

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

FACULTY SENATE

3 MARCH, 2016

3:06 p.m. - 5:21 p.m., Eastern

CHAIR: Despite the absence of our Secretary, I call this meeting to order. I have asked Senator Miller to act as Secretary in Secretary Schulze's absence. I hope she'll be coming soon. And I hope everything is okay. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Moved by Senator Clark. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Bouchard. There are three changes that we need to make to the agenda. The first is the deletion of the adoption of the minutes of the October meeting. Those are not available yet. And then there are two additions that we need to make. If there are no objections, we would do it by unanimous consent. After the remarks of the Interim Provost, I propose that we add the opportunity for David Gordon, Dean of the College of Health Professions and now Special Advisor to the President for Faculty Affairs, to speak to us and to hear -- and I think, more importantly, from his perspective, to hear from us, and then following that, the election of three representatives to the Board of Trustees in its capacity as the search committee for a new Senior Vice President and Provost. Is there any objection to adding those items to the agenda? Are there any other changes anyone wishes to propose to the agenda? If not, all those in favor of adopting the agenda as amended, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted. Next item is the remarks of the Chairman. Among the items on today's agenda are the election of three representatives of the Faculty Senate to the Board of Trustees serving in its capacity as the search committee for a Senior Vice President and Provost; and; and the approval of curriculum changes reported by the Curriculum Review Committee. As you know, I transmitted to Jonathan Pavloff, Chairman of the University's Board of Trustees, the no-confidence resolution adopted by this body in its February meeting, along with a letter taking strong exception to his public characterization of the resolution as a collective bargaining tactic. I subsequently met with him for two hours at his invitation. We spoke frankly and openly. I conveyed the concerns of the faculty about the directions in which the President and the Board of Trustees have been leading the University, and about the state of shared governance. He explicitly accepted my assurance that the resolution was sincere and not a collective bargaining tactic. He assured me that the Board of Trustees strongly desires to engage with the University's internal constituencies through its shared governance mechanisms, including the Faculty Senate, and that he would like to foster a closer relationship between the Board and the faculty leadership. We agreed that he as Chair of the Trustees and I as Chair of the Faculty Senate should talk regularly, which has not occurred in the past, and that members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee should meet from time to time with members of the Board of Trustees.

This past Friday through Sunday, as your representative, I participated in the annual meeting of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. The meeting was held in Indianapolis at the headquarters of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Many of you will remember that approximately two years ago this body voted to join this Coalition. COIA, as it is known, is an alliance of faculty senates from NCAA

Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools, formerly known as Division I-A. COIA's mission is to provide a national faculty voice on intercollegiate sports issues. It has a strong commitment to defending and promoting the ideal of *amateur* collegiate athletics; the academic success, health, and well-being of student athletes; academic integrity and quality; and the faculty role in governance on these issues. I will be meeting next week with the Faculty Senate's Athletics Committee to brief its members on the meeting and to discuss these issues with them.

As you know, yesterday the University announced that it is required to rescind the increase in the student facility fee that was put into effect last Fall. This entails refunding the approximately \$4.1 million that students paid last semester and forgoing a similar amount this semester. The loss of this revenue will further strain the University's budget and, I expect, necessitate further cuts in spending, as will the anticipated loss of tuition and state subsidy that will result from a sharp decline in enrollment of first-year undergraduate students next year. As of last week, confirmed admissions of full-time first-year undergraduate students were down thirty-five percent from the same time last year. This situation is nothing short of alarming and should be of the utmost concern to all of us.

Universities exist first and foremost to serve their students by educating them. In that sense, students are at the center of the university. But students come and go over relatively short periods of time. Trustees, presidents, provosts, and deans come and go. The most enduring part of the university is its faculty, and it is they who directly perform the university's core mission. In that sense, the faculty are the heart of the university. Although as a legal matter the University is its Board of Trustees, in reality the University is its faculty. It is, therefore, both self-destructive and irresponsible for faculty members to say or do things that discourage students from enrolling in the University. The Akron Beacon Journal editorial board recently and rightly observed, in reference to the President, that a leader needs followers. I would add that a faculty needs students. I urge all faculty members to do all they can to promote student enrollment and to refrain from actions that might discourage enrollment.

This concludes my remarks.

Next, special announcements, and there are three. Donald McIntyre, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, died on February 14th at the age of 87. He earned a B.A. in Chemistry at Wayne State University in 1949 and a Ph.D. in Chemistry at Cornell University. McIntyre joined the staff of the National Bureau of Standard in 1956 as a physical chemist in the Polymer Structure Section of the Organic and Fibrous Materials Division. He conducted research in the physical chemistry of polymers in solution and went on to become the Chief of the Macromolecules Synthesis and Structure Section at NBS. He joined the university faculty in 1966 as a professor of polymer science. He was Chair of the Department of Polymer Science from 1988 to 1994 during a time of substantial growth in the polymer faculty at the university. He retired from the university in 1996.

Charles M. Dye, Professor Emeritus of the Educational Foundations and Leadership, died on February 12th at the age of 77. He joined the faculty in 1972 as an Associate Dean of Educational Foundations and Leadership after earning a BA at Harris Teachers College and an MA and a Ph.D. at Washington University. He became the Dean of the Graduate School in 1995 after serving as interim dean for two years. He retired from the university in 2000.

Gregory F. Robinson, Senior Associate Director of the Counseling and Testing Center, died on February 5th at the age of 53. He earned a BS in psychology and an M.A. and a Ph.D. in counseling psychology at Ohio State University. He joined the staff of the Counseling and Testing Center in 1994 as a counseling

psychologist. His contributions to the field of mental health were recognized nationally in 2015 by a screening for Mental Health, Inc. His coordination of the Counseling and Testing Center National Depression Screening Day event in October 2014 resulted in the university being named one of the top ten college response screening sites in the United States.

Would you all please rise for a moment of silence in memory of our deceased colleagues?  
Thank you.

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

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Since the Faculty Senate last met on February 4th, the Executive Committee met twice by itself and once with the Interim Provost. The Executive Committee met on February 18th for regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the Interim Provost. The EC appointed Amy Dreussi of the College of Applied Science and Technology to the General Education TAG Subcommittee For Global Diversity. We discussed the apportionment of Senators. We asked the Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant to notify Senators whose terms are about to end. We discussed Faculty Senate elections in progress.

Later that day we met with Interim Provost Ramsier. We discussed the following topics: The rewritten University Council Bylaws forwarded by the Board of Trustees to the University Council and the recent published article in Inside Higher Education about President Scarborough's discussions with higher education partners. We were updated on the Provost search, GenEd Core 13, the General Education Coordinator position who reports directly to the Provost, the allocation of assistantships for fiscal year 2017, and the role of the Subcommittee of the Graduate Council headed by Bill Allen, the search for the Assessment Coordinator whose title will be Associate Provost for Assessment, meetings with deans regarding implementation of college strategic plans and allocation of additional full-time faculty positions, the status of proposals to reactivate the suspended and revised theater BA program, strategic -- the strategic planning progress -- process for University

Libraries, the Graduate School, and the Honors College, the Dean of the University Library search, Ducall Construction, evaluation data for Trust Navigator success coaches, the Center for Data Science and Information Technology, the EXL Center, and the Corps of Cadets Leadership Academy.

The EC next met on February 26th regular Senate business and to prepare the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. The EC certified the election of Lori Fielding of the University Libraries. The EC appointed Pamela Schulze to the Commencement Committee. The EC discussed university Bylaws and changes made by the consultant from the Association of Governing Boards who visited campus in December. Chair Rich updated us on his conversation with Jonathan Pavloff, Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Further meetings between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be scheduled at a later date.

This concludes the Executive Committee's report.

CHAIR: Are there any questions for Secretary Schulze about the Executive Committee report?  
Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the President. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Chairman Rich. What I'd like to do at this time is provide a one-page handout which is a summary of the items that our office is currently focused on. This is the same document that we use at our staff meetings. Hopefully it'll be a nice way to communicate our current priorities.

While that's being distributed, let me at least make mention of a few significant events this week, one of which is the launch of the EXL Center, the Center for Experiential Learning, Entrepreneurship and Civic Engagement. Those events have been well attended and seem to have been well received. That new center is under the direction of Administrative Lead Jeff Hoffman and Faculty Director Carolyn Behrman. So I would encourage you to attend those events, if possible, if you are interested.

Secondly, last night, in Washington, D.C., University of Akron hosted the Ohio Birthday Party and Event at which we cultivated relationships with our federal legislators and members of the Ohio delegation attending the event. That was attended by over 400 people, so it was a nice event for the university and good relationships that I believe that were enhanced.

Thirdly, I would mention my appreciation to David Gordon for his willingness to serve as Special Advisor to the President for Faculty Affairs and hopefully he will be allowed to speak today. I look forward to his help moving forward.

And then, lastly, I think tomorrow night we have our annual rivalry game against Kent State University, if you are in the mood for a very festive evening. Our men's basketball team won the MAC conference championship, I believe, by winning the last game, so this would be icing on the cake to beat Kent tomorrow night. Does everyone have a copy of the document now? So, again, this is a document that we use regularly at the staff -- at our staff meetings. These are the current priorities of our office.

Listed in the first box entitled current priority is strengthen satellite campus structure. So as has been reported, we continue to explore opportunities to partner to strengthen our satellite campus structure. This is -- these are the structures through which we most effectively serve nontraditional students, and as we look to diversify our enrollment profile, become increasingly important as we move forward. Next item on the list is to ask the governor to appoint new Board members. There are nine Board members appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate, nine voting Board members, I should add. Two of those seats are currently vacant and one additional seat vacant on June 30th. We are doing everything we can to ask the governor to fill those slots. We also have two nonvoting student Trustees. Both of those positions are currently filled.

Third listed priority is to finalize the collective bargaining agreement. I have been informed that the noneconomic issues have been primarily agreed to. We are simply left with wages and benefit issues to remain to be collectively bargained, and that process is moving forward. I think it's still in the mediation phase now. If it advances beyond that, it can then go to fact finding. And I think most of you are aware that once we receive the fact finder's report, either side would have to be rejected by a vote of 60 percent, otherwise the fact finder's report becomes the new collective bargaining agreement.

Fourth on the list is to try to move along conversations with the University Council and then ultimately to the Board to get the Bylaws of the University Council finalized before the end of the academic year, beginning of the next year.

The next item that we're working on is to fill some key senior management positions that are listed below. I'll go through each one of those in just a moment. And then the last current priority, again, is the process to develop the 2016-17 operating budget, which will be led by our CFO, Nathan Mortimer, working in conjunction with University Council Budget Finance Committee. Listed below under the key projects and tasks, the status report that we have provided to NCERCAMP, the corrosion federal grant, that's been completed.

