committee took that seriously, we reviewed the posted final exam schedule, asked the Registrar Office to independently review the posted final exam schedule. Academic Policies Committee finds no place where there can be an actual overlap temporal overlap, between scheduled final exam periods. But we entertain and will accept if people have specific issues that they can let Academic Policies Committee know through me as the Chair or through Chair Rich. We certainly will continue to investigate, but we can’t find anywhere where the scheduled exams actually have an overlap in time. Unless there are people who start early or end late or have an off cycle schedule that isn’t in the schedule, the published schedule has no overlaps. So that’s the informational report.

Chair Rich – Let me add that the problem had been reported to me among others and I can no longer remember who it was that reported the problem to me. So if anyone previously reported a problem or knows of one, we’d like to hear about it. Senator Clark.

Senator Clark – Just a point of clarification. So that the way the final exams for spring will be same model as it was for the fall? I’m just checking. Is that what you mean?

Vice Provost Ramsier – Well it’s based on 15 minutes in between class periods but what you want to be sure you do, everyone should go and look at the posted Spring 15 final exam schedule. Because based on some concerns we had the Registrar, we’ve been working with the Registrar to make sure we accommodate issues and try to make the schedule better every year or semester. So please check the updated Spring 15 schedule.

Senator Clark – Not being sure if this was corrected, but I had the experience of having these overlaps with the graduate evening class and late afternoon classes. They almost by like an hour were identical.
So I ended up having creative solutions, but so if it’s the same that was an absolute, and I was going according to the rule, it wasn’t absolutely allowed.

(talking over each other)

Vice Provost Ramsier – Share with us the exact details so we can go look at it and find out why it happened, because it should not happen.

Chair Rich – Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson – I was another person who contacted Chair Rich about the situation in our department, and I know that the Registrar’s Office would say were aware of it, changed it, so it was dealt with. And I hope that means when they rewrote it and I remember, and I just can’t remember off the of my head what exactly but the one thing if I remember rightly, the problem was that the faculty member had to be at two places at once. It wasn’t the student, it was the faculty member, because her two exams were scheduled at the same time.

Chair Rich – And that’s a problem why? That is a joke.

Senator Erickson – The Registrar’s Office fixed it last semester. I haven’t checked to see if they fixed it again but will do.

Senator Clark – I will just add I had students who had complete overlap schedule issues too with their schedules.

Vice Provost Ramsier – This bears more discussion. So the schedule as posted, doesn’t have overlapping periods, okay? Now maybe there’s an issue with evening versus day that there’s some confusion about was that the same issue here?

Senator Erickson – It was an evening class versus a day class.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Well, apparently the Registrar figured out how to fix that, we’ll hope permanently.

Senator Clark – I’m excited to see.

Vice Provost Ramsier – We’re going to get it fixed so just let us know the details, but there is with multiple, with students taking different classes at different times during the day, there certainly is the opportunity for students to have multiple exams in the same day. We’ve always had that problem right? But this issue is probably because of what’s the definition of evening. When do the evening classes start, and then when should the exam start? As you realize, we lost time slots for exams by trying to have more time in between so some things got compressed, and it was probably evening where it came up. But please share the details, and we’ll get it corrected.
Chair Rich – And if you know of colleagues who are not in this body who have problems please either collect their stories with specific facts or just refer them to either of the two of us. Was there another senator who wishes? Senator Sterns.

Senator Sterns – This is a question, and perhaps this isn’t the right moment to raise it, but the multiple exams on a particular day. It’s my understanding going many many years, a student did not have to take more than two exams in a day on this campus. It was a rule that was in effect for many, many years. Is that still an official rule?

Vice Provost Ramsier – If it was a rule, it certainly hasn’t been changed in my time. I think it was three? Four?

Chair Rich – Do I hear five?

Vice Provost Ramsier – We haven’t changed that rule for sure, to allow students to have some options.

Chair Rich – Senator Cutright.

Senator Cutright – Point of clarification: if you have four exams back to back, one could be moved. And no exams were to be moved unless they referred back to that. And that’s how it’s been since 1980.

