

University OF AKRON

FACULTY SENATE

1 OCTOBER, 2015

Chairman Rich: The October meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order at 3:04 pm.

I want to mind everyone to please, every member of the Senate to please sign in if you haven't already, and also please make sure you have your name cards in front of you so that they are visible from the front of the room. And also, when you seek recognition, please hold up your name card horizontally with your name facing toward me so that it can be read right side up.

Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed?

Senator Raber moves. Is there a second?

Senator Saliga seconds.

Are there any proposed changes to the agenda?

All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chairman Rich: Opposed, nay?

The agenda is adopted.

Next is the adoption of the minutes of the April meeting. We don't have the May minutes yet.

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

Moved by Senator Bouchard.

Is there a second?

SENATOR STERNS: Second.

Chairman Rich: Seconded by Senator Sterns. Are there any corrections to the minutes of the April meeting?

All those in favor of adopting said minutes, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chairman Rich: Opposed by opposite sign?

The minutes are adopted.

The next item is the remarks of the chairman.

On today's agenda are the election of a second representative of the Faculty Senate to the Graduate Council: from the Academic Policies Committee a proposal for the creation of a Center for Data Science Analytics and Information Technology; from the Curriculum Review Committee a set of curriculum proposals for our approval; and from the Computing and Communication Technology Committee a resolution concerning online student evaluations of instruction, consideration of which was postponed in the May meeting of the Senate.

Another round of runoff elections in the College of Arts and Sciences has been completed. Five Faculty Senate seats were filled as a result. There are two seats remaining to be filled, which will require yet another runoff.

In addition, Parizad Dejbord Sawan of the College of Arts and Sciences has submitted her resignation from the Senate, so there is also an unexpired term to be filled by special election.

I want to welcome three new Senators to the College of Arts and Sciences: Stacy Nofziger of Sociology who was elected to a full three year term, Robert Pope of English and Randall Mitchell of Biology, both of whom were elected to unexpired one year terms.

I also want to congratulate Senators Janet Klein and Phil Allen, both of whom were re elected.

In addition to three elected representatives on the University Council, the Faculty Senate has two representatives on each of the several committees of the University Council, one of which must be a member of the Senate and the other of which must not be a member of the Senate. Appointments of these representatives are made by the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee.

There are currently two vacant positions: One is for a Faculty Senator on the University Council's Communications Committee. The other is on the University Council's Information Technology Committee, and that is for a faculty member who is not a Senator.

If you are interested in representing the Faculty Senate on the University Council's Communications Committee, please let me know. If you know of a faculty member who is not a member of this body who you think would be well suited to serving on the University Council's Information Technology Committee, please let me know after confirming that he or she is willing to serve.

Last Friday I attended a meeting of the Faculty Senate Chairs of the Universities of the Mid American Conference which was held on the campus of Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

The subject of the meeting was the escalating costs of intercollegiate athletics in general, and especially football, and the strain that those costs impose on University budgets.

In absolute terms, The University of Akron is behind only Eastern Michigan University and Buffalo in the amount by which the University subsidizes intercollegiate athletics, according to published figures. Akron, however, has the largest intercollegiate athletics budget in the MAC and is in the middle of the pack in terms of the proportion of its intercollegiate athletics budget that the University subsidizes. On average, MAC University subsidize their intercollegiate athletics budgets in the neighborhood of \$20 million annually.

All of the representatives in attendance agreed that in this era of declining state support for public higher education, the escalating costs of intercollegiate athletics pose a serious threat to their respective universities' ability to perform their core academic mission.

This year all of the MAC universities decided to increase athletic scholarships to cover the so called full cost of attendance. At The University of Akron this increase costs the University approximately \$700,000 annually, which is roughly the amount of money that was saved by the elimination of the University's baseball team.

An Eastern Michigan University faculty member in attendance at the meeting who was highly knowledgeable about intercollegiate athletics, having previously been a football coach and an athletic director at various universities, predicted that escalation of the cost of the intercollegiate athletics will continue unless and until deliberate steps are taken by the universities to restrain this escalation.

There was also general agreement that the MAC universities ought to work together toward de escalation of costs and that the leadership of the faculties of those universities should take action to encourage their universities to pursue such a course and to education the public about the consequences of the increasing cost of intercollegiate athletics.

In the September Faculty Senate meeting I reported that the administration had promised to conclude the process of allocating full time faculty positions for the 2016 2017 academic year during the month of September. I said, and I quote, "The outcome of this decision process warrants close scrutiny by the faculty. The recent budget cuts represent an opportunity for the University to do what the faculty have long advocated: To allocate a greater proportion of the University's limited resources to its core academic mission, which is performed largely by faculty." I continue to quote, "I expect to be able to report the results in our next meeting so that we can evaluate how well the universities has done at seizing this opportunity." End of quote.

This past Tuesday, the administration announced the allocation of 55 full time faculty positions for 2016 2017. Approximately one third of these positions are tenure track. The annual cost of these 55 positions is estimated to be \$4.5 million, which is somewhat less than the total amount of money already in colleges' fiscal year 2016 budgets for faculty positions that became vacant due to retirements and other separations that occurred after January of 2015 for full time for temporary full time faculty positions that are to be made permanent and for positions that were authorized but not filled for this academic year. Positions that became vacant earlier than February 2015 were removed from the college budgets. None of the 55 positions are to be funded with money from the \$10.4 million pool of funds for strategic initiatives.

Essentially the allocation of these 55 positions means that so far the amount of money allocated to full time faculty positions will be approximately what it was before, but vacant positions will be filled and temporary positions will become permanent, although these positions will not necessarily remain in the same departments or colleges.

The administration has indicated that a second round of position allocations will occur during October and November in conjunction with meetings with college deans about implementation of college strategic plans.

These position requests will have to be justified in accordance with college strategic plans and presumably will be funded largely from the \$10.4 million strategic initiative pool. Any such position allocations would represent new investment in full time faculty positions relative to the last fiscal

year. It remains to be seen how many positions would be allocated in the next round.

I am concerned about the timing of the second round of faculty position allocations. I had previously urged that all of the allocation decisions be made by this past August 31 and the administration had agreed to do so. When it became apparent that this deadline would not be met, a new deadline of September 15th was established. When I addressed this body on September 3rd, I already suspected that the new deadline would not be met and so I said only that I expected the allocations to be made in September.

As it turned out, only the first round of allocations was made in September. We are told now that the second round will be completed in October and November, as I mentioned earlier. Even if there is no further slippage in the schedule, second round of allocations will occur late enough that searches may not begin until December, or perhaps even January, and which in many academic disciplines is too late to attract the strongest candidates. I have urged the administration to make these decisions this month.

I am also concerned about the fact that approximately two thirds of the 55 positions allocated are not are nontenure track. Under the current rules, these faculty members have no job security beyond the end of each academic year. The University may decline to renew their appointments, not only for just cause or because the position is no longer needed, but for almost any reason or for no reason at all.

Under such conditions of insecurity, academic freedom is more theoretical than real and the University is unable to attract the high caliber faculty it can attract with tenure track appointments. Moreover, if appointments are made at the rank of lecturer, the service responsibilities are concentrated among an ever decreasing number of tenure track faculty which necessarily detracts from the time they have to do research and teach.

It must be noted that, to a large extent, the predominance of nontenure track appointments reflected a similar predominance in the position requests submitted by the deans, but it must also be noted that the deans appeared to believe that request for nontenure track positions would be

more likely to be granted than would requests for tenure track positions.

I hope that in the next round of faculty position allocations there will be a much higher proportion of tenure track positions, especially because the first round of allocation decisions addressed only the requests that were deemed to address clear, almost undebatable needs.

This concludes my remarks.

Next on the agenda is special announcements. I have one. Dr. Carlo A. Bersani, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, died September 24th at the age of 86. A native of Detroit, Michigan, Dr. Bersani joined The University of Akron faculty in 1965 after teaching at both Winona State and Drake Universities. He helped to establish the modern sociology program here as well as the Akron Kent State Joint Ph.D. Program, the M.A. Program, and the undergraduate degree programs in law enforcement and corrections. He served as department head from 1976 to 1980. He earned a Ph.D. at Iowa State University, an M.A. at the University of Michigan, and a B.A. at Eastern Michigan University. He continued to teach part time at The University of Akron until 2000.

Would you all please rise? A moment of silence in memory of our deceased colleague.

Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the report of the Executive Committee Secretary Schulze.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Since the Faculty Senate last met on September 3rd, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met twice by itself and once with the Provost. The Executive Committee first met on September 17th to conduct regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the Provost. The EC made appointments to the Faculty Research Committee and the General Education Advisory Committee. We were updated on the Gen Ed Core 13, the appointment of the general education coordinator, the allocation of graduate assistantships for 2015, the allocation of permanent full time faculty positions for 2016 and 2017. We discussed proposed changes to the academic calendar, The University Press, strategic plans for libraries, the graduate school, and the Honors College. We also discussed the creation of an assessment coordinator position. The Provost

updated the EC on falling enrollment.

The Executive Committee next met on September 24th to discuss regular Senate business and to prepare the agenda for today's Faculty Senate meeting. The Executive Committee certified the election of Philip Allen, Stacy Nofziger, Randall Mitchell, Robert Pope, Janet Klein, who were elected in a runoff election. We discussed University Council committee vacancies and Senate seat vacancies. We then planned the agenda for the upcoming Senate meeting.

This concludes the Executive Committee's report.

Chairman Rich: Are there any questions for Secretary Schulze about the Executive Committee report?

Thank you.

Next on the agenda are the remarks of the President.

President Scarborough.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Chairman Rich.

Senators, once again it's an honor to me to have the opportunity to be here and to make some opening remarks, and then if Chairman Rich allows, I'll be happy to answer whatever questions that you might have.

Much of our time over the last few weeks has been, as Chairman Rich reported, finalizing the first round process of approving the 55 new faculty positions. Chairman Rich did such a nice job of summarizing that, I'll skip the details for now and be available to answer questions about that after my opening remarks.