The next item on the list was to prepare college and departmental income statements based on fiscal 2015 audited financial statements. We have them based on 2014, but we have not yet received the versions that are based on the 2015 audited financials, so those are a work in progress. Hopefully we'll receive that so the University Council can benefit from that analysis. Then beginning with number 3 on the list are all of the search processes that are in various stages of completion, the first of which is search process to fill our Chief Diversity Officer position. Paul Herold is serving as the administrator coordinator on that search. The process to select a new General Counsel, Paul Herold is working with the Board in that search process as well. As mentioned by Chairman Rich, the search process to select a permanent Provost and Vice President For Academic Affairs, Paul Herold, is also working with the Board moving that search forward. The process to select a permanent Dean of Engineering, and I believe Rex and/or Eric Amis are working to complete that search. That search is in what I would call the final stages. Four candidates have been recommended and are in various stages of meeting campus constituencies. I believe there's one on campus today?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yes.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Today. The next search process is the one to select a new Director of Facilities and Construction. That position reports to Nathan Mortimer, so he is supervising that search. Number 8 on the list are to – are efforts to implement diversity proposals recommended by the Black Excellence Commission and the community organization known as Educate, Motivate, and Succeed. I think that should say EMS, not EMC. EMS. And our current Chief Diversity Officer, Lee Gill, Secretary of the Board, are making sure that we are following up on those proposals. Number 9 on the list is a process that should begin, I think, next week to identify what facilities projects need to be completed during the optimal time, the summer months.

And last, and hopefully least on the list, is to prepare for the worst, so we're updating our strike contingency plan. So these are our current priorities on which we are working, and I'd be happy to answer questions about these or any other issues that you might have.

CHAIR: Are there questions for the President? Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: Do you have insight into how the governor selects and appoints Board of Trustee members, like what that process looks like? Do you know much about it?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, I have learned a little bit about it since I have been here. I think, number one, it depends on the party of the particular governor, so it has historically tended to be different, whether it's a Democratic governor or Republican governor. If it is a Republican governor, as is the case now, historically I believe the Chairman of the county Republican party has had a lot of influence in that process. I don't know exactly how much, but my sense is that it's a very significant influence in the process. That does not mean that there have not been trustees appointed kind of outside of that typical process. I have known at least one significant citizen in the state who was able to

recommend an appointment to the governor outside of that more typical process, but I think that's been the exception to the rule. Nominations can come from anywhere, so I think my guess is there have been many names submitted, but ultimately this particular governor has taken considerable time vetting the candidates, so as a result, there are a large number of vacancies, not only on our Board, but other boards as well. And I think with his particular issue at the moment of running for President, that process is even extended further. So having said that, though, at some point if it becomes a problem, I mean when you get down to the six, then I think we begin to communicate in a little bit more aggressive manner to say it would be a nice time to get some of these appointments made. So that's what I know about the process at this point. But it does have to also be confirmed by the Senate. Because there was an example that probably most in this room are aware of where a governor appointed a candidate, but forgot to get it confirmed, and then when it was recognized, the governor had shifted to the other party and that person never got confirmed. So it does, it does need to be posed.

CHAIR: I do believe that is the first time that that happened.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: No, it is.

CHAIR: That the Governor forgot to get confirmation. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: One item I wanted to ask you about in conjunction with what we had just heard is is this not a good time to consider appointing a faculty member to the Board of Trustees, given that we have got three openings? Surely there must be somebody who might be suitable for that, you know, for that position. Are you aware of whether or not there's been any thought given to that, to that option going forward?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: No, I know that it has been discussed, not only at this Board, but other boards in the state. I have seen at other universities, and you are probably aware of at other universities where a faculty member will sit on a board committee, but not necessarily as a voting member and not as a member of the board. The most common objection to putting a faculty member on the Board and making them a voting member or a student member of the Board and making them a voting member or an administrative member of the Board and making them a voting member is the issue of a conflict of interest. That is the most common objection.

Therefore, the closest we have gotten to having any of those groups represented on the Board are the student members, but they are nonvoting members. And every member of the Board is expected to recuse themselves in conversation, not just the vote, but conversation, if there is a issue that they could personally benefit from. So the thought is how many of those issues would a faculty member have to recuse themselves from even the conversation of to maintain the absence of a conflict of interest? So that's where most boards kind of get hung up on the idea of putting -- now, maybe a retired faculty member might be a way to advance that cause without creating the concern over, over a conflict of interest. Though, I mean, Mr. Chair, you may know of other universities, what they do, but that's the extent of my understanding what's done here in the State of Ohio.

CHAIR: I would say that the issue of conflict is not that difficult to solve, and there are universities that have faculty members on the boards. I think the real obstacle would be if you are talking about a voting member of the Board, the governor has to make the appointment and has to be willing to do it, and the Senate has to be willing to confirm, and that's probably a pretty considerable obstacle. Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: I have one other question. Thank you for your answer Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh-huh.

SENATOR LILLIE: The other question relates to the University Council proposed Bylaws that have been, have been sent to the University Council for their, for their review and comment. I have been a little bit confused, and this is the opportunity to get this, to get this clarified, as to exactly what the consultants did and exactly what they presented to the Board and exactly what the Board then sent on.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh-huh.

SENATOR LILLIE: Now, in an effort to help us understand what happened, we have had a couple of different documents that are trying to show where some of the differences are. But what I'm trying to get at is where, where are the original recommendations that came directly to the Board so that they can be considered by the University Council? And, secondly, could you speak about what your view is about the, about the current proposed Bylaws that the Board has returned to the University Council? What do you think about it? Have you any thoughts? Have you any kind of -- anything that you can discuss with us? Thank you.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: No, happy to. So my understanding of the issue when I got here is that the university had worked for years on a draft of the University Council's set of Bylaws, and I'm not sure how many drafts it took to get to that current draft, but there was a well-developed final draft when I first arrived. The request was to forward those to the Board because they had delayed consideration until a new President was hired. I forwarded those to the Board. The story is that most of them had attended very recently an AGB conference where there were new principles of shared governance shared with members who attended the conference, so having been freshly advised at that conference, they then sought the advice of an AGB-recommended consultant on the draft. Consultant came, visited various stakeholders, input was provided, the current draft was provided to the, to the AGB consultant. Predictably, it came back in a version that is more aligned with a AGB view of shared governance. Faculty Board received the document, and before acting on it, requested input from each of the individual trustees as to what they -- how they felt about the recommended changes. I think at least two trustees suggested changes to what the consultant had recommended, but before entertaining those changes, the rest of the Board wanted to send it to University Council to get their feedback. My understanding, it's been sent to a subcommittee. The subcommittee's charge will be to provide input on how to change the recommended document to something that it would be pleased with for final approval, and there is a deadline on that, Rex? So that we can get it to the Board --

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yeah.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: -- by what date?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: The June Board meeting.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The June Board meeting. So hopefully the subcommittee can do it. And my personal view on it is that we need to find a document that both faculty or University Council and the Board feel comfortable with.

SENATOR LILLIE: Okay. One clarification, if I may. It was my understanding that the Steering Committee of the University Council is going to propose to the University Council that a committee be created. It actually hasn't happened yet. So that's one of the reasons I was asking. I mean I know sometimes we get into a situation where we have compliant and complacent people who perhaps create the impression that we are going to go and do something before we have the full consultation. I think this is just one more example of how the respect for reasonable processes can avoid the potential for problems. So thank you for your, for your response. I appreciate it.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I believe that a member of this body is now serving as the Chair of the University Council, so hopefully that can help ensure process is followed.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR: If I may follow up on that. I don't believe the University Council has seen anything in the way of a rationale for the changes that were made. Did the consultant provide any rationale for the changes?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: No. Not in writing. He did meet with the – he did meet with the Board and discussed shared governance generally, but not -- nothing in writing.

CHAIR: I see. Other questions for the President? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich and President Scarborough, could we have an update on any plan for whether the \$4.1 million in reimbursement, whether that will be attached to this fiscal year, or next fiscal year or a hybrid? Because that's not far off from a one-percent cut for our total budget and it's toward the end of the budget year and that's, that's quite a bit.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah, no, there will be no attempt to make an adjustment to this year's budget based on recent developments on the facility fee, and I would want to listen closely, but it's a \$4.1 million annual amount, not semester amount, it's an annual amount. So that will need to be simply another issue that the next budget process will have to try to resolve. Among many.

CHAIR: So is 4.1 a refund or is only part of that a refund?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: 4.1 is both the fall and the spring amount together.

CHAIR: Oh. Okay. And the spring has already been collected.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Right.

CHAIR: Well, that's only half as bad as I thought.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yeah.

CHAIR: Senator Landis.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, sadly -- if you don't mind me making one last comment about it.



CHAIR: No, go ahead.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: What is sad to me about this is we went through that painstaking line-by-line process trying to contemplate, to imagine kind of a three-year plan to improve the university's financial health to the tune of about 60 million a year. What we came up with, what we thought would be reasonable, although extraordinarily difficult, is \$40 million of expense -- expense cuts, \$10 million in price increases, fee increases, and then the plugged amount, the unidentified amount was 10 million. But at the moment we said we don't see any more expense cuts, we don't see any other ways to raise tuition and fees. The only way we'll be able to resolve the final million will be to reverse the enrollment decline at some point. What this unfortunately causes us to do, since the state has essentially said all 10 million of the fee, planned fee increases were general fees and therefore subject to the cap, what that essentially does is change that three-year plan to be something different other than a 40/10/10 plan. Now, what it ultimately ends up being, I don't know. We'll go through the budget process, we'll engage University Council Budget Finance Committee, we'll engage all the administrative structure. It's hard for me to imagine the possibility of other efficiencies. It's hard for me to imagine. So what that -- but on the other hand, let's, let's see what the process yields.

If I am right, it simply puts pressure on growing amounts of deferred maintenance that are growing because we have this particular issue and it creates even additional pressure to reverse the persistent long-time enrollment decline that we have experienced. That, to me, is the issue that will concern us most moving forward.

CHAIR: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: If I might, could I have one follow up.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh-huh.

SENATOR ALLEN: Is it -- is it feasible, given that in that \$60 million plan there was seemingly some low hanging fruit of 10 million for new projects? Could that be looked at perhaps?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Everything will have to be looked at.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I mean the reason why the \$10 million fund was prioritized was it was thought to be the pool from which we could make investments that, over a three, four-year period could give us the possibility of reversing enrollment so as to not always be in the situation of cutting, cutting, cutting, trying to be more efficient. So it's a delicate balance between how much of an investment pool do you maintain when resources are so tight and the only other option is to cut.

And, again, just as a side note, the sad thing about the facility fee is that, to me, it was the easier sell to our students, and we had not received one objection to the facility fee increase. I think people know what we have built, people know we have great debt service, 36 million a year to repay, and it wasn't because anyone complained about the fee, it was simply a determination that it was not exempt from the cap.

SENATOR ALLEN: Thank you.

CHAIR: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. President-- Mr. President, I am really not very envious of your position and I'm very sympathetic to it. You have a lot of things to deal with. In the month that has passed since this body passed a no-confidence resolution, I would like to ask you if you would share your opinions, please, about the points that were raised in that resolution and what you would do going forward to address those issues. Shared governance, full-time faculty positions, ITT association, and so on. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, in fairness to the, I think to the document itself, it probably deserves a response that would be more than what I could provide at this standing today. Any attempt to do so might even diminish, I think, the weight of the issues that were raised in the document, and in light, I might suggest it would be best to try to do that with the Executive Committee before trying to do it with this full body. Having said that, I mean the document as a whole represents an issue that needs to be addressed in the global sense, and I have elicited the help of some folks to accomplish that with the goal of trying to get us all on the same page, working together for the common good and for the achievement of our teaching research and service missions. So if I can, I would recommend that that would probably be the best approach to try to address the point that you have made.