Senator Sterns – Well, I go back farther than that. Let me point out though that I think it’s ridiculous to have a student do four exams in one day, and I would do everything in my power to help that student by moving them to have greater success. I think that lacks empathy and lack of humanity.

Senator Lillie – I would like to rise to support. Particularly the humanity.

Chair Rich – Not to mention that it’s probably not a very good measure of the student’s achievement.

Senator Willits.

Senator Willits – Just to add to that, the idea that we can just move and make up a different exam for one or two students who have multiple exams in a day. It’s almost as obscene as having four exams. So I agree, I don’t think they should have four exams, I think three if we were to ever make a rule. But we can’t just make up arbitrary exams for different people on different days, so I think sticking to the final exam schedule and maybe readjusting is probably a good idea.

(talking over)

Chair Rich – Order please.

Senator Willits – I agree. Four exams in a day is a lot, but it’s also when students come to you and say, ‘I have four exams’, and they’re back to back to back, what do you do? So I think that there’s questions that we probably need to address, but I just searched and couldn’t find a rule. There’s no rule.

Chair Rich – I think that maybe this is something that the Academics Policy Committee should first determine if there is such a rule, and if there is then determine what the rule is, and third think about whether it should be changed.
Vice Provost Ramsier – I’ll take that as a referral to the committee.

Chair Rich – Is there any further discussion? Thank you. Next is the report of the Curriculum Review Committee.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Thank you Mr. Chairman. Curriculum Review Committee brings forward a list of proposals that have come forward without any current objections or issues, we’d to ask your approval of these (end of tape)

Chair Rich – Motion from the committee is to approve the curriculum change proposals that you have before you. Is there debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion please say aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you, Vice Provost Ramsier. Next item of the representatives of the Faculty Senate to the Graduate Council. Senator Sterns or Senator Allen, do either of you wish to report? Senator Sterns.

Senator Sterns – Phil, you may want to jump in. I think my question to the President clearly was the concern that emerged when the Graduate Council has met I think on that Monday, the acting dean of the Graduate School thought it would be great to have just a release of graduate assistantships in the format, and yet by the next day it had changed. I think all we’re trying to understand is what is going to be the game plan and how it will be allocated and so forth, and I think this is a concern. I think the fact that all of us who have admissions approaches, and I truly want to get ahead of this, but we’re now admitting students for this year. And I think in some departments this is a real problem because they’re having to hold on their offers, and I think if we’re trying to build a better and positive reputation in graduate school, we need to be very proactive with this.

Chair Rich – Senator Allen do you wish to also report?

Senator Allen – I would like to follow up on that. It seems to me that there are two things that are kind of conjoined here. One is do we have enough money in the budget, and the other is are we going to have a policy change? And it seems kind of late in the process for this year to be contemplating a policy change particularly when it could hurt substantially. Could we have that clarified if it is a budget issue or if it’s a policy change, and if it is a policy change would it make sense to have a policy change, like change our philosophy on who we fund this late in the game for one cycle?

Chair Rich – Does the Interim Dean of the Graduate School wish to comment on that?

Vice Provost Ramsier – I believe the Chairman’s remarks covered what’s been decided to this point. And there’s a memo to that effect that’s actually been disseminated to the Deans as of today. So I mean we’re trying our best, knowing that there is a budget issue, to make decisions earlier than we have in the past. Without in some sense being arbitrary, and saying everybody is 90%, which is across the board cut to every program, so we attempting to use at least some logic to how we allocate the money that we hope we’ll have as earlier than we have in the past. So I view that as at least a step in the right direction, but I think the most important decision that the President has just today announced to everyone here is that we will plan for graduate student allocations a year in advance going forward.
That’s the real answer to many of our department’s questions is what are we going to have to hopefully recruit with for the following year? And, as you know, those of you who’ve been here as long as I have, and Senator Sterns has been here longer, that’s never been the case. We almost find out too late how much we’re going to have to offer graduate students. So we’re doing our best knowing that there’s a budget issue and it’s simply following the past of everyone’s 100%, or 90 now and 100 later, there’s really no strategy in that at all because the 100% allocations across the board, there is no policy behind it, its’ simply historic. So we’re slow but sure going to try to have a strategy around this, and we’ve engaged the Graduate Council to try to really help us think about how to approach this because the faculty have not really been involved in this in driving the graduate side of the house. And I think it’s about time.

