

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

FACULTY SENATE

5 MAY, 2016

CHAIR RICH: The May meeting of the Faculty Senate is hereby called to order.

Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? So moved by Senator Sterns. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Schwartz.

Does anyone wish to propose any changes to the agenda? The only one I have is with the -- the March minutes have not yet been distributed. We obviously are not in a position to vote on those, but we do have December and February. Any other changes anyone wishes to propose to the agenda? All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted.

Next is the Adoption of the Minutes, first of the December meeting. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the December meeting? Moved by Senator Bouchard, seconded by Senator Kidd. Are there any corrections to those minutes? All those in favor of adopting the December minutes, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The minutes are adopted without dissent.

Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of the February meeting? Moved by Senator Kemp, seconded by Senator Saliga. Any corrections to the February minutes? If not, all those in favor of adopting those minutes, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Minutes are adopted without dissent.

Next are the Remarks of the Chairman. Among the items on today's agenda are the election of two Faculty Senate representatives to the University Council; two

reports from the Academic Policies Committee, the first recommending approval of the transfer of the Department of Economics from the College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Business Administration, and the second concerning the Resolution referred by the Senate last month which calls for an immediate suspension of the Gen Ed Core program; a report also from the Curriculum Review Committee recommending approval of various curriculum changes; a report from the Computing and Communications Technologies Committee recommending creation of an ad hoc Senate committee to investigate alternatives to the current online course evaluation system; and a report from the University Libraries Committee recommending the creation of an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Scholarly Communications in relation to the University's institutional repository.

As a follow-up to action taken by this body in our last meeting, I wish report that the cohort block scheduling of incoming first-year undergraduate students has ceased, except for those specifically requested by a College, and students are no longer being preregistered for classes. I have requested, and been promised, that students previously preregistered for classes will be informed that they are free to alter their class schedules.

I also met with President Scarborough, Dean Rickel and Vice President Burns to discuss the need to aggressively market programs in the College of Applied Sciences Technology, especially in light of increasing competition from Stark State University. I urged them, and they agreed, to consult with the CAST faculty in developing the marketing plan, and to involve the faculty in the implementation of the plan, as appropriate. Since then a draft plan has been prepared and shared with Dean Rickel, so that he, in turn, can share it with the CAST faculty.

The precipitous decline in confirmed admissions of our first-year undergraduate students has abated further since we last met. According to the most recent information, confirmed admissions are down 24% from the same time last year. I

expect that some additional ground may be made up between now and the beginning of the fall semester, but I would be surprised if next year's entering class is not at least 15 to 20% smaller than last year's, or I should say, this year's. This will necessitate budget cuts significantly larger than those already needed. The President has indicated that the University will begin the 2017 fiscal year without a budget having been approved, but a budget will be adopted toward the end of the summer, after we have a better idea of fall enrollment. In the meanwhile, units will face uncertainty about the resources that will be available to them for the new fiscal year. The decline in confirmed admissions is great enough, and so disproportionate to the decline in the number of students graduating from high school in the region, that there can be no doubt that it is caused largely by the injury that the University has sustained to its reputation during the last year. The health, and perhaps even survival, of the University depend upon repairing the reputational damage quickly, to minimize its impact on first year enrollments in subsequent years.

This being the last meeting of the Faculty Senate for this academic year, let me thank all of you for your service to the University this year, and wish you all an enjoyable summer. This concludes my remarks.

Next item on the agenda is Special Announcements. I have three deaths to report. John F. Kline, Jr. died on April 13th, at the age of 63, after a long illness. He worked as a cataloging specialist in the University libraries for 32 years and taught as an adjunct faculty member in the history department for 20 years. He had earned master's degrees in history and political science from the University of Akron. An Army veteran who served five years on active duty, and 17 years in the Army Reserves, attaining the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

Dr. Rudolph Joseph Scavuzzo died on April 24th at the age of 83. Dr. Scavuzzo served on the faculty for 27 years as Head of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, and Associate Dean of the College of Polymer Science and

Polymer Engineering. Before he was a faculty member at the University -- before that he was a faculty member at the University of Toledo, and at Rensselaer Polytechnic University. Dr. Scavuzzo received his undergraduate education at Lehigh University, and earned a master's degree and a PhD in mechanical engineering at the University of Pittsburgh. He was a fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, receiving its Dedicated Service award in 2014. He also received a lifetime achievement award for 50 years of work in the field of shock and vibration. He authored textbooks and dozens of published technical studies in various disciplines.

Dr. Donald McIntyre died on February 14th at the age of 87. Dr. McIntyre joined the University of Akron faculty in 1966. He was a founding member of the University of Akron's Polymer Science faculty, and served as head of that department. He received his undergraduate education at Lafayette College in Pennsylvania, and earned a PhD in chemistry at Cornell University. Before joining the faculty here he served in the U.S. Army at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and was awarded a National Defense Service Medal. After that, he worked at the National Bureau of Standards until he joined the faculty here. Dr. McIntyre retired as Professor Emeritus of political science in 1995.

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

Thank you.

The next item is the Report of the Executive Committee. Secretary Schulze.

SECRETARY SCHULZE: Since the Faculty Senate last met on April 7th, the Executive Committee met twice by itself, and once with the President and Interim Provost.

The Executive Committee met on April 21st, for regular Senate business and to prepare for the meeting with the President and Interim Provost.

The EC certified the elections of four newly elected Senators in the College of Engineering: Richard Elliott, Robert Veillette, S.I. Hariharan, and Minel Braun. The EC certified the election of Marcus Braga-Alves from the College of Business Administration. The EC appointed Walter Pechenuk of Computer Science to the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-time Faculty Issues.

Later that day we met with President Scarborough and Interim Provost Ramsier. We discussed progress on the final version of the collective bargaining agreement.

We asked why there are fewer work-study approvals for graduate students to date. We were informed that Dean Midha is looking into the issue.

We discussed progress and timeline for the fiscal year 2017 budget. We expressed concern about the likelihood of significant cuts resulting from lower enrollment. The President said that the University Council Budget and Finance Committee will be involved in a significant way, and there's a lot of work to be done, so it won't be rushed. We will likely begin the fiscal year without a budget.

We discussed the Western Governors University. The Governor is supporting a bill allowing Western Governors into the state. We don't know when it will be considered. The Ohio Inter-University Council is trying to defeat it.

We were updated on the General Education Core. We were told some analysis would be presented to the Senate at the May meeting.

We discussed marketing the technical programs in CAST that Stark State might be competing with.

