

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

FACULTY SENATE

3 SEPTEMBER, 2015

3:00 pm. - 5:15 p.m.

CHAIR RICH: The September meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. The Agenda was distributed electronically, there are two corrections that need to be made. The first is the deletion of item II, adoption of the April and May meetings. Those minutes have not been circulated. We're not in a position to adopt them. Also under item 7, Senate elections, the second to last item. Under that item, representatives to graduate council, it should say one representative one-year term, I'll explain that later. That was clerical error in the preparation of the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed with the modifications that I just mentioned?

SENATOR SCHAEFFER: So moved.

CHAIR RICH: Seconded by Senator Landis. Any changes anyone else wishes to propose to the agenda? All of those in favor of adopting the agenda, please say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR RICH: Opposed by opposite sign? The agenda is adopted. The next item is the chairman's remarks.

Welcome back for the new academic year. Welcome to the newly elected members of the Senate: College of Arts and Sciences, Todd Blackledge, Daniel Coffey, Kathryn Feltey and Travis Hreno; The College of Health Professions, Marc Haas; University of Libraries, Ian McCullogh; the USG, Taylor Swift. Congratulations to recently re-elected Senators: College of Arts and Sciences, Pam Schulz; College of Business Administration, John Matejkovic; part-time faculty, Shannon Osorio; School of Law Sharon Morath and me.

For the information of those who are new to the Senate, and as a reminder to those who are returning, the Faculty Senate is the legislative body of the faculty at the University level; it's meetings are relatively

formal and are conducted according to its bylaws and Robert's Rules of Order. If you wish to address the body, please hold up your nametag to seek the recognition of the Chair, and please be sure that your name is facing the Chair, not you, and it is right-side up so that it can be read by the Chair. Please do not speak until recognized by the Chair. If I should fail to say your name when recognizing you, please state it when you begin to speak so that your remarks may be properly attributed in the record.

This meeting is being transcribed. Please do not make noise that may make it difficult for the transcriber to hear the proceedings. When you speak, please bear in mind that your remarks will be transcribed for all the world to see. For new members of the Senate, we will be conducting an orientation session in the near future.

Today's Agenda includes several elections, including, Faculty Senate Chair, Faculty Senate secretary, Executive Council, two seats, Faculty Senate representative to the Graduate Council, Faculty Senate representative to the Ohio Faculty Council and Alternate Faculty senate representative to the Ohio Faculty Council.

Like the terms of the Faculty Senate Chair and secretary, the term of the Vice-Chair is expiring. The incumbent Vice-Chair, Jon Miller, stood for reelection to the Senate this Spring and is a candidate in the run-off election which is to be conducted shortly in the College of Arts and Sciences. Following prior practice, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee decided to defer the election of a Vice-Chair until the Senate's October meeting, by which time the run-off election in the College of Arts and Sciences should have been completed. Similarly, one of the Senate's two incumbent representatives to the graduate council is in a run-off election for the reelection to the Senate in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Executive Committee has decided to defer the election of one of the Senate's representatives to the Graduate Council until the Senate's October meeting.

This has been, to say the least, an eventful summer at the University of Akron. There is much for us to discuss in this and successive meetings of the Senate. For now, I wish to make but a few observations: First, the expenditure cuts included in the budget for the current fiscal year, 2016, were severe, too deep not to have a significant impact on the operations of the University in many areas. Second, we believe the departure of the 161 colleagues and friends whose positions were eliminated as a result of these cuts. Third, there were no lay-offs of faculty. Fourth, this does not necessarily mean that there

have been no cuts in faculty positions. There were quite a few faculty positions vacated as a result of retirements and other separations. What remains to be seen is how many and what kind of faculty positions will be authorized to be filled through searches to be conducted this academic year. The process for making these decisions is underway, and the administration has promised to conclude this process and announce the results this month, which would allow the searches to begin earlier than in previous years, thereby allowing the university to compete more successfully for the best faculty candidates than it has in previous years. Fifth, 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 the faculty. I expect to be able to report the results in our next meeting, so that we can evaluate how well the University has done at seizing this opportunity.

Next item on the agenda is special announcements.

Dr. Eberhard A. Meinecke, Professor Emeritus of Polymer Science and Mechanical Engineering and a founding faculty member of the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering, died May 23 at the age of 81. Dr. Meinecke taught and researched at the University for 31 years. As a frontrunner in the application of rheology and the mechanical behavior of plastics and rubber, Dr. Meinecke Mentored more than 100 doctoral students during his time at University of Akron.

Dr. Lindgren Chyi, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Geosciences, died June 11. Professor Chyi earned his Ph.D. in geology in 1972 from McMaster University, joined University of Akron as an assistant professor in 1979 and retired in 2014.

Professor Emeritus of Music and Director Emeritus of Bands, Robert D. Jorgensen died July 4th doing what he loved, conducting the Freedom Brass Band during a Fourth of July celebration in downtown Akron when he fell ill. Professor Jorgensen retired from the University in 2013 after serving for 26 years as director of the University's bands. He also served as Assistant Director of the School of Music. Professor Jorgensen received a bachelor's degree from the University of Illinois and a master's degree from Michigan State University. Before joining the faculty at the University of Akron in 1987, he was on the faculty of Morehead State University in Kentucky, and was the director of bands at Midwestern State University in Texas. The recipient of various awards and honor, professor Jorgensen served as

President of the Mid-American Conference Band Directors Association.

Dr. David E. Kyvig, Professor Emeritus of History, died June 22 at the age of 71. Kyvig earned a B.A. cum laude at Kalamazoo College in 1966 and a Ph.D. in American History at Northwestern University in 1971, shortly before joining University of Akron. He retired on July 1, 1999. Kyvig then joined Northern Illinois University in 1999 as a professor of history. He retired from Northern Illinois University with the title distinguished research Professor Emeritus. The author of several books, Kyvig received the 1997 Bancroft Prize for his work, "Explicit and Authentic Acts: Amending the U.S. constitution, 1776-1995."

Nathan F. Cardarelli, Professor Emeritus of General Technology and adjunct fellow in the Institute for Life Span Development and Gerontology, died on July 7 at the age of 84. Prior to joining the University in 1966 as a part-time counselor in what was the then Evening College, Cardarelli had a varied career, working at NASA and the B.F. Goodrich company and as consultant for the World Health Organization. He is credited with more than 50 Patents. On September 1, 1968 Cardarelli became a full-time associate professor in the Community and Technical College, now the College of Applied Science and Technology. He was promoted to professor in 1978. Until he retired in 1993, professor Cardarelli had a variety of titles, including coordinator of general technology and coordinator of chemical technology.

Dr. Stanley Akers, assistant Professor Emeritus, University Libraries Collection Management, died on July 9 at the age of 70. He joined the University in January 1967 and retired in December 1997. He earned a B.S. and M.S. at the University of Akron and a Ph.D. at Kent State University. Following his retirement, Akers taught both social science and natural science colloquia as a senior lecturer in the Honors College. He taught as recently as this past spring semester. He is survived by his wife, Sarah Akers, who was head of interlibrary loans for University libraries circulation at the time of her retirement in 2004. She has worked part time as an associate lecturer in the Honors College.

Dr. Lynn Rodeman Metzger, Distinguished Senior Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology and Classical Studies, died July 24 at the age of 78. Metzger earned bachelor's and master's degrees at the University of Akron before earning a Ph.D. in Anthropology at Case Western Reserve University in 1989. She joined the University of Akron faculty in 1973. She ended her full-time assignment as a visiting assistant professor in classical studies, anthropology and archaeology in May 2002. Dr. Metzger

continued teaching part time through December 2014 in the Department of Anthropology and Classical Studies, the Department of Sociology and the Honors College. She received the Buchtel Award in Humanities in 2008.

Clifford J. Isroff died on June 30 at the age of 79. Mr. Isroff served as a Trustee of the University of Akron, having been appointed by Governor George Voinovich to a nine-year term in 1998. Isroff served on numerous board Committees and played a vital role in shaping the New Landscape for Learning building campaign that transformed the University's physical campus. He also was a director of the University of Akron Research Foundation and was awarded an Honorary Doctorate from the University in 2001. That same year, Mr. Isroff and his wife Judy, received the Bert A. Polsky Humanitarian Award for their contributions to the Akron area. An Akron native, Isroff was president and CEO of Sterling Jewelers, Chairman of the manufacturing firm I Corporation, and a longtime director of FirstMerit Corporation. Isroff also served in leadership positions on the boards of numerous nonprofit organizations, including Akron General Medical Center, The Akron Community Foundation, the Akron Jewish Foundation, Archbishop Hoban High School, the Cleveland Orchestra and the Blossom Music Center.