Secondly, looking forward, we're particularly focusing on the Honors College. If you will recall, last year we worked with each of the colleges to develop college level strategic plans to work to in Arts and Science. Two academic portal colleges that we had not yet begun are the Honors College and the Graduate School because we knew that there would be change in the leadership in those areas. With the arrival of a permanent dean for the Honors College, our intention now is to begin that process with the Honors College so they too can have an updated, or in this case new, strategic plan moving forward. The Honors College represents a huge opportunity for the University. There's tremendous momentum with the Honors College. I believe in the last two years, enrollments have been 57 percent higher than they were beforehand. I think this year it was ten percent higher than last year. So there's tremendous momentum there.

Coming out of the University's New Initiatives Summit that occurred in February and April of last year, one of the initiatives, among many, was to take the Honors College, to brand it, to give it a new strategic plan, and to grow, grow that college. This is a strategy that has been successfully employed by many universities across the country, Ole Miss, Arizona State, Michigan State, Penn State, all that have branded and grown their Honors College so it becomes that wonderful liberal arts experience that many of us still hold as kind of the gold standard of undergraduate education. So our goal would be to find a donor, which we are working we are cultivating one at the moment, for a significant gift, to then put that name on the college to then brand it, and then to market in a more aggressive way a wonderful undergraduate experience for well prepared and generally well resourced students, and in the case of well prepared and underresourced, we would have, obviously, very competitive financial aid packages that would allow students of all socioeconomic backgrounds access to that experience.

So this Honors College strategic planning session is a huge opportunity. We plan to involve the Honors College Advisory Council, which is constituted by the recommendations from each of the colleges as being really the constituency group that will work with the team to develop that plan, much using the same kind of a process that we used with each of the colleges last, last academic year.

So that's a major new priority. As we kind of walk through the series of new initiatives that we have implemented since April, that is one that is targeted for implementation in the next, in the next few months.

In terms of kind of final comments in terms of opening remarks until we get to your questions, one thing that kind of came to mind this morning is that many, many years ago there was a great professor that I had who taught me the difference between cognitive conflict and affective conflict. And it was one of the great days in the classroom that you don't forget because it had great application over my lifetime.

The lecture began with the fact that cognitive conflict, or the active and aggressive debate of issues by an able and informed team, is a huge contributor to great decision making, and the moral of the story in this first part was to say if you are the leader of a team, one of the best things that you can do is assemble a diverse group of individuals with different competencies and abilities, provide them the information that they need, encourage them to engage in active debate, aggressive

debate, and if that's done so in the right way, it'll lead to better decision making.

So that's relatively straightforward. He said, however, the literature is pretty clear that if the same group engages in what's called affective conflict, it's actually not a positive contributor to decision making, it becomes a negative, a more destructive force. And what's the difference between affective and cognitive conflict is that affective conflict is not about the issues anymore, it becomes very personal. It's when the members of the group turn away from the issues themselves and begin to focus on the differences of the people involved. When that happens, things become destructive. And so the implication for the leader of that team is to work diligently to make sure that everyone understands the difference between the two and to keep it in the constructive, constructive arena. Now, what is it that would have caused me to be reminded of this? It's the clear evidence that we have worked so hard in the last, I think, 15 months to take constituencies of this University and to bring them together in kind of a team environment, encouraging the active debate, dialogue, informed conversation around the issues that we face, the opportunities that we face, and trying to get it to a decision that is the best decision for our University.

But recently there seems to have been a movement into the affective realm. And it's starting to show signs, some fairly clearly evident signs. So I only close my opening remarks to say let us pull together, faculty, administrators, students, trustees, community members, to keep the debate constructive, keep it in the cognitive realm. Don't let it be drawn into the shadows of affective conflict where things turn very personal and things get ugly. If we keep it in the cognitive realm, anything is possible for this University. If we allow it to go affective, if we allow it to be drawn into the shadows of plots and plans, there's nothing that can work for our University.

Chairman Rich: Thank you, Mr. President.

Are there questions for the President?

Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes. This is a follow-up question from last month. And at the time you talked about how we had 190 incoming freshmen taking part in the Gen Ed Core.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

Chairman Rich: And at the time you promised to come back with numbers on how many of these people who had applied for the first time after April 15th, when it was first announced. Do you have that number?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, actually, of the 192 freshmen, we had two thirds of them, 128 of those, who paid their confirmation fee after April the 15th.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The evidence there. So I think that is coincidentally exactly 66.6 percent. Okay? So that is two thirds. But that was not an approximation, that's an actual count.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. Because that was something you hadn't had last time. I just wanted the data on that.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: For next semester, since we're getting I mean, I know the semesters just zip along, we're only five weeks in, but we're already thinking about spring, are you going to be able next spring, assuming that the Gen Ed Core is still in place, are you going to be able to offer it the way it was originally intended, as a blended thing where students would actually have field research and internships rather than just being a hundred percent online?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That is certainly my personal hope and my expectation, and my directive would be make sure that we have both blended learning and online learning modalities for each of those Gen Ed offerings. The advantage of the the advantage of the blended is obvious. I think that's the best pedagogy one can imagine.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The advantage of the online is a tradeoff, to some extent, of quality for the also highly valued characteristic of being convenient, and in particular in high schools where they would like us to provide dual enrollment opportunities for these general education courses, and it allows us to deliver that fairly efficiently and to widen our pipeline in terms of the students that can be recruited in the University. What we obviously have to work on is to make sure that there is while it may not be the ideal level of quality that we wish, it needs to at least be at a minimum level of acceptable academic quality that all of us can feel good about.

I think that's part of what we are trying to work on at the moment, these faculty who are working on these first iterations, that they are working to achieve that level of quality. And I will tell you in the one experience that I had in doing this at Toledo, it took them a year to develop it, teach it, amend it, to get it to the level that I think all of those faculty that continued to offer those courses

were very excited about. But I do distinctly remember a day when five or six of those early faculty members who developed and offered these courses for the first time came to a group meeting like this and shared what their first experience was like and the positives and the negatives and how they planned on changing the course for the next time, and so the conclusion that I walked away with, all the greatest planning in the world, it takes at least offering these once and experiencing once until we get it to the level of quality that people start to more universally feel better about.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. That does worry me. I'm on the General Education Advisory Committee and what we are trying to do is to crank up the level, not talk about some minimal quality level. So let's see how that goes.

And I do worry, just keep your eye on the keeping it blended, because as late as the day before classes started the paper was still saying that these were going to be blended, which and there was never an announcement, it just turned out that they weren't, and it was announced that there were going to be no more than 25 students in a section and, whoops-a-doodle, there turned out to be 40.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: So, I mean, these are worrying things, especially since, according to the numbers you just had, we have spent three quarters of a million dollars in lost tuition and gotten maybe 120 new freshmen, and I'm not sure that, given the financial exigencies, that having maybe 120 new freshmen who we aren't even sure are going to be able to perform well is worrisome. So I hope that in the first Senate meeting after Christmas that you will be able to give us the figures on how many of them actually passed the courses, because that's also another data point that we are going to need. But thank you for the information.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Sure. And I'm just hoping that that 700,000 doesn't stick because it's not an easy calculation because in reality we have what's called the plateau. Any student taking above 12 semester credit hours gets essentially the next, you know, several hours free of charge, so this general education course sitting on top of a student who already is taking 12 hours, we wouldn't have received any additional incremental revenue to begin with. So I realize that's an estimate, but my guess is that's a pretty high estimate.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay.

Chairman Rich: I just want to make sure that I understood correctly. It has been your directive that

each of the Gen Ed Core courses to be offered in the spring would be offered in both blended and completely online modalities?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. It was actually my I don't know if "directive" was the word my express desire for that last

Chairman Rich: I'm quite certain you used the word "directive" in this context, but

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, last semester. Yes, so to the extent I didn't see it this semester, the express desire takes on a little extra specificity going forward.

Chairman Rich: It's been elevated to a directive?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. Well, I that's where I'm headed. I have not issued it yet.

Chairman Rich: Ah.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Okay? I didn't think I needed to. Because really what we said from the very beginning is that we do want both modalities, and I understood that once the dual enrollment option--but I am permanently committed, I don't know about you, I am personally committed to this notion of a blended pedagogy. It's the pedagogy that I would want for myself. And I think it's the ideal in most disciplines, not all, but in many, many disciplines. So it is, it is certainly, in every conversation with those developing this, it's being communicated as in the end we need to have both, we need to have both versions. That's what's been communicated. I have not characterized it in any of those meetings or any memos or e mails yet as this is a directive.

Chairman Rich: Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: Hi. You mentioned something about wanting to extend this to high school students, and I would like you to talk a little bit more about that and the logic of that-- and I frame this in the context of I was on the BCAS Online Committee, which was all about trying to push for online courses, and what we found in that data, I don't know where that data ever ended up, but what we found in that data is the only ones who are successful in online courses are the higher level students. The seniors, the juniors, the very self-motivated. The freshmen are going to struggle, so I agree with Dr. Bouchard that I'd really like to see the successes of our freshmen before we even consider going to more problematic students of high school students, because I know at least in our experience of the distance learning courses in high schools, it's a nightmare, it's a mess. So could you talk a little bit more about what your logic is of extending it to that before you know success?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, Todd Rickel would be the better person to visit with, but my understanding is that they are targeting the more highly prepared high school students for as the target audience for this rollout. And because dual --because College Credit Plus has recently received the benefit of a better funding model from the state, there is a lot of interest in kind of expanding dual enrollment in College Credit Plus, not only because the funding model is a little bit better, because it opened, it broadened the recruitment pipeline for greater numbers of well prepared students in the process. And if they have good experience with us in a dual enrollment, if we can engage them in a positive conversation, theoretically it makes it a little easier then to recruit that student to the University. So I believe that's the intention, but, again, in terms of greater levels and specifics, we'll have to get you someone else who is closer to the ground level to explain that. But my understanding, the target audience is the better prepared high school student looking for a dual enrollment option.