Chair Rich – Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – I appreciate the explanation and appreciate as well Senator Sterns’ comments about what happened at the Monday Graduate Council meeting, and his comments that Vice Provost or in this capacity Interim Dean Ramsier hadn’t been aware of the budget. And yet the following day the memorandum went out over his name. So the question I have relates to strategic planning and one of the issues that arose has been discussed and to some extent had explained here by the comments of our Chair and also the President has to do with why we have certain programs funded at 100% and other will consider by a particular date and others perhaps still later. My question is still is this an indication of the direction that strategic planning will be going primarily towards STEM and STEM-related kinds of disciplines?

Chair Rich – Does the Interim Dean wish to comment on that?

Vice Provost Ramsier – I’d be happy to.

Senator Lillie – Sympathetically and with humanity.

Vice Provost Ramsier – I don’t believe that any of the allocations announced today really set a strategic direction for the academic side. If you note what was mentioned, we are still funding doctoral programs at 100%, with respect to the graduate student allocations. Masters programs are still funded at 100% with respect with the positions that support teaching cause. The argument for many of the Masters programs is that the graduate assistants teach courses, run discussion sections and presentations and labs and help us generate more revenue than they cost, and that’s a valid position to take, a valid argument. Those are now fully funded. But you’ll note from the language in the memo once you see it that those excluded from 100% funding to this point are students that are given administrative assignments, students that work in offices that maybe are not doing the work that’s associated with the reason they’re a student, but they simply happen to be a convenient person to do that work. Those have not yet been funded, and it’s important for us to understand what these students are doing for their stipend and for their tuition waiver which is a substantive compliment that’s budgeted for. And, as the Chair will tell you, there’s different viewpoints on what the waivers look like as far as a budgetary perspective, but it’s a lot of money. We allocate more than 30 million dollars a year in waivers and stipends to graduate students. That’s a lot of money, and there’s been no plan for what happens except
to follow history, so we haven’t set a direction for STEM versus something else. It’s really been looking at what was the easiest decision to make which is fund the distinctive doctoral programs. Now the second decision is the rest of the doctoral programs and masters programs where the students are primarily helping us teach undergraduates which is good for the university and also good for the bottom line of the finances. And then we’ll look at the rest in the next couple of weeks.

Chair Rich – Do you have, I know you may not have this off the top of your head, but do you happen to know if you use the total number of dollars that are allocated for the graduate assistants for this year as of today, as of the allocations that were made today, that is last week’s and today’s combined what percentage of that number are now allocated?

Vice Provost Ramsier – I don’t know the number but I can give you probably an estimate. We’ve probably allocated about 90% of the total monies already, there aren’t that many administrative assistants, there aren’t that many research assistants in masters programs, so those are the ones that currently have not received full funding yet. There can’t be that many, even though I don’t have the numbers in front of me so it’s a conservative way to allocate the money at the same time the Graduate School does not track or record these data. As of today, I cannot access the data that indicates what students are continuing in programs versus those that are going to graduate. The Graduate School has not really operated in a way that helps the administration make a decision. It’s simply been well we’ll fund everything the way we always have. We need to change that if we want to do anything proactive to grow graduate education.

Chair Rich – So that causes me to wonder how it’s possible to actually apply the announced decisions if you don’t have the information, that is you can’t differentiate between the graduate students who are doing teaching or research from those that are doing administration. So how do you actually carry out that decision without knowing that?

Vice Provost Ramsier – I’ll use a phrase that people probably don’t think that I know, trust and verify. The units now have the money. There’s an expectation that they will use for what it was allocated for. And so we will trust that will happen but we will verify that it did. I think that’s a pretty fair way to deal with it.

Chair Rich – And to recapitulate, those allocations that have not already been made will be made by 11 days from now.

Vice Provost Ramsier – Yes, the President said March 16th and we will abide by that.