We discussed the President's response to the grounds for the Vote of No Confidence resolution. The President suggested that he will work with Faculty Senate EC on a process to work through those issues. Faculty Senate EC agreed to meet with the President over the summer.

We were updated on the search for an Assessment Coordinator. Provost Ramsier will meet with the search committee to go over ideas for dividing the positions of the various -- of the various roles for that position into two positions rather than one.

The President informed the EC that Board Secretary and Special Assistant to the President Paul Herold will retire on June 30th. The President has spoken to the Board about not refilling the Board Secretary position but allowing Paula Neugebauer to fill that role. He would like the Special Assistant to the President position be full-time, and he discussed finding a faculty member or a game-changing community member to serve in this position.

We were updated on the status of the process for reactivating the suspended and revised Theatre baccalaureate program; Zook Hall reconstruction; and discussions regarding ITT-Tech. With regard to ITT-Tech we were informed that the nondisclosure agreement would end soon, and an announcement would be made.

We discussed the Center for Data Science and Information Technology, and the involvement of various programs across campus in that Center.

We discussed Trust Navigator Success Coaches. Their contract has not yet been renewed. The administration is collecting data, and Trust Navigator is conducting their own survey.

We discussed cohort block scheduling, which is now suspended. Any unit that doesn't want classes to be reserved has the ability to remove those restrictions.

The EC next met on April 28th for regular Senate business and to prepare the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. We discussed meeting times over the summer for discussions with the President. Lynne Pachnowski from Education was elected to the University Council.

This concludes the Executive Committee's report.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for the Secretary about the Executive Committee report?

The last item concerning Lynne Pachnowski. I don't recall which committee but it had to have been an appointment to a University Council committee. It was not an election to the University Council -- this body does that, and will be doing it shortly. And we don't have here a note about which committee it was. Are there any questions about the Executive Committee report? Thank you.

Next item is the Remarks of the President. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, Chairman Rich. Thank you, senators for the opportunity to be here today. I think what I'd like to do is just to supplement the excellent reports of Chairman Rich and reporting Executive Committee with a couple of comments.

With regard to the enrollment work that's being done, the Chairman is correct. We have seen a closing of that gap from 34 to 29 to 24%, certainly trending in the right direction. The only thing that I would add to that report is that typically you're going to see 20% of our freshmen class make their decision during the summer. So the summer is an important period for the University historically.

The other thing that I would add is that we've been attending events with high school counselors recently. They did say, in an unsolicited manner, that there are unusually high numbers of undecided students this year. So we're hoping that will take that summer period and be able to again close that gap further.

The other positive note that I've seen is that we began the process of course recruiting the junior and sophomore classes for the fall of 17. We had our first Spring Visit Day and we did have a historic turnout for that. The highest number of registrations that we'd ever had for an event like that was around 600; 580 -- 600. And this year we had 740 so it was a big day and it was a good sign that hopefully, while this fall certainly has been a challenge, hopefully we're getting a good start on the next fall.

The other thing, of course, everyone is working on is commencement. The good news is we're graduating a very large class this year. The bad news is we're graduating a very large class this year, from the enrollment standpoint. So again, as you think about enrollment as being that pipeline, that undergraduate pipeline, we've got a big number dropping off the back, we've got challenges on the front, retention becomes all the more important. We have seen steady improvement in the retention. I think due in part to the fact that we've had more selective enrollment, now, for a period of time. That's working its way through the pipeline. That decision alone caused us to lose probably 40 -- oh, 4500 students throughout our pipeline, and then of course, what's happening on the graduate side, too, is very important to us. So, again, simply to supplement some of the points that Chairman Rich reported.

We also have, I'm happy to report, have seen some nice -- in the last few weeks, not some very nice gifts to the University, pledges to the University. From the Smuckers and Wagstaff family, from an anonymous donor to the College of Business building program, with a very sizable and very nice matching grant, so

we're starting to see the pledges beginning to recoup and actually exceed what we had in last year.

Last thing I'll mention is we're spending a lot of time on searches. We have recently, in fact ongoing, we've had a Interim Chief of Staff search, the Engineering Dean search, Provost search, General Counsel search, Chief Diversity Officer search, Chief Development Officer search, and Director of Facilities and Construction. So this would have been the Curtis position. The Ford position, the Lee Gill position, the Mallo position, etc. And so those searches are all ongoing.

The one that we have at least concluded on an interim basis, you heard the report from the Executive Committee, is that Paul Herold, after 37 years with the University, has decided to retire. So he will retire at the end of this month. As I discussed with the Executive Committee, we saw that as kind of a huge opportunity to either appoint someone who could help us with some of the community issues, or could help us with some of the internal issues. We explored candidates in both dimensions and ultimately decided on Bill Lyons. Bill Lyons will begin Monday. Actually he's already begun, informally, this week. But he'll move into the office on Friday and begin on Monday, so he's already been a significant new addition to the office. And I really feel good about that appointment, what he's going to be able to do. We're sorry to see Paul go, but like with every sad ending there's also a hopeful beginning, and I think Bill brings that to the office. That concludes my report, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIR RICH: I'd like to start with one. You said that the small increase in the admission standards that was made a few years ago probably cost us about 4500 students.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: About 900 students a year. As it works its way through that pipeline.

CHAIR RICH: Okay, and you have solid information on this?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: I think so. That's the number that the Board has been told by the enrollment folks, and that they've been using for quite some time. So I'm actually quoting the discussion that's been ongoing at the Board level for quite some time. And I'll confirm that for you

CHAIR RICH: Okay. It sounds a little high to me.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Okay. Yeah, I'll confirm that.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for the President? Yes, Senator Braun, who continues to hold his sign vertically.

[Laughter]

SENATOR BRAUN: When I get my next degree....

[Laughter]

SENATOR BRAUN: Would you comment on the Dean search? Bring us up to date on where we stand there, so I can communicate it?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Yes, sir, I'd be happy to do that. The search process generated -- recommended four candidates. I had the privilege and the opportunity to, along with the Provost, to meet the four recommended candidates. I think we felt really, really good about a few of those four. And the one that has been targeted is scheduled to make a second visit to the campus,

so that's part of his ongoing -- are they all male? Okay good, I didn't want to give anything away yet -- part of his ongoing recruitment. It's a strong group and we think we have strong interest, so we scheduled a second visit for the one that were trying to target, and try to negotiate with. A strong pool; the committee did a great job, and as soon as we can get him here and hopefully get him signed up, then there will be something to report. And if there's anything more the Provost will report on that in his report.

CHAIR RICH: Any questions for the President? Senator Franks.