Edward L. Bittle, who served on the Board of Trustees from 2002 to 2011, died August 1 at the age of 80. A 1968 alumnus, Bittle is the founder of Seal Master Corporation and ELBEX Corporation, both based in Kent. At University of Akron he was a member of the Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity and Phi Alpha Theta Honorary Society. Throughout his long career, Bittle was active in the community as well as his alma mater, where he lectured in entrepreneurship classes. He also served as president of the Varsity "A" Association and served on the University College Advisory council and the Zip Athletic Club Advisory Board. Bittle was awarded an honorary Ph.D. from the University of Akron in 2011, an Alumni Honor Award for Excellence in Professional Achievement in 1994, and the "Red" Cochran Award for Meritorious Service in 1999. He and his wife, Francis, endowed "The Edward L. Bittle Scholarship" and "the Bittle Residency in Jazz."

Would you all please rise for a moment of silence in honor of our deceased colleagues.

(Moment of silence.)

CHAIR RICH: Thank you.

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

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Since it last met on May 7th, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met seven times by itself and four times with the President and the Provost.

The Executive Committee first met on May 21st to prepare for the meeting with the Provost. The President was unable to attend. We next met with the Provost. We were updated on College Strategic Planning Process, the review of Deans, the HLC focused site visit report, Vision 2020 Summit, Trustees' consideration of University Council Bylaws, the General Education Core 13 plan, the polytechnic marketing campaign, the College of Education's independent school, the state higher education budget, enrollment projections and admissions. We also discussed graduate assistantship contract deadlines.

The Executive Committee next met on June 4th to discuss regular Senate business. We discussed the budget planning process. We certified the elections of senators from Fine Arts, Natural Sciences and the Humanities Division of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences. We were unable to certify the votes of Social Sciences and "At Large" because no one received a majority of the votes, and thus a runoff election is needed. The Executive Committee also made several committee appointments.

The executive meeting met on June 18th to conduct regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the President and the Provost. The Executive Committee certified the election results for BCAS. The Executive Committee certified the election of Senator Coffey for an "at large" seat. Runoff elections must be conducted for the other three seats.

The Executive Council certified the election of Senator Feltey for the Social Sciences Division. The College of Arts and Sciences will need to conduct runoff elections to fill the other two seats. Later that afternoon, the executive council met with the President, Provost and Vice-Provost. We also discussed Gen Ed Core 13, the budget, allocation of graduate assistants for fiscal year 2017, process and criteria for allocation of replacement faculty positions for fiscal year 2017, and proposed changes to the academic calendar. We were updated on recent and planned administrative appointments, the implementation of college Strategic Plans, the polytechnic marketing campaign, and admissions and enrollment projections for the Fall semester.

The Executive Committee met on July 16 to prepare for the meeting with the President, Provost and Vice-Provost. Later that afternoon, the executive council met with the President, Provost and Vice-Provost. We were updated on the General Education Core classes, the allocation of graduate assistants for fiscal year 2017. We discussed the appointment of a general education coordinator and the proposed changes to the academic calendar. We also discussed the Corps of Cadets and the Leadership Academy. The executive council was updated on undergraduate admissions and enrollment projections.

The executive council met on August 10th for regular Senate business. The executive council made Committee appointments. We also discussed Trust Navigators, success coaches, the UA press, E.J. Thomas, and the proposal to approve the Center for Data Science, Analytics, and Information Technology.

FSEC concluded that in light of the large allocation of resources the Center would require, the proposal needs further development; that faculty from the relevant academic units should be more involved in the development of the proposal than they have been so far; that the proposal should be more specific about what the Center would do; that the proposal should present reasonably concrete evidence of the need for the activities in which the Center would engage; and that a more fully developed proposal should be submitted to APC in the Fall for eventual consideration by the Faculty Senate.

The Executive Council met on August 25th for regular Senate business. Later that afternoon, the Executive Council met with the President, Provost and Vice-Provost. The Executive Council was updated on the Gen Ed core. We discussed the need for a general education coordinator to be appointed this year. We discussed when allocations for graduate assistants might be expected. The Executive Council was updated on the allocation of replacement faculty positions for fiscal year 2017; announcement expected mid-September. We discussed the academic calendar. A draft of a proposed revised academic calendar will go out soon including rationale. We discussed the UA press, the Trust Navigator success coaches and the Honors College.

The Executive Council met August 27th to prepare the Agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

This concludes the Executive Council's report.

CHAIR RICH: Secretary Schulze, there was a -- I think at least once instance in which the Executive Committee acted on behalf of the Senate over the summer.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: I did not capture that.

CHAIR RICH: The one I recall is the approval of the graduation list --

SECRETARY SCHULZE: That was on the 21st --

CHAIR RICH: If you say so. I don't remember the date. That requires ratification by the body. Any other instances in which the Executive Committee acted on behalf of the Senate over the summer? I don't recall any. Anyone else?

The Executive Committee puts before you the questions of the ratification of the Executive Committee's approval on behalf of the Faculty Senate of the summer graduation list. Are you ready to vote on that? All in favor of ratifying the Executive Committee's approval of the graduation list, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed by opposite sign. Thank you. Motion is adopted.

Are there any questions about the Executive Committee report for the secretary? Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the President. President Scarborough.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. It is always a pleasure. Senators, it is a pleasure to be with you as we begin a new academic year. I know we have much to discuss and I would like to begin by providing some context for our discussion.

When I took the office of the presidency a little over a year ago it became clear to me that the institution faced two key challenges that we needed to face together: First, the financial issues of the institution, the financial shortcomings that were presented to me during the interview process; and in second, where the enrollment declines that the university has been experiencing in recent years. And one of the things I wanted to show you is really what our biggest problem is that we're trying to solve. So this is a look at the university's enrollment over the last five years. It really represents the largest challenge

that we have because when the university decided to rebuild the campus over the last 15 years and incurred about 500 million of bonded indebtedness to do that, I think it did so with the expectation that enrollment would increase not decrease. Given the fact that that bond -- that that bonded indebtedness is still outstanding, the fact that we're growing smaller, represents a huge challenge for the institution because we have so many fixed costs. Roughly on a \$500 million annual operating budget. Our annual debt service alone is 36 million a year. That's 7% of our budget right off the top that represents amounts that we have to pay in debt service.

The issue of the financial issues: The persistent enrollment declines were clearly, again, what we had to address. There were immediate, critical problems that needed addressed and directive action. The first step was to make sure everybody was aware that these were the challenges needed to be addressed. For almost the entire year I attempted to explain to almost every constituency, reminded them often of our vital need to address these issues.

For about six months the administration's financial team worked diligently with key stakeholders on how to best do that. We had -- we tried to make the process as transparent as possible, as practical, given the challenges that we faced. Representatives of key stakeholders participated in regular meetings at which we shared and discussed ideas and what progress that we were making to date.

As a result of all of that good work, on June 10th the University of Akron Board of Trustees approved a proposed budget which unfortunately required us to implement a reduction in force and to eliminate or significantly change several non-active programs to improve the University's overall financial condition. As Chair Rich mentioned, the reduction in force eliminated over 200 non-faculty positions of which approximately 160 were filled. About a third of the eliminated positions were professional, managerial or higher posts. We eliminated as much of the administrative costs as we could. It is something that I think faculties across the country have longed for for some period of time.

All of these reductions were painful. They were in our opinion necessary steps that now

have placed us in a position to make the investments that we need to make to grow stronger and to move forward. The new budget was designed to try to address both of our key challenges, the financial shortcomings and the persistent enrollment declines.

The first issue, the financial shortcomings, you can address to some extent through cost reduction but the persistent enrollment decline, that actually requires investment in order to see the road that we need. In the new budget we do now have funds to invest in opportunities that make our university financially stronger and attract more students. One of our top priorities now is to invest those funds in ways that advance college strategic plans, including the hiring of new faculty.

We will invest in university initiatives that also will help us attract more students. We have already accomplished much that will help us to do that in future years. Nine of our eleven colleges do have updated strategic plans, and in some cases surprisingly we're already seeing some positive results. For example, in the School of Law, new student enrollments are up 26% this year. This, at a time when law school enrollments across the nation are plummeting.

We have expanded our recruitment efforts, and as a result this freshman class enrollment is up 5.3%. It is the largest freshman class since 2012, and the number of freshman honor college students has increased 10% this year.

Last year we implemented several of the university initiatives to begin the process of attempting to attract new students and grow enrollments. We announced the new National Center for Choreography with Dance Cleveland. We have submitted a proposal to the Faculty Senate for a new Center for Data Science and IT. What we know from meeting with many companies in the region is that there are literally thousands of unfilled IT jobs. The question that we are addressing is how can we organize to better meet the need, that opportunity, especially a time when enrollment is such a critical issue for us.