CHAIR: Other questions for the President? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I had -- I am going to do this as expeditiously as possible. The finance issue that we were talking about, there were two parts to it, the fees. Now, you have said that the state turned us down. What puzzled me, and maybe if we talked about it, I mean it's been cast and it's done, but it might be useful for further ongoing situations, how was it, I mean how is it this was put in before it was checked that the state was going to accept it? I mean this seems fairly obvious as to, you know, this is a planning issue, how did that occur? And the second thing, of course, which ties into the financial situation, and you have mentioned it already, which is the enrollment, and I noticed that you went through the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 along the top, but the one with the red is the ongoing priority of enrollment, and I'd like your comments on the enrollment situation, if you would.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Be happy to.

SENATOR ERICKSON: That's the second thing. The third, there is an issue on --

CHAIR: Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: But I'll stop. That will be enough. That was the University Council, but we will get to that as well.

CHAIR: I'll give you a chance to ask your third question, but if you ask enough questions at once, it gets hard to remember.

SENATOR ERICKSON: That's it. Two pieces on finance.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: So, let's see, what was the first question?

CHAIR: I think the question is –

SENATOR ERICKSON: The fees.

CHAIR: -- why the –

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Oh, the fees, yeah.

CHAIR: Why we found out only later that the facility fees –

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: The state has no process by which to seek approval for fee increases prior to the Board exercising – this is a retroactive review process that identified this issue. I mean our advisers at the time of preparing the budget believed that this was within the purview of our Board of Trustees, for a couple of reasons, one of which was that when you look back on the history of raising this fee, particularly to 2003-04, it appeared that the Board and the university had increased the fee during that period of time and it was -- then it was not flagged by the state as a general fee or an objection to whatever exemption was granted on the general fee. Further, there was other opinions within the university felt like as long as this was used for debt service, and not operations, that it was exempt from the fee. So we believed we had a legitimate basis for making this a decision of our own Board of Trustees, not the state. But this is a different political climate that exists today, I think that's kind of the bottom line to the issue, and in the retrospective review, they identified it as a general fee, not exempt from the tuition cap. And therefore we will refund it accordingly.

CHAIR: I understand that there's no formal mechanism for preclearing these things.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh-huh.

CHAIR: But I wonder whether there's any opportunity for some informal consultation.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yeah.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Well, when you have something like this happen, you will compensate with some type of process that will now seek pre-approval. But we believed there was sufficient historical experience to suggest that this was, this fee increase was going to be fine. But in the future, we'll make a telephone call. The rules of the game have changed a little bit in Columbus since 2003-04.

SENATOR ERICKSON: And –

CHAIR: Your second question, Senator Erickson?

SENATOR ERICKSON: It has to do with the enrollment situation because that has serious financial impact. Your comment on the financial situation -- I'm sorry, on the enrollment situation.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: We're obviously following it very closely. It is the lifeblood of the institution. I think you are following it as closely as we are, that would be my sense. Many of you get the

same reports that we do. When you look back on it, the application pool is still strong, up from two years ago, down from last year, but last year was a historic high, but the pool is still very healthy, 15,000-plus applicants. In terms of the admission officers -- admission offers, that still is a robust number relative to previous years, down slightly, but still over 10,000 admission offers. What is running behind is the part of the process where a student puts down the deposit. Okay? As a firm and committed obligation to attend. And we're listening very closely to the ground in terms of why that is.

Our best running theory, based on kind of anecdotal feedback, is that there is some concern about the financial condition of the university. That is the primary issue that is working against us at the moment, so all of our recruiters, all of my speeches to superintendents and to guidance counselors and to prospective students and their parents is that the University of Akron finances are going to remain strong because we're going to make the changes necessary to keep them strong, and we are as concerned as anyone about the affordability of college education and, you know, don't look at the sticker price, go meet with a financial aid counselor and find out what unique financial aid package can be put together to ensure your ability to afford college education.

So that's the message that we are, that we are continuing to communicate. Yeah, we're doing some extraordinary things this year, trying to kind of earn back performance of -- and there are many things, probably too many to mention, but some that come to mind, we have got a new telephone campaign that we are engaging. Just out of our office alone, in the last two weeks, we have sent 400 personalized e-mails to prospective students who have been admitted, but not yet sent in their confirmation. They're giving me a list of 50 telephone calls to make every week. I sat down, for example, with the chair of our Biomedical Engineering Department, made a call to a prospective student this week.

So it's the number one priority because it is the lifeblood of the institution. And now those are the initiatives I am aware of because they are the ones that most directly impact my calendar, but the Enrollment Management Group are doing some new and different things with financial aid leveraging, they are doing some new and different things by adding a significant recruitment event, I believe, in the jar in addition to what we would normally do on a senior day or a scholar day. Again, a new -- and a new contract for some telephone calls and a new contract for some social media help in reaching these admitted but not yet confirmed students. So a lot going on, and I think the Chair and I would both agree, anything that any of us can do to help kind of get back on track is in everyone's best interest.

CHAIR: Can I ask, obviously the problem is that the yield rate is down.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh-huh.

CHAIR: Has anyone looked at, analyzed the yield rate in relation to geographic proximity or distance from Akron?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Uh-huh. Yeah. I think we have looked at it in two different ways. We have looked at it to see if there are any college-specific trends that are worth noting. I have looked at that data, and while there is some mild variation, they are down across the Board. So I don't believe that there is a college-specific trend that is significant enough to kind of put your finger on anything. The second thing that I have not looked at personally, but it's been communicated to me by those who have looked at the data, that not surprisingly we're most down in the -- in our traditional areas that happen to coincide with the readership territory of the Beacon Journal and that we're actually doing fairly well in distances further from the university. So it is localized. And, again, I think it speaks to the

concern, the overall concern over the finances of the institution, which we have got to find a way to turn that conversation to say you shouldn't be worried about our finances, we are making the changes necessary to keep our university strong, and to kind of turn the conversation around if we can.

CHAIR: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Just one quick follow up on that. My understanding is it's not just that there's a sizable drop in committed freshmen, but the pattern of freshmen that have committed have a significantly lower composite ACT score.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: That's not -- I don't -- that's not -- that has not been seen in the data that I have looked at.

SENATOR ALLEN: So there isn't a drop in --

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: There's not deterioration.

SENATOR ALLEN: -- higher ACT scores compared to load?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Nothing I have seen over the last several weeks suggests deterioration in the overall quality. It's primarily a quantity issue.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay.

CHAIR: When I looked at it a month ago, it did appear, and this information may be outdated, it did appear to me that the decreases in confirmed admissions were proportionality greater among those with higher ACT scores, which is -- doesn't seem surprising to me at all, really, but it did appear that way. I don't know whether that has changed.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I didn't see it over the several weeks that I have looked at it, but we ought to look at it together when we are next together and let's just see what the current data suggests.

SENATOR ALLEN: And I will suggest maybe a reason for why some of this is occurring, and I'm not sure how we can fix it, whenever there is a drop in any cyclical industry, such as the petroleum industry, and that drives our engineering program, that can hit that, and that may be part of it. But I'm not sure.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Okay.

CHAIR: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: This is really just a technical question at this point, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Sure.

SENATOR LILLIE: Number 7, complete the search process for Director of Facilities and Construction. Is that a new position or is that the renamed position that the former Vice President Ted Curtis had?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: It's a downgrading of the position that Ted held prior to his retirement.

SENATOR LILLIE: Okay. And I also happened to notice that this sheet says at the top right, The Rallying Cry. Is there –

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: It's just it's out of a book, so it's attributed, this style of a report is attributed to a book that calls it -- the book's name is The Advantage by Lencioni, he calls it The Rallying Cry document.

SENATOR LILLIE: Thank you.

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

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. President, I'd like to switch, I'd like to change the topic just for a moment. So I am involved frequently with the Office of Technology Transfer, and I'm in communication there, I have a number of provisional patents that I have submitted over the last several years, and some of my colleagues, in Polymer Science, Polymer Engineering. Other departments have done likewise. So the Office of Technology Transfer has been impacted, seriously impacted by the policies now of the administration and the fact that the university now is not supporting nearly to the extent as before the costs of -- and they are considerable, to be sure, over time -- of provisional patents and patents going forward. This office is one that has generated, my understanding, my understanding historically, some tremendous financial numbers for the university. So the fact that I think that the spigot has been really seriously turned off has a huge impact, and it's impacted me, for example, with three patents, three provisional patents. We're having a lot of trouble trying to go forward with them. I'm wondering whether or not there is some consideration being given to having the spigot turned back on even a little bit so that that, that realm of university finances really can move forward to the extent that it had in the past. I think it's a really serious problem.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: And I appreciate that. I can try to recall what I remember from a conversation that occurred many months ago, but I think -- and I will try to do that, just -- but I think we would be better informed perhaps at the Executive Committee, perhaps at a future meeting of this, of this body, to have Nathan Mortimer, our CFO and temporary head of the Research Foundation, to explore this with you, because the parts that I remember, in round numbers, please don't hold me, be better, before you lock in on a number, to hear the report from Nathan, but what I remember is spending as much as \$2 million a year in legal fees to maintain an inventory of some of this intellectual property, and a decision made as part of the budget process, last year's budget development process, to scale that back and to align ourselves more with what more universities are doing, which is to look at the quality and the predictability of what the returns from maintaining this broad inventory of intellectual property, and the one piece of data that I had from those conversations, it's a little different than what is suggested, is that the return on that investment actually was quite small and didn't, did not merit the level of legal costs alone to maintain this, this unfiltered inventory of intellectual property.

The idea wasn't to cut it off, the idea was to value it and then, in doing so, to minimize the number of patents that we're maintaining, those that had the greatest potential for a return on investment, but in doing so, spending a lot less than \$2 million in legal fees to maintain the broad inventory. So that's what I remember. But I think we would all be better served to ask Nathan to prepare a report and let's look at the hard data and see what you think after you have seen that data.

CHAIR: Are there other questions for the President? Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Sure. Thank you.

CHAIR: Next item on the agenda is the remarks of the Interim Provost Ramsier.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of announcements and follow ups from last meeting. With respect to phase 1, and now we're calling phase 2, faculty and nonfaculty academic hiring, we currently have 34 tenure-track faculty positions approved, that includes some from the first, from the fall, from phase 1, four of the open rank positions, and 107 nontenure-track faculty positions. I need to remind you that almost every one of those positions is to replace a currently filled visiting position. We have not in this process changed the ratio of tenure-track to nontenure-track faculty. We are simply posting bargaining unit positions. The people that get those positions will replace the work being done in the current visiting positions. And a lot of the committees are actively working. Some of the application pools are quite impressive. I have actually even commented, when I approved the CVs. That I'm really impressed by some of the people that we're having apply for these jobs. So that's the first thing. You heard earlier about the discussion we had about the Associate Provost for Assessment. I know Senator Hausknecht sits on the committee, the search committee, I think we have about 15 applicants, he reports a couple are really strong, so we're going to move forward with that process. Very important to our learning outcomes assessment for our students as well as for our accreditation. Last time I mentioned that I would take the lead on looking at the indirect cost account issues that the faculty have. I have done that, I am currently working on it with Nathan Mortimer, CFO, and Eric Amis, Vice Provost for Research. It turns out that across the entire campus we only have \$1.85 million in all faculty IDC accounts. Now, that's not a lot of money with respect to the annual operating budget, but it's a lot of money to the faculty that have 48 those accounts, so, again, we are looking at it, trying to determine if there is a real need or a real emergency to spend some of that money, all we have to do is get a rationale and we'll petition to have that money released. We're going to work on a process, as we did with the startup issues that you heard about last time.