Chair Rich – Any other comments or questions concerning the report of the Graduate Council representatives. Senator Willits.

Senator Willits – I just had a quick question for Rex again if he’s willing to answer it but I’m interested in the awards from like the diversity, particularly the diversity awards for the students who are underrepresented are those maintained or are they like where do those fall in the graduate assistantships?
Chair Rich – Interim Dean Ramsier do you wish to comment on that?

Vice Provost Ramsier – Another very good question. I have recently learned that the Graduate School has certain programs in place that many of us were not aware of. That involve funding students that are really not on the books as being part of specific degree programs. I certainly support utilizing the diversity funds, as they’re currently called, to continue that process. But again we need to make sure that the students are funded to do the kinds of work that we would all hope they are doing and also making good academic progress toward degrees, so we’re not anticipating that those monies will go away but they certainly are supporting students that are in degree programs so the question is which ones? For example, simple question. I don’t know the answer so we have more work to do, but please don’t be concerned that somehow that’s going to disappear, but it has to be part of the strategy going forward I guess is the fairest way to say it.

Chair Rich – Senator Schaeffer.

Senator Schaeffer – I don’t know if Dean Ramsier would agree with my utilization of my graduate assistant, but as faculty trying to attain tenure and receiving no load relief, my graduate assistant is the only way I have gotten any publications in the last five years. So I think that consideration should be given in light of the fact that we are expected to research, we are expected to produce, and not given load time.

Chair Rich – Thank you. Senator Allen did you wish to speak?

Senator Allen – Yeah, I just wanted to follow up on one case that I had heard of in which this student was an international student that was funded actually through the international student office and they had terminated that position in the middle of the year. And the last we had heard-the student may have to drop out of their doctoral program. Now I understand that’s complicated because they actually weren’t teaching, and that’s another issue, but it seems like changing directions in the middle of stream like that, in the middle of the year for an international student, that was problematic and I was just hoping that we could do our best to confirm that we didn’t really hurt someone we’re hoping to help.

Chair Rich – Any other discussion? Senator Sastry.

Senator Sastry – My request is that going forward as part of the strategy that you mentioned, all of us should be very uniformly aware of these diversity funds and other funds. Right now it appears that only a few of colleagues are aware of it.

Chair Rich – Any other discussion? Thank you. Next is the report of the Part Time Faculty Committee, Senator Osorio. Where is she?

Senator Osorio – The Part-Time Faculty Committee met. I have a written report, but we also have two resolutions that we are proposing for the Faculty Senate, both related to proposed changes to the rules regarding the hiring of part-time faculty, both of which the currently written rules have no, I’ll read these I think they’ll be clear.
Chair Rich – These are not mutually dependent so I think we’ll take them...

Senator Osorio – One at a time?

Chair Rich – Yes.

Senator Osorio – The first then would be the proposed rule change for 3359-20-06.1, Section H.3 – Whereas current language of 3359-20-06.1, Section H.3 states that the Planning and Budgeting Committee of the Faculty Senate review annually the salaries for part-time faculty, and whereas the above mentioned committee no longer exists, resolve that the budget and finance committee of the University Council be charged with an annual review of salaries for part-time faculty, and the relevant sections for 3359-20-06.1, Section H.3 be amended accordingly and further be it resolved that the part-time faculty minimum salaries be increased no less than once every 2 years, and that the salaries of part-time faculty members earning more than the minimum salary for their rank be increased by an amount sufficient to preserve the percentage by which their salaries exceed the minimum.

Chair Rich – That’s the motion from the committee. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – It’s really just an implementation question. Mr. Chairman, as you probably are aware as of this moment at least, the University Council does not have an official formal existence.

Chair Rich – This will make it official if the Board adopts it.

Senator Lillie – Are you trying to be empathetic? I would just point out that that it would be my understanding and connotation of this that this might have to happen after there is an actual University Council that can be part of the rule.

Chair Rich – I think the point is well taken.

Senator Lillie – Thank you.

Chair Rich – Senator Matejkovic.