We have a new Center for Experiential Learning, Entrepreneurship, Civic Engagement to elevate our already strong position in experiential learning. Something that's very

important and exciting to perspective students.

We have introduced low-cost general education courses through Wayne College to attempt to thwart the enrollment gains that community colleges enjoy because of their price advantage. We have implemented new success coach program trying to retain more of the students that we attract to the university. We have implemented a new Corp of Cadets and Leadership Academy to attempt to attract a new type of student, a different profile of student than we have been able to recruit in large numbers in the past.

We have a new partnership with fairly well-known individual and their foundation, the Lebron James Family Foundation, not only to help Akron kids but also to attempt to brand our college of Education in a distinctive way. We have a new branding initiative to try to strengthen the University of Akron name in distances and geographies further away from Summit County and the five continuous counties in our expanded recruitment areas. Bottom line, we need to recruit more aggressively both at home and beyond to attract more and better students if we're to thrive in this changing landscape of higher education.

In addition to the college and university initiatives, on May the 15th we did announce our intent to try to embrace the historical strengths of this university in the polytechnic areas to enhance and strengthen our brand in parts of the state and country where we'll increase our recruitment areas. I believe many prospective students will identify with this new brand persona in the sciences and in the arts and in humanities and the professionals.

I would like to at this time -- with your permission, I would like to show you a video that really kind of represents our first attempt to take the announcement of an initiative and to bring life to that new brand persona. It is part of a new branding campaign that we hope to launch sometime over the Labor Day Weekend. Joe, is it going to work?

JOE: Yes. It will be good. You see the light switch there? I don't know which switch it is. There is a switch over there. Okay.

(Video playing).

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: This represents our first significant attempt to try to define what it means to be a student, a member of the community at the University of Akron. It is an attempt to say to not only those in Summit County and the five contiguous counties, it is an attempt to say not only to the 80% of the students that we get from Northeast Ohio, but it is an attempt to say to students in Pittsburgh and in Chicago and Detroit and in areas from which we need to recruit greater number of students in the future, 'Would you like to be a part of this experience?' This experience is unique, this experience is different, this experience is better, and therefore it makes sense for you to choose to jump over three other state universities and two other very good private universities and choose to attend The University of Akron.

This gives you a sense of the flavor of how we'll attempt to do that. This gently introduces the theme for -- those who study marketing will tell you that there will be different layers of this that we'll build off of this introductory theme, layers that show up in 30-second spots, 60-second spots in signage, in print material, in micro websites, social media, all attempting to reach students with a message that we're worth the choice to come here from areas that we have not historically recruited from.

We have tried to consult and to involve, you know, a wide spectrum of our community on how best to do this, how best to address the financial issue, how best to grow enrollment. As any process, as any shared governance process dictates, not everyone can participate directly, but hundreds of people did, hundreds of people have, representing every constituency from students, faculty, staff, alumni, community leaders. These constituencies are represented by good people who did their best to make good decisions on behalf of all of these groups.

We made and initiated plans for financial reengineering that were difficult. We made and initiated plans to reverse enrollment growth and to try to return to a position of growth and strength. I believe last year we accomplished much because we attempted much. Along the way, there is no question, we made some mistakes. We understood and we actually talked about it during the process that mistakes were likely, perhaps even unavoidable, when you try to tackle these big, complex problems under strict time

constraints. We resolved during the process that we would identify our missteps when they became clear, that we would try to fix them immediately, learn from them, and then continue on. I mean, after all, we do tell our students to be innovators, to take calculated risks. We tell our students not to fear failure because setbacks and dead ends are an inevitable part of the innovation process. We do tell them to research available information, consult others, shrug off self-doubt, and when you have done everything that you can, to move forward when you have great challenges that we must solve. That's what we attempted to do.

I have certainly not been shy in admitting that when we made mistakes that we did and that we needed to fix them. We needed to learn from them, and then we needed to move on. That's what we are attempting -- still attempting to do.

On the other hand, the progress that we have made in the last several months, in my opinion, far exceeds the downside of the mistakes that we're fixing. I believe with all of my heart we're now a stronger university, financially, strategically. I believe that we can and will move forward with confidence. I believe that the plans that we have created at the college level, at the university level, what we're attempting to do with our brand and our enrollment recruitment reach are all very good plans. The good thing is, we now have financial resources to put behind them.

I believe now the challenge is to implement the plans effectively, our fall in enrollment numbers indicate that we see some good news on the horizon. They also indicate we still have a lot of work to do. For example, we have great diversity in our University. Our diversity is our strength. We have grown diversity in the Honors College; graduation rates among minority students are rising. A lot of work left to do.

We have increased diversity in key leadership positions at the University with new heads of the College of Health Professions, the Honors College, Information Technology, and our proposed Center for Data Science and IT. There is no question there is more work to do. There is always more work to do. These are pieces of accomplishment that points us in the right direction.

We're also moving forward in other key areas. Soon we'll announce new faculty positions that will add to our scholarly ranks, and we'll announce a new strategy for the Honors College that will attract more students to the vital part of our university. Soon we'll announce new partnerships that will improve our university by enabling us to enhance teaching, research to our region and world. I do see our university growing larger and more impactful, emerging as a national, international leader in the evolving world of higher education, becoming that great public university that we have talked about, the great public University that our region, our city, our nation needs us to be.

I believe that we are stronger today than we were one year ago because of the difficult decisions that we have made. This time next year I believe will be even stronger. In that, I'm confident and I'm certainly committed with your help. So I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I look forward to answering whatever questions Chair Rich shares my way.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for the President? Let me remind those of you that are continuing as Senators from previous years and inform those of you who are new that questions should be directed to the Chair. They're in fact really for the President, but as a matter of formality, they should be directed to the Chair, and then the Chair--I, I'll forward them to the President an opportunity to respond to the questions.

Are there questions for the President?

Senator Bouchard?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes. I have a couple of questions about the new Gen Ed program. First of all, I would like to know when it was decided and why it was decided to take the courses that were originally announced as blended courses and make them 100% online?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Bouchard, for your question. I had a feeling we may get a question about that today. I appreciate the opportunity to have a little data with me that addresses some of that.

My intention is for those General Education courses to be blended courses. That is my preference. That word blended means different things to different people, but to me when

I use the term, I use it to say there's going to be an online component to the course, there's going to be a classroom component to the course, and there's going to be some experiential aspect of the course outside of the classroom there's not online. That is -- that's -- that was my request. It is my request. That whatever courses that we put through this low-cost option, my preference would be for every one of them to be offered in a blended version. Now having said that, when I made that request, it was also reminded to me that these courses would also be used in the high school environment through a dual-enrollment program. The effort has been to actually develop first a series of courses that can be used in either environment, the dual-enrollment or at the university. Ultimately -- my thought is that a faculty member ultimately needs to decide when they teach the course what proportion of on line classroom and experiential they believe that the course most requires.

I do understand that many of these courses would appear at first glance to be more online than I would have thought, and I think it has to do with them trying to also roll these out as an option for each of the high schools to offer these at their locations. I'm still committed to the blended format.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: It looks like there is no classroom part at all. There is no rooms assigned, there is no times assigned. What worried me is that if someone who is taking an online course suddenly discovered in October that they're supposed to come to the University every Monday, Wednesday, Friday at 4:00 they'll have to drop.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: There was somebody in the paper in South Carolina taking this course. He was clearly not going to pop up here. It is just somewhat disturbing that what was announced as blended format has turned into 100% online, at least for the fall.

As I warned you, I was going to ask --

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's the piece I have.

CHAIR RICH: I would like to know, I know we have 500-plus students who signed up to take these Gen Ed courses. I would like to know, do we have a breakdown of how much are high school students, how many are our own students who had been enrolled before, how many are freshmen, but freshmen who had applied to the University before this was rolled out, that is before the announcement made, and there were we're not attracted to it, and how many applied for the first time after April 15th because this would -- it would give us a clearer sense than we have had so far of how successful this is as recruiting device.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right. This is what they have thus far: Of the 798 registrants, which includes duplicates for those enrolling in more than one course, you have 190 or 24% are entering freshman students; 266 or 33% are all new students, but that includes not only the freshman, but transfer students, the high school dual-enrollment student and a category of student that I'm not all that familiar with -- perhaps you are -- called a guest student. That must mean something to you. Of the Gen Ed core classes enrolled, 70% of the students have signed up for one course; 20% -- 21% of students signed up for two courses; 2% took three courses; and 1% of the students enrolled in four courses, four of the courses.