SENATOR FRANKS: May we anticipate any movement on the search for a new Dean of University Libraries?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Oh, yes. The Provost will probably have an announcement on that in his report, but I think there is a -- he'll report on the interim plan, I think is what he'll share with you.

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

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: I've been informed that there's been a reduction or withdrawal in support for the Fulbright Scholars Program. Can you help sort that out a little bit?

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: You know, I'm not familiar with that issue. I heard it discussed at one meeting, but my impression is that it had moved forward. So again, I'll pitch that one to the Provost and his report. Perhaps he could share more than what I know.

CHAIR RICH: Other questions for the President? Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SCARBOROUGH: Thank you, sir.

CHAIR RICH: Next item on the agenda is the Remarks of the Provost.

PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of things for you to know, and then I'll be happy to answer questions, including the ones that were just asked.

Again hiring continues. We have a lot of searches open still for faculty. Some of the searches did not launch, so you will see people in visiting positions being renewed for next year, so we don't have a gap in continuity of faculty. But as you may remember I've been interviewing all the tenure-track and open-rank candidates. I've been very impressed, and continue to be, by the quality of the people were attracting. Part of my story to them is I have a twofold reason to be meeting with them. They're not used to meeting Provost when they do an interview. Even though I remind them I'm Interim Provost. One is sort of a self-serving thing that, you know, I've lost track of faces to names, because I used to know everybody now it's becoming less and less likely that I know who the faculty are that I'm reading their CV. But the other is to really convince them to want to come here, because it's a good place to work. And that we have a fair process, and good colleagues, good students, and a lot of work to do. I think we've landed -- there are offers we've made, I think we got the number one on every search that I can think of, which is really a good sign.

To answer the question, to follow up to Senator Braun's question, I was on the phone this morning trying to begin to set up the dates for the second visit for the Engineering Dean candidate, the number one candidate recommended by the search committee. That may help you. And he wants to come back for a second round for about a day and a half, two days. He wants to know more details. We're sending them all the budget statements, budget requests, those sorts of things so he's obviously committed, because he's asking serious questions. That's a real good sign, so.

I do have the recommendations from the Dean search at Wayne campus. I got it two days ago, I think -- about two days ago. And I discussed that with the President. We haven't made a decision yet on where to go next, but I'm very happy with the results of the search committee. They were much in line with my way of thinking after the interviews I did, so I hope to hear something about that.

We will be doing -- to answer the question of Senator Franks, I recommended that we do a one-year Interim Dean in the University Libraries. As you know, the current Interim Dean is retiring in June and I think we need -- especially with respect to the budget situation -- I know we don't like to continue interims after interims. That's usually not healthy, but we will be announcing an Interim Dean from within the library system, for one year. Similar to College of Education. The interim leadership has been renewed for one year, so that we can get sort of back on track and then we'll hopefully be in a position to do searches for permanent replacements coming in the fall, again, depending a lot on the budget.

I met with all the Chairs today that could attend an All Chairs meeting. Chairs and Directors. I think is a very good meeting. I went, in particular, to discuss their issues that they raised in the letter they wrote to the Board. I think it was a healthy conversation. I offered to do that every week, if need be. To continue to try to make this place the kind of place that we used to think it was. And so I'm committed to doing. So that will continue over the summer.

I'm really happy to see some of the motions that are coming, especially from Grad Council today. It's good to see the Graduate Council stepping up. By rule, the Graduate Council's the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty. It can be a very powerful body. And I'm happy to see what they're bringing forward. I've always wanted to move the Research Office and the Graduate School to up on main campus. So I don't know where we're going to put it, but I certainly would support the concept.

Commencement. Starts a week from tomorrow. I understand that there are going to be some protests. I know I can trust the faculty to be professional about it. It's a good time for us to celebrate our students and all of our hard work, so I look forward to being there. For all five. Plus Law. The following Sunday. Six total. So anyway, that's really all I wanted to relate to you, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have for me.

CHAIR RICH: Are there questions for the Provost? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Thank you, Chairman Rich. Senator Hausknecht brought up the -- the student Fulbrights? And this is the first I've heard of that idea of cutting back on resources for that. I can't imagine anything that is a more strong incentive for honor students than the possibility of getting student Fulbrights and we have a history at this University of getting student Fulbrights. Ohio University has it all over its Honors College page to say that's what they need to get and it is a strong, strong incentive. It is one that shows the quality of the program, of our students, and I hope that I heard incorrectly that it's going to get less resources. Because I know I've been busy thinking of going and making sure that we would add to resources. We were trying to add resources several years ago, and it didn't work, so could you please expand on what this is all about?

PROVOST RAMSIER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know little bit more than the Present obviously did. This, I think, is particular to the College of Business Administration. They have had, for some years now, the ability to bring in Fulbrights to their program.

SENATOR ERICKSON: That's faculty.

PROVOST RAMSIER: These are students from other places that are coming into our graduate program. We have been giving free tuition to all of those students, for many years apparently. Other schools don't do that, necessarily -- automatically give free tuition to Fulbrights who already have stipends and living wages in hand from the Fulbright Foundation. So that discussion, I've been in a couple of meetings with this is been discussed, what we heard from the College of Business Administration's administration was that they would work on trying to balance the amount of money that they offer to the Fulbright students in the form of tuition remission, with respect to the amount of money they're offering to the industrial assistantship students that they have in the college. They've grown both of those, and both of those come with full tuition waivers. Where the companies are paying a few thousand dollars for a student, for a stipend, and they're getting a complete ride, free ride, in the graduate programs in the College. So the Dean's been asked to look at this and try to come back with a balance. Certainly we want to have good Fulbright students in our programs here. That's a good attractor, and it's supposed to raise the level of every classroom these students are in, right? And they're generally international, and it brings a lot of diversity. So I don't really know that anything's been limited. I think the Dean's been asked, okay, give us a plan for how, in terms of the College, you're going to manage these monies realizing that the Graduate School doesn't have an open ended, bottomless pit of free tuition waivers. But again, the Colleges all have the same amount of funding for graduate students next year, as they had this past year.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Could I just ask one more follow-up question -- so there is no suggestion that we're going to cut back on our support of the general idea of our students applying for Fulbrights? Is that correct?

PROVOST RAMSIER: Absolutely not.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Because that would seem to me would be appalling for the honors program. Possibly increasing, that would be nice.

[Laughter]

PROVOST RAMSIER: Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree that would be nice.

CHAIR RICH: I feel like we're haggling now.

Are there other questions for the Provost? Other questions for the Provost?  
Thank you, Mr. Provost.