Senator Matejkovic – My move is to amend the proposed resolution to strike the fourth paragraph. “Resolved that the part-time faculty minimum salaries be increased by no less than once every two years.” I believe that imposing a requirement of an increase every two years is inappropriate. I believe that the review of the budget and finance committee is the appropriate step here, but mandating an increase every two years is inappropriate.

Chair Rich – There’s a motion is there a second? Seconded by Senator Hausknecht. Debate on the motion, this is the motion to amend the resolution by striking the second resolving clause in the resolution.

Senator Osorio – So the Part-Time Faculty Committee discussed this at some length. The reason that this wording is included in this resolution is that it has been well over 10 years since there’s been any movement. Once base salaries are written into the rules they become pretty immovable. So just
suggesting a review doesn’t have a lot to do with what happens with the base salaries, at least that has been in past experience, so since base salaries are being addressed in the rules, then some kind of movement of those base salaries also needs to be addressed in the rules. Just requesting a review is not going to take care of movement of base salaries. And we debated at some length what kind of wording, how to address this issue of some kind of movement of the base salaries. I’m not going to say that we have the solution to that movement, but I do strongly support some kind of rule addressing that need for periodic movement of the base salaries.

Chair Rich – Senator Matejkovic.

Senator Matejkovic – I don’t object to the review, I do not object or disagree that it may have been 13 years since the salaries have been adjusted. I understand that they’re grossly underpaid. The objection I have is to the mandate of an increase in the salaries. I think that the Finance Committee should have the ability to review, to make a recommendation, to make a proposal for that adjustment, but to mandate an increase I believe is inappropriate especially in comparison to the fact that the rest of the faculty goes through collective bargaining.

Chair Rich – Senator Quinn.

Senator Quinn – Do we have the authority to mandate such an increase?

Chair Rich – I’ll address that. We don’t have the authority to do anything in this regard. What this amounts to is asking the Board of Trustees to change the rule. If the Board of Trustees wishes to change the rule, they can do so, and if they do not wish to change the rule, they don’t have to. It’s a recommendation only to the Board of Trustees. Other debate on the motion which is to amend by striking the second resolving clause. Senator Landis.

Senator Landis – So I am very sympathetic to the original motion, but I really also understand the concern in the wording. So I’m wondering whether or not there could be some resolution to the wording so that it isn’t really a mandate, but, you know, a strong suggestion or something like this. I don’t know whether that subverts the intention of the committee, but you know, it’s like being between a rock and a hard place here. I agree with both of you in terms of the need for having this kind of a statement and coming to the Senate for support, but I also agree that it’s very very restrictive in terms of the mandate. So I’m wondering whether or not essentially the wording can be changed, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Rich – Well, the answer to your question is the wording can be changed if there’s a motion to change it. And the motion passes. Let me just add that I do have some question in my mind about whether the Board would be willing to change the rule in the way that the second resolving clause proposes, and on the other hand this doesn’t actually required anything more than an infinitesimally small increase. Senator Saliga.

Senator Saliga – I can see both sides of this also and understand a mandate is hard. As Chair Rich just pointed out, it might be that they agree to increase by a penny every two years, you know, that satisfies
a mandate there-so it could be done. I would to have the committee consider some way to tie raises for 
the part-timers to what the union for the faculty, if we get, and I don’t know how to put that in writing 
there, but if the faculty is going to get a 4% increase, then even though the part-timers are not part of 
the collective bargaining, they are faculty. And they should be getting a 4%, and I have no idea how to 
go about that. But it’s a suggestion.

Chair Rich – That’s the context of the kind of a change that would necessitate a referral back to 
committee. I don’t think it’s something we can really work out on the floor on the fly, as it were. I 
would comment on that too I think that the Board would be at best extremely reluctant to put into a 
rule that a change in one salary results in a collective bargaining is also going to be made in another 
sector. I think it’s extremely unlikely the Board would agree to do that. Senator Bouchard.

Senator Bouchard – I was just going to say that we as faculty get distraught if we don’t get raises every 
year, or at least every other year. And even if the Board of Trustees doesn’t go along with it, I think the 
least we can do as faculty is to tell the part-timers who teach their butts off for us that we support them 
getting at least a few more pennies.