I need to let the faculty know, and please let your colleagues know, that we will not make the April Board meeting for tenure promotion consideration. The time line for Board submission is just too, too soon. The university wide review committee has not yet met. They begin meeting next week to review files that they need to review, and the Board deadlines are so far in advance of Board meetings now that there's no way we can make the April Board meeting. Which has been the norm in the past, except for last year. Last year caused some anxiety. Please don't get anxious and tell your colleagues don't be anxious. All of the files are in our office, they have all been reviewed. Letters are generated, but we don't send out letters from the Provost's office until they are all ready. So that some people don't get a letter and others do, then people get really nervous. Okay? So letters will be generated from the Provost's office on the same day and distributed to the colleges, but by the time that happens, it will be too late to meet the Board, Board of Trustees deadline. So the June Board meeting is the target for tenure promotion decisions and, of course, then the certificates of appointment. So please don't be

alarmed by the timing. I'm happy to announce that if we ratify the new collective bargaining agreement, I think we'll have a much better streamlined RTP process that hopefully will mitigate this problem going forward.

A couple other things that may be on your mind or you have heard about. The GenEd Core project pilot at Wayne, we have received the first set of data that were requested. That's been passed on to Academic Policies Committee and they have a subcommittee that's going to look at the effect, the impact of this program, at least from the fall semester, along the lines of how well did the students do compared to what they would have done, compared to comparison groups, control groups in the regularly offered sections and so forth. So that committee is looking at the data, and if they have more questions, of course, we'll get answers and we'll see what the outcome is.

There's been an issue that's been raised in our office about the College Credit Plus program. I'm not sure how many of you are familiar with this program. This is the state's replacement of the former postsecondary enrollment option, the PSEOP, many of us have had PSEOP students in our classes at one time or another probably. The CCP or College Credit Plus program required every school system, public school system, to have written agreements with colleges and Universities for students in 7<sup>th</sup> grade to 12th grade to take college credit courses. So every school system had to have written agreements by last -- sometime last spring. The issue that's been brought to my attention is some faculties' concern over the quality of the faculty teaching those College Credit Plus courses if they are taught in the high schools. Everyone should realize that every single person who teaches a class for credit The University of Akron is hired by the same process. The same academic credentials have to be there, it's an accreditation requirement, it's in our rules, and it's in our hiring process. So if a high schoolteacher wants to teach a, say, **Biology course, 101**, make it up, 101 in any discipline, as a College Credit Plus course for high school students, that person has got to be hired as a part-time faculty member by us. When we review the CV, we make sure they have at least 18 graduate credit hour in the content area that they want to teach in. That's an accreditation requirement. Okay? So if there's any issue, if anyone is aware of a specific issue, bring it to our attention because it's an accreditation issue for the campus. So it shouldn't be a concern. Hopefully it won't be, but I know some people are concerned that somehow the full-time faculty are going to lose quality control over these College Credit Plus courses. That is not the intent, and, of course, we want to make sure that we don't allow that to happen without our knowledge. Okay?

So that's my -- those are my remarks. I would be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR: I have two follow ups. First, on the proportion of non-tenure-track faculty positions, I don't expect you to be able to answer this quantitatively off the top of your head, but I do, I do wonder how many of the non-tenured visiting positions that are being replaced by non-tenure-track faculty were at one prior time tenure-track positions, that is a tenure-track faculty member retired and instead of another tenure-track faculty member being hired a visitor was hired, and now the replacement is a non-tenure-track faculty. So that even though from last year to -- or from this year to next year, there won't be a significant change in the proportion of non-tenure-track faculty members, if you look back enough, you would see a change.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Absolutely. And certainly it's not zero percent or a hundred percent, but it's closer to a hundred. I think we know in this campus, and including -- well, across the campus, it's only been very recent where we actually had non-tenure-track faculty. Okay? That was the college lecturers that were in the rule that then got migrated to the contract in '05. So it's a relatively



new experience for the campus anyways. Only in the last ten years have we had really utilized non-tenure-track faculty, full time. But, yeah, you're right, I mean if you look back far enough, you are going to find the lines that were, that used to be tenure-track now are not. It's very, very true.

CHAIR: The other question had to do with the ability or inability to meet the deadline for the April Board meeting. What's changed? Is it that the deadline is now earlier in relation to the meeting or

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yes. Yeah. The Board's -- the Board now has a process where when they have a meeting on a Wednesday, they now have a process where all the committees meet the Monday of the week prior. So there's an extra ten days.

CHAIR: Was it shorter before?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yeah, there never used to be fixed committee meetings before Board meetings. The Board meetings used to be on the same day as the Board. Now they are --

CHAIR: The committee meetings.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yeah, I'm sorry, the committee meetings. Now they are the Monday of the week prior. So there's ten days. They also pushed back when things are due. Unfortunately, because some people were turning stuff in late, so, as you know, then what you do is you set your deadline even earlier. So that's really been the issue for this last two years. It's only been recently that these committee meetings have been held in advance, which has then pushed the deadline even farther back. So I think the deadline is March, I want to say March 23rd, which is like, you know, less than three weeks from today. And there's just no way we can get everything done by then. It's just not possible.

CHAIR: Thank you. Are there other questions for the Provost?

SENATOR BRAUN: I have.

CHAIR: Senator Braun.

SENATOR BRAUN: I would like to ask a question to follow your questions to Provost Ramsier. It has to do with tenure-track versus non-tenure-track. I'm on the search committee for the Dean from Engineering and I have to tell you that in our discussions with two candidates that we had today, while the existence of a professors of practice and the method of having non-tenure-track faculty is accepted, both candidates have expressed the view that replacing-- increasing the number of the NTTs to a large extent could be detrimental to the quality of education. So if you could comment on that, because this, this is one of the things that was actually discussed.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Well, I certainly understand the candidates' position, and many of us understand exactly what this might, what this might mean. My point currently is to fix the problem at hand that we have more than 100 visiting faculty and we need to renew them. And so what we are trying to do is we're not converting, everyone needs to -- don't use the word "convert." There is no mechanism to convert visiting faculty into the bargaining unit. There's no such thing as a search waiver into the bargaining unit. Visiting positions will end in May the way that they are -- the way they have been budgeted. Non-tenure-track positions primarily have been requested by the deans. And those

have been approved. Not all, but most. Okay? So this current process is not about the global issue, which you point out, that globally we need to look at this. These are individualized, localized decisions, that the work being done by a current visitor is teaching of our sections of interim. The department doesn't think they need a tenure-track person to do that. They think they need a non-tenure-track person to do that same work next year. Okay? Those are localized decisions. When you add it up, it has a global impact. And I have been educated on this in an analogy that Wall Street had a similar issue some years back, when localized decisions ganged up to have a global problem. That needs to be analyzed. We need to look at this, take a step back after this year and look at the impact. And I think that should be something that is discussed openly. So I understand the concern, but to speak directly to the College of Engineering, last year when I was Acting Dean, there were 90 tenure/tenure-track faculty and 4 non-tenure-track. Now, some units in Arts and Sciences and Health Professions would love to have such ratios. Okay? 90 to 4. Okay? Only 30 of the 90 of the tenure-track faculty were generating a hundred thousand dollars a year in research dollars. Enough to pay themselves in the summer and two grad students a year. So the ratio of 90 to 4 probably isn't the right ratio, given the amount of the 90 that were actually generating enough research to defend the teaching load. So we need to be honest about it. The ratio needs to be looked at, but we'll look at it in detail.

CHAIR: Senator Scotto.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Chair Rich. So then what's going to happen to our visiting professors in May? They will not be invited back as visiting professors? If they are not invited back, will they have to apply for their -- for another non-tenure-track position again?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Absolutely. Because that follows the contract.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Then you will call them a new hire?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Yes.

SENATOR SCOTTO: Wow. Okay. It's just surprising to me because I've been hearing about the emergency hiring that happened last summer and the first wave of hiring that happened in the fall and the next wave of hiring. And over at The School of Nursing, we haven't had so much as a drop of water splashing on us yet, we haven't had one single person, so I just wonder where all this hiring is happening. Because we haven't had even one puny little teacher coming through the door.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Well, the updated spreadsheet was sent to all the deans again this week, as we do regularly, to be shared with the chairs and all the faculty. You can see every single line that's been approved. We share it openly. So --

CHAIR: Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: I have got a couple questions. One is regarding College Credit Plus, and just was wondering if you -- if -- I have a concern regarding the possibility that I'm glad that you addressed the quality issue with the faculty that will be teaching these courses, so even if it's a high school teacher, they have to meet the requirements, and I'm just wondering how confident you are in the vetting in general. So like especially with regard to Wayne College, and whether if an arrangement is made with Wayne, if faculty that would be teaching these courses, like a high school teacher or something like that, is going to be given the same screening and so forth as if they were vetted by -- vetted here, and then

just in general, I was wondering if there -- I have been talking with some people about this lately, whether it's a possibility to strengthen relationships with Wayne, and formally strengthen the relationships between academic departments here and the corresponding academic department there, because I'm in the philosophy department, in our case, Dimitria Gatzia is there who we would love to find ways to have her more involved with things going on here and possibly us being more involved with things going on there and so forth, but that I'm just wondering if there's any possibility of formalizing that relationship. And then an unrelated question just has to do with a few meetings ago you mentioned something about it's really quite surprising, although we offer faculty professional improvement leave sabbaticals, it was never a line item in the past, and I was wondering if any progress has been made on that issue having like a dedicated line item in the budget if somebody is granted a sabbatical.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Okay. So I'm trying to remember the three --

CHAIR: In a moment I'm going to ask you seven questions all at once and see if you can answer them.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Well, it's a test, so what was the first question?