So to your latter question, which they're still struggling to do, still trying to pull it together: They said preregistration for the Gen Ed core began in mid-May with live, full registration beginning in early June after formal Ohio Board of Regents approval. Now, this is their -- this is their -- this is not my quote but their quote, it would be irrelevant to consider the date by which students applied in relation to the go live date with Gen Ed core because this program could have attracted early admits from last fall on the fence about attending Akron until this low-cost option was made available. The short summer window exceeded estimates, realizing 798 course registrants or 698 unduplicated students. I said fine, thank you for that. Still, can you figure out how many enrolled after, what was the date, April 15th? They're still trying to determine that. They have to match two databases for that.

You can see that -- here is my opinion independent of what they said: I think we'll get a better sense of what is actually the enrollment poll for these particular courses, not this

Fall, but probably next Fall. Frankly I didn't encourage them to advertise this for two reasons: One, the community college presidents didn't react very nicely to this, and I get that. They much prefer growing enrollment to decreasing enrollment. I can understand their reaction to this. Secondly, I didn't really want us to have big numbers until we're certain that we can do this well. I wanted enough for it to be a good pilot, but not enough to really put the whole program at risk for the first cycle. And having been through this at the previous university that I was at, it took one cycle of doing this for the professors that taught the courses to understand what they really needed to do to make these work. So that's what I know at this point.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I would like to, at some point -- it sounds like you're going to get the data on how many of the new, whether transient, whatever students came in after this was announced. It was certainly a big deal in the papers even before it went through the trustees. I had heard back in the Spring that we were going to have up to 3,000 slots for students. The 798 may sound better than it actually is. Just a comment.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I hope that also by the end of the semester we can see what the pass rates are. The last time that the University tried to put freshman into all online courses, they flunked in droves. We don't want that. I just would like to know the data. Keep that in mind.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Me too. Hopefully there will be learning assessment built around this. Not only can we understand pass rates, the extent to what learning objectives are achieved would be good.

CHAIR RICH: Are there other questions for the President? Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I would like to ask the question about the upcoming planning process regarding the graduate school. Since the graduate school planning process is interactive with the various college plans, this requires an integration into two levels. I was curious, Mr. Chair, if we could understand what is anticipated as part of our upcoming

planning process.

CHAIR RICH: Mr. President

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's a great question because we have 11 colleges but -- I pointed out, we only completed updated strategic plans for nine of them. The two we did not, the Honors College and the Graduate School, we anticipated leadership changes in each of those areas. We held off in updating those strategic plans until the new leadership is part of that process.

What I know is they're moving forward in beginning to organize both of those planning processes. I think the Honors College working with the Honors College Advisory Council, and the Graduate School working with the Graduate Council so the process that we employed at each of the college levels where we started with the leadership, gathered data, took ideas to the faculty that were then updated, amended before final updates is the process that we're likely to employ working with the Honors College and the Graduate School moving forward with the Honors College. We have a new dean in placement with the Graduate School, the intent would be to try to find permanent leadership before engaging that process.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Thank you, Mr. President. I think there's one error in what you said. You said there were only two colleges that had finished -- had not finished the strategic planning. May I point out to you that the College of Arts and Sciences did not -- not -- initiate the strategic plan. It came up with a planning process of its own, which was to start this Fall, and would in fact come up with a plan during this semester. I wanted to, as you were saying that -- so that's step one.

Then, two, is that you said that the college strategic plans would be part of the input on which you would decide how we were going to allocate the new faculty positions. Given

that the College of Arts and Sciences is still working on its strategic plan, have we got a process set aside or what is going to be done for the College of Arts and Sciences given that it has not yet completed its plan but is in process of so doing?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Good point. I guess the way I would respond to your very good point is that in my opinion all of these documents are still living documents. All of these documents are subject to constant revisiting, constant updating, constant amending, and each college probably will have its own process to do that, to keep these plans current because really, if you will recall, I'm using the word strategic plan in a loose sense of the word. For many of you in this room, you have commented to me -- understandably -- that your notion of a strategic plan, you know, includes, you know, mission, vision, core values, goals, action plans, tactical steps, responsible parties, deadlines for completion, and that's your notion of what a strategic plan really looks like. I can't argue with that. That's a very strict definition of strategic plan.

In reality what we have done is worked with every college to identify unique issues to that college and what I would call strategic corridors within which the college would pursue to determine whether or not the direction would indeed either solve a particular problem or pursue a particular opportunity. It is a high-level at best kind of strategic plan, but it does represent some sort of an agreement to do certain amounts of due diligence in certain directions. At any point in time if that due diligence turns out to say this is a dead end, the plan should be amended on the spot to remove that from the plan to pursue some of the other paths. My hope is that if 50% of the strategic paths that we outlined work out, that's sufficient to really advance the college and the University forward.

Not all of these things need to pan out. Yes, I agree. I think that the College of Arts and Sciences had less concurrence for those general paths, but I think this the case of all of the colleges these are living documents that should be pursued. In terms of them informing the faculty hiring process, you know, my guess is that they -- that if the same criteria is used to determine, you know, which strategic paths to pursue, if those are the same criteria that determine which faculty do we need to hire then there ought to be concurrence. If on the other hand, you know, the need for a particular faculty position has more to do with the

maintenance of something rather than a new strategic path, then they'll diverge because we'll need to hire faculty simply to maintain certain areas that don't necessarily represent a new path, a strategic opportunity.

My hope is -- we have had representatives of the faculty sit through the July, August process. My hope is that the process that we have gone through with each of the colleges to identify those faculty positions took all of that into effect. I have not seen the results coming back, but as Chair Rich pointed out, we originally set a goal for August 31st to get all of these decisions out. The process moved more slowly. Our new goal is to try to get these decisions out by September 15th. Chairman Rich was trying to be nice to us and just said the month of September. I think what you really need to know, we're trying to move through this process as quickly as possible because we know how important these types of decisions are.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson, do you want to follow-up?

SENATOR ERICKSON: Mr. Chair, I just want to be clear on this: President said back in the spring in each case where we had a vote of the faculty and vote of the faculty was over 50%, in fact, many cases unanimous for strategic plans and of the kind that you have put out, and the College of Arts and Sciences did not have such a vote. So I think that is why I represented the way I did.

The College of Arts and Sciences -- I understand the idea that strategic planning is dynamic, et cetera -- we never did as a college have a vote of a majority that supported those particular initiatives. Now, on the other hand, I hear you saying that one of the major factors that will be involved in allocating faculty positions could well be maintenance. I'm sure that those of you that are College of Arts and Science representatives would agree with me that in many cases that's a -- that's a desperate need just to maintain. So that's a good thing. I do want to make sure that as we go about the process, as we said we would, of what we think would be a quite exciting process of coming up with some new initiatives that there will be the opportunity for them to be resourced in some way in the reasonably near future. That's the question.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is in reference particular to the video we saw. I saw it for the first time myself today as I imagine most of the rest of us did. Perhaps I missed, you know, something, but in my field I have been sensitive for a long time to the fact that there are a huge number of students with disabilities who could be highly successful at the college level. I realize that folks that haven't had the kind of exposure or maybe grew up in a different time may not see it that way. This video showed me a number of people who indicated that the University of Akron -- the point of the subtext -- welcomes people from a variety of backgrounds for a variety of outcomes, but I saw no obviously disabled people. There may have been somebody with a -- with some form of a mild impairment who was also represented. What I saw were people who were successful and were athletic and who were involved in a variety of activities that, while valuable, also exclude, at least the case could be made, at least 5% of high school graduates excluded.

I don't think that a marketing department would have made the same mistake when talking other minorities. I want to -- the question I have, you know, can you tell me about why that occurred? Was that for some reason? I mean, I'm aware of a couple of students with disabilities, significant disabilities, who are doing well, one in the Honors College, so on. Is there any particular reason why the students with disabilities were effectively excluded from this particular effort?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's a great observation. Great comment. Not the first time that we have received a comment like that. We have had others that viewed it to say that you missed this group, you missed that group, you missed this group. You know, really at this point, it gives us the opportunity with that feedback in the very next step to try to get at that. Remember, I said there were layers to this. I think we ended up with the students we ended up with because literally I believe Joe just went around campus trying to find people one day. These were really our students. I think all except for two. Which were the two that were not our students?

JOE: The ones up on the roof.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Up on the top of the Goodyear Polymer Building. Those were the only two -- I think that was staged at some other time. The rest of the students you found on campus in one or two days.

JOE: It was me going around visiting all of the classrooms. I think, Dr. Blackledge, I popped in your class the student in the greenhouse was a graduate student. It was all our students doing what we do.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: We did check to see if that was glaring, but thank you for bringing that to our attention. The next try we'll do better, and many layers to this and an opportunity to include what we missed on the first attempt.