Next item on the agenda is the election of two Faculty Senate representatives to the University Council. These are for three-year terms, and these two positions - - these two seats -- they must be Senators. There is a third seat that must not be a Senator, but that one is not up at this point. We'll do the elections for those seats seriatim. So we'll just call them seat A and seat B. Is there a nomination for University Council representative -- Faculty Senate representative to the University Council for seat A? [silence] This is what you hope won't happen.

[Laughter]

Self nominations are welcome, by the way. I'm guessing that there isn't one for seat B?

[Laughter]

Or did I just pick the wrong one to start with? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: Could I make a comment on this, please? Neither Senator Lillie nor I are eligible for this, but both of us, and Senator Lillie isn't here

so I can't -- I'm trying to speak for both of us here, the only person that we have is -- and Senator Sterns, I would like to suggest that he would expand on it a little. But this role of the representing the faculty on University Council is really, really important. It truly is. This is how I know about the budget. There is the Budget Committee, and Senator Sastry was the Chair of that committee, and it was that -- this is where we can have some influence on the things that are not just academic, but as they say, goes beyond one constituency. And that includes the Budget, the Facilities Planning, the area that I'm in that I chair a committee of which is Human Resources and Talent Development. These are things that go beyond one constituency but is really, really important to the University, and we as the faculty are one of the -- on University Council there are representatives of SEAC, CPAC, graduate students, undergraduate students, Deans, Vice Presidents, and it's the faculty that have the ability to get up and say what they think is really important without having to worry that maybe somebody who is their boss is going to take it out in terms of their employment. And so it's really important that we have a strong faculty voice. So please consider serving in this capacity. I really, really suggest that you consider it.

CHAIR RICH: I would add a similar plea myself. And also translate CPAC, that's Contract Professionals Advisory Council, and SEAC, Staff Employees Advisory Council, which is really just the nonunionized staff. Those are among the constituencies represented on University Council. I think faculty play a critical role on the University Council, and without faculty representatives -- I'm not going to finish that sentence. Senator Sterns.

SENATOR STERNS: Mr. Chair, I'd like to speak. Three weeks ago I was elected the Chair for University Council for the next period of time, two years. I was Vice Chair, when Stacy Moore left, I became Chair. As you know, we are at a very critical time in University Council because we receive from the Board of Trustees, the Bylaws Committee headed up by Councilperson Lillie with participation of Senator Erickson and many others, we drafted those bylaws.

They have been immediately returned to the Board of Trustees, and we're waiting for finalization of those bylaws. In the interim, as you heard from Senator Erickson, the Budget and Finance Committee will be intimately involved in the budgeting process of the University so it really is important that we have a faculty representation. But keep in mind that only one fifth of the constituency is faculty. So we really need spokespersons that are committed to this other form of governance. Remember all academic decisions are made here in the Faculty Senate. But the planning arm of our University, as we look to the future, will come out of the University Council. So please consider, you know, my approach to self-actualization through committee membership.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: Let me add one other thought, even though this probably cuts two ways for some of you, and that is the University Council, unlike the Faculty Senate, does meet over the summer. If we were to not elect somebody, two people, in this meeting and had to try again in September, that would mean that the Senate would go mostly unrepresented in the University Council over the summer. Provost Ramsier.

PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Senator Sterns mentioned, the new -- the response to the consultants version of the bylaws has been taken back to the Board. This will certainly be discussed under Strategic Issues Committee or one of the committees that now I'm responsible to liaison with for the Board. And now I'm serving on the University Council in my role as Interim Provost. I don't want to be redundant with what was already said, but to be honest, it's going to be impossible for me to convince the Board to approve a set of bylaws, which establish formally this new body, if we don't have a faculty willing to participate. I mean remember -- please remember, this was part of our response to a higher learning commission visit, in the past, that we would establish this entity to generate more widespread discussion, especially about

planning, which has been a part of our downfall on this campus. So I would not only urge, I would plead for people from the Senate to step up and take this seriously. Otherwise, honestly, I don't know how we'll get the Board to approve it. If the faculty aren't willing to participate it loses a lot of its -- a lot of its oomph. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Barrett

SENATOR BARRETT: One question. If this is supposed to be a Faculty Senator, if your Senate term is up with this meeting does that mean you would not be eligible?

CHAIR RICH: Well, technically it does not mean that. It would be best if it were someone who were going to be a Senator next year, but in a pinch what we could do is elect someone whose Senate term ends at the end of August, who could serve through the summer. That's not the ideal solution but it's certainly better than nothing. Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: So there's no way that we could have the current people serve again past August?

CHAIR RICH: That's correct. The current people will not be Senators after August and so they're not eligible to serve. By the way, even if they were, it really is a good idea for at least two, and I would've argued all three. I did argue, and lost on that one. All three of the representatives of the Faculty Senate on the University Council to be faculty Senators. The then Provost, Mike Sherman, disagreed with that. But I think it would be a step backward if we were to have fewer representatives who are members of the Senate.

SENATOR ALLEN: In lieu of that response, I would like to self-nominate myself.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen has kindly nominated himself. Senator Roy.

SENATOR ROY: I would be willing to self-nominate, my only question is I'm currently serving on a one-term replacement position right now in the Senate.

CHAIR RICH: You're filling an unexpired term of one year.

SENATOR ROY: But I am up for election again, so ....

CHAIR RICH: I don't see any problem. I'm confident in your reelection.

[Laughter]

SENATOR ROY: I have a couple of planned times that I have to be away this summer, but do we have any notion of when the meetings would be?

CHAIR RICH: I think Senator Sterns can inform us.

SENATOR STERNS: Yes. This is an issue, and so we, in the age of modern technology, are thinking about Skype or phone conferencing so that you can participate electronically.

SENATOR ROY: Then I'll self-nominate.

CHAIR RICH: Let me do it this way. Is there anyone else would like to serve? If there are only two will handle it one way, because I have two seats. And if there more than two, we'll do it the other way. Is there anyone else who's interested? Okay. So we have two people who have nominated themselves. Is there a motion to elect those two people Faculty Senate representatives to the University Council? Senator Sterns moves. Senator Lashbrook seconds. Any debate on the motion? All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by

opposite sign. Motion is adopted; the two Senators are elected. And the Chair thanks them, wholeheartedly.