SENATOR HUSS: Okay. So is the vetting --

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I'm kidding. No, you are right. Again, any faculty who teach any credit-bearing course for this university have to be hired the same way and have the same base minimum standards for credentials. That includes Wayne. That includes Holmes County, that includes Medina and Lakewood, everywhere. It includes mode of delivery. Okay? Independent of mode of deliver or location, qualifications of the faculty have to meet a certain minimum standard. And that has to be maintained and enforced. Okay? And we have the same hiring process. All those part-time faculty at Wayne come through the same PAF process through our office as everybody else. So, again, I'm glad the question has been posed. It's a good time to discuss it. Connection with the departments, between main campus and Wayne, need to be strengthened. We have a potential inconsistency problem, which is unacceptable to the accreditors. Unacceptable to us as educators. A course -- actually, the courses at Wayne, Wayne College itself owns very few courses. Almost every course taught in the Wayne campus is owned by a main campus department. Okay? The curriculum is owned by the main campus faculty. You are the one who submitted the proposal for Intro to Ethics. Okay? There should be a strong connection. It should be seamless. There should be no -- the students shouldn't know the difference, as far as the learning outcomes, where they took the course or how it was delivered. If that's not the case, every department should make it their case. They should make it their task to connect with their counterpart and work together. These are our students. They are not someone else's students. Wayne College is just a college at The University of Akron that happens to be located at a branch campus. We really should work on that. And that's really an academic endeavor. Faculty have to get together and make sure that they have the same learning outcomes, that the students are being -- the same kind of rigor is being maintained, the same kind of expectations, given that there's academic freedom to the instructor to run the course, but there still should be a very strong overlap. If the accreditors come here and notice that there isn't, we've got a real problem. Okay? And we have got to fix it now. Since it's been identified, some people are shaking their head yes, that there is an issue, we should look at it. Okay? And that's a disciplinary -- that's a discipline -- disciplinary issue that in Philosophy it's you, and Dimitria, and English it's somebody else. And that should be done soon.

CHAIR: The other one was about sabbatical.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: We're just in the budget process, as you heard. My calendar filled up with about 38 meetings today and yesterday about the budget issue – budget hearings. This is on my agenda for the Office of Academic Affairs, is to make sure that each dean sets aside enough money to cover what they think they will have as far as replacement costs for professional development. It's going to be important. And so we should start now. So --

CHAIR: Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: Thank you, Chair Rich. I have to go back to the IDC issue. We had a discussion last meeting here. Last two, three days we were asked to fill out forms that asked for a plan for IDC, how it can be expended next year. Many of my colleagues are of the view that since it's such little money in the faculty IDC, at least that part should be left to our discretion without, without having to force us to have a plan that we'll be held to. So I would like to know what you think about it and if there's a chance we don't have to have this plan.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Well, I think that -- let me make a statement. I know the faculty are very frugal and mindful of how they would spend their IDC, and I don't have any question that faculty are very careful with those dollars. Having said that, I think it's important to realize that if we can't come up with a plan to spend our money wisely, how can we expect any other unit on campus to do the same? Okay? Everyone needs mutual trust. If we can write down a plan and stick to it, we set the precedent that this is how you do it. So I would suggest we do it. Make a plan, write it down, and stick to it. That way the academic part of the budget isn't in the red and isn't too much in the black with a lot of carryover. Okay? Then we set the precedent for how the rest of the campus should be operating. The faculty are smart enough to do this. Let's prove it. Write it down. And stick to it.

CHAIR: Senator Willits.

SENATOR WILLITS: So while, yes, I agree that we have -- we all have a plan for our IDC, and it generally requires something to break, and us having the money to fix it, which isn't a planned thing, as you know. So I wondered if there is -- there has to be some room for that type of use of all IDC accounts, that there is a flexibility that there is a plan for me when I need repairs, when I need a new computer, when I need a new hard drive, and that is the plan. And I don't feel like I'm asking for anything out of the ordinary. I put aside money in a savings account at home that I can use in case I need it. Well, that is what I see IDC as here for, and that's what the purpose of it is from the government, it's to maintain my lab. So I wonder why it needs to be so planned. I understand startups being planned out, but I do not understand IDCs planned out for down to the dollar. So if you can maybe give us some idea of why that -- or I understand that there are very large IDC accounts, too, so I think that those probably are distinct, I will distinguish those. I'm talking about the 10 to 20 thousand dollar IDCs, and I don't even have that much, but, you know, so that, looking at that dollar, why -- those are repair costs, those are things that we have to pull out on a dime, so can you, can you kind of give me a little bit more information as to why I should have to plan out every dollar?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I think I mentioned earlier that in emergencies where you really need to spend the money now, all you have got to do is ask. I think that's very fair. If something breaks, you have got to fix it. Like the steam line or the hot water line that broke today,

Nathan is going to have to find some money to fix that big hole in the ground. So those are the unplanned things.

SENATOR WILLITS: Yes.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Down to the dollar? I'm not so sure it needs to be to the dollar. But there should be a reasonable plan that the budgeting people can count on. If you don't start somewhere, if you don't start with 1.85 million, where do you start? You only start at the VPs? Or do we only start in athletics? Where do we draw the line? Where do we start? We've got to start somewhere. Okay? This campus has suffered from the fact that we haven't planned. And the planning hasn't gone along with the budget. Now you see what that gets you. We're in a situation because of lack of planning. Do your best. I think that's all that can ever be asked of anyone. And everyone knows things break. I'm an experimentalist. I know the feeling. Okay? But you can kind of predict when you need to replace your computers. Depending on the kind of work you do.

SENATOR WILLITS: Sometimes.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Sometimes. But generally, you know, there's a certain kind of turnover time for certain kinds of things, or maintenance schedules for certain kinds of equipment. You can plan for that, roughly. I think that's all that's been asked. And if more than that is being asked, then somebody needs to talk to me about it because I understand what it means to be a faculty member with a lab.

CHAIR: Senator Cutright.

SENATOR CUTRIGHT: Oh, I and my colleagues pretty much follow the rules for filling out things when it's requested, but I wanted to point out one thing. You said we should provide an example, and if over 10, 15, 3, whatever number of years we have accumulated and stashed and saved a little bit money to come back for the rainy day, isn't that a good example of how to plan? To not spend excessively, to make sure that you have got a rainy day fund?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, I can't -- I completely agree. I mean that's what I said at the beginning, that I know the faculty are very frugal with these dollars. That's good. Okay? Now the only thing that's being asked in addition is to have a plan. And I think everyone had a plan in the back of their mind, it just wasn't written down. That's probably the case. So --

CHAIR: Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: Thank you, Chairman Rich. So I guess my question is, again, with the uncertainty that goes along with this, some of it is kind of good, I'm certain, right? So if I plan to replace computers or equipment or student support or summer salary or whatever it is and then suddenly I get a grant that will cover some of that, now my plan is, my plan is wrong. Because now I have, now I have money that I don't want to spend from my, say, IDC, instead I want to take it from the grant, which is now perfectly allowable, and so I guess my question is what happens when you underspend on your budget? Does that money then hopefully not get absorbed back into the university, but does it, I hate to use the word "carry over," but does it carry over until the next year?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Well, then currently you are seeing this 1.85 million. Most of that is carryover.

SENATOR QUINN: Sure. Of course.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: It's 15 years' worth of people accumulating these dollars. There's been no discussion in my presence that those dollars are not going to be carried over further. Okay? There's no taking of the money. The money is there. It's a matter of planning. You're right, if you get a grant and you can offset, you can use that money now, faculty generally would keep their IDC. I did the same. Okay? I still have an IDC account. Because I kept it because I didn't need it because I had other monies.

CHAIR: Do you have plans for it?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you for asking. Actually, it is on the OAA budget that I reviewed this morning to go to the budget hearing. I'm going to spend my IDC money on the Corrosion Center. Okay? That's my plan. I have asked to have all that money released for next fiscal year because the main grant runs out June 30th. July 1 I have got to have some money to pay the people that work there. That's what I'm going to use it for.

CHAIR: See? He's got a plan. Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes. I've got a different question. I wanted to ask about the international exchange program, because we have had for years an exchange program where students go to foreign universities, foreign students come here, and we just found out very suddenly from our partner universities overseas that your office has just shut the program down. And I'd like you to explain why this happened, and also explain why we had to find out about it from our overseas partner universities and why this wasn't discussed with the faculty.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Very good question. Just to clarify, the Office of International Programs doesn't report to our office, but I know about the issue, so I'll explain what I know. The issue is that this international exchange program has a set of agreements with, you know, international institutions to exchange students. The idea is it's supposed to be sort of a reciprocal arrangement, where the students in other, in other institutions, they send so many students here in a year or over a period of several years and we reciprocate by sending roughly an equal number of students back. There's a couple of issues with the way these agreements are written. First of all, when our students participate in that program, they pay a flat fee. They don't pay tuition to us, to The University of Akron. They pay a flat fee of like \$4900 or something. That fee historically went to the Office of International Programs. It was like a direct charge and it went right to that program, not to the general fund. So current enrolled students are getting a full semester where the university didn't generate any money. The 4900 went to the International office to be used for whatever. And since there was never a plan, nobody knows how it was used. The problem with that, so there's a financial issue, but the biggest issue is that the reciprocity is completely lopsided. That we have some institutions that have sent us lots of students, and they don't pay us a dime, they come here for free to take our classes. And we didn't send anybody back. So it's completely lopsided. And in order to correct that, okay, there has to be an understanding with those institutions that they have to take some of our students now to kind of make up the difference, and that's the issue that you are hearing about. Now, why it wasn't communicated, I don't know. That could be partially my fault. I knew about it. I even read about it. But I'm not sure how far that was disseminated. I guess I should never assume that the information was transmitted. But as you heard earlier, our office sends things to the deans with a specific,

specific statement, share this with all the chairs and directors and they, in turn, to all faculty. Again, if that's not happening, we need to know about specific cases where we can correct it. But that's the way it should work. Okay?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. Could I just follow up on this?

CHAIR: Yeah, I want to follow up and then I'll let you follow up.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay.

CHAIR: The problem with the lack of reciprocity is that the foreign institutions are just not accepting our students or that our students aren't choosing to go there?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I don't know, but I think it's the latter. Either they are not choosing to go or we are not advertising that they can go or something like that. I don't know that they are denying our students, but they actually do have the right to deny admission, like we would as well. But I don't think it's that. I think there's some kind of a lack of communication over the past so many years that their students know to come here and ours don't know to go there. And we've got to fix that. So I think -- I don't think it's been shut down. I think the idea is that there's going to be a hiatus until we figure out how to try to make it right. And go back and review all these documents that have been signed way back when to see exactly where we are.

CHAIR: Okay.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. If I can just follow up, then. Because what you are saying is very different than the information that we in History and Modern Languages got, and especially since, I mean I don't think I have to state anything here, it's really important in this area that our students have a global experience, it's even on the President's handout, and yet the international exchange program was one of the main ways for our students to go overseas, and the deans yesterday found out for the first time, or at least the first time that they noticed it, and then conveyed it for the first time to the chairs, that this program was shut down, and your name was labeled as the official shut downer. And with --

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, it goes with the territory. Just blame Rex.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes, that'll work.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: May I ask the Senator how many students History has sent on this program in the last two years?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: We usually send two or three a year.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: And how many do we receive? Do we know?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I think we usually receive one.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: So maybe in your case it's lopsided the other way.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: And the person who is now the assistant director of the international programs, because there is no director, his contract is up in June and he told us that because the whole program is being shut down, that we might as well just forget it. And this is disturbing because students can still hook on to another university's international exchange program, but only for one semester. And so someone cannot do like junior year abroad, which used to be kind of the gold standard for these things. In fact, it's not even one semester, it's 12 hours. So they can't even get a full semester's worth of credit. And so what this has done -- I mean if the program has not been shut down, tell people this, because this is the message that everyone has received, and the message that has been disseminated down through the deans. So I just would like to get you back on to that.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Consider it -- consider me on it.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay.