SENATOR LILLIE: A main point you made earlier, Mr. President, the need for more students. Historically, if you go back 40, 50 years, we see that women were overlooked, perhaps minorities were overlooked. I don't doubt your good intent. I don't doubt the good intent. I don't doubt the efforts that were made. What I'm trying to point out that is in an environment in which we're asking people to be successful students, I want to suggest and even -- I sense there is a lot of people with disabilities that can be successful students and there are, in fact, students with disabilities now who are successful students. I think that -- I think it is really incumbent on the University of Akron to not necessarily meet somebody's individual idea of which group should be in, but to point out that if we're -- as I said in my comment -- if we're going to be welcoming to a lot of people that go in a lot of places, we're losing 5% or more of the high school population by not including them. It is not intended to be -- I hope it isn't taken -- as some kind of a politically correct effort to make sure we have one of the right number. I'm saying these are people who can succeed with the right kind of outcome. You say you want that. The Board of Trustees say they want that. You want to, you know, do these kinds of things. I think here is a whole area that's being so far ignored. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: It represents a great opportunity. Another glaring omission, adult students. This doesn't get at that market. There will have to be another layer of this that's directed and targeted, and where there is an opportunity we need to pursue it.

CHAIR RICH: Any other questions for the President? Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: So my question is in regard to the money that's been set aside for the special initiatives. Can you describe the process for deciding what kinds of projects will be funded out of that pot of money; and in addition, who will be ultimately responsible for both advising and making the final decision.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right. Generally speaking, the first call on moneys is activities called for in a college strategic plan, the University's list of new initiatives, and what comes out of the faculty hiring process in July, August, September. Generally speaking, that's the first call on the moneys created to do that. Ultimately we have to convince our board that's a good collection of investments to make. As typical, they're the ultimate decision maker in terms of moving forward.

SENATOR QUINN: Will it be -- what is the makeup of the group that will ultimately evaluate and recommend to the Board of Trustees? Will it be inclusive of faculty, staff, students, obviously administration? Is it going to be primarily you? I mean, I would imagine not.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I would say this. For the three components that I outlined: For the faculty component, it has been a process that's included college leadership, typically down to the department chair level, working with the Provost office and attended -- the meetings attended by either Bill or Matt in some cases. I attended the College of Health Professions. I promised the Dean I would do that. It was literally impossible for me to attend all of them. I did not. I only attended the College of Health Professions so get a sense of the process. Through that process and the meetings that follow probably over the next couple of weeks we'll come forward a list of recommended faculty for me to approve. I'll take that to the Board. I'll say here is the list of faculty, here is the reason to approve these, here is the grand total of what investment that represents

and kind of seek their approval to do that. That's how the faculty process will probably occur.

On the college process: A Dean says here is a strategic initiative in the college strategic plan that makes sense. Here are investments required to do these types of activities, we would like to -- we need funding to do it. My guess that will come through the Provost to me to the Board for final decision because it is already in the plan that helps make the decision making simple. If it is outside the plan, it will be a higher level of conversation within -- with the leadership of the college probably within the college to include that in the investment pull.

A list of University initiatives, that list was derived from a group of about 50 people that met in February, March, April over about 12 hours, and in many cases we have moved forward with some of those, that would be the success coaches, that would be the Corps of Cadets and Leadership Academy. That would be if approved the Data Science and Center for Data Science and IT, that would be the Center for Experiential Learning, Entrepreneurship, Civic Engagement, that list of activities. It would be those that would be funded by the poll as well.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I certainly understand what I'm hearing, Mr. Chair. I would also like to point out that as another process that takes place, the University Council, and so the various committees, if they're to function as they should and to provide the adequate input need to be at least mentioned. I can't sit here as Vice-Chair and not say at least that much.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: If I respond, I agree completely. To some extent that represents an opportunity for me personally to do better in the future because I'm so focused on Faculty Senate leadership, Faculty Senate, student government leadership, student bar graduates, student council leadership, the Board, the Alumni Board, legislators, et cetera, et cetera, I didn't spend a lot of time last year with University Council. Now maybe I rationalized it in my mind because their bylaws hadn't been approved yet, that's

not a good rationalization. Maybe that was in the back of my mind, when and if the Board finally approves that, the -- you know, I'll understand what my obligations are and how that's going to work. That's more of an afterthought than a real -- really I just need to prioritize it from a scheduling standpoint. I agree I think the University Council is something that's important to this campus. I think that the campus, you know, wants to see those bylaws ultimately approved and kind of move forward in that way.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the President? Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. President, so I'm very concerned as you, of course, in trying to strengthen the University. As I was looking at that video, I was wondering about emphasizing the strength of the University of Akron in terms of the industry in the area. I don't know whether or not that's within the capacity of these ultimate layers that you're talking about.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I know that's in the second layer

SENATOR LANDIS: That's the second layer.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's in the second layer. I couldn't agree with you more. Now, what I -- their reaction to a comment I made that was similar to yours was this is to get their attention and to direct them to a place where they get more information. It is at that next layer where they're going to get more information, that's where they get more information about the experiential learning, the internship, the coops, service learning, the study abroad, the things that really grab a student's attention and the connection to career placement.

SENATOR LANDIS: Right.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: And then the next layer is to get them to visit campus. This

beautiful new campus that's been built over 15 years needs to be that environment that seals the deal. As one of our department chairs -- which is really the first time in my career that this has happened -- one of our department chairs constantly reminds me while we may have made progress in the budget, we didn't ultimately solve the problem that if we don't at least spend enough money to keep the campus at a current state we lose the advantage of all that investment that's been made. While we made progress, this is really a three-year plan. Now that shouldn't -- well, I don't know -- I shouldn't say it shouldn't concern you, but our intents have been that all of the really hard decisions made in July of this year and so even though it is a three-year plan, that's not to suggest that there is this second shoe to drop or third shoe to drop. The plan was to try to get it all out of the way and tell people -- look people in the eye, say okay, we have made the hard decisions. Now let's leverage the investment money that we have and find new ways of doing things that we have. There isn't -- people are concerned, fearful, honestly there is no reason to be. There isn't a plan for second, third shoe. We have more work to do.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the President? Senator Coffey, not holding the sign horizontally.

SENATOR COFFEY: So we're spending a million or so on the name change, or possible name change at the University, marketing name change of the University. New faculty is what, 50,000 a year, 60,000, benefits. I look at Taylor, Joe, they're former students of mine. They didn't come here because politech, tech, whatever it was, they came here for good faculty. We spent 13% of the budget on tenured faculty salary, 15% if you throw in the NTTs. It is a million -- not as much as your house -- but it is a million dollars on how much we're spending on naming the University.

There is an Ohio Technical College, it does automobile repair. Why are we spending this money? Why not invest? The number one factor that we have found when coming to this college, the faculty. The high-quality faculty. The number of faculty/student ratio.

We're planning an \$11 million glorified driveway. How can we take you seriously?

The problem is students around the country, every other university in the different states, they are doing the same marketing efforts, same thing. The problem is they're going to research us and find a puppet parody on Youtube. How do we recover from that? That's

my question.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I invite you or anyone else to do, if you have questions -- there were about 10, 11 questions kind of embedded in that. If you have questions about -- of the house, the question of why did we gather data on various shortcomings of our various campus, if you have questions about the value of the marketing campaign and its ability to attract greater number of students so that we can have the funds to hire more faculty, I would be happy to sit down. We can't do that -- we can't cover all of that ground today unless you want to take the whole rest of your meeting. I think you have other things to do.

Rather than simply read it and assume it is true, why not critically think, why not do our research, why don't we sit down together, and I'll walk through everything that I know. If it -- if at the conclusion of that time together, you still think it is a bad idea, well at least we're dealing with a common set of mutual understandings. We don't have that right now.

All that was suggested, half of which wasn't true, is an opportunity for us to sit down, come let us reason together, and see how close we can get to consensus when we have good information when simply generating clicks on a website is not the primary objective.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Scotto.

SENATOR SCOTTO: I'm Carrie Scotto. I'm the -- we have a School of Nursing, what's left of it, and we are a very large part of a College of Health Professions that by his own admission brought in \$16 million. So maybe he might want to throw a few nurses into his next commercial.

We did ask the question, we did say why are you spending so much money on a grand driveway that nobody -- that leads to nowhere-- when we need faculty. We don't have that information. The information we do have comes to us from Youtube and the Devil Strip. We really do need to hear this stuff. All we have out there is Youtube and the Devil Strip. We don't know why you're buying a driveway to nowhere when we really need a faculty.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Let's use at least this issue to point out how communication is so difficult. Okay. So now twice it has been mentioned a grand entrance of \$11 million. Okay. The facts are these: When I came to the University they took me on a tour of the campus on a golf cart with a -- I had a notepad and a pen in hand. My intention was to say, okay, I'm a fresh set of eyes. To everyone here this is the most beautiful place imaginable compared to what it looked like 15 years ago. I had not seen what it looked like 15 years ago. With a fresh set of eyes let me just see what I see as I drive through all the elements of the campus and get to know it. I literally made notes to myself, meeting notes, in terms of, you know, things that I saw, buildings that didn't appear to have future life, that just represented a utility drain. The sense of where do you arrive at this University. I made notes.