[Applause]

Next. Committee reports. First Academic Policies Committee. Associate Dean Kennedy

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Good afternoon. There are two parts to the report. The first of which was alluded to in Chair Rich's remarks, and this pertains to the meeting that we had on April 19th. It's a recommendation regarding the move of the Department of Economics from the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Business Administration, so I would like to propose this resolution: We unanimously recommend that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution: approving the movement of the Department of Economics from Buchtel College of Arts And Sciences to the College of Business Administration. Whereas the faculty of the Department of Economics has voted to move as a unit to the College of Business Administration; whereas the Buchtel College Council of the College of Arts And Sciences has voted to approve the move; whereas the faculty of the College of Business Administration has voted to accept the move and has made the necessary changes to their College bylaws and retention, tenure, and promotion criteria and procedures; and whereas the mission of the Department of Economics aligns well with the mission of the College of Business Administration; resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Department of Economics be moved as a unit to the College of Business Administration effective July 1, 2016.

CHAIR RICH: This motion comes from the Academic Policies Committee and does not require a second. The motion is open for debate. Is there a discussion of the motion? Senator Huss.

SENATOR HUSS: Can somebody just summarize the reasons for the move?

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: I think, if I can speak to one part, I believe this was part of the College of Business Administration's strategic plan? No? Then I can't speak to it.

CHAIR RICH: I think Senator Erickson would be a good person to speak to this, being a member of the Department of Economics.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I think that the -- and I'm not giving an official statement here --but 40% of Departments of Economics are in the business school, compared to Arts and Sciences. I think this time, when the President allowed this as a possibility, our department decided to evaluate our potential for expansion in the College of Arts And Sciences versus the College of Business. When we thought that the way that we get our majors, frankly, is through all those business students who take Principles of Economics, and that it would be more effective if we were in the College of Business Administration. In the past, that wasn't really an option, because frankly we've had -- some considerable time ago -- but still we've had Deans of the Business School who have -- quite willing to say that they didn't think that economics was worth anything. Which clearly was not the time for us to move.

[Laughter]

But the present Dean, and several of the present Chairs in the College of Business have been encouraging us to do that. We decided as a department that that would be an appropriate move for us. To give us the best chance for our expansion, and continued support for the expansion of both our graduate and undergraduate programs. Does that answer your question?

SENATOR HUSS: Yes, it does.

CHAIR RICH: Any other discussion on the motion? If not, I take it you're ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The second part of the Committee's report has to do with the GenEd Core program. The Academic Policies Committee met on April 19th and May 3rd to address the Faculty Senate directive which referred to the Committee a resolution proposed by Connie Bouchard, with instruction to report back to the Senate at its May 5th meeting. With the Chair's permission, may I read the resolution?

CHAIR RICH: Yes.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Senator Bouchard 's resolution: whereas the GenEd Core 13 was put into place without meaningful faculty input; whereas the results from the first year have shown it to fail at attracting or retaining or educating our students to a high standard; and whereas delays in making decisions about next fall's classes would only hurt our students; resolved, that the program should be immediately suspended.

Discussions were held during our regularly scheduled April 19th and May 3rd meetings. At the APC May 3rd meeting, Dick Steiner, who is a member of the General Education Core subcommittee which also consisted of Heather Howley, Alper Buldum, Joe Minocchi, and Chair Rich, presented analysis of all online General Education Core sections of a given course, as compared to its online UA main campus counterpart. For the analysis, the variables considered included: course grade, DWF-or drop, withdrawal, failure rates- fall to spring retention, high school GPA, and an ACT composite score.

Based on the results of these analyses the committee concluded that there is not enough evidence at this time to suggest significant differences exist between the students in the General Education Core classes, and those enrolled in the regular UA online sections with two exceptions: in course grades, the GE Core students perform significantly better in the Principles of Microeconomics; UA main campus online students performed significantly better in English Comp one. Therefore, the Academic Policies Committee recommends to Faculty Senate that the GenEd Core data from the spring and summer semesters be collected, just as the fall semester's data has been, and carefully analyzed.

That said, however, the committee also recognizes the need to consider the financial impact of the program on the University. The GenEd Core program did not attract new students as had been intended, but instead, you'll pardon the word, harvested students who might otherwise have enrolled in Buchtel College of Arts And Sciences, or CAST GenEd programs. CAST did have the highest percentage of students in the GenEd Core program. APC was not asked to analyze financial information at this time to determine the impact this initiative has had, and will have moving forward, on the University. To be balanced, as Chair has mentioned, marketing efforts designed to attract new students for the program to date have been nearly nonexistent and we understand that these are the works.

CHAIR RICH: So the Committee's recommendation is -- concerning this resolution that was referred to the Committee, is to postpone further consideration until the fall?

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Yes. I believe our desire is to be able to collect more data and analyze and then return the results in the fall. Reporting in the fall.

CHAIR RICH: And I was there for much of the meeting but not the conclusion of the meeting. One of the concerns that was discussed in the Committee was that the cancellation of sections in which students are already enrolled for the fall would be problematic.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Right. It's our understanding as a Committee that we do have students that are currently enrolled in the fall sections for the GenEd Core. We also understand that summer has a very robust enrollment as well. But we are again concerned about the financial impact.

CHAIR RICH: The resolution proposed by Senator Bouchard is back before the body, with the recommendation that you just from the Academic Policies Committee. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Senator Rich, I am concerned that the sample size is not adequate. I understand the point, but if I read -- if I make an inference about this, it appears to me that it is not just these 12 courses that seem to have a potentially problematic pass rate. That it may be deeper than this, in all online courses. I would like to see the success rate in these courses -- all of them -- compared to in-class, to make sure that we're not in some way harming our students. Because I am concerned. I would have thought you have also compared it to all sections of that class.

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: There was a GenEd Core preliminary report that was produced and provided. That, I believe, was dissected by the subcommittee and discussed primarily at the April 19th meeting. Unfortunately, I was in jury duty on the April 19th meeting -- not sequestered, but nonetheless not there -- so I don't know if Chair Rich wanted to speak to the discussion on that day. I do know the original GenEd Core report that was produced by Dean Rickel had those kinds of comparisons but I don't believe that they were tested for statistical significance.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen, I would add that -- I think what happened was Professor Steiner was operating under a very short deadline. Did the analysis that he was able to produce in time for us to have something at this meeting. And it is responsive to the resolution that was referred, because the resolution actually doesn't call for suspending online courses. It calls for suspending specifically the GenEd Core courses. I think the question that you raise is a good one and well worthy of study. In fact, I think we should certainly do as you suggest. But the proposal before us immediately is to suspend the GenEd Core programs -- courses. So it really is aimed at the discounted versions of the online courses, and not the non-discounted, the full price, ones. When in fact, if there's a reason to think that there are educational weaknesses in the courses, and I don't know that there are, but if there is there's no particular reason to think it's tied to price. It's probably tied more, if there is one, to mode -- so-called mode of delivery. I don't even like to use the word "delivery" in this context, but that's what it's called. Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: I studied memory and learning, and there are clear concerns for about half of the graduating high school class, for online education unless it is different from traditionally taught. That's my concern. There's a long list of literatures out there suggesting that it may not work as well for half of a high school graduating class, and we aren't even looking at it and it does concern me because it may have a serious downward pull on retention.