CHAIR: Senator Braun.

SENATOR BRAUN: I want to follow up on NTT/TT issue, on your comments. You are talking about that the College of Engineering has 90 tenure-track people and 4 non-tenure-track people. When you look at the funding, and there are so many -- so few people that have large amounts of funding, and it seems to me, and correct me if I am wrong, that you made a relation, you drew a connection between the funding and creating more NTTs versus TTs. Because it's not enough funding. And this sort of connection I never heard before. So maybe I misunderstood you. I hope I misunderstood you. But could you comment on that?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I think I directly connected the research funding to the current teaching loads of the faculty. Did I not? Okay? Most of the work being done in the College of Engineering is teaching of undergraduates. That is the heavy load. Right?

SENATOR BRAUN: Okay.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: And if the faculty, the full-time faculty, the tenured faculty, have a 2-2 load, which is the average for the college, it's my understanding, if they are not going to teach more, they are going to have to have more NTTs to do that work. I would assume. Isn't that a logical assumption?

SENATOR BRAUN: But when you, when you connect this to funding, let me just clarify the way, the way these two plus two is done, in addition to teaching the two credit courses, we advise graduate students, we write proposals, we do service, we work in labs, we write papers. So that getting to a two plus two, they start to count down in number of credits if you write papers, if you advise graduate students, if you do service, if you create labs and so forth. So just two plus two absolutely does not represent the totality of our activity. To just look at that, it is completely unfair, because if everybody would say, okay, I will bring you money, I am going to do two plus two, and none of the rest, you would have a catastrophe.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: I don't disagree with Senator Braun, but it all needs to be considered, is my point. The strategic plan of the college posted those numbers, not me. So that's what's on the website.



SENATOR BRAUN: But the point is we are saying these things. I'm just not sure if anybody listens. Okay?

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Senator Braun knows that I listen.

SENATOR BRAUN: Yes, I would agree with you. But now you are the big man on campus --

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Write that down.

SENATOR BRAUN: -- so, so if you listen, and I know that you heard me before, so I have no problem with that, and I'll acknowledge that publicly. Okay? And the adequate steps should be taken and recognition of all these other activities should be done. We mentor other faculty. We go and recruit people. So these are things that I even forgot about. That seems to not count.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: It counts with me.

SENATOR BRAUN: Okay.

CHAIR: It's after 4:35 and we have other business to transact, so I think we need to move on. Thank you, Mr. Provost.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR: And in light of the hour, I propose, if there's no objection to switching the order so that we do the Curriculum Review Committee's report, approve the curriculum change proposals, make sure that gets done, and the election of the representatives to the Provost search, make sure that gets done, and then hear from Dean Gordon, and let's try to move this along as quickly as possible. Is there any objection? Okay. Curriculum Review Committee report. You're back.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Curriculum Review Committee brings forward, hopefully you've had a chance to review, a two and a half page list of proposals that made it through the system without any complaints or outstanding issues. It comes as a report from the committee. We ask for your approval of these proposals.

CHAIR: Okay. The motion is on the floor. Is there debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed to by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

INTERIM PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR: Next is the election of representatives to the Provost Search Committee, which is the Board of Trustees. The way we'll proceed is, since there are three positions, we will call them positions A, B and C, and we will have an election first for position A, and then for position B, and then for position C. So are there nominations for position A? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I nominate Senator Rich.

CHAIR: Are there any other nominations for position A? Any other nominations? All those in -- sorry. Is there a motion to close nominations and elect me as a representative? It's been moved by Senator Allen, second by Senator Saliga. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. Now, is there -- thank you. Is there a nomination for position B? Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: I'd like to nominate Senator Bouchard.

CHAIR: Senator Bouchard, do you accept?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

CHAIR: Are there any other nominations for position B? Any other nominations? Is there a motion to close nominations and elect Senator Bouchard by acclamation? Moved by Senator Schwartz, seconded by Senator Huss. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent. Congratulations, Senator Bouchard. Is there a nomination for position C? We need one more. Self-nominations are quite permissible.

SENATOR LILLIE: I did it last time. I'd like to do it again, if there's no one else.

CHAIR: Senator Lillie nominates himself. Are there any other nominations? Senator Kemp?

SENATOR KEMP: I'd like to nominate Senator Saliga.

CHAIR: Senator Saliga, do you accept the nomination?

SENATOR SALIGA: Yes.

CHAIR: All right. Are there any other nominations for -- Senator Lillie?

SENATOR LILLIE: Then in that case I withdraw my self-nomination.

CHAIR: Thank you. And I appreciate your willingness to serve.

SENATOR LILLIE: Well, you were asking for a third person.

CHAIR: And I am expressing my appreciation for that. Are there any other nominations for position C? Any other nominations? Is there a motion to close nominations and elect Senator Saliga by acclamation? Senator Nofziger moves, seconded by Senator Huss. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. (Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Congratulations, Senator Saliga. All right. Next. Dean Gordon. Come on down. While he's coming down, let me just say it has been my privilege to get to know Dean Gordon reasonably well over the past several months and I could not be happier about the new role that he's taking on.

DEAN GORDON: Thank you, Senator Rich. It's good to be here and meeting with you folks. I want to have a bit of an informal conversation, if I may, in the remaining time. Because with this new position, and let me just give you, you know, kind of my perspective. So I am the Dean of the College of Health Professions and I haven't been here quite a year and a half. My perceptions of the University of Akron are, you know, manifold. One, this is a great institution, it has a lot of infrastructure, it has been serving the local community and the area very well. We have a lot of talented faculty, we have a lot of ideas, we have a lot of, you know, strong feeling administrators and certainly a President that has a lot of visions and thoughts in terms of where this university should go, so all of those I think are positive things that we have. What I guess amazed me a bit, and one of the reasons I mentioned to the President that I would be willing to serve, is, to me, I tend to want to work on unmet needs, and I look at this university and we have a lot of unmet needs and things that we need to be working on in terms of how do we -- you know, I mean all the issues that are listed on, for example, the dashboard that the President mentioned. How do we decide what's the appropriate mix of tenured versus non-tenured faculty? What should be the role that decides what are the guiding principles that we should be having as far as, you know, tenure versus non-tenure-track faculty? Are we doing the best job in terms of experiential learning? I mean there's a whole host of things. And what amazed me, I guess, is that what I hear more often -- let me back up here.

The approach I would like to see is for people to say, okay, here are the unmet needs. Here, therefore, are some goals that we should be following to address these unmet needs. And then here is our process to try to get the best ideas on the table and let's be most inclusive about this, you know, not just simply limit it to certain faculty members, but get as many inputs from faculty, staff, and students, frankly, the kid on the street I'm happy to have ideas from as well, but to get those ideas together and then let's start working with them to try to come up with the best solutions to these things and let's move forward as a team. What instead I hear too much of is what I would call a lot of communication that's people talking past each other, people blaming each other or saying, well, this person isn't listening to me, this person doesn't understand where I'm coming from, and I don't see this coalescing, you know, into kind of actionable items or enough actionable things that this university ought to be working on. In particular, right now we have a big enrollment problem, we have a whole -- we're not hurting for problems, but what we are hurting for is really sort of coming together in focused teams and really trying to get the best ideas together to really solve these problems. So what I suggested to President Scarborough is that, look, I would be willing to do the best that I can to try to provide some kind of bridge thing, because I'm tired of hearing people saying, well, gee, those faculty, they are always angry, they are always grumbling about things, you are never going to get things to happen, and then I'm hearing faculty saying this administration is off on its own track, it's doing its own things and not listening to us and not hearing what we are saying. I'm not saying that there is not truth to all of this, but as an institution and the value that we can provide, we can do a hell of a lot better in terms of identifying goals and identifying, you know, what it is that we should be working on and really trying to bridge this, what I call communication understanding gap. Let me give one example, if I can borrow from Senator Rich. So I'm told, for example, that we have our existing, you know, retention and tenure-track promotion, RTP policies. There have been suggestions of things like faculty of practice as another way of adding to our ranks or this. I don't know if there's been any rigorous discussion among you folks and other faculty about this idea. I know that Senator Rich has come up with another proposal in terms

of how we can value faculty being tenured, but actually focusing perhaps less on the scholarship and research, but also a track that focuses more on, you know, education and things like that.

What I have heard, and I won't give names, is people say, well, gee, I have not seen that fleshed out and therefore we can't consider it. And I'm saying, gee, that something is wrong here, because, you know, we have good ideas here, we should be able to crystalize these things, work at them, struggle with them, if need be, and come up with some really actionable types of things that our administration and our whole university can work on. So that's why I am not seeing someone really playing that kind of, you know, or sufficiently playing that kind of what I call diplomatic role, getting the best ideas on the table, working hard to try to come up with things that are win-wins for faculty and central administration, things that we can all be proud of. That's why I said, gee, I have to step up to the plate. You know, I may not be the best person to do this, but I'm willing to give it a try. And so I have had discussions with President Scarborough and he's agreed that let's give this a try, and so I think he has said that I will have his ear, and what I would like to do is to get your thoughts in terms of how to perhaps move this kind of dialogue forward and perhaps identify two or three things that we could work on for the next, you know, couple of months or so and really come up with actionable things so that you folks feel that you not only have made suggestions, but he see some of your suggestions in tangible reality being resourced and being followed through on by this university. So that's really why I'm here, is really to get your input, what is the best way to do that? What is the best way to approach that? Who should I be talking to? What's the kind of forum? And let me say, and my own people in the College of Health Professions have heard me say this before, but I really mean this, you know, in this kind of dialogue, it needs to be as open as possible. As far as I'm concerned, no question's a dumb question. All questions are politically correct. We need to really be open and honest and deal with anything. So, for example, and, you know, I apologize to my colleagues from Health Professions because they have heard me say this too long, but I really believe this: I happen to be a pathologist, that is my M.D. training specialty, and some of you may say, pathology, aren't you the guys who, you know, are hunchbacks that work in dark basements? That's okay. We can have that discussion. Okay? It turns out there's some truth to that. I actually do have scoliosis, which is the most common form of being a hunchback, you know, in the U.S., but among my pathology colleagues, I'm the only person who has scoliosis, so being a hunchback is not a common thing among pathology. We do our autopsies in the basement, this is true, but they are well lit because we need to know what we are looking at in the case. Okay? The point is that I really want to try to have as much open dialogue and really try to come up with solutions to things that, again, all of us here at the university can feel proud of. Now, we may not get a consensus on absolutely everything, I recognize that, but it seems to me that for certain things that this university is considering, for example, you know, if we are dealing with, for example, negotiations that are going on with ITT in terms of satellite campuses, you know, I'm not privy to those things, there is a nondisclosure agreement as far as that's concerned, okay, I have worked for a corporation before, I understand nondisclosure agreements, but that shouldn't stop us from having a vigorous conversation among our faculty about what are the pros and cons of satellite campuses? And what makes sense and what doesn't make sense? What's been on in history? How can we improve our own situation? And so that's the kind of dialogue, it seems to me, that we can have and that's the kind of thing I would like to promote until we come up with concrete proposals and begin to say this is what we need to make happen and look for the win-wins. And let me stop there and say, again, ask again, what is the best way to do this? You know, I'm happy to meet with people here, meet with individual faculty meetings or department meetings so, you know, certainly people can e-mail me and have individual meetings. I want a variety of different ways of doing this. But I need your guidance in terms of what is really going to make a difference.