Similarly in preparation -- here is the key point -- in preparation for the submission of a capital request to the State of Ohio, which we do every two years, which we're going to have to do in the next couple of months, I asked for that list that was created weeks, maybe months ago to be priced out so I could see whether there would be anything on that list that we might be able to request new capital money in the next capital budget bill submission to the state. In addition, I asked our IT department to list all of their various IT needs for IT infrastructure.

My conception of what we're going to submit -- although we haven't had the meetings yet to even bring that together -- it is what we're likely to submit are things that represent deferred maintenance of our campus in critical IT infrastructure needs. We're not going to request money to build a new building. We're going to request money to take care of what we have. If we request a new building and somehow we get it, that's simply meaning they won't give us money to take care of what we have. I have gotten the information from IT, I have it. It is sitting there waiting for the time we're going to have a meeting. I haven't even received back from the facilities department yet my listing with the costing of those items. Somebody -- doesn't matter, we're a public institution, doesn't really matter -- knew about that list and through an open records request requested that list with costing which evidently did exist in the facility department -- even though it hasn't been delivered to me yet, it is not yet done. Okay. And then some very wise person on the web decides to opine on the fact that I have requested that this be built. Okay. Totally out of context. With

information that's incomplete that I have not even received, not understanding that it is simply input to a decision-making process that one day represents a request to the state for money that you can only use for capital projects. Nothing else. Okay.

So, is the picture a little different than saying the President wants to build an \$11 million entry into the University? Is the picture a little different with actually real information?

CHAIR RICH: Senator Scotto.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Not that much different. I just wonder why you couldn't tell us this upfront, and we still don't know whether you're going to build a big driveway or not.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The reason I can't tell you upfront is because there are 1,000 things like this happening at the University of which are in process, and various parts of the University in conversation that haven't made it up to any approved process to even get close to a set of possibilities that we might realistically consider. I could spend all day with you updating you on everything, and there wouldn't be enough time. I wouldn't know everything that's going on that ultimately you may be interested in.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Is that how –

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: It is inconceivable.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Is that how Academic Partners happened?

PRESIDENT: Well, that's a -- that's another -- we can -- I have no problem sharing the story of Academic Partners or any of these issues.

SENATOR SCOTTO: The story is great. We just didn't have any input.

PRESIDENT: It takes time to convey all of that to a group. I'm happy to do it. There is just a good answer to that question as there was to the \$11 million grand entrance.

SENATOR SCOTTO: I'm sure there is. We didn't have input in Academic Partners, and I feel we're –

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The College of Health Professions had input in that process. To my great surprise, they came back to support it.

SENATOR SCOTTO: They don't have to deal with it. The School of Nursing does.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I was told that School of Nursing was part of that process too. I don't expect every nurse to be for it. What I was told is nursing program supported it.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: I want to say in regard to the capital projects that the Physical Environment Committee has been very careful to look at all new projects that are coming through. I was just as surprised as you were when I first learned about this. I also became aware almost immediately that this was a document that was a pre any kind of committee vetting, any kind of discussion. It doesn't fit with our previous planning processes. There was nothing like this in plans, other things that we have had long-term involvements. This came out of nowhere and hasn't been fully vetted by the most basic groups that would talk about it.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Howley.

SENATOR HOWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question about Trust Navigator, and perhaps Mr. President you could talk a little bit about why you selected this particular organization.

You know, you mentioned not wanting the press, Youtube or blogs, and yet we have been

asked to work with the success coaches, but our only exposure to this company was their website. In their curriculum, they cite a blog, The Art of Manliness -- I would encourage everybody to check that out. It is a blog which talks about how men can go back to being real men. Whatever that means. There was also a Youtube video, The Economy in 30 Minutes. So this is our exposure to this company. I was wondering if you could talk a little bit about why you chose them.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: So the success coach initiative has its roots in a successful program that was implemented many years ago at Central Michigan University. They have got a good, long history and good statistical results that show that there are reasons to believe that there is a strong return on investment, a strong increase in persistence rates as a result of something called Success Coaching.

Success coaching, in brief, is simply norm of what the industry or what our world calls intrusive advising, but it is very low-level and really more of an accountability mechanism or a success coach. They proactively try to connect a student to all of the various resources on campus that we have to help students succeed in a just-in-time type of environment, rather than waiting on the student to self-report a need and then connect with an entity on campus that they may not know exists. The purpose of the success coach is to take their assigned student group to study that group based on information and data analytics to proactively create a relationship with that student, to get to know that student and then try to engage the student in an educational process that gets to them the resources that they will uniquely need.

Other universities I have been at have attempted to implement the Central Michigan model, also showed good results. Based on the input that we have received from some of the experts on minority persistence, they believe that this has a chance of achieving results that we have not yet achieved before. And unlike the advising component, which is tied to a major, this success coach sticks with the students even though they have changed majors two, three times. Each coach is assigned between 250 and 300, but the data analytics allows them to identify the students most at-risk in the program. When it became clear that through the budget process we would be -- that we would have to create a sufficient investment fund where the level investment to do this would not jeopardize our ability to

hire faculty, do other things that we needed to do, we then tasked a group on campus in the Student Affairs area to say do you want to try to do this with internal staff or through an outsourced operation. The reason we became -- the reason that we even considered the outsourced operation because it was going to be new in a lot of ways. Whether we did it inside or outside, that start-up risk was going to exist whether we started by hiring new employees ourselves or had an outside firm do it in management under our supervision.

The other critical piece of information is that we knew that at least one bidder -- when we did an open RFP process, we knew that at least one bidder was a group that was already planning to be on our campus led by University of Akron alumni. Okay. That was Trust Navigator, although they were going by a different name at that point. We knew that they were going to be on our campus.

Interestingly -- I never saw this before -- they had found a way to register as a student organization. So they had students as part of their enterprise. They were registering as a student organization and offering success coach services on a fee for service basis only to those students with the ability to afford this would be able to out of their pocket engage this group for this type of success coaching.

When we realized that this group would be here anyway, we said maybe an outsourcing model is possible. But realizing we couldn't simply select this group, we opened it up to an RFP process to see what other bidders we may get. We got one other bidder. One other bidder was a group -- I believe it was in California, who did have a good track record in this, but only through an online type of support from California, also at a significantly higher price. The committee that looked at this said, you know, even though they don't have experience, we would rather have people on our campus that we can work with physically to try to roll this out in the right way. In every outsourcing relationship you have a monitoring liaison role where you're working with the outsource group to provide this service. There was also the belief that the timeframe to try to implement this would be greatly aided, not only the cost advantage, but there was also the ability to move a little bit more quicker with an outsourced organization. There was also the belief, whether it is true or untrue, that accountability would be easier to achieve and maintain with an outsourced

relationship rather than an internal operation. For all of those reasons, and because of the concerns that a lot of people had, I got engaged in evaluating the individual and we took the group to the Board to be evaluated -- which we don't normally do -- to try to get as many people comfortable with this as possible.

Every time I get a report, at least to date, it has been positive. Now, I'm surprised by that. I'm skeptical of that. I'm worried about that. I don't believe this is going to be flawlessly implemented. Any new start-up, whether done internally, externally, always has hiccups that you try to work through. We're watching it very carefully.

The other thing that we have made it very clear to the outsourced vendor, it is this group of 17 to 20 people that were initially going to be hired, there has to be obvious diversity in this group. Okay. Or it won't work for a lot of our under-represented populations. Okay. Why do I know that? It is because I have seen that in terms of the model that we're implementing elsewhere, and the person we brought on campus to advise us on how best to achieve minority persistence said that to us when he was here last year. One of the early tests, when I see the 20 people that are probably going to be our alumns, our young alumns is what I'm looking at, it has to be a highly -- that's the first test, did they hire a highly diverse group and we have to monitor this.

Students have been most dissatisfied with the general advising in general for decades. This is an attempt by higher education to supplement what we traditionally have done in the name of academic advisors with something that's more proactive and supplemental to what we have historically done trying to get to a point where not only our students -- the number one reason -- I have one study that shows the number one reason why students leave a university it is not academic, it is not financial, it is the statement that no one seemed to care. This is trying to get at least -- this is one study, I don't know the limits of that -- that's to make sure that that doesn't happen. They have to know there is at least one person, regardless of whatever they do, that they do careful. That's the background for how we ended up with Trust Navigators.

CHAIR RICH: I want to point out it is 4:35. We do have elections to conduct. I think we're

going to need to move on. Senator Sastry has been patiently waiting. I will recognize him. If there is anyone else that has a question that can be handled briefly and you consider it be to urgent, I will recognize you on that promise. We're going to need to move on.