CHAIR RICH: Well, Senator Allen I hope you'll be willing to help us undertake this.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay, next year.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I think what's happened is what I was afraid was going to happen when I made my motion last month, rather than this month, is that students have -- last month only a handful of students had signed up, but now you can say, "Well, we can't do anything now. They're all signed up." Which worries me. And in the initial report, which I had read quite closely, it was very clear that the students in these online GenEd Core courses were doing substantially worse than the face-to-face version. That they were doing slightly worse than the on-campus online version. But what we've done is we've added a whole bunch of new online courses which didn't exist before. So what we've done is take what is at least potentially the worst-performing form of delivery, if we can use this word, and lured students who don't have very much money into them. So I think we are doing a serious disservice to our students. This was the reason I proposed it in the first place, although I have this grim feeling it may go on for summer and fall. Summer is what really worries me. Summer wasn't even on the table, and all of a sudden it's there and you're saying the courses are full up. We tried this three years ago. We tried this with Tressell, and he set up a whole group of online courses for incoming freshmen to take in the summer, and they flunked in droves. This shouldn't be like a big surprise. You take incoming freshmen who are sort of by definition the least prepared for college-level work, the least ready to focus and be self-motivated, and put them in a course, in summer, in a very restricted period of time, when they're all these other things to do in the summer which are not scholarly, and work at your own pace for five weeks. Yes, and after four and a half weeks you suddenly remember you were taking this course. I think we're going totally in the wrong direction, and I do want to underline something that you're hinting at, which is that the University is screaming about how many millions of dollars we are losing, and yet we are charging students one seventh of the regular amount. That's especially a problem for the summer. You could say at least during the year with the plateau that maybe we aren't losing that much money if they're a full-time student. Nobody takes 12 hours in the summer. So what we're doing is handing them free courses, that are going to lose us money, and then they are, as the

preliminary data suggests and certainly the data from three years ago in the summer suggests, they're going to flunk. And then we also have the data from fall that a full quarter of the students who took any GenEd Core course in the fall didn't come back in the spring to take anything. This is not a retention model. Only 16% of the students who took a GenEd Core course in the fall took one in the spring. The students didn't like them. I do not think this is a good use of our resources. It doesn't help us financially. It doesn't attract new students. It doesn't retain students. And it doesn't help the students graduate. I'm still waiting to hear the upside.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Howley.

SENATOR HOWLEY: Chair Rich, I agree with much of what Senator Bouchard has said, but I do want to make a point of clarification. I would not characterize the majority of these courses as new courses. Nine out of the 13 were already being taught online, and I think that that confusion is the way in which they were marketed. They were initially advertised and marketed as innovative new blended courses. I do not believe that is accurate. I believe that they did -- that there was a Wayne College faculty member in many cases, and an Akron faculty member in all cases, that worked together on these courses to have them quality-matter certified in cases where the online courses were not already quality-matter certified. Three of the other courses were approved for online through the curriculum review process but never taught online prior to the GenEd Core. Only one course, Introduction to Biology, which is, I believe, was just approved, that is the only new course. So the majority of these courses are not new.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I just want to clarify by "new" I didn't mean "new" as in never seen before. What I meant by "new" is that an online course that might've

had one or two sections suddenly have, like, 10 sections being taught. That's what I meant by "new".

CHAIR RICH: Senator Klein.

SENATOR KLEIN: Thank you, Chair Rich. I wanted to emphasize something that Senator Howley said, and this is that these are not blended courses. They are being advertised as blended courses. They are not blended courses. And we discussed at the Academic Policies Committee meeting that Todd Rickel has a very, very different understanding of what blended means from what the rest of us understand blended to mean. So, as people deliberate, I just wanted to emphasize that point about the non-blendedness. These are strictly online, with no kind of communication.

CHAIR RICH: Among us, I think we can just understand these are online courses. There's a separate question about whether there's truth in advertising going on. Other debate on the motion? Are you ready to vote? The motion which has been -- Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: Could you clarify -- maybe you were just going to do this. There seems to be two competing things about an immediate suspension that was recommended by Senator Bouchard --

CHAIR RICH: I was about to state the motion. The motion that is before the body is to adopt the resolution proposed last month by Senator Bouchard, that calls for an immediate suspension of the GenEd Core courses. Really meaning the sections; they're not unique courses, they're sections of courses, right? That is the motion that is before the body. So, if you are in favor of the motion calling for the immediate suspension of all the GenEd Core sections, meaning, I assume, at the end of this semester, please signify by saying aye. Opposed say no. All right, we need a division of the house. All those in favor of the motion to

immediately suspend the GenEd Core sections, please raise your yellow tag so we may count. There are 23 in favor of the motion. All those opposed, raise your yellow tags. We're going to call it 18. So the motion is adopted by a vote of 23 to 18. That concludes the Academic Policies?

ASSOCIATE DEAN KENNEDY: Yes, it does. Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Next is the Curriculum Review Committee report from Provost Ramsier.

PROVOST RAMSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Curriculum Review Committee brings forward a list of proposals that have come through the system without any further issues so we ask to recommend these -- we recommend these to you for approval, so they can be implemented.

CHAIR RICH: All right. The motion is to approve the listed curriculum change proposals. Is there any debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

Next is the report of the Athletics Committee. The Chair, John Nicholas.

JOHN NICHOLAS: Hello again, everybody. When I was here a month ago, there were several very good questions raised by this body concerning some of the athletics and I did not have all the answers then, so we reconvened the Committee and we met on April 22nd. The first question that was asked was concerning the academic department's student advisor's ability to waive prerequisites. As it turned out, they cannot waive prerequisites. There were some mistakes made that were addressed immediately. According to Anne Jorgensen, who had a conversation with Don Visco. Now they can put a student in a class if they're in a prerequisite that semester, which I think is common

among many academic advisors. I wanted to clear that up and make sure that everybody knows that if they have been put into a --

SENATOR CUTRIGHT: For the person that brought up that statement, and was the direct advisor for the student, the student was put in the Senior Design capstone course in -- before he had taken the other courses prior to that. He has since been removed from that. They jumped ship. They put them in my course that he was taking before he had the prerequisite course . So that was incorrect. This is they directly waived the prerequisite, and put them in that class without our permission.