CHAIR: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR LILLIE: Some of us, in particular Senator Erickson here and I, have been working for a long time to try to come up with a framework, or I should say frameworks, that might actually provide the skeleton that would then be able to be seen as the system that the university would use to begin to vet, to develop, to have ideas flow through that are then -- that are then -- that are then reviewed by people who have a stake in them, and can make informed recommendations. The responsibility would be twofold: One, to recommend things up, and, two, to communicate with colleagues down, if you will.

DEAN GORDON: Okay.

SENATOR LILLIE: Now, one of the examples, one of the reasons you are here, is because this process, which has been honored more in the bridge than in the observance over the past few years, was used to create an ad hoc committee of concerned and dedicated individuals who, from what I heard informally, had some very frank and free conversations about the language of the final resolution and generated a resolution that had overwhelming support among this body. So the process of Faculty Senate members taking responsibility for these things, working on them in committee, developing, talking to their colleagues and to others, worked in this particular case, or at least it appears that it is beginning to work. So I would argue very strongly that part of what we need to be looking at is how do we institutionalize that structure, not just rely on it when we happen to have a major crisis and people come together. There are ways, it seems to me, that we could institutionalize that that would, that would, that would help, for instance, the Faculty Senate committee system to flourish, the University Council, as it was, you know, as it was designed also has that kind of a model of vetting something, talking about it, and then bringing it up and talking down. So I think there are some things that are in existence. Unfortunately, that would mean that there would need to be the kind of take too that appears to be being seen by a number of people as being perhaps it's going to take too long, I don't have the time for this, we need to make the change ourselves, and that, I think, has led to some of the, some of the difficulty. So I would argue that there is a very good argument on this campus that we have some systems that have not -- that folks have worked very hard on that have simply been ignored by the powers that be.

DEAN GORDON: Okay.

SENATOR LILLIE: And that, in my view, perhaps in others', that's part of the reason why we have been where we have been. And, again, I want to point out that the reason why we seem to be making some progress this month is because of using that process last month and in the months prior. Thank you.

DEAN GORDON: Thank you.

CHAIR: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

SENATOR LILLIE: Excuse me, Senator Bouchard. I'd like to get by you. I'm generating revenue.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Generating revenue. I appreciate you coming and talking to us, but I'm a little bit disturbed because we have a body for faculty to communicate with administration, it's called Faculty Senate. And why I'm a little bit disturbed -- I mean I'm delighted to have you here, nothing against you.

DEAN GORDON: Sure. I understand.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: But as Senator Landis was saying a few moments ago, this body came up with a full list of very carefully reasoned and thought-through concerns, to which we have received no answer.

DEAN GORDON: Okay.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: And I think that for the President to have sent you as his representative sort of puts you in a tough position, because you are kind of caught between the person we were trying to talk to about these very serious issues and the person who is not responding to this body.

DEAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: So I think that that -- you know, we have got a list of things we're intensely concerned about, and I think your first priority should be looking at that list, going with the Senate, Executive Committee of the Senate is, I know, a very active body, and looking at these things and how they can be changed. The Senate did not make that decision rashly or flippantly or without extremely careful thought. So that's my main thought.

DEAN GORDON: And just so I am clear, this is the document that encompasses the vote of no confidence for the President?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes. Absolutely. Yes.

DEAN GORDON: Okay. I just want to be sure. Yeah. I agree with that.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes. Thank you. Want to make sure. Yes. My second thought is I'm delighted if you want to start talking to constituency faculty groups, and I think another group you should talk to is the Executive Committee of the Akron AAUP, the faculty union. And part of -- this is not Senate business, this is separate -- the faculty union contract, we are trying to get a finalized contract. We actually have gotten virtually everything taken care of, including the professors of practice has now been agreed on both sides, that's going forward.

DEAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: But where we are hung up is that on the financial issues, we're back to the point that this university always used to be, is if by some bizarre chance there is a few cents left over, then the faculty might get them. And you can talk to the people who are doing the negotiations, but the university's so-called last best offer to the faculty was essentially minus raises over the next four years. And I think that perhaps you could step in. When Mike Sherman first became Provost, that was when we were having our last negotiation, and he stepped in as new Provost to try to say, okay, faculty are important, we need to find something which is financially possible and is also not insulting to the faculty.

DEAN GORDON: Thank you. So let me make my role -- just make one clarity as far as my role is concerned.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay.

DEAN GORDON: So I am not an official negotiator for the AAUP.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: No, I know you're not.

DEAN GORDON: That is not my role.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I know you're not.

DEAN GORDON: I'm certainly happy to entertain, you know, any of the issues, you know, that are pending on that.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Uh-huh.

DEAN GORDON: To give one example, I know that, or at least I have heard, I should say, because I am not directly involved with this, that there are discussions about changing our benefit plans, perhaps trimming that down.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

DEAN GORDON: I don't know what form that might take, but one of the aspects that I don't think has been sufficiently part of that discussion is the idea of having an employee health service, for example, on this campus, which many institutions have generated and in many cases have done well, should help to reduce costs and hopefully ameliorate some of the pain in terms of, you know, increasing the costs that would be transferred. That's the kind of thing, it seems to me, that we could have vigorous discussion about, pros and cons and how that's done and things like that.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Yes.

DEAN GORDON: So what I would hope to do, I mean with the points also that were raised in the letter, the document of no confidence, I'm happy if people feel that, you know, maybe marching down that list and really saying if you feel like you haven't gotten adequate answers from central administration about that, I'm happy to, you know, weigh into that and try to get, you know, a better understanding of your thoughts, get a better understanding of the central administration thoughts and have a vigorous

dialogue, because it seems to me, we're a university, we should be the kind of place that has at least pretty open and honest dialogue about things. So I'm happy to help with that.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. But I think you could, with benefit, just meet with the Executive Committee of the Akron AAUP.

DEAN GORDON: Okay.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Which I am on. We would have happy to have you.

DEAN GORDON: Okay. Okay.

CHAIR: Senator Erickson? You are seeking the floor?

SENATOR ERICKSON: Just with respect to the benefits, I'm chair of the University Council Talent Development and HR Committee and one of the roles of the HR Committee, as it is now, who knows what it will be, but as it is now, is to look at, to include health benefits, and what I -- why I say that is that when it comes to things like health benefits, this applies to a group, and I know, and I really appreciate that you are talking to faculty, and faculty is really important, but I also want to recognize that when it comes to things like health benefits, that there are contract professionals and staff, and also faculty who are not included in the bargaining unit who are chairs and stuff like that, and --

CHAIR: And law faculty.

SENATOR ERICKSON: -- that health benefits apply -- I'm sorry -- but that health benefits apply to them as well. And their input into this process is supposed to be coming through us, but, you know, which originally the Faculty Senate had agreed to, but then it's a mess, and we don't need to talk about how difficult it is to get planning on this campus, because it is, but there's more than, I guess, faculty that needs input. That the employee health part, our committee talked to University Council, and that was part of University Council, that the work that you are doing with the Nursing --

DEAN GORDON: Nursing Center For Community Health?

SENATOR ERICKSON: That's right.

DEAN GORDON: Yes, uh-huh.

SENATOR ERICKSON: That the whole issue of including people on campus on that was brought in. Admittedly, that's at the edge, but it was a starting point, and yet I don't think faculty really know very much about that.

DEAN GORDON: Yeah. So I mean on that point, we're in the process, at least we have proposed to try to begin to integrate all of our clinics on the University of Akron campus.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Great.

DEAN GORDON: So not just simply the Nursing Center For Community Health, we have two other clinics in the college, audiology/speech pathology and counseling, but also beginning to merge



with the student health service. And then with that as an infrastructure, we are proposing to build a employee service. But we clearly need the input of as many people as we can, not just faculty, staff, other people as well, to make that happen. I have had some conversations, for example, with Dr. -- I'm blocking on his name -- Petrylak, I believe, he's the chief medical officer for Goodyear, and they have an employee health service there, but what he's underscored to me, for example, is that it's more than just simply having a clinic or two on the place. You have got to really change the whole culture of wellness. So he showed me, we went to visit, you go into that cafeteria, it's true, their pizzas do, in fact, cost more than their salads, their sodas do, in fact, cost more than their fruit juices. And these are some of the things that perhaps we need to think about if we are really going to be able to make, you know, a positive return on our investment and reduce costs and things like that, but we clearly need to have input from all sorts of people in terms of how to make that happen.

SENATOR ERICKSON: There are at least two committees of University Council that you need to interact with.

DEAN GORDON: Good. I'm happy to follow up with you about that.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Thank you.

CHAIR: Senator Mitchell.

SENATOR MITCHELL: At the risk of repeating what Dr. Bouchard said, I appreciate you being here, I've never had the chance to meet you, but it's really puzzling to me that the response of the President to the idea that there's not enough communication is to delegate that task to an administrator to talk with faculty. As she said, this is a body to which he is supposedly conversing, refused to answer questions about the vote of no confidence and the process there, so I'm really puzzled. We told him we need to work on these issues, and the response is, what do you need to work on? I'm very puzzled by this whole thing.

DEAN GORDON: So if I can be frank, I'm a bit puzzled by this as well. Anytime groups of people meet and they talk, and then the groups say they don't understand where the other is, I mean I'm very puzzled by that sort of thing, and so, you know, to me, I feel like, my dad was a diplomat, so maybe I have inherited some diplomatic genes, I want to get to the heart of this and sort of make things happen, because I think we are the kind of community that can get past, you know, slogans and perhaps, you know, individual beefs that we have and really come up with, you know, mutually constructive things. Am I the best person for this? I have no idea. You know, I'm just coming up to the plate because I didn't see anybody else, you know, coming up to try to do this sort of work, and I think, again, that hopefully anything that I do I want to be value added, it's not to replace any of the communication venues that we currently have or things like, you know, Senate or University Council, it's to add to that hopefully in a value-added fashion, so that's what I intend to do.

CHAIR: Let me just say that I appreciate your humility. I think you are the best person.

DEAN GORDON: I'll try the best I can. And let me also say, again, my faculty have heard me say this before, you want to talk with them, you can get the reality check. As I try to do this, and this is a tough issue, some would call it a mission near impossible, you know, feel free to, you know, correct me, kick me under the table, above the table, whatever it takes to get my attention. You know, I want to be

able to get the kind of feedback so that we can move ahead, you know, in a positive fashion, hopefully in a synergistic fashion on any of the things that we decide to work on.