Chairman Rich: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I'd like to ask the President, you have been talking for many months now about the changing landscape of higher education. Even so, yesterday I was surprised to hear on Public Broadcasting the announcement of the legislature becoming even more involved in suggesting cost cutting and reductions. Can you tell us what's come down to you about that? Because it just makes matters worse, I guess.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, I can speak, I can speak broadly to this reality. I mean for quite some time I think I have known, I think perhaps many of you have known, that the governor had appointed a task force looking to generate ideas about how public higher education could be more affordable and cost effective. And he appointed a number of people to that commission, and it was headed, the commission was headed by the chief financial officer at Ohio State University. And so they had been meeting for quite some time.

At the regular meetings of University presidents convened by the Inter University Council in Columbus, we have been receiving updates on the nature of those conversations. Frankly, there wasn't anything being reported that I hadn't heard before. To me, it didn't represent kind of a significant shift in one direction or the other. The draft report that I saw, although I have not seen the final report, I would assume it's pretty close to the draft report that I saw, really was just a listing of best practices, and so I think perhaps a next step would be for Mike and I to meet with

Faculty Senate Executive Committee and say let's look through the report ourselves and see if there's any new and really surprising idea that we haven't already considered before. I suspect not, but let's, let's confirm that reality. I think more than anything else, it is not the report that is significant, it's simply the fact that at a very political level, and maybe most assuredly also at a very public level, there remains this deep seated concern about the affordability of higher education. We have seen the public opinion polls. And if you and I have seen the public opinion polls, you can assure yourself that our elected leaders have seen the public, the public opinion polls. And what they are seeing is that 60 percent of us in the general public are, quote, concerned about being able to afford a college education for their children.

Now, when the elected officials see that, they feel like they have got to respond to that to bring that level of concern down. And, of course, if they do that successfully, it also increases their chances of being re elected.

So the appointments of commissions and the caps on undergraduate tuition and general fees are all reflective, I think, of the general public's concern about the affordability of higher education. I believe that that concern is a little bit overinflated. Okay? Because I believe what the general public is looking about and reads articles about are the sticker price of higher education. Even worse, they read about the undergraduate coming out with a teaching certificate and degree who went to a private college and who incurred 80, 90 thousand dollars of debt to take a job that meant that he or she wouldn't be able to repay that debt for their entire lifetime. And, you know, you get articles written about that.

But that's the outlier. You know, but the public begins to believe that that's a representative sample of what must be going on. The reality is I think we could bring the temperature down quite a bit if we said, look, that's the, that's the sticker price. You know? You know, let's use huge round numbers. Come to The University of Akron that's tuition and fees of \$10,000. But the average student doesn't pay \$10,000. The average student has a merit scholarship, a need based scholarship, the opportunity for financial aid, and loans beyond that. But even before the loans are calculated, the actual amount that a student pays is much, much less than that sticker price.

Because so many of our students get some discount, either by virtue of scholarship or grant, before they even take on a dollar of loan, and the loans are so easy to get for most students, but the average student graduates with well, I take that back. Sixty percent of students graduate with an

average debt that's still, you know, less than the cost of a new automobile. Okay? Still in the 20, 22 thousand dollar range.

So you don't really need to be as afraid of access. What you need to be more concerned about is success. Because access to higher education is not the insurmountable obstacle that I think that most people and that's the story that we have to tell better, I think, because the politicians are going at it the other way. We'll just do everything we can, then, to keep, to keep the cost, the downward cost pressure on public colleges and universities. Who doesn't have more than one legislator tell me, well, we're not going to give you any more money because you're just going to increase the cost if we do that. And I'm saying, hmm, okay. We've got to combat that. The IUC has to do a better job doing it, individually, college presidents, all of us on all the councils that we sit on in Columbus, we have to do a better job of saying, hey, higher education is very accessible, here's all the things that we do. Come here, we'll make it work.

Chairman Rich: Are there other questions for the President?

Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Just, just two, two brief ones. One was the College Credit Plus, and I'm not sure I have the programs correct, but I know that some of the, some of the state mandates are expecting that we'll be able to or the state institutions will be able to provide education or opportunities for college credit to as young as 7th graders.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I haven't heard that. I'll look into it.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: What?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: No, that's true.

SENATOR LILLIE: That's particularly of concern, obviously, and that's if it's a rumor, then it needs to be cleared up, but I know I have heard it.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: It's true.

SENATOR LILLIE: And if Dr. Bouchard said it's true, then it must be true.

The other question has to do with The LeBron James Family Foundation college education arrangement, and I know you have spoken about it a time or two, but it seems that when I talk to people about it, like at the soccer game last night or wherever, there's this impression that Mr. James gave a massive amount of money to fund scholarships, and isn't that wonderful, and it would have been wonderful if he had.

My understanding is that while he has, you know, committed to five years of a commercial a year for The University of Akron, that neither he nor his foundation has actually, you know, committed any funding, it's that the LeBron James Family Foundation and The University of Akron will work together to try to, try to raise the funding that would be necessary, and if for some reason it cannot be raised, then The LeBron James Family Foundation, Wheels For Education, and I Promise students will have first crack at the scholarship money needed in order to keep that promise.

Is that more or less right, or have I missed something?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: No, you are right. Several of the media outlets have assumed that he's writing a check. It's more of an in kind gift. It is the five commercials he'll do for us over five years that's valued at some extraordinarily high number that is the value. But as I have explained before, it's also a last dollar scholarship, so all of these students who qualify, and they have to qualify under criteria that both the foundation and the University agree to, you know, they are still going to be applying for their Pell Grant, they are still going to be applying for need based aid that they might, they will still be eligible for any merit based scholarship, so our commitment is that last dollar to fully cover.

So in reality, when you project the number of students that are going to be coming for the period of time that we it is not a huge amount of a financial commitment to the University. We are by far the we gain the greater value in terms of the impact of being able to have him promote our University on our behalf or for the next five years.

It doesn't matter what the value is. To him, it's just the idea that his kids, who he cares deeply about, that that last dollar will be covered. At least at one University. And they're just a wonderful partner with wonderful people. You know, I don't pretend to know him well, probably someone in here knows him a lot better than I do, but every interaction that I have had with him has been I have walked away saying he really cares about these kids.

And also I think I have also pointed out, the University is really committed to Akron Public Schools, where all of these kids come out of, a rather large amount of scholarship dollars, for the exchange that occurred sometime back, I don't know how far back, for what's it called, Central Hower High School.

So, again, you know, this was a win win. But no, he's not but on the other hand, I'm not eager to go rush out and to correct certain media outlets who believe you know, if they want to believe

that, let them believe that.

SENATOR LILLIE: Well, it's, you know, I mean I think it's important to understand where the truth lies.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, it's important for us to understand, right.

SENATOR LILLIE: Whether or not everybody else in the world does or not is perhaps something we can guarantee, but--

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: In reality, he's giving us something of extraordinary value. Some people estimate, yeah, some people estimate that those commercials he's doing for them are worth 8 to 10 million dollars a piece.

SENATOR LILLIE: You know, if we're talking in terms of access, I think it's a great idea.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

SENATOR LILLIE: I don't know Mr. James, never met him, but the impression I have had over the years since he came to fame here in Akron is that he has got, you know, a lot going for him, he has a lot that he's giving back to the community, that's all positive. I was just trying to clarify what the relationship for this particular thing was because it's a large commitment.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

SENATOR LILLIE: The second thing is that I have heard you I think I have heard you say a couple of times in public, public venues, like college education meeting and so on, is that the criteria for the kids in his program will be determined by him and by the University.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR LILLIE: Does that mean there may be different criteria than the ones that the University may have? And I just would like to get that cleared up, too. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. I think it does mean that it could be different. And I would think what it really means is they just didn't get that level of detail worked out before it was time to make the announcement. And I don't suspect it'll be greatly different, but we wanted to leave it open simply because, you know, understandably he takes kind of a personal ownership for these kids. He just wants to make sure that whatever numbers we select, whatever criteria we select, is appropriate for the children that he has invested so much in. I 100 percent guarantee we will get to that common agreement as to what is appropriate. But it hasn't, to my knowledge, it hasn't been done yet.

SENATOR LILLIE: Right. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: You bet.

Chairman Rich: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you. You know, I wanted to ask about the Honors College questions.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, ma'am.

SENATOR KLEIN: You are planning on expanding this, and you mentioned yesterday at the college meeting and also today that you seek to attract well prepared and well resourced students. Can you elaborate on what that means?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: No, what I

SENATOR KLEIN: Because you said that twice, so I want to know what you meant by well resourced students.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Usually the way I say that is well prepared, and those are generally well resourced students, on average.

SENATOR KLEIN: White students?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Huh?

SENATOR KLEIN: I mean just statistically that means white students?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, no, I would certainly never mean that.

SENATOR KLEIN: I just wanted to clarify, because that's what it would translate into, and I would hope that the Honors College would recruit minority students.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's why I said earlier that the financial aid package that we make available, we make it available to students of all socioeconomic backgrounds.

SENATOR KLEIN: Okay. I just wanted to clarify that.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: You bet.

Chairman Rich: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Mr. Chairman, I was had a question for the President that related to something you were saying about the Honors College as well --

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh huh.

SENATOR ERICKSON: -- in the sense that they are going to be working on the strategic plan, and Chairman Rich in his remarks talked about the second round of faculty appointments and how those will relate to the strategic plans of the colleges.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh huh.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Now, as you said, the Honors College is just starting its strategic plan. At this point in time the Honors College doesn't have a faculty of its own

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR ERICKSON: but it clearly ties into a lot of other faculties. So they haven't got their strategic plan, and the College of Arts and Sciences is now in the process of, I think the word you used was having an informed conversation?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh huh.

SENATOR ERICKSON: We are about to be starting on an informed conversation to determine our strategic plan in some reasonable detail

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's great.

SENATOR ERICKSON: and I was wondering whether this whole process that's going to go on in October/November for the second round will have money that will be set aside for those colleges that have not yet or those colleges that have not yet finished their strategic plans.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Absolutely. That would be, that would be the plan and intention for that to be the case. And I suspect that to be the case.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Thank you.

Chairman Rich: Are there other questions for the President?

Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY: So this came up at the meeting yesterday and it's come up repeatedly about Chairman Rich brought it up the allocation of tenure track to nontenured track.