JOHN NICHOLAS: It's my understanding, when we talked to Anne Jorgensen about that that she said that that was an error made on their part. So I don't think -- I think that was just a one-time mistake according to them. I don't know if that's what happened, but if this is an ongoing issue, then we have to take it up with them. I'm just reporting what they reported to us.

CHAIR RICH: Let me just ask that, if there are members of the body who are aware of other such instances, that they communicate directly with Chairman Nicholas so that he can pursue it.

JOHN NICHOLAS: Just feel free to email me and I'll talk to Anne about it or you can contact Anne directly. She's usually pretty approachable. The rest of that is if this does happen again, and we see that there's a pattern and maybe there is a problem at this moment, that they're not being forthright but I didn't get that feeling after I had a talk with them. So we simply need to -- if we see this come up contact Anne Jorgensen and they will resolve the problem.

The second part of the question was, what was the ratio of student advisors in the athletics department to student athletes? There are currently 450 student athletes and there are two academic advisors: Anne Jorgensen and Kristina

Artino. Kristina handles about 175 of them, Anne handles 275 of them, but there are a team of tutors and a study hall that are also doing some monitoring of the students. I did also find out that the student athletes are required, three times per academic year, to meet with their academic advisor to make sure that they're on track and that sort of thing. And it is worth noting that, because of eligibility requirements for NCAA and all of that, that athletes are often times scheduled ahead of time to try give them as many courses as they can to make sure that they meet the eligibility requirements, and during that process sometimes mistakes are made. So again, contact them if you catch that and they can straighten it out.

Second question was, how much of the student fees go to athletics? After calling around for a while, I finally just called Nathan Mortimer -- I emailed him, and asked that question directly. His answer was that there is a general service fee, which is charged up to \$432 in the fall and the spring, so a total of \$864 per year. A portion of that goes to athletics. He was unclear how much --

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: Did you want to finish saying something before you were interrupted? Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY: Last year we had the exact number from the students who asked for it. It was 400 out of 432 that went to athletics.

CHAIR RICH: That's approximately what I recall, as well.

JOHN NICHOLAS: He had said it was roughly about 90% or so of that fee.

CHAIR RICH: Were you under the impression that something had changed? -- other than just the amount of vagueness had vastly increased.

[Laughter]

JOHN NICHOLAS: The question that was asked was how much of the student fees went to that, so --

CHAIR RICH: -- and the answer was a portion.

JOHN NICHOLAS: And then, finally we talked to Athletic Director Larry Williams, providing a breakdown of the budget in athletics department. We had a pretty lengthy and open discussion of that. He gave us some numbers that were rounded to the nearest million so we didn't drill down into everything to the penny. It's not the purview of that Committee to be involved with the budget at that level. But he was very open in sharing some numbers with us, and as I reported last time, in The Plain Dealer article reported 34.1 million as the budget but of that about 5 million is the debt service for InfoCision Stadium and the fieldhouse. It is my understanding, and as reported by the Athletic Director, that there aren't many other universities who attribute the debt service into the athletics budget. And then another 2 million of that goes to the youth summer camps that are offered by athletics which we staff ourselves, which is also something that's unique to us or not many other universities do that. That becomes a zero because the students who attend these youth programs have to pay a fee and that kind of thing, so that pays for itself but we do staff that. So when you take out those two numbers it brings the operating budget for the athletics department to approximately \$27 million, which is in line with other Mid-American schools. In fact, I found out the budgets for all of the Mid-American schools and that put us about fifth or sixth, depending on whether you round up or down on whatever the change is on the millions. But also the Athletic Director wanted me to report that a lot of that money stays in the University, in terms of the scholarship money that goes back for tuition and room and board and food plans, and also goes to physical facilities who take care of the facilities. So a lot

of that money stays internal; it's not just a gone cost. And the Athletic Director did say that currently the expenses do exceed revenues, but they are working to increase ticket sales and get money through donations to offset that cost. And the message he wanted me to bring to you they're not going to ask for more money; that that deficit that exists they're trying to make up through their business plan.

CHAIR RICH: And I don't suppose that any specific number was mentioned concerning the amount by which expenditures exceed revenues?

JOHN NICHOLAS: We did get an approximate number I'm sure Larry will be happy to share that with people privately. All of this is public record, but I think if you want to know I'm sure you can send an email to Larry Williams and ask him directly. But it is in the millions, I will say that.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: With some trepidation I have a question because I'm afraid of hearing the answer. And I don't think you can answer this now, but if you could find out. You said, if I member correctly, that there's \$5 million a year of debt servicing. And if I think that that's like 20 years, that's somewhere around a hundred million in debt servicing for somewhere probably around a \$70 million stadium. But here's my question: does that include the 20 million from InfoCision and the 10 million from Summa, and could we get a clarification that that money actually ever occurred, and if so, why is the debt servicing so high?

JOHN NICHOLAS: Well, I don't know that even the Athletic Director would know that. I think that's probably more at the administrative level.

SENATOR ALLEN: Well, I am requesting -- or I don't know if that's an appropriate question.

CHAIR RICH: That's really probably something that should be asked in the University Council's Budget and Finance Committee. I would add one clarification and that is this: If I heard correctly, and I believe I know this independently, that's the debt service for both InfoCision Stadium and the fieldhouse, not just InfoCision Stadium.

SENATOR ALLEN: But that's a much smaller amount, for the fieldhouse.

CHAIR RICH: Do you have anything further to report? Are there any further questions for the Chair of the Athletics Committee? Thank you.

Next is the report of the Computing and Communications Technology Committee. Is at least one of the Chairs -- Co-chairs of the Committee present? I don't suppose they made an arrangement with any of the members of the Committee, who might be present, to present the report on behalf of the Committee? [no response] Well then, I take it that there's no urgency to this matter. I might be wrong about that. This was to create an ad hoc committee -- ad hoc Senate committee to look into -- that consists of some members of both CCTC and DLRC, Distance Learning Review Committee, to look into the online course evaluation system. That's what that was about. I hesitate for us to entertain it without somebody from the Committee able to speak on behalf of the Committee's recommendation. Is there a motion to postpone consideration of this until the September meeting? Moved by Senator Selena; seconded by Senator Bouchard. All in favor of postponing this item until the September meeting, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent.