Chair Rich – Senator Huss.

Senator Huss – Well, I just wanted to say that it doesn’t make sense to do anything to back off on the 
wording because we’re not setting policy. In a sense we’re saying what our position is. We know that 
our position is very unlikely to be carried out by the Board of Trustees, so you don’t bargain down from 
the position that you wish to assert, you assert it and if they want to do less than what’s being asserted, 
they’re course entitled to do it. They’re entitled to do more or less, but if we feel strongly about it we 
should say something strong. And it could be as strong as earlier Linda when you said that, I thought 
that was a great suggestion, I was thinking somehow tied to the cost of living, market conditions, 
something like that, but tying it to something, and not demanding an increase because strange things 
can happen with the economies where all the sudden everyone finds themselves, God forbid, overpaid. 
It could happen. So, anyway, the idea, though, is to not back off on the wording, and say we strongly 
suggest this to be done.

Chair Rich – Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – I want to rise in support of Senator Bouchard’s recommendation in opposition to the 
motion to amend. I also intend to vote no on that.

Chair Rich – Thank you Senator Lillie, Senator Lazar.

Senator Lazar – Chair Rich, I might suggest to Senator Osorio that if we feel as though the Board would 
be very reluctant to approve any rule that would actually give them a mandate, then perhaps we 
separate the resolution into to two so at least one would be assured of going through, and then the 
other could be seen as a statement regardless, a statement from the Senate regardless of whether or 
not we feel as though the Board would approve it. But I would like to see it at least get that initial rule 
of let’s just review this, get that initial resolution of even just reviewing the salaries gets passed.
Chair Rich – I think it would be easy enough for the Board to do what the first resolving clause recommends and not what the second clause does. I don’t think it necessary to put them into separate clauses.

Senator Lazar – I don’t pretend to understand what the Board does.

Chair Rich – They’ll be able to figure that one out. Senator Sterns.

Senator Sterns – This discussion is in the right place. In these hallowed halls of the Faculty Senate our biggest concern should be about academic quality in our institution. And the biggest situation that we have here is the fact that we’re not even competitive right now, relative to the schools around us. We have a serious issue of not getting quality faculty to teach for us because we’re not competitive. And I consider to an overriding issue.

Chair Rich – Senator Matejkovic.

Senator Matejkovic – Senators, colleagues, please understand that I am not suggesting that the part-time faculty are overpaid or even fairly paid, that’s not the point of my suggestion that this be separated. Okay? I agree that they are underpaid, personally seeing what we get based upon what we pay our adjunct faculty, I deal with it every two days okay. Somebody comes in because what’s going on with an adjunct isn’t what should be going on, and it’s because we’re not paying them. I understand they haven’t received an increase in 13 years. That’s an abomination. It should not have happened. All I’m suggesting is that telling the Board of Trustees that we expect them to mandate a raise every two years is going to guarantee that this isn’t enacted. It’s going to strike it down because they don’t have to whereas suggesting that a review of the salaries should be taken on a regular basis at least provides an opportunity to argue on behalf of the part-time faculty. I started as a part-timer, I know what they’re paid. I know what they’re expected to do. But getting something before the Board of Trustees—which I were on the Board, I would say ‘you don’t have the right to mandate anything, you lose everything’ by demanding too much. Negotiating away isn’t really what I’m trying to do. I’m trying to put before them the idea that every two years, they need to look at these. That they shouldn’t have a problem with.

Chair Rich – Senator Hausknecht.

Senator Hausknecht – I think the place for a mandate is to the committee that’s doing the review to ask them to report on the fairness and the market competitiveness of the salaries. And at that time, if further recommendations are in order, we make those recommendations. To Senator Matejkovic’s point, I think sending up an untenable resolution to the Board simply invites them to disregard it and anything associated with it.

Chair Rich – Anyone who has something to say that hasn’t already been said? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – Yes, I actually do. The debate so far has been that this is going to the Board, the Faculty Senate bylaws actually I think would say that if this were to be passed it would be sent to the President who could then determine if it needs to be put into effect or if certain other actions including those in the report. We certainly hope it would get to the Board, but it actually, technically, is a
recommendation to the President. I think what we’re doing is pretty common. We’re talking about the merits of the entire proposal not the actual motion to strike a part of it, and perhaps we should be talking about the merits. But I would like for us to consider that particular part and go from there. Thank you.