So one of the reasons that we are concerned and I figured let's be evidence based, as you have said in your opening remarks. So studies show that students who take classes with tenure track faculty are more likely to graduate than students who take predominantly courses without tenure track faculty. They are more likely to get a job upon graduating. This is shown by dozens of studies. This is especially true at state universities, state public institutions. In fact, direct faculty contact with a tenured faculty member is one of the strongest links to graduation. Studies show tenure track faculty publish more, they bring in more grant dollars. Studies show the number of classes held by full time tenured faculty members is one of the most important factors students, and especially their parents, have when choosing where they go to college. Overwhelming evidence in

favor of hiring tenure track faculty.

Here at The University of Akron less than 15 percent of the operating budget is spent on tenure track faculty, and as Chairman Rich indicated, we are spending less this year than we could have because the people who are coming in will cost less money than their replacements.

In fact, to maintain the tenure track faculty to student ratio we had in 1999, we would have to hire almost a hundred new tenure track faculty.

And there's more. I won't take up too much time with this. But it just goes on and on.

I have asked repeatedly, and this come up yesterday, it's come up before, why wouldn't we invest in tenure track faculty? And I have got this quote from you. You said it more than once. Make sure I get the quote right. "The national trend is the national trend." That's a reason for not hiring more tenure track faculty.

There is not a single substantive reason every single one of those 55 positions shouldn't be tenure track. Not one. In fact, many of the full times we're hiring could just be named tenure track. They are doing the same responsibilities. They could help us with service, they would have job security, they would help publish, they would increase the profile of this University. We could bring 55 of the best young minds to this area. No reason not to do that. Not one substantive reason. This is all evidence based. I'm not being affective here. Evidence based. Not one reason.

(Applause.)

Chairman Rich: Do you wish to comment on those comments?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I didn't hear a question, so we have addressed it a lot of times. I mean the short answer, and the hard thing about it, I have said it, this is the hardest issue in higher education. Not only here, but everywhere.

So there's so it's not as simple as waking up one day and deciding we're going to be different and believing that we can be different when no one when very few in the country have found a way to be different in the way that is being suggested. There is an economic reality that has to be dealt with. And the fact of the matter, too, that there are disciplinary differences that need to be taken into account. One should also recognize the fact that all the literature is not consistently in one direction on this issue, which means there probably are disciplinary reasons.

There is also the reality that there are other solutions that might be available to us. I can prove it. The guarantees of employment of lecturers that might actually be a preferred choice for some very

highly qualified people if we could make it a better career choice for people.

So this is an extraordinarily complicated issue, and it is most easily addressed, not on a global level, but on a department by department, discipline by discipline basis. But there are just some very real reasons why these trends are as strong as they are. I'm not saying the trends are the trends. I'm saying underlying the trends are some real issues that have to be teased at, understood, and addressed, and it's never as simple as some people would want you to believe, like just waking up one day and spending money we don't have for a level of productivity that we can't afford to achieve a gold standard of quality that no one else can afford either, or very few.

So that's the recap of the conversation, and, again, if you are passionate about this issue, let me know. It almost always comes up at book club every month. Maybe you are a prime candidate to join us every month and talk about this for three hours with us.

Chairman Rich: Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: Chairman Rich, I'm wondering if the President would like to comment on the leadership at the Graduate School, or lack of leadership at the Graduate School, and how we are going to build that, and since this is the only place that doesn't even have a strategic plan started.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, we're really kind of in the middle of a process right now to make a leadership change that involves the Graduate School. We're trying to be respectful of tradition, process, protocol in terms of the steps that we're taking to appropriately communicate in the right order leading to a decision that would lead to a permanent Dean of the Graduate School. We have consulted with the Graduate Council, we have conferred with the particular college faculty that this might affect, but I believe, Mike, we might be leading to an announcement this week, or will it be likely be next week, on the new leadership of the Graduate School?

PROVOST SHERMAN: I think it's essentially announced.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Oh, it did go out?

PROVOST SHERMAN: No, it's essentially announced, having had those conversations.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Okay. I know it's out there.

Okay. So we met with the College of Liberal Arts, Arts and Sciences, yesterday to inform them that we had asked Dean Chand Midha to become Dean of the Graduate School, that we will be asking Dean Eric Amis to assume the position of Vice Provost for Research, and that we have asked Department Chair John Green

PROVOST SHERMAN: Vice Dean.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Vice Dean, to be the Interim Dean of Arts and Sciences until we conduct an open search process to select a permanent dean.

So, again, we try to be respectful of the process, but evidently we're at the point now where we can talk about that more generally.

Chairman Rich: Are there other questions for the President?

Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chairman Rich, I have a question, a real question, I promise this time, about just a follow-up on what President Scarborough said about this.

Being partially a statistician, maybe a rational way to look at it is to look at our comparisons in this area, say, Cleveland State and Kent State, and look at the ratios that they have to see our market niche.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR ALLEN: What I understand and what worries me about this is my understanding is that we're a bit out of whack on the low side, where we have fewer tenure track, and it seems like that's a market driven process with similar programs, and particularly in terms of the College of Engineering, they probably have some needs, maybe a more tenure track using that same model than, say, Kent State would without. So my question is can we at least use those metrics from our competitors to look at this?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes.

SENATOR ALLEN: And could you give us some numbers back on that so that we could actually look at those data?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah. To your, to your general principle of metrics, absolutely. To the general principle of benchmarking, absolutely, but also remember benchmarking, as it was originally suggested many decades ago, was to try to find the outlier, the person that was doing something extraordinary, and then to study it and to understand what conditions made it extraordinary. It wasn't meant to be a regression to the mean for everyone, but nonetheless.

Thirdly, I would say that when one looks at the national data that we have, and you have seen it, it actually suggests the percentage of tenure track faculty that we have in tenure track faculty is right about where the national average is. And that where we're actually low is in the number is in the

percentage of the lecturers. We're like ten percentage points low, but I suspect that it has a lot to do with, rather than high lecturers, we hire instead a number of temporary visiting faculty members. So my guess is if you threw them to the lecture category, we would be probably right at the national norm.

SENATOR ALLEN: But was the national norm bench not benchmarked, was it compared to community colleges as well

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

SENATOR ALLEN: or was that just baccalaureate school? So yeah.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: It does include the community college data, but we are an institution that has at least two entities that we very much resemble a community college, with Wayne College and what used to be Summit College. So that may be, but, again, it's data only to raise questions, it's not data to lead to a definitive conclusion. It's data to ask the question can we be different? Okay? And I think that's a valid question.

It also when one looks at a particular institution, for example, any institution we pick, you also have to try to understand how are they doing it as an outlier? If Cleveland State has a different kind of an outcome than we do, the next step is to study the institution and find out what are they not doing that allows them to do so much here? So we want to compare the scope of missions and activities with our two institutions, because what it might raise the question is, well, if we stop doing this at our University the way they stopped doing that at their University years ago, maybe we then could afford to take those resources and invest it in an area to get the kind of outlier. But you have to understand the whole in order to get to the solution that you want. And we typically fail to do that. We usually stop the argument with, well, they're higher, therefore we must be higher. Well, that would be nice, that's the gold standard that we all aspire to, but why is it that they can be higher? Let's understand that. Let's see if we are willing to make that decision as an institution to stop doing something. I mean you have seen how easy it is for our institution to stop doing something in the last three months. You have seen how easy that's gone down. So it's not an easy thing for an institution to stop doing something in order to do something more extraordinary somewhere else.

Chairman Rich: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes. This is just a comment on your comment on Senator Coffey's remarks.

That was sort of after the fact here.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh huh.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: You have often in the last year talked about let us be different, let us be out in front, let us not stay with what all other institutions are doing.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: And I think that hiring more tenure track faculty would be an initiative. I mean we're talking about \$10.4 million in initiatives. You could hire over a hundred tenure track faculty

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: with that kind of money. That would be an extremely exciting initiative. On top of just replacing the people as they retire.

So if we're going to not go with the crowd, not I mean in your address in May you talked about how many state universities are going to go down the tubes and so we have to go off in an exciting new direction. If the ones that are not hiring tenure track faculty and are replacing them with part timers and nontenure track are going down the tubes, maybe we need to be exciting and different. And I also just want to add to what Senator Allen said, which is that, sure, if you compare us with all public universities, including the community colleges, we're somewhere in the middle. If you compare us to state affiliated universities with doctoral programs, I have seen the data, you sent me the data, we're way behind the curve in terms of how many tenure/tenure track faculty we have. State wide in Ohio, the other eight or nine schools that face exactly the same challenges we do, they average 25 percent of their operating budget on full time faculty salary and benefits. We average less than 15 percent. So if anybody is an outlier, I mean you talk about a gold standard, we're the lead standard. We don't want to be that.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, I get that. But you also have to remember, again, you just can't make these broad level comparisons. And that's the reason why I have never made a decision, that I know of, in my lifetime by looking at benchmark data. Okay? It's informative, it's interesting, it signals an area to dig deeper, it provides context to begin work, but it's never sufficient to conclude or to make a decision. And so instead what did we do? We I'll just use it because I'm sure there seems to be some question about this. I sat down with the budget director and the CFO and went line item by line item through our budget to see what we could eliminate in order to do more

somewhere else. Okay? We went at it as aggressively as one humanly can, and we paid a price for it, in some ways. Okay? We even knew we were too aggressive in some areas, which is a reason why we needed to bring some people back and fix it. Okay? My point being that once you go through that exercise, you know what the limits are to the pool of funds that you have created to what you can then invest more in. And if all we had to invest in is hiring faculty, it would be a much easier thing to decide. But, you know, in addition to a great faculty, which is the core, you also need motivated and resourced students. There's a cost and an infrastructure to get sufficient numbers of motivated and resourced students at your institution that represent a real cost that must be funded. There is an attractive and a functional facility, that one needs, both to attract and to provide a learning environment for that faculty and for those students in which to operate, and that requires a certain level of investment.

There is engaging and functioning information technology infrastructure that has to be paid for, instituted, maintained, and updated that has a cost that one must pay. You have to have a few administrators around here, sadly, to keep things running. Okay? In addition to expert and wonderful faculty at the University.