SENATOR SASTRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. President, I'm representing a concern of my colleagues about the IDC accounts. We have heard several things that I have found that it is an 8900 account. I have two issues. One, it is helpful for our colleagues to know what timeline they should expect a response in, that would be helpful. I checked my own today. I found that there was only about \$1600 that was moved to the 8900. What do I have to do to get it back? They said, the comptroller's office, he said you have to sign off on that. That leads me to my second question: What problem is being solved by you having sign off on 1500?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you. That's a great question. It doesn't involve all colleges. This issue is particularly localized in the high externally funded research colleges. It is a big challenge for us just to be honest with you.

The short version -- and I'll be happy to meet with you off line to go into the longer version -- it is that we have promised a lot to faculty in part to recruit them here and in part to keep them here. When I say we have promised a lot, that's start-up funds, that's a commitment to retain indirect cost. That's the commitment to retain the amount of one's salary that one buys out with their grants. What has happened, is that we have made promises to people that far exceed our ability to meet all those promises today. Okay. Part of what we had to look at as a budget process, how do we honor those processes without endangering the University? How do we -- we're not looking for an either or, the University or honor -- it is how do we find a solution to this dilemma.

The -- in short, the end solution that we have attempted to find is that if we made a promise to faculty member to provide a certain amount of start-up funds in this fiscal year we're going to honor that. That's in the budget. The good news -- you know, we're talking a lot of bad news. The good news, that's in the budget. Okay.

Now the question becomes, what about moneys that we have promised in the past, in previous years the faculty member didn't spend and now becomes part of this huge carry forward commitment that if everyone spent we would be in real trouble, real trouble. What we have attempted to do is to say we're going to take 500,000 of our 10.4 million strategic initiative pool, and for those carry-forward balance -- not the new commitments that are this year, we're going to try to provide everybody at least a small dollar access so that they can have immediate access to small dollar items to go to a conference, whatever, that they were planning to do.

Anything that requires a major draw on that, on those historical balances has to come through a special process basically to amend the University's budget to include it. That's not a good outcome. It is the best one we can find for now. It is going to require a lot of dialogue with a particular set of faculty. Obviously every faculty member is important to us, but these are faculty that we have made pretty big commitments to and it is going to require us to kind of work it out together of how we both honor the commitment without weakening the rest of the University in the process.

Anything beyond that, I'm hoping -- I'm hoping that account that you saw, the \$1600, while it is small, to a lot of folks with those accounts, that's all the money they have in the accounts, it is almost like getting the full balance. There are some people though with huge balances. That's not going to -- that's not going to fully satisfy them in that -- that's just an issue we have to work together to try to resolve over time.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: A quick follow-up, I think -- I have been here 12 years on this campus. I think the elephant in the room is cost share commitments that we make.

PRESIDENT: Okay

CHAIR RICH: I'm not convinced that we have or that we understand what the process is for

making those commitments, and I think that's a big drain on our resources, and we have to fix that.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I agree with you, sir. If that's the last thing I get to say, let me say this, look, everybody in this room is important. You are important because you're a faculty senator. As you point out, you represent people. I can't talk to everybody, but there are enough of you, there are -- the number is small enough where I can engage in creating meaningful relationships with most of you. Now a lot of times it will be working through your chair, your Executive Committee, on the [inaudible]. But if you have particular issues that are just burning a hole in your mind, there is nothing wrong with e-mailing me saying hey, can we get together? I would much rather you get real accurate information from me than, you know, the Angel Strip or whatever it is.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Braun, you have something very brief? In the future would you --

SENATOR BRAUN: I will follow-up on what Dr. Sastry said, the explanation that you gave, it has to do with start-up money.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: With what?

SENATOR BRAUN: Start-up money. The packages that go through the new faculty that brings them here. The IDC money are money that have been returned to us, from money that we brought in. So de facto those money are ours, the University is a custodian, those are moneys that have been earned, it is not a matter that the University committed anything. It is moneys that were earned, and as such they should stay with the earners.

Those moneys -- just so you know if you don't -- those moneys are used for conferences, for sending students to conferences, for buying equipment, all things that contribute to the proper functioning of the faculty. Once you cut those, those things cannot be done. It is completely unfair to put in the same bucket the start-up money and this IDC money that's been earned. A guy who has 100,000 in the College of Engineering, he has brought millions

of dollars to put those things inside. There is no reason that those moneys should be denied to him because in the grand scheme of things it is peanuts compared with what the debt of the University are. What I would like to urge you, is to have somebody to reexamine this and the moneys that are returned either by buying your time out, paying salaries to students, and then there were moneys -- this is a mechanism that existed in the past, and they're not moneys that were contributed by the University. This is research money that came from the outside.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Can I have 30 seconds on that one?

CHAIR RICH: Yes.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Because the other side of that argument is fairly compelling, because really what indirect cost moneys are moneys that belong to the University, not the faculty members. What indirect cost moneys are on the grant is the federal government saying, hey, you know, there are costs that universities incur to support your research like utilities, the space that you're in, the human resources, the accountants that pay your bills, there are -- and really what indirect cost is, it is supposed to go to pay those bills that are the indirect cost of performing research. What most universities do in the name of promoting more and more research is that they pass policies that say, I know that this money isn't ours, but we'll divide it. You know, we'll give the principal investigator back a little bit to put in a little account that maybe, you know, the grant runs out, they need a little bridge funding, they'll use that. We'll give a bit to the college so that they can pass it around a bit so that everybody gets to go to a conference. And when you really look at what the University retains, it is not near enough to pay the cost of supporting the research infrastructure that we have. That's the other side of the argument that actually is closer to reality than this money belongs in a principal investigator. It only does because the University passed a policy that said in the name of furthering even more research we're going to find another way to pay the utility bill and we'll give this piece of money back to the researchers. I agree with that.

SENATOR BRAUN: This, if you want to do this, then it should be clearly stated that you're not returning any more money and people with this money from past policies should be grandfathered in there. Not basically say I'm just going to take this money.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Which is not what we have said. We didn't say it was an either or.

SENATOR BRAUN: That's okay. I'm happy to be corrected about this.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: What I will say: We have to work together to make this decision work. There is no intention to take the money away, but there is an intent to manage the spend on this money so that it allows us to regain our breath, financial breath, before we make all of these moneys available to people.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: Yeah. This is picking up on the –

CHAIR RICH: I urge you to keep it brief, please.

SENATOR HUSS: I'll cut the preamble. Is there anything new you can tell us about the case involving Dean Rickel and, you know, possible fabrications, so forth on his application materials and so forth? There is another Devil Strip-type thing where you seem, you're in a debunking mode, maybe there is something to be debunked or not. I would like to hear what you have to say.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I will be happy to say what I have said. I don't know that I know more. I can tell you what I do know. I do know that he submitted a CV that there were three presentations that were listed with incorrect information, three presentations at conferences with incorrect information. Two titles of the presentations were wrong and

one date that it was given was wrong. When it was brought to our attention, we notified him, yes, that's a mistake, we immediately posted it. Okay.

Now, there would some who would say, okay, we shouldn't have hired him. Okay. My job is to try to judge, determine, number one, was it intentional? I found no evidence of that. Two, was it consequential to the hiring process? It really wasn't consequential. This was not someone trying to portray a peer reviewed article that wasn't peer reviewed. This is not -- that would have been consequential to say a tenured decision. Okay. That is kind of a clear case of intentional or not. I guess you would still have to determine. In this particular case that you're asking me about, I did not deem it nor could I find any evidence that it was intentional, and I was certain it was not consequential to the hiring process.

My fear, my fear is -- I've seen it before, which is the reason why there is some basis for my fear -- is this constant attack has more to do with his non-traditional academic background than this issue. So I'm -- I'm following it closely to make sure that we keep it within context, we keep it within a spirit of collegiately and academic integrity which speaks to the issues on his CV as much in terms of the motives of those pursuing it.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. We have -- it is 4:50. There is obviously a lot more to talk about. The President will -- will the President be present for the next Senate meeting?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I believe I will.

CHAIR RICH: There will be other opportunities to ask questions and I'm sorry I have to cut it off. We do need to at least conduct the elections if not hear from the representatives to the University Council. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you. Thank you all.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. The next item on the agenda, it is the elections, the first one is for Chair of the Faculty Senate. Are there any nominations for Chair of the Faculty Senate? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes, I would like to nominate Senator Rich.

Second by Senator Gatzia.

CHAIR RICH: Are there any other nominations for Chair of the Faculty Senate?

Any other nominations, nominations of any other persons for Chair of the Faculty Senate?