Chair Rich – The chair rules that the prior discussion was not out of order. Is there any further? Are you ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion to amend by striking the second resolving paragraph please signify by saying aye. (aye) Opposed by opposite sign. (nay) We’ll have a division of the house, all those in favor signify by raising your hand. If you are in favor of the motion to amend by striking the second resolving clause, you should raise your hand now. (counting of hands) 10 votes in favor of the motion. All those opposed raise your hand. Chair rules that the motion fails. We’re back to the main motion. Is there further debate on the main motion? I take it you’re ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. (aye) Opposed by opposite sign. (nay) The motion is adopted. Thank you. Oh, now we go on to the next one.

Senator Ososrio – There is a second motion, hopefully quick. Proposed rule change for 3359-20-06.1 Section N Whereas current language of 3359-20-06.1 Section N makes a distinction between part-time day and evening teaching and whereas that distinction no longer exists, resolve that the wording of 3359-20-06.1 Section N be amended to delete the reference to day and evening part-time teaching.

Chair Rich – A motion is on the floor, is there debate on the motion? Take it you’re ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. (aye) Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Next item of business is the report of the ad hoc General Education Learning Outcome Committee Chairs Committee, Senator Saliga.

Senator Saliga – How did we get such colorful names here? We have three recommendations that we would like to put forward. The first one is a recommendation to appoint a coordinator of the General Education, this is actually emphasizing part of the document as was put forward. The position is outlined in the plan and is within the section called “recommended campus implementation procedures” on General Education oversight in order to ensure the successful functioning and integrity of the new general education program and to oversee its assessment process, a faculty member should be designated as responsible for the program. This must be a formal appointment by the Provost and appropriate resources must be set aside for this position. We are recommending that the Faculty Senate work to ensure that the general education coordinator is appointed as soon as possible.

Chair Rich – The motion is on the floor. Is there debate on the motion? Take it you’re ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. (aye) Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Next.

Senator Saliga – The second is a recommendation to revise the language for the Learning Outcome 3. The original outcome is Learning Outcome 3.B.i says “articulate the nature of the scientific method in the natural and social sciences and humanities, apply it through hands-on laboratory experiments and critically evaluate applications of the scientific method.” The proposed revision removes the “natural and social sciences and humanities” part so it would read “articulate the nature of the scientific method,
apply it through hands-on laboratory experiments and critically evaluate applications of the scientific method”. The rationale is that the main point of this learning outcome is that students learn and critically evaluate applications of scientific method and apply it through hands-on labs. All this is retained in the revision and this learning outcome will be met in the natural sciences. As written, all parts of it would be highly unlikely to be met in the humanities and most if not all social science general education courses.

Chair Rich – The motion is on the floor, is there any debate on the motion? I take it you’re ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. (aye) Opposed by opposite sign. Motion adopted without dissent.

Senator Saliga – The last recommendation is to transfer the current practice for the math requirement to the new quantitative reasoning requirement for general education and establish a practice similar to that used for the quantitative reasoning for the written communication. Currently the implementation is in the academic foundations for writing we are requiring two courses and a minimum of six credits and for quantitative reasoning one course for a minimum of three credits. What we would like to change under these is for the writing with two courses to put a clause saying that students who are placed in the second written communication course and successfully completed thereby satisfy the general education written communication requirement. The second one for the quantitative reasoning, students who successfully complete the mathematics or statistics course listing department numbers there, with a prerequisite that satisfies the LO2.b.9 thereby satisfy the general education quantitative reasoning requirement.