CHAIR: One of the things the President may have recognized is his own weakness in this area and may be trying to supplement. Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: A couple things. First of all, thanks a lot for coming. It's very nice to hear you speak and the things that you are saying. So I think that the principle -- just to distill some of the stuff that has been said and then just move beyond it, I think the principle breakdown in communications is that the President often seems to think that informal ways of getting faculty input are a substitute for procedural ways of getting something sort of vetted, approved, all of the relevant like, you know, okay, we have now officially said that we agree with this and that we have had sufficient input, and so now please, you know, proceed as you will. So the President often like wants to talk to a few faculty, get their ideas and so forth, and once that's been done, then he often seems to think, hey, I solicited faculty input, what am I doing wrong? I mean I did try and get it. You know, I'm -- you know, he seems at a loss. And so some people I think in the room, if I'm reading the vibe of the room correctly, believe that by having you in this role, he's again doing something similar to that. Like, hey, I appointed a person. That person is directly going to -- he's going to be speaking with you directly getting your input, and instead of some of the procedural things that a lot of people are talking about that are really a the way that a lot of us believe it should be done. That being said, set that off to the side for a moment, it's great to both have procedural ways of dealing with issues and more direct pipelines of communication, because sometimes institutional change, because of the procedural ways that it's done, is very slow. And we can't respond to immediate opportunities we can't take advantage of particular moments, a headline that happened, let's, you know, capitalize it or mute it, or whatever, and there are all kinds of different things that where both things, informal discussions with the President through you or through other means, and making sure that we have a robust procedural process-based way, so that he's never going to be thinking or worried or surprised that the faculty don't agree with something, where he, in fact, did get some input.

So I think that's the kind of thing, we could do both. We could, we could have informal dialogue facilitated by you, make sure people are hearing one another, and also make sure that we have a robust process-based way to do it.

DEAN GORDON: Yeah. Yeah. So I'm not here to interfere with sort of existing processes if people feel like they are working and, you know, they are valuable. I'm here to try to add to that and make them more effective. What I worry about is that, you know, and I hear a lot from our faculty, you know, people come up with ideas and thoughts, they say, gee, the university should be doing this, and then it goes off to a black hole and either nothing happens, or instead people pick up the The Devil Strip and realize here is something that's come up and wasn't fully discussed. So the deliverables need to be did we get the best ideas on the table, and be as inclusive as possible. Some of it's going to come from procedural, some of it's going to come from places you don't expect. You know, and then do we rigorously vet those ideas, you know, to come up with the best action plan? That's what I'm trying to facilitate. You know. And, again, I don't mean to step on any existing procedures. I want to talk with groups and things like that. But at the end of the day, there have got to be things that you folks can point to, to say this originated with the faculty and now it has happened and we are better for it. My guess is that if I ask most of my faculty about that, they would say there's precious few things that they can point to right now with those sorts of things. Whereas they can point to several things that they have learned about in The Devil Strip. Now, again, I don't want to get into the specifics about all

those things are appropriate or inappropriate. But I will challenge this and say were they the best ideas? Did we have clear goals in terms of what the unmet needs were and did we come up with the best ideas to address that, being enrollment, being how we advise our students, being what new types of institutions we create on this campus. We always have to be asking ourselves that question, and I think it's important because, at the end of the day, if students are going to decide to come here versus someplace else, they need to know that they have the best opportunity coming here and that we have tangible reasons as to why we're doing those things. So I'm happy to help in any way that I can with that.

CHAIR: Senator Otterstetter -- Otterstetter. Excuse me.

SENATOR OTTERSTETTER: Really quick. I'm going to follow up Chairman Rich's endorsement of Dean Gordon. He -- I'm in the school that's in the College of Health Professions, so I have had interactions, more interactions with Dean Gordon than most people here. He came to our school last week, I believe, or earlier this week and we had a conversation about this. You know, one of the things that was, you know, that was striking about what he said when he was in our department was he basically said I'm going to be appointed this position, position why, this is what the position is going to be about. If this isn't working, I'm out. I'm not -- you know, there's a lot of conversation about yes men on campus. This is not a yes man. He literally says, if this isn't working, I'm -- I'll get out of the position and move on. Because he's not willing to waste his time to keep doing the same thing over and over and not getting the -- and getting the same result, which is no result at all, so he -- I have full confidence in he is going to do his best, as Chairman Rich said, he is the best man for the position at this point. He's going to do the best he can with the information he gets. If what he's doing isn't working, he is not going to sit here and tell us, you know, spin awesome tales of magical things that are going to happen. He's going to say, you know what? It's not working, and I'm out. So I definitely want to endorse him on this.

DEAN GORDON: Or how better to make this work. You know, what are the ideas to be more constructive about this? And, again, I am going to need your input, you know, in large part to be able to say is it working to your advantage, you know, is it working from your perspective or is it not working, and so how to change that sort of thing. So I'm open.

CHAIR: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Chairman, Dean Gordon, thank you very much. You and I have worked together several times and I really appreciate the fact that you have come to the Senate to speak with us, and as my colleagues here on the floor said, I have every confidence that you are going to be absolutely fantastic in this position. I want to compliment you with respect to that, but I also want to say something to the Senate as a whole. It seems to me that the appointment of Dean Gordon in this position gives us a chance not to abrogate our position with the President, but gives us now two pipelines, and we don't want to forget the pipeline directly to the President as well as to Dean Gordon. So I think we should continue to make every effort when he speaks with us, when we interact with him on campus away from Faculty Senate, when we speak to the President, we need to make certain that he understands that he does not have, in a sense, Dean Gordon as his only man. We need to keep the pressure on the President as well as continue to interact or begin to interact and continue to act with Dean Gordon. So we have got, in my mind, two advantages here, one through Dean Gordon and one continuing with the President.

DEAN GORDON: I agree.

CHAIR: Okay. Anything else?

Thank you, Dean Gordon.

DEAN GORDON: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR: Next item is the report from the Graduate Council representative. Senator Allen, is there a report?

SENATOR ALLEN: I think we will have next month, but not right now.

CHAIR: Okay. Good. Thank you. Report from the University Council representative? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Oy. Here it is a quarter past five.

CHAIR: I don't suppose the report is going to end there.

SENATOR ERICKSON: The University Council this time has got those Bylaws, and you guys don't know what those Bylaws are about. And we have to represent the Faculty Senate in these Bylaws and we haven't had a meeting yet of University Council, but our first response to those, and the response of the Steering Committee, is that they are totally unacceptable as they are. Chair Rich said I was meant to sort of summarize it. This is going to be the super simple summary because I'm looking at my notes and thinking how can I make it even shorter? The Interim Provost said, well, they came up with a system which is run by the Provost, and that's about right. There's no independent chair of the University Council. And the Executive Committee is chosen by the Provost. The elected officials, instead of there being 35 members of the University Council, there would be now 18. Two faculty, two graduate faculty, two -- two of everybody. So it's two -- well, it is, it's two by two. Two, two staff, two contract professionals, two -- what else have I got -- graduate students, two undergraduate students, two chairs, two deans, two vice presidents. That 18 people make up the total University Council. They cut down the committees, they do away with all of the official planning language about what University Council is meant to do. They don't in the mission statement say it shouldn't be the planning institution, but all of the ways that you would actually bring that about are gone, and the committees are somehow -- are to be chosen by the Steering Committee and the Provost. No disability, of course, that it is run by the Provost, right? And they are to come from University Council. There are 7 committees and 18 people and --

CHAIR: We can do the math.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yeah. They would be all the same rule. So we have been -- the Steering Committee has -- is going to bring to University Council that we form an ad hoc bylaws committee. I put myself in because I helped write the original Bylaws. This will be the third group of Bylaws I have worked on for University Council. And notice the difference here is 18 versus, with the committee structure we have, 118 people who are going to have input into what's going on. Apart from the fact that it's not run by the Provost in this case either. And we have been asked to go through and make

changes, start with this new version, and then make changes, giving reasons for those changes all the time. What my committee said --

CHAIR: Although the consultant gave no reason.

SENATOR ERICKSON: -- was, and I'm puzzling at the last statement, what my HR Committee looking at this material said was why isn't it that we hadn't got from the Board of Trustees consultants, why they had put it the way they had? And, in fact, what was the request by the Board of Trustees, what were they supposed to be answering? We don't know either of those two things and it makes it really, really difficult and frustrating. CHAIR: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Briefly. Was there any comment in the redline version in terms of where Senate fit into this new organization?

SENATOR ERICKSON: Oh. I left out one extra piece. They added an extra committee which was an Academic Affairs Committee. We have made a clear, clear statement when we first got involved as a Faculty Senate and University Council that we kept here in Faculty Senate all academic matters. This is -- it's only a hypothesis, my -- our hypothesis is that this is the nose of the camel under the tent to potentially try to get rid of the Faculty Senate because they could make a statement, say, well, all of these need to go to the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate needs to interact, but this is -- that's the first committee that would go, as far as we are concerned.

SENATOR ALLEN: Thank you.

CHAIR: Let me just add from my own perspective that these changes are utterly unacceptable.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Absolutely.

CHAIR: Utterly unacceptable.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Utterly.

CHAIR: And it would be better to not have a University Council --

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes.

CHAIR: -- than to have a University Council that approximates what's provided for in these amended Bylaws.

SENATOR ERICKSON: And I can't say that University Council agrees, because we haven't had a meeting, but I would say that personally, and I know that this would represent the position of all the Faculty Senators on the committee. On University Council.

CHAIR: Any other questions for -- yes, Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: I have no question.

CHAIR: Any new business to come before the body? I hope not. Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: I do have a report from the University Council Budget Committee.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Oh, yeah.

CHAIR: Yes. So this is not new business, this is still under University Council representative.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes, if you could.

CHAIR: Go ahead, Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SASTRY: Okay. Thank you. So we have had issues with representation on the committee. Dean John Green from BCS was appointed to the committee. The chairs are in the process of electing a replacement for Professor Matley on the committee. CPAC appointed Jessica DeFago the committee to replace Kenny Karch. We are working with the graduate student government to help us adding three new student members. We started to review the institutional finances. We are beginning to understand where major sources of revenue are and major expenses. Mr. Mortimer has been helpful in sharing information. We still do not have admin support for the committee. Either I or Ed Conrad will be attending all the scheduled budget conversations, as David calls it, in hearings, as it was mentioned earlier. These have been scheduled as economic and noneconomic units over the next few weeks, so we are, we are engaged with that. And we are expecting to receive draft versions of the 2016. This concludes the report of the UC Budget Committee.

CHAIR: Thank you, Senator Sastry. I apologize for forgetting. He had mentioned to me that he had this report. Are there any questions for Senator Sastry?

New any business?

Anything for the good of the order? Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: I'll be brief, but I appreciate being -- indulging me. On behalf of the students, I put some fliers out by the name cards. Chair Rich last month was good enough in the special announcements to recognize the untimely passing of Zak Husein, the student who was murdered at the pizza shop. You have probably seen in the press that some students are putting together a commemorative service event in Zak's honor. It'll be coming up in April. I'm looking to the faculty to join with the students and the larger community and participate in that event, to the extent possible, and I'll be sending some stuff out through the Senate's e-mail system to kind of remind people and ask people, if you have got question, I'm acting as faculty adviser to the students who are organizing that, so please see me about that. Thank you.

CHAIR: Let me second Senator Hausknecht's urging faculty to participate in that.

Anything else for the good of the order?

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Can I just remind you all again that Faculty First Friday is always is first Friday of every month, so faculty can come to Lockview. It is hosted by Akron AAUP.

CHAIR: Okay. Anything else for the good of the order? I think you are probably ready to adjourn. I declare this meeting adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned at 5:21 p.m.)