So one cannot simply take the limited financial resources you have been able to assemble from all the difficult line item by line item and say, I'm just going to take that whole amount and do nothing but hire tenured faculty. We can't meet the other needs to have a complete University. And that's the process that we went through. And it's been a wonderful, in my opinion, it's been a wonderful thing because we were in a position to say, yeah, we had faculty retirements. We have got at least enough money now to fund 55 critical positions. Okay? That the process determined. Okay? Were critical. Okay?

In addition to that, we still have some money left over to look at some strategic opportunities in a lot of these different areas. And what will be the best use of that limited amount of funds that we created.

My guess is that there are a lot of universities that don't have the opportunity to even have that conversation right now. So I look at it as a huge step forward that we have made to take an unsustainable model, get on a path over a three year period to get it to a sustainable model, to make investments to keep us from losing ground and still have a resource pool to look at college level initiatives, University initiatives, and student recruitment campaigns that allow us to go from

where we have been to where we want to be.

And I agree with you, I think every day I believe you have to be different. So I agree with you on that point. We have to be distinctively better. At the program level, college level, the University level. And we can. We can be. I'm convinced that we can be.

Chairman Rich: Bearing in mind that we do have other business to get to, are there any other questions for the President?

Senator Hallett.

SENATOR HALLETT: Talking about being different, my department in the School of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology, we're looking for a full time tenure track faculty member in adult neurogenics and it is very, very difficult to find a viable candidate in that area to come to Ohio. We were just wondering, since we have a full time distance program, learning program, master's program, that involves telepractice and e supervision clinicians, we were just wondering if it would ever be possible to hire a full time tenure track faculty member who would be located in California or some other location where they would then teach remotely and attend meetings via WebEx or some other system, and conduct research at their location. We were just wondering if that would be a possibility.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, in my opinion the answer is yes. I would say this, though: There are some folks in Columbus who would begin with the answer no. Okay? So we have a little bit of work to do to get to a legislative environment that would feel comfortable with us doing what you are suggesting. But, again, you know, someone referenced my speech where I prognosticated into the future, and I was really just consulting literature that was already out there. I think that what you described is what there is going to be more and more of. So if we want to be a vibrant part of that future, which I think there's always a choice to make, if one wants to be a vibrant part of that future, it'll lead to saying yes to those. If that's a real request, then, you know, visit with Mike and his team about what that looks like and we'll see where that conversation leads.

SENATOR HALLETT: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Rich: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chairman Rich.

Just one petite question.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, ma'am.

SENATOR KLEIN: You talked about the improvements to the campus to, you know, as part of attracting students and making it a nice and functional facility and I was just wondering if you could clarify some of the rumors that are out there.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I'd be happy to. Which one do you want me to clarify?

SENATOR KLEIN: The grand entrance.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The grand entrance. Okay. I think I talked about that last time, but if not, I'll give you the short version this time.

SENATOR KLEIN: Sorry. Last month, I apologize, last month was the one month that I was not a Senator.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Don't worry about it. I'll give you the short version.

So shortly after coming to the University they gave me a big tour of the campus, and as I was getting the tour, I was keeping notes of first observations. Knowing that I'd never get a chance to have a first observation again, I wanted to record those notes.

One of the first things that I noticed about this University that, unlike Kent State, it's hard to tell where the front door is at the University. And so one of the notes that I made is lacking a, lacking a grand entrance. I don't know if I used that term, but if I did, lacking a grand entrance to the University. It ended up being on a sheet, a notebook piece of paper that had 30 items on it. I tore it off, I handed it to our facilities director and said, "Hang on to this. At some point I'm going to tell you to cost it and just let me know what the 30 items on this might estimate."

At the same time, when our new IT person came, I asked him, I said, "Take an inventory of our IT infrastructure and tell me what our obvious needs are in terms of maintaining a healthy infrastructure."

My intent of getting both of those and I haven't, I haven't, I haven't I have got the IT document back. The other one is still a work in progress. The intent is that at some time probably by January or February, I am told, the legislature is going to ask for our list of capital requests, of which they have recently only funded about \$10 million a year, 20 million for the biennium, \$10 million a year. So from those two lists we will probably handpick which of these projects we request to be funded by the state. Because they will only fund capital projects with this money. Okay?

Somebody, and I don't care, doesn't really matter to me who, probably someone in physical plant, alerted their cousin at the Beacon Journal or somewhere that on this list was a grand entrance. So

the Beacon Journal actually requested, or maybe it was The Plain Dealer, a copy of this document before I had even seen it back, and evidently it totaled, subtotaled, \$11 million. Even though it only had a few items that had been cost estimated. And then somehow it got reported that there was going to be, I am told, an \$11 million grand entrance to the University. So which is not true. So that's the facts, and that's the reason for the list. I will say this: The fact that we eliminated baseball does make the possibility of a potential grand entrance more, more viable.

Say that again?

Chairman Rich: The Senator will please remain in order.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Oh, sorry.

And that's where we are on my conversation.

Chairman Rich: Are there other questions for the President?

Senator Braun.

SENATOR BRAUN: Actually, it's a common fallback question and also refers to these tenure track positions, and it's more of a functional question, and it goes as follows: If you look, at least in Engineering, I'm sure it is pretty universal, so if you offer a nontenure track position, in general, less qualified people will apply. The colleagues that I have that are not here at this University and would like a University position, the major, the major attraction to them, even if the salary is not in the range that they would hope, is the security of the job. These people happen to be very good. So when you go and you offer nontrack positions, the crowd that you attract will be a less qualified crowd. The less qualified crowd will produce less qualified students. And the reputation will not go where you wish it to go.

Now, when you talk that this is something that is all over in the country, if you look at the first tier universities, they can afford to do that because, for instance, a guy who goes for an nontenure track position at MIT, after three, four years there, he can name his place. We are not in that club. So for us to attract good people, we have to give them incentives.

So now comes the question, what incentives are you going to offer to attract the top of the crowd with no job security? That's, that's, that's a conundrum for me. And not only for me, it's a viable discussion in the college.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right. I think it's a viable conversation in every college, and in every department, and it's a slightly different conversation in every college.

SENATOR BRAUN: Correct.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: And in many departments. It's a different kind of conversation, I know, in many of the professional schools. All right? So I'm happy to sit down and to deal with it kind of in the context of your college, but it's a lot easier conversation to have because the norms in the labor markets are slightly different or not slightly different, in some cases very different, depending on which discipline that we are talking about. So I would be happy to engage you kind of offline just to learn more about your unique environment.

SENATOR BRAUN: Okay.

Chairman Rich: Senator Scotto.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Chair Rich, I would just like to make a suggestion to the President that when he and the Board of Trustees decide to build a driveway up to the back end of Buchtel Hall, if he would let us know about that, why and how and when he's going to do that and how it would be funded, if he could just tell us that's what was happening, then we would be more cognitive and less affective in our discussions with the surrounding community when they ask us about it.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: May I answer?

Chairman Rich: Yes. Please.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The answer is there hasn't been a substantive conversation with anyone about this. It was one person's first observation that was written down on a notepad the way that you might have an idea moment when you are sitting at a conference and listening to someone speak of something that you might want to think about researching or doing something new in the future. It was an idea handed to someone and saying if we ever did this, what might this cost? Is this a hundred thousand dollars or is this \$10 million? If it's \$10 million, somebody is going to have to be a pretty generous donor who only cares about aesthetic issues to begin to commit that kind of money to that type of a project. If it's a hundred thousand dollars, it goes into a whole different level of thinking about how we might create something that might create an obvious you have arrived moment for a prospective student and their parents with easy access to visitor parking that might make their campus tour a lot more pleasant and a lot more rewarding and might help them make a decision. So that's all it is. I haven't had the conversation with my staff, I haven't had the I haven't got the piece of paper back yet.

SENATOR SCOTTO: But this is how we hear about everything. The ideas that might happen some

day and the things that are going to happen tomorrow or the things that happened yesterday.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR SCOTTO: And we're not hearing this and that's why we're getting all affective on you.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, I understand that. Where is that affectiveness? It's coming from somebody in the physical plant. Saying, oh, my making an assumption that, oh, my goodness, someone is about ready to spend money. And then instead of inquiring and being part of a team, engaging in a cognitive conversation, it becomes very destructive very quickly.

It gets back to

SENATOR SCOTTO: But this is how we hear about everything.

Chairman Rich: The Senator will stay in order, please.

SENATOR SCOTTO: I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: So it just gets back to the notion that we just need to decide we want to work together, and trust each other a little bit.

SENATOR BRAUN: But this is how we hear about everything.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: And move ahead with that understanding.

SENATOR BRAUN: We don't hear about it from you, we just hear about it from the Beacon Journal and The Plain Dealer.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: But why would you hear about it from me in this case? Why would I? Why would I bring this to you? Do you see my point?

SENATOR BRAUN: I do see your point, but do you see mine, that we would like to hear about things before they happen?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh huh. This hasn't happened.

SENATOR BRAUN: Like people getting laid off?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, okay. That's a different issue. I would be happy

SENATOR BRAUN: Not really.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Huh?

SENATOR BRAUN: Not really, because we don't hear about things, we don't know what's happening.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: But your representative leaders are a part of those conversations.

Okay? But your representative leaders knew that we were going to require layoffs. They might not

know the exact layoff. I didn't know the exact layoff.

I got hit in Arts and Sciences yesterday with a question of will you allow the new Dean of Graduate School to actually make any decisions? Absolutely. Just as we did with the layoffs. We came up with the ones that we thought made most sense, given the level of priorities at the institution, but we allowed the deans and vice presidents to make the final decision as to which layoffs were necessary in their area to continue the proper operation of their division.

So of course we'll let you know, but we are a representative forum. I don't have a direct forum of communication with everyone. I have a direct forum of communication with those who you elect to represent you in more of a democratic republic than a direct democracy.

Chairman Rich: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to respond to the Senator. As the Chair of the Physical Environment Committee of University Council, I can assure you that nothing like that has been brought to our attention. And we do look at those kinds of things, and we also look at them in the context of what has been done in terms of campus planning over the last 20 years.