Chair Rich – Motion is on the floor, is there debate on the motion? Take it you’re ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye. (aye) Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you. Next report of the University Council representatives do we have a report from said representatives? Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – I can start it and I’m sure the other representatives of this body on University Council can complete anything I may have missed. The bylaws were reviewed and revised. I think that was commented on at the last meeting, and we received a written communication from the President about two items. One was that he had received and would pass along the proposed revised University Council bylaws. The second was that he had received and would pass along for review to Vice President Mortimer a University Council proposal for a nursing center employee health care clinic. So those two items he had acted on. There were several reports that occurred in the last meeting. One was from the committee developing a smoking survey, and we had a very good discussion about that. There had been an effort a few months ago to ban smoking on campus because it was a bad idea or unhealthful idea and the University Council thought it’d be wise to have a little bit more data, a little bit more understanding of what actually was needed. So that’s in the process of being developed. It should be going out to what we call the campus community fairly soon. The University Marketing and Communication Committee made a report that they’re developing a comprehensive crisis plan so that the university will be able to communicate quickly in a crisis situation. When asked if we were going to be asked to help to develop whatever that policy is, they assured us that no, they don’t need University Council to help
them with the policy they just want us to know they’re working on it. The Sexual Assault Response Team also gave a report, and they told us they had developed a campus climate survey which as some of you may have seen came out a few days ago with regard to their charge. The report that they gave in February, I think, should be on the University Council website, or one of your representatives should be able to help you find it if you want to. The Sexual Assault Response Team appears to be an effort to combine the response across campus with regard to sexual assault issues, sexual harassment issues, Title IX issues and just a variety of areas that have long been of concern to a number of people. We did also receive a report—you may have heard about the discussion we had a couple of meetings ago about how people were paying the application fee before their applications were accepted, and we did get a little bit of an update on that, apparently as a result of some kind of what somebody characterized as pain in the neck questioning. We ended up with about $14,000 more this year than last year in terms of application fees. The main question as to who has to pay the application fee is still, I think, a little vague, but I think we’re making more progress on that, so that’s positive response from the Student Success Committee. The Talent Development and Human Resources committee provided a report from them on succession and time and planning. They just wanted us to be aware of it, to think about it, so that’s also- that will be coming down the line. I’m sure that Senator Erickson can fill you in more on that and I think that’s everything that’s on the minutes from the last meeting. There were some other discussions but that’s it.

Chair Rich- thank you Senator Lillie. There’s nothing more from the UC representatives? Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson – Well as Senator Lillie suggested that I should mention something about the HR one we have brought forward a succession and retirement planning document which we wanted people to have a look at. It was about five minutes to five when it came onboard, so obviously it wasn’t a time to get it passed, but which has the idea that looking at best practices elsewhere that would have a succession planning process that took into account people who might be likely to retire and to tie their replacement in with the objectives of your program. That’s assuming that you’ve got a strategic plan that represents the objectives of your program and that rather than just having a response that people want to retire and, oh no, what should we do now? So we’ve got a document going through council, we hope at this next meeting. I think the only other point and I understand why Senator Lillie couldn’t mention it is that the Student Success committee also talked about the approval to date but the date, is so out of date by being the meeting in early February that I think we would be more legitimately-our meeting comes just this next Tuesday so it’ll be virtually a month later, and so I don’t think it was worth taking those early figures very seriously, would you agree?

Senator Lillie – Yes I think that we should wait.

Chair Rich – Senator Lillie.

Senator Lillie – One item that I forgot, there is a leave bank policy that is being recommended that would not apply to anybody in the union ‘cause that would be a matter of collective bargaining, but this is something that’s been talked about for a long time and so stay tuned for that. The other is that there
will be an opportunity for an election to at the end of April to fill the new term for one of the representatives from the Faculty Senate to the University Council under the existing, non-approved bylaws. But anyhow that is coming up in April, so be ready.


Senator Holliday – Yes, is it appropriate to make an announcement?

Chair Rich – It is, under good of the order.

Senator Holliday – I just wanted to the body to be aware that there’s a new certificate for museum archives that will be available to undergrad students in the fall of 2015, so any undergrad from any college or major are welcome to enroll. Essentially it’s 18 credit hours will two modules and a capstone practicum experience at a local museum or archive, so just to let them know that’s an option. Thank you.

Chair Rich – Thank you. Anything else for the good of the order? If not, I take it you’re ready to adjourn? I declare this meeting adjourned.