Any other nomination? Is there a motion that nominations be closed and that I be elected by acclamation? Moved by Senator Franks and seconded by Senator Lashbrook. All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR RICH: Opposed by opposite sign?

Thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR RICH: I feel honored.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: A hard-fought contest.

CHAIR RICH: Next, election of Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Senator Schulze has served us as secretary for the last -- I have lost track now.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Just a year.

CHAIR RICH: Just a year. Is there -- her term is ending as my previous term just did. Is -- are there any nominations for the Secretary of the Faculty Senate? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I would nominate Senator Schulze.

CHAIR RICH: Does she accept the nomination?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: I will accept it. Okay.

CHAIR RICH: Are there any other nominations for Secretary of the Faculty Senate? Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations are closed? Senator Schwartz is moved and seconded by Senator Saliga. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, by opposite sign. Motion is adopted. Senator Schulze is elected. Thank you. [Applause].

CHAIR RICH: Next, we have two positions on the Executive Committee the terms of which are ending -- one is held by Senator Sterns, has been held by Senator Sterns and the other by Senator Lillie. We'll take those in that order. For the -- for the seat on the Executive Committee that is currently held by Senator Sterns, any nominations?

SENATOR SALIGA: I nominate Senator Sterns.

CHAIR RICH: Do you accept the nomination?

SENATOR FRANKS: I second.

CHAIR RICH: Is there any other nomination? Any other nominations? Any other nominations?

Is there a motion that nominations be closed and that Senator Sterns be elected by affirmation? Moved by Senator Schaeffer; seconded by Matejkovic. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Congratulations to Senator Sterns. You're reelected.

[Applause].

CHAIR RICH: Next is the other Executive Committee seat currently held by Senator Lillie. Any nominations for that seat?

SENATOR FRANKS: I nominate Dr. Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Mr. Chairman, if I may, there were way too many names of people that I recognized on that list that you read at the beginning of the meeting, so I'll respectfully decline the nomination.

CHAIR RICH: The nomination is declined. Any other nominations? Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: I would like to nominate Senator Coffey.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Coffey is -- do you accept the nomination?

SENATOR COFFEY: I do. Yes

CHAIR RICH: Are there any other nominations?

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: Senator Doug Hausknecht.

CHAIR RICH: Do you accept?

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Yes.

CHAIR RICH: Any over nominations? Any other nominations? Okay. At this time we'll

actually not elect by affirmation since we have a contested race for the first time in quite a while. We will vote by secret ballot. I think we have ballots here. Please write the name of your choice, Senator Coffey or Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: Or Doug. You can spell that easier.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Coffey is elected by 25 to 8, with one abstaining.

[Applause].

SENATOR LILLIE: I looked like you two years ago.

CHAIR RICH: Next is the election of a representative to Graduate Council. This person served for a term of one year and needs to be a member of the Graduate Council. In order to be qualified, that person must have Grad Faculty II status. The incumbent is Senator Sterns. His terms are ending. Any nominations for representative to Graduate Council?

SENATOR HUSS: Senator Sterns

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns, you accept the nomination?

SENATOR STERNS: I do

CHAIR RICH: Any other nominations for representative to graduate council? Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominating be closed and Senator Sterns be elected? Moved by Senator Saliga, seconded by Senator Kemp. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR RICH: Opposed by opposite assignment. Congratulations Senator Sterns. You're reelected.

CHAIR RICH: Election of representative to the Ohio Faculty Council. We also need an alternate, but first a representative. Is there a nomination for representative to the Ohio Faculty Council?

I guess I should explain for those that are not familiar that this is a council that's made up of representatives, all the four-year public institutions, higher-education institutions in Ohio, it advises the Ohio Board of Regents and the Chancellor. It also effectively functions as a means of communication among the faculties of several four-year institutions in Ohio. The Senate Chair, that's me, is ex officio a member, but we also have an elected representative and an alternate in the cases that one of us can't attend a given meeting.

Is there a nomination for a representative to the Ohio faculty council? This is --

SENATOR SCHAEFFER: Myself.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Schaeffer nominated herself. I don't have to ask if you accept the nomination. Are there any other -- Senator Arter.

SENATOR ARTER: How many times a year does that Committee meet?

CHAIR RICH: 8 or 9. They don't always meet in January, but 8 I think. It may be 9. Once a month. I think it is the -- the meeting on the second Friday of the month. So it means driving down to Columbus in the morning and then they meet from 12:30 to 2:30 and then coming back. Frequently we can work out some sort of car pole, sometimes with our Youngstown colleagues.

Any other nominations for representative to the Ohio Faculty Council? Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations are closed and Senator Schaeffer be elected by affirmation?

SENATOR SCHULZE: I was going to nominate Senator Howley if she would like to.

SENATOR HOWLEY: I will decline. Thank you though.

SENATOR SCHULZE: We hadn't discussed it.

CHAIR RICH: Any other nominations? Is there a motion that nominations be closed and Senator Schaeffer be elected by acclamation? Moved by Senator Sastry, and seconded by Senator Matejkovic. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR RICH: Opposed by opposite assignment. Motion is adopted. Congratulations, Senator Schaeffer, you're elected representative of the Ohio Faculty Council. [Applause]. Is there a nomination for alternate representative to the Ohio Faculty Council? The alternate would need to attend only when either Senator Schaeffer or I could not attend.

SENATOR ARTER: I will sign up for that. I'm okay with that one.

CHAIR RICH: I should warn you, occasionally I have a Friday class and that means that I miss -- you know, all of the meetings.

SENATOR ARTER: You said --

CHAIR RICH: I said if either of us. It would be especially important in neither of us could.

SENATOR ARTER: Okay.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Arter, you're willing to serve?

SENATOR ARTER: Yeah. I'll serve.

CHAIR RICH: Okay. Any other nominations? Any other nominations? Is there a motion

that nominations be closed and the Senator Arter be affirmed moved by acclamation?
Senator Sterns and seconded by Senator Kem. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR RICH: Opposed by opposite side. The motion is adopted. You're the alternate representative.

[Applause].

CHAIR RICH: I don't believe there are any Committee reports. Do we have any reports from the University Council Representatives?

SENATOR LILLIE: I suppose I should report that there was no meeting last month. The Steering Committee of the University Council decided there was no business to be brought to the body. We didn't have it.

The next meeting is the 15th of September. You heard the President indicate pretty clearly that his lack of prioritizing the council last year was due to the bylaws not passed. This is in the context of understanding that we have been told over and over again by various people including provosts -- assured, yes, the Board wanted us to use the bylaws in place, working on it, in favor of it, appears to be some conflict there. So there will be the regular meeting on the 15th. Then on the 17th the President is going to come to a special meeting of the University Council in which he will present I believe his plan for the future. Little unclear on exactly what it is. Both of those meetings are public, so if you want to come, you're certainly welcome to come to the University Council meetings either one. At this point that's really all the information that I have since the last time I think that the Senate heard from us.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I would add that -- let me see, I think it was the June meeting -- was it the July meeting they canceled? The June meeting didn't have a quorum. So this is -- I think this is an issue and it is something that hopefully that will be discussed in the next meeting. The meeting in July, I happened to be away in Australia at the time when they canceled the meet -- I'm sorry, the meeting for August --

CHAIR RICH: Senator Erickson, would you please speak up?

SENATOR ERICKSON: That was the -- they said that it was -- but hopefully when we meet we will be having serious discussion. For those of you that are new members of this body, University Council deals with issues that have more than one constituency. So it doesn't deal with academic matters, it deals with matters that involve more than academic and so, therefore, a whole lot of the situation that's occurred during the summer is legitimately in the purview of the Council.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I would like to say as Vice-Chair of the Council that these two meetings that are coming up are extremely important. One, as member of the Steering Committee I fought very hard for a complete budget presentation to take place at this meeting. I understand that that will happen. It does fall on the second day of the Jewish New Year which some of us will be observing. We won't be there. I specifically requested of the Steering Committee that the President make a presentation to University Council similar to the presentation he's made here because that's not happened, and in some respects the questions were raised about Physical Environment Committee still make it extremely important. I actually believe that if they had come to the Physical Environment Committee to talk about E.J. Thomas, as an example, that there could have been a lot more of a positive approach that would have been generated by that in the same way that we have integrated and deliberate way discussing the library situation or the Physical Environment Committee played a major role in helping to get the College of Education instruction on track. Even though -- I basically was very surprised that the President's attitude about the University Council because it really is the other planning and deliberative

body that we need not only faculty to have a voice in but also the other major constituencies. That's it.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Next on the agenda, new business. Any new business to come before the body at this late hour? Hearing no new business, is there anything for the good of the order? Anything for the good of the order? If not, I hereby, declare us adjourned.

Transcript provided by:
Premier Visual Voice, LLC
216-246-9477 www.premiervisualvoice.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