The only reservation I have is because of our informal status as University Council and our Bylaws have not been adopted, I feel that we are on a little precarious grounds there. There was a time on this campus when Physical Environment Committee worked with the Board of Trustees Physical Environment Committee and actually made decisions together, and such changes could not be made unless there was an agreement by the chair of such committee.

I would say, however, a good example of where things have gone right was a discussion of the science library and the incorporation of that into the main library and the fact that we have been gathering information from the Library Committee, staff of the library, and the Physical Environment Committee did not take action because we didn't have all the information, and the Provost, in a very decisive moment several months ago, said this is on hold for a period of time, which I thought was a very good decision, because that's the last library space that was funded by capital projects money in the state. And if we turn that away to other uses, we will never regain it.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

Chairman Rich: I had my own question, actually, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, sir.

Chairman Rich: And that is, in the decision process about which projects to ask to be funded by the

state legislature, will the University Council's Physical Facilities Committee be consulted?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, sir, they will.

Chairman Rich: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Yeah, I have been working with a number of the people in this body for a long time in terms of trying to support a substantive and workable shared governance process at The University of Akron. I think it's been eroded over the past eight or ten years to the extent where there's very little left. There are few of us around who have been around for a while and we, you know, talk and we keep saying over and over again that there is a structure.

One of the, one of the observations I want to make is that when the structure of the institutional governance is respected by the administration and the Board of Trustees, then the kinds of affective discussions that you have referred to tend to occur in committees, where people are saying what do you mean by that? Where did this 11 million come from? It doesn't occur in the Beacon Journal, it occurs in the committee.

When, as this happened over the past few years, that gets pulled back, because of whatever reason, then we have lost the opportunity to do what you said, which is to talk about, you know, what we are going to do and how we are going to plan.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes.

SENATOR LILLIE: University Council is supposed to be, according to its Bylaws, a planning body, not a policy making body in the sense that some people think. We have said that, I have said that 20 times, other people have said it. It is ignored.

Now, I have to say recently that the issue of institutional governance, University Council, the Faculty Senate, all of it is more honored in the breach than in the observance. We hear a lot of lip service, but we don't see the structure. You need to have people who will be on the committees. You need to have people who feel their time on the committees was well spent. You need to have people such as vice presidents and others who understand that the committees of the University Council are not their committees, they are there to help, to help with the, with the proper functioning of the committees. You have to have people trained and learning how the process works. If you don't, we have the situation we have now with lots of rumors and spending a lot of time trying to track things down that we are not sure about.

I mean I didn't know until I heard about it by e mail that the name of my college had been changed.

I mean it's the kind of thing that you would think there ought to be some level of internal institutional governance that works.

Now, it's easy to say, well, I talked to your elected representatives. But that's different than respecting the entire institutional structure. Because the elected representatives may be overworked, they may have 27 other things to do, and the fact that they have been consulted doesn't mean that anybody else has learned anything about the process, learned how to communicate, learned how to say, well, okay, I hadn't seen it from that point of view before. So this is, this is maybe one of, as far as I can see, it's one of the last opportunities we have in trying to honestly get the University Council up and running, and also to get back to where we were a few years ago with the Faculty Senate, not because it's somehow going to interfere with the legitimate functioning of the University, but because it enhances the legitimate functioning of the University. We understand change is going to happen. But if it's top down, this is a push back. Or if there's no pushback, it's going to be something else that will happen without, without, without verbal or other, you know, public ways of speaking out about it.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR LILLIE: Anyhow, I really do feel that there has been ten years of missed opportunities due to hurt feelings, as much as anything else, that has led us to a situation, and, you know, which is perhaps somewhat of our own, and when I say our own, I mean everybody's making, but is really unnecessary. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I really like what you said, because here's kind of the sad reality: I think, I think there's just a disconnect between significant elements of the University who are trying to go over and beyond to make sure governance works and another segment of the University that says, well, you may be trying, but you keep missing. And it may be time, it may be time to get everybody in a room where the only topic to be discussed for two days is what is everyone's shared understanding of shared governance and how do we operationalize that at the University. Okay? Call it what you want, call it a summit, call it a meeting, call it, I don't care, but, you know, it gets back to that not so funny, but very well known statement, yeah, I believe in shared governance, depending on what my share is.

And so we just kind of need to get in the room and just decide what is everyone's share and how do we operationalize that. Because I really do have people on the board, for example, who believe

they exalted shared governance in a way that is historic by coming to your meeting to talk about a big issue. And they considered that a huge step forward in the name of shared governance. And my guess is not everybody in this room viewed it that way. You know? But they did. And so we need to take note of that reality.

So while they think they are advancing shared governance, Tim, you think we have regressed, you know, over the last ten years, a missed opportunity. Where is the truth? Or they are probably both true, depending on your perspective. Which means we just we're starting at a different place. So it may be time to get the board and your elected representative, you can't get all the faculty in the room, your elected representative, some elements of administration to have a summit on what is shared governance at The University of Akron and how will we agree to operationalize it, and because the University Council Bylaws are still not yet approved, it would be the perfect time to then inform the final approval of those University Council Bylaws by whatever comes out of the meeting, the summit.

Now, I just throw that out as--there may be a better way to do it, and I'm sure Bill and the Executive Committee and you and others will say that's not the best way to do this, but I agree with you, it's probably a time to do something because there's a lot of people who feel like they are killing themselves in the name of shared governance, but it seemingly keeps missing the mark.

You know, everyone knows this hasn't been perfect, but neither have the conditions with which we have been dealing with it been perfect. But instead of focusing on the positive improvements, we keep nitpicking the deficiencies in what we are trying to do, and then it just feels bad to everyone. And then people wake up in the morning and say do I get out of bed today?

Okay. So we don't want to get to that point. Let's not let it get to that point for everyone. So let's do something extraordinary to try to move it forward.

SENATOR LILLIE: It's been at least 15 years since the Board of Trustees has had any direct contact with faculty members that I was aware of. So I think there's a lot of history here and I just think it's important to understand that there's also a lot of goodwill. But if there is the if the continued kind of response of the board and the administration is, well, you guys really haven't understood us, I think that's not necessarily going to be the way we want to go. I think that there is an opportunity for the stakeholders to do this, but I think it's eroding.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, and so maybe we ought to get the, whatever we call it, have

someone else facilitate it that everybody would agree would be a good facilitator of something like that. I actually have been a part of something that we tried like this before. It didn't turn out like I had hoped, but nevertheless I have seen it tried before. Maybe we can learn a little from that experience. But it's better than what we are doing now, where people are just they are actually thinking they are trying and they are still getting hammered. You know? At the end of it. Or not respecting it. But we have to try something new to get everybody on the same page.

Chairman Rich: It is now 4:30.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Ooh.

Chairman Rich: We have other business to transact. I think we need to move on.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

Chairman Rich: Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you. I appreciate it.

Chairman Rich: Mr. Provost, your remarks, which I encourage you make brief, in light of the hour.

PROVOST SHERMAN: I will take that encouragement under great consideration and do exactly that, Chairman Rich.

So in light of that, I will be brief. It was great that we were able to announce the

Chairman Rich: Order, please.

PROVOST SHERMAN: faculty positions earlier this week, although it took a little bit more time than we anticipated. Really appreciate the perspectives that were offered by Chair Rich and Department Chair Matt Lee from the University Council Finance Committee. Their input, guidance, advice and perspectives were very useful as we deliberated the requests from the deans. I think it's very important to acknowledge the great work the deans did with their leadership team to make those requests following the guidelines that were placed out there for them to consider in proposing those positions, and I agree with Chair Rich that we need to proceed posthaste with the next phase of the process of making the additional decisions with regard to the faculty positions. When I get out in the community and interact with individuals about The University of Akron and they say, "How's it going?" I say it's going great. And they ask why. I say applications are up the last three years, 13,000, 18,000, 22,000. We just have to increase the yield of that increasingly more and larger body of individuals interested in this institution. Every year we graduated more students from the last five years. Our retention rates are up from the mid 60s to the mid 70s.

Graduation rates are up from the mid 30s, around 42 percent. Faculty are working absolutely great, diligently, with intentionality, and wonderfully supporting that illustration of student success. And I hope and anticipate that perhaps you would join me in articulating to the community that wonderful aspect of the great work that is happening at The University of Akron, a great University. So I think with that I'll conclude.

Chairman Rich: Thank you.

Bearing in mind the hour, are there any essential questions for the Provost?

Finally my words are having effect.

Thank you, Mr. Provost.

PROVOST SHERMAN: I appreciate it.

Chairman Rich: The next item of business on the agenda is the election of a second representative to the Graduate Council. This is the position that was held by Senator Allen and there was a brief interregnum because he was one of those who was just recently, in his case, re elected to the Senate in a runoff election in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Is there a nomination for Faculty Senate representative to the Graduate Council?

Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I nominate Senator Allen.

Chairman Rich: Senator Allen has been nominated. Are there any other nominations? Any other nominations? Any other nominations?

Is there a motion that nominations be closed and that Senator Allen being elected by acclamation?

Moved by Senator Saliga. Is there a second?

SENATOR STERNS: Second.

Chairman Rich: Seconded by Senator Sterns.

All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chairman Rich: Opposed by opposite sign?

Congratulation, Senator Allen, you are again our representative to the Graduate Council.

Next we have committee reports. If the body has no objection, I would like to dispose of the Curriculum Review Committee report before the Academic Policies Committee because I think the Curriculum Review I could be wrong, but I think the Curriculum Review Committee report will be a

quicker one. Is there any objection?

Thank you. Would you present the Curriculum Review Committee report?

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Curriculum Review Committee brings forward a list that we shared of curriculum proposals that came to us without any further comment or objections, so we bring these to you for your approval.

Chairman Rich: Is there debate on the motion to adopt the curriculum proposals in the report?

Senator Franks.

Turns out I was wrong.

SENATOR FRANKS: Oh, no. I was

Chairman Rich: I was asking for debate on the motion.

SENATOR FRANKS: Oh, no. I was trying to dispense with.

Chairman Rich: I take it there's no debate on the motion. All those in favors of the motion to adopt the curriculum proposals, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chairman Rich: Opposed by opposite sign?

The motion is adopted without dissent.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Rich: Now the Academic Policies Committee report.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: The Academic Policies Committee, or APC, brings forward a proposal for a Center For Data Science Analytics and Information Technology at The University of Akron that was distributed electronically, hopefully you had time to review it, and it comes with an addendum with some examples from the literature about the rationale that could support this. As you can see from the authorship on the front page, a good number of faculty worked on this over the summer and then finalized it in the fall after the arrival of Mario Garzia who was hired to be the executive director of the center. This comes to you as a motion from committee, doesn't need a second, for your discussion and approval.

Chairman Rich: Is there debate on the motion to approve the proposed Center For Data Science Analytics and Information Technology?

Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes, I would like to speak against this, and I think that it may possibly be a

good idea in the long run, but I would like to see it much better discussed, much better led, much better resourced. As it's set up now, it looks like it's going to cost about a million dollars a year, and we have been hearing about how we don't have a million dollars just lying around, between the salary of the director, the salary of the associate director, the salary of the assistant to the associate director, the benefits, and then a \$250,000 operating fund, and offices expenses. And so what they are planning to do with this million dollars seems rather skimpy. That is in the first year they are going to have a total of 12 hours of meetings with faculty to find out if faculty know anything about data science, and then they are also going to be talking to industry to see if industry might be ready to submit or not submit, but to hand over some money for scholarships and things like this. And I mean we already have a development office to go out and talk to industry and talk them into giving us money, so I'm not sure that we need this sort of bonus group to do this.

I'm also very concerned that it seems to be doesn't seem to be quite sure what its mission is. That is that the rationale that it gives is all about big data. Big data is a very specialized area, it's not just information technology. I do not know Mr. Garzia at all, I don't know his credentials, all I know is that he came from Microsoft, which I mean, as we all know, does software for PCs. Software for PCs is not the same as big data. I've got some very good friends in Silicon Valley whose specialty is big data. I know what they do; I don't understand what they do. So, for example, right now StrataCon is going on, which is the big international conference on big data, it's going on in New York right now. I assume Mr. Garzia is not participating in this. And he may know all about this. But he was hired without a search, and so there was no time for involved faculty who did understand these areas to assess the qualifications of different people who might know something about big data to be there in a position to assess the different qualifications of different applicants for the directorship. So that's already a question mark.

So part of it is just talking about big data, and yet big data itself is something that is run primarily by people who are trained in Computer Science or in Math or in Statistics. And although faculty from those areas were on the initial group, the ones who are set up to actually run it are from CAST, from Business and from Engineering. So they are not actually people who are in what are the core areas of big data, which this proposal is supposedly addressed to. So I'm a little bit worried that they're all associate professors, and we already overwork our associate professors. They are never going to make full at this rate.

And there's this talk about trying to raise money and have post docs and all these good things. You can't have post docs if you don't have a doctoral program. Computer Science does not have a doctoral program.

So my final biggest point, the point that is missing in this is faculty. And I find it putting the cart before the horse to approve a center before there's any discussion of having faculty for it. And they're saying they are going to like have this workshop for four hours and look around campus, are there any faculty who know anything about data? Come to our workshop. And then once we have identified them in the first four hour workshop, then maybe we will have another workshop, and, gee, now that we have identified you, what do you know?

So it just seems to me that it's being put together for a million dollar project, it's being put together on the cheap. That is that we just sort of tried to cobble together pieces from around campus, hope they look like we know something about big data even if we don't. I mean like do they talk about Mahout? Do they talk about Apache Drill? No, they don't talk about any of these good things.

These are things that my friends told me.

So it just strikes me that for us to say that we have a data center that is going to address big data, when we don't, strikes me as a big waste of a million dollars that we don't have.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Appreciate your comments. Thank you.

Chairman Rich: Is there other debate on the motion?

Senator Allen?

SENATOR ALLEN: I whoops, I'm falling over.

I read the letter from Dr. Sastry. I believe he was saying that there were three or four other centers that are popping up, and I was wondering what the strategic differentiation was of this one from theirs and how it differed.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: You will have to refresh my memory about this.

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes. In other words, we have apparently we're a little late to the game for this perhaps, and there may be some others popping up. And I was wondering how this one was different and if we had a strategic advantage that they didn't have.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: It's my understanding that the intended difference here is to intimately couple the work of this center with the needs of the local economy, the local industry. That's why

Dr. Garzia has been out meeting with leadership in the region. That's the first primary goal, in my understanding, is to try and provide a format through which our students in the disciplines that are to be represented by the center, not taken over by the center, but pooled together by the center, so that the industrial people know where to go when they are looking to hire our students. That was part of the message the President sent out last year about this, was that he's hearing from industrial people that they don't know where to go on our campus to hire people, students with the skills that are needed. So the idea first and foremost, in my understanding, is to have the center bring together as many people, including Economics, as Senator Erickson had suggested, that do train students in areas related to IT, big data and analytics, all of which, to my understanding, are also sparse in these areas, are different, they're not one and the same. It's a three legged stool. And, to me, I see the value in having a center that can help our academic programs come together to have what we have always asked for, is interdisciplinary type training and work for our students, and potentially jobs. Most of the students in these areas are really looking for employment upon graduation.

So that's the first step. I think that the fact that we hired someone from outside who isn't part of the University until recently, to me, the idea of having summits or retreats or forums where you ask people if you are interested, come and let's talk, I don't know how much more shared governance you can get than asking the people that would be the players to come and help us build the thing rather than say, we built it, okay, are you now interested?

So, yes, it may not be as well defined as one might imagine or hope, but I can think of other center proposals that were not well defined either, they were primarily driven by faculty, got together, started an idea, the idea turned into something that looks very different than the original idea, because other faculty had got involved, which is the way it's going to work.

So to me, and to APC at least, there was only one abstention from the vote, everyone else was unanimous for this. The one abstention was from Senator Klein, your colleague.

Chairman Rich: Dr. Garzia, do you wish to address the body?

DR. GARZIA: Sure. I'd be happy to.

Chairman Rich: You don't have to.

DR. GARZIA: Is there any question? Would you like me to come up or

Chairman Rich: You may stand where you are.

DR. GARZIA: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you for the comments. I think that the basic idea is to do something that's collaborative. I have friends in big data, too. I did big data, for many years, so and I'm happy to share that with you.

The idea here is not to cobble together anything we can and then put a shiny name on it. I think the idea here is to see what we do have, do an assessment both external and internal, find out what the interest is within the University, what we do have available, where the gaps are, and how that compares with what the local businesses, huge businesses that we have in the area, like Smuckers, Goodyear, et cetera, what their needs are. And they have lots of needs that are unmet. And the whole thing is to build together a center that's right for us here at this University in this industry. And otherwise, you know, we could define something in a vacuum, but then it may not work for the University, it may not work for the environment that we are in.

Chairman Rich: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: It's hard to tell you how much it pains me to say that our colleague here may be right in terms of some of the collaborative issues that have gone on in the last few months with regard to this. As I recall, we first heard about this particular center in the spring, and it was just a couple of pages and it was very vague. And then over the summer the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was asked to approve it. And the Faculty Senate Executive Committee said no, we need more information, we need to have it looked at, we need to have it fleshed out.

This report, for what it's worth, is a result of that process. In other words, it was sent back, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee said no, you need to do more work on it, it went back to the committee, and then it came back through our regular process, now, through the Academic Policies Committee and is now being presented to us here.

I'm just speaking at this point about the process. I'm not speaking about the merits of the proposal. But I am saying that at this point, this is the kind of thing that does illustrate what happens when there is a shared governance process that works. I have to admit that, just, again, from the process point of view and from being dinged a few times over the past year or so, I don't think we have got a really good track record that if we approve something now it won't morph into something else in the future. However, at this point I must say that this particular process went through the governance structure that we have, and I think that's something that we need to bear in mind. That

doesn't mean that people shouldn't vote the way they think they should vote, it's just that this is, this is one of those things that didn't, didn't get dropped on us at the last minute, that the administration did say, okay, well, we'll go back and look at it again, and I think that's something that has to be said. Thank you.

Chairman Rich: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the Chair of APC, indeed I was part of that discussion over the summer when I was in Australia about the data center and the original report that came from the group that sent that first report that we did not accept. What puzzled me is that this was done in August, I know, because that was when I was in Australia and that's when the Executive Committee voted on it, and this is just one month?

Now, what we asked at the time was that it be fleshed out a lot more, that it did, in fact, come up with something that was the that it didn't just describe Senator Lillie has been talking about processes within shared governance, but the new potential leader of the center has talked about the process and you talked about the process within the system, and that's what I remember from the original report, was the notion of process. It was not filled out as much maybe as it is now, but we asked that it be much more clear and much more developed, and I at this stage, in terms of my vote, I want to know how it was that within four weeks you were you know, what did you do, how much did you changes did you make and what did you feel that you now could bring it because it met what the Executive Committee thought were the problems. Because obviously in most cases the Senate would have heard those problems because it was done during the year, you know, but now this is one where we in EC did it, but, you know, nobody else essentially knew about it.

Now, could you tell us what was the process and why you think it was okay now and wasn't before?

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: I'd be happy to. Actually, it wasn't me or APC proper that did the work, it was actually the three faculty that are listed here, Shiva Sastry and Bill McHenry and John Nicholas, two of whom are Senators, and obviously Shiva isn't here today, but they really worked exceptionally hard.

SENATOR ERICKSON: This month.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: This month. All this work

Chairman Rich: Last month. This is October.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Last month. I'm sorry. September.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Last month. So basically since the end of August, when the Executive Committee said this doesn't have enough meat on the bones, they really worked extremely hard to put this thing together. It's much different than when the EC looked at it in August. Because of the hard work of the faculty. The three primary faculty or the three lead authors that are on this. And then when Dr. Garzia arrived, September 15th, they met with him and fleshed it out further and then all of them came to the APC meeting to present. And questions were answered to the satisfaction of Academic Policies Committee. That is the body that Senator Lillie mentions that brings center and institute closest to the Senate. It seemed to the Academic Policies Committee that its questions were answered, they saw the passion and the hard work of the faculty in only a few weeks to try to build something new, but not an exclusive club, which I think APC also resonated with, that this would be open, to people in all disciplines, not just the main departments, because there may be experts or people who wish to become experts in some of these areas, that are not in departments that we would think of a priori.

So the idea of having an open call and letting faculty who are interested come together, personally, I think, is a really nice model for building something new that we haven't had before. I don't know how centers in the past, the ones that I wasn't involved in, were conceived of and built, but this one looks like, to me, following the kind of process that we followed to this point, is the real way to build something and invest money at the University, and really with the goal of helping our students, helping our faculty, okay, and then also, of course, coupled with the needs of the industry. So Chairman Rich: I do want to add that it was I who asked Senators Professors Sastry, Nicholas and McHenry to work together to make the latest set of revisions, and I do know from having talked to each of them and occasionally met with them that they worked very hard during the month of September, and I wish to thank them for it.

Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Chairman Rich. I just also had a question about the process. I have, you know, in the past three years, being on Senate and the APC, it's been really great to learn how the University functions, but one thing that I just kept thinking about after, actually after the APC meeting, during which this was discussed, I also think that this could be a wonderful center, but in terms of centers that start sort of through the initiative of faculty and then get approved and then maybe there would be if it was deemed necessary to have a director, that, you know, with import, that's

different from this where what if this didn't pass the committee or Senate and then we have hired a director already, so I just want to I guess, I'm trying to understand the process here, how and you have said, yes, this is a different kind of center than, you know, sort of the other way in which it is put together. I guess I just don't understand why there would be a director hired before this, the center, has been approved.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: That's a good question. I don't have, I don't have a direct answer like I usually do. I think that it must have been an opportunity that an alum, Dr. Garzia, was leaving Microsoft from a very high profile position, he's from the area, had an interest in coming back, it was an opportunity presented to the University, I think it was seized, with the intent of following the regular process to build something that could benefit many of us for many years to come. It's a different route, okay, but at the same time, sometimes I think when opportunities present, decisions makers paid to make decisions, they have to make the call. And I think, in my opinion, that's what happened in this case, and I think it was a good call, from my short term interacting with Dr. Garcia. And he's coming to APC of his own free will to make the case, and it took the day. And, again, he's here today to answer your questions if you have technical details that I can't answer.

Chairman Rich: Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Thank you. And I applaud the process and I'm glad to hear that things have proceeded that way. I guess I'm curious as to the practical implications of a slightly longer delay in making a decision given that Dr. Garzia has been brought on staff, he has begun the process, and there are committees working on this already, I'm curious as to what the feedback has been from the potential community partners, I look at the dues structure, the contribution structure, and I'd feel better making a decision having heard a little bit more feedback from outside as to, yeah, this is a great idea or, no, you're barking up the wrong tree. So if we were to not make a decision this month and put it off until December or January, get some more feedback from the community, is the process harmed in any way?

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: I don't know if I would use the word "harm," in particular because I didn't do all the work, and didn't do basically any of the work. The faculty did the work. I think when people put that much energy and effort of their own time, overworked associate professors, undersupported, potentially, associate professors, because they have, they see the value, the resident experts in the area see the value of having such a center, I tend to defer to their judgment.

If they were willing to put up that much effort, there must be something there. And if it doesn't pan out, well, I'm sure Dr. Garzia will be the first to say, look, this isn't working. And since he moved here all the way from Seattle, I figure he believes in this, too.

Chairman Rich: Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: I have two general questions about one about the structure of the center, so as you said, this is a different format for a center than at least I have seen here at the University where they are reporting to the Office of Academic Affairs rather than a college or a department or whoever the varying structures are throughout the University, so

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: That's not quite true.

SENATOR WILLITS: That's what it says in the proposal.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Well, no, it is true that the center will report to Office of Academic Affairs. So does the Corrosion Center, so does the Biomimicry Center, so does the Center for the History of the Archives of Psychology, so does the Innovation Practice Center. These all report

SENATOR WILLITS: So there's a number of centers that do report there.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: They all report to the Center For Academic Affairs. They are interdisciplinary centrally located centers in order to not have them buried in a college. That's the key, is to have centralized centers so the deans can be convinced to have their faculty be supported to work across the college boundaries, which

SENATOR WILLITS: And I completely agree with that. I think that that is a good center a better center model than sticking it within a department. That's my personal opinion.

The problem with it, though, is that you have, and, again, this is from what I got from the proposal, for they are using a fee structure for companies, which is great, and the money was noted to be used for student scholarships and projects, which is fine. But then that's not a self supporting center. So if you have an executive director and a director and staff that aren't teaching, so in terms of the faculty, they are not they have a weird type of faculty position in terms of they are not teaching or interacting with students, so how do we if we are going to start centers, I really believe that they should be ultimately self supporting. So how is that model or is that model even part of this review?

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: I think I can't disagree with the concept that a center should be self supporting or that it should be part of the whole. I think the fee structure is intended to begin to do

that, to begin to raise money. I think first I like the emphasis of supporting the students first, projects by the faculty.

To my knowledge, there are very few self supporting centers on this campus. David Baker Center I believe is partially self supporting. The salary is not supported by the center, it's supported by the University.

The only one that I know of right now that's fully supported by its own idea is the Corrosion Center. So it's a very rare model on this campus. Good goal to have. Hard to manage, hard to sustain. So I am not going to assume that in, you know, three to five years the center under discussion will be fully self supporting. Meaning all salaries, all benefits, light bill, et cetera. But that is obviously part of the idea, is to raise money from industry. That's a start. Unlike many of our centers don't even have that in their in the idea. Okay?

Chairman Rich: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Well, I'd like to address the issue of how centers are created. Since I have been a director of the Institute For Lifespan Development and Gerontology, it will be 40 years in February, when at the time, through a process of groups of faculty coming together wishing to develop research and applications and working with the community in the field of aging. What happened was that there were many faculty who wanted to add aging as an area to their academic teaching and research, so they came together as a group, we actually had a developmental period of a couple of years and then we were officially designated by the President of the University as a multidisciplinary center. We did report originally to the Provost's Office, but then various administrative shifts have put us elsewhere. We were able to garner initially a half million dollars from the Administration on Aging that got us launched for a couple of years, and then we, because of our courses and so forth, we then take on additional research projects. We got most recently 12 years of continuous funding from the National institute of Developmental Disability Research, and more recently we have not had funding, but we do have an academic program that reaches across the University, I think we have given certificates with 22 different majors in gerontology.

But the point I want to make is it benefits the faculty. And the students. In that people can have a professional role that encompasses this particular area that augments what they are doing and it is valued and supported. And so, to me, no one quite understood necessarily almost 40 years ago what we were going to do, but it has changed our campus, it has changed what we do. I just wish I

had a budget like the one that is proposed.

Chairman Rich: It is now after 5 o'clock. Is there further debate on the motion?

I take it you are ready yes, Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: Just one question/comment. What if faculty aren't interested, other than the three that wrote the proposal?

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Well, there were others interested, obviously, over the summer. They are listed at the bottom of the front page of the proposal. The three at the top did all the work recently.

SENATOR SALIGA: I know some of those. I'm not

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: If what we have heard is true, that big data is a big deal in Silicon Valley, you have heard from Senator Bouchard, that Dr. Garzia knows because he's been in this business for many years, that this is a big deal, that there's just recently other centers popping up at institutions we would all probably like to work at if they would have us, I think there's probably a lot of faculty interested in this, and if they are not, it'll dry up and blow away. Right? Because it will be a failure. So, to me, Dr. Garzia is putting his time and his reputation on the line to make this thing work. But it's for the faculty and the students. If there aren't faculty and students interested, there's a problem, because we have a lot of students in areas that are related to this three legged stool. Lots of students. So I have a hard time believing there aren't associated lots of faculty, maybe not a lot -- maybe not a lot, enough, okay, for some of you, in those very disciplines that are very much interested in seeing how they can pull together to make more than the sum of the parts. Which is what I believe is the value of the center, is to empower the faculty with administrative support and finances to do what they do best collectively.

Chairman Rich: Is there any further debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, which is to approve the proposal to create a Center For Data Science Analytics and Information Technology, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chairman Rich: Opposed by opposite sign?

(Several nays.)

Chairman Rich: In the judgment of the chair, the ayes have it. The motion is adopted.

VICE PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you.

Chairman Rich: There is an informational report from the Athletics Committee. Is there an oral report?

SENATOR NICHOLAS: No oral report.

Chairman Rich: Is there a report from the University Council representatives?

SENATOR LILLIE: I think you have heard sort of the spirit of the report from me earlier. The University Council next meeting is next Tuesday, and we continue to hope that there will be some resolution of some of the issues that have come before you. At this point we're still in the process of trying to figure out how to move forward. Very often we have trouble meeting a quorum, so there are some serious issues with regard to the University Council that may need to be talked about later, but right now I would wait until at least after the next meeting.

Chairman Rich: Thank you.

It being 5:07, is there any objection to our postponing yet again the resolution concerning online evaluations?

Hearing no objection, we will postpone that.

Is there any new business to come before the body? Any new business?

Anything for the good of the order?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: I just had this.

Chairman Rich: Out loud.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: I just wanted to let you all know, if you don't already, there is a Town Hall Meeting offered for students that this is being hosted by the USG President Taylor Swift, and this is October 5th, 3 o'clock, Student Union Theater. Please encourage your students to attend that.

And I wanted to also let you know

Chairman Rich: You want to mention that he's

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Oh, featuring Dr. Scarborough. I'm sorry. Featuring Dr. Scarborough. I will leave this here and you can look at it as you leave if you want.

And there is an upcoming AAUP Chapter Meeting. If you are a member, I hope you attend. October 22nd, Thursday, noon to 2:30, Student Union, Room 335. There will be food, and if you have not yet joined, there will be membership forms available at the door as well.

Chairman Rich: Thank you.

Anything else for the good of the order?

I take it you are ready to adjourn. I hereby declare us adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.