Next is the report of the Faculty Research Committee. This is an informational report. I don't know whether there's a representative of the Committee here who wishes to say anything? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I'm on the committee. I just want to mention we were able, as we've been able for the last few years, to give 14 summer grants and we got 56 applications, so it was certainly competitive, although even though not as competitive as federal grants these days. And one of the things that the Committee wants to urge everybody who has played a role in research, has gotten a summer research grant in the past, is to come and join the Committee. It's a fun Committee. And it's a lot of work for about two weeks in February, where you get to read everybody's applications, but that's actually really interesting to find out the different kinds of research that are being done across campus. And I think it's an extremely worthwhile Committee, and that there's a positive result. We come \$10,000 for a person who otherwise might have to teach summer school rather than working on their own scholarship, or travel money for people to go to archives or other places that they need to go to get their materials. So it's a -- it's really good, I just we had more money. We used to be to give 20 grants a year, and it got sucked back, so we're just holding firm at 14.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you, Senator Bouchard. I would add my own encouragement to people to consider volunteering to serve as members of the Faculty Research Committee. We do need people to serve on the Committee. Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: I'm also on the Committee. I couldn't service this year since I had application in. Didn't get it. At the last meeting, which only like five of us actually were able to attend, we also did discuss cutting that workload in those two weeks, so not having everybody read every 56 things, but having three readers on each one to divide up the workload, so if you are considering it, it will be less onerous, less work in those couple weeks, in future. We didn't have a quorum, obviously, at the last meeting but it's going to be on the proposal for next year.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. Anything else concerning Faculty Research Committee? If not, next is the report of the Part-time Faculty Committee, which is just an informational report. I don't know whether there's anything to state here in the meeting?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR: No, no additional.

CHAIR RICH: Thank you. And the last of the committee reports is from University Libraries. Senator Miller.

SENATOR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the University Library Committee brings forward the proposal to create an Ad Hoc Committee for Scholarly Communications. Should I read the proposed charge? I provide -- there's a lengthy rationale that was provided.

CHAIR RICH: The charge, yes. The rationale, maybe you could just summarize.

SENATOR MILLER: The first official charge is that this Committee will recommend, subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate, policy for the development and maintenance of the institutional repository which, I'll remind you, we branded Idea Exchange at UAkron. The Committee will review and approve proposals to host new collections for content, serious journals, book series, etc. in the repository.

CHAIR RICH: Is there a debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you.

Next is a report of the Graduate Council representatives. Senator Allen.

SENATOR ALLEN: Should I introduce the second half of it in New Business, or -  
-

CHAIR RICH: No, this is a report of -- just so that people know what we're talking about. The Graduate Council took some action in the nature of legislation at, I believe, its most recent meeting, is that correct? Under the bylaws of the Faculty Senate, any such action comes to the Faculty Senate for its approval or disapproval and so, this is the place, this is the time on the agenda in which to report any action in the nature of legislation that was taken by the Graduate Council.

SENATOR ALLEN: Okay, so two new resolutions were proposed and approved. The first one is that the Graduate School should be moved to a central location on campus. Provost Ramsier had mentioned that in his report. That was approved 14 to 0. No abstentions or against. The second resolution --

CHAIR RICH: One at a time. Would you please just read the motion itself.

SENATOR ALLEN: Sure. A resolution was made that the Graduate School be moved to a central location on campus. The resolution passed unanimously 14 to 0.

CHAIR RICH: You heard the motion. Is there debate on the motion? Senator Saliga.

SENATOR SALIGA: Do we have an idea of where, centrally? You know, just to say --

CHAIR RICH: Senator Saliga may be concerned that it's her office.

[Laughter]

SENATOR ALLEN: Our feeling was that several people have mentioned maybe either in the Student Center, or in Simmons Hall. But, I mean, that's not our decision to make. But it has to be central, and by the way, this is pertinent to the enrollment in the Grad College and the retention and graduation of people in the Graduate College. If you have to go out to the hinterlands to fill out your paperwork, it just doesn't make it nearly as -- a positive experience for graduate students. Say anything about if the graduate student has a question about anything, they're less likely to inquire about it at the Graduate School if they have to walk clear down to Polsky.

CHAIR RICH: Any further inquiries or debate on the motion? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: As Senator Sterns is not here, I'm going to ask a question that, perhaps, is most relevant to the Provost that, given that indeed it is not the role of this body to recommend location. It is, however, in the purview of University Council Facilities Committee, and I hope the request to do that will go to that Committee for its recommendation on where it should go.

SENATOR ALLEN: I should note-I am remiss in mentioning that Senator Sterns, before he left to go teach his class, said please to tell his colleagues on Senate that he wholeheartedly supported this proposal. So I assume that will be done but he is supportive of this.

SENATOR ERICKSON: It's just that the actual location is the role of the Facilities Planning Committee, and even though it's only a recommendation, it is I think important that they get that request to give their recommendation. Not that it necessarily be part of this motion but that it be followed through.

CHAIR RICH: Any further debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Second item.

SENATOR ALLEN: The second resolution was that the Graduate Council recommend that a Vice Provost for Research not also be an academic dean because of concerns of a potential conflict of interest.

CHAIR RICH: You've heard the motion. Is there debate on the motion? I take it you're ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent. Thank you, Senator Allen. Anything further to report from Graduate Council?

SENATOR ALLEN: I think that's enough for now.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: I wonder if I could ask a question? Our School of Communication was reviewing the strategic directives from the Graduate Council and had lots of concerns. And so, my understanding is going forward those are going to be explored; that no decisions have been. But what will be the opportunity for faculty to have a voice in those initiatives?

SENATOR ALLEN: It would help if -- my recommendation and my understanding of the rest of Grad Council and the Grad Dean and maybe that would be a better question to forward to Chand Midha.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen, I would remind you to please address the Chair, especially as the proceedings are being transcribed. Let me just ask Dean Midha if he wishes to address the body? Without objection.

DEAN MIDHA: Thank you, Chair Rich. As I addressed that question during the Graduate Faculty meeting last week, all those points which have been raised in the Strategic Plan, they will be discussed by the subcommittees of the Graduate Council there. And yes, you have a representative on there, but [inaudible], you don't have a representative. Every College has a representative on that, on there. We'll be discussing that, we'll form the subcommittees, and any recommendations will go to the whole Graduate Council there and then we'll bring back, for the good. That's what our plan going forward is.

SENATOR CLARK: And will that eventually come to Faculty Senate?

DEAN MIDHA: As Phil brought information today, any changes which will be recommended will come by sharing of the information to the Faculty Senate.

SENATOR CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIR RICH: Do we have a report from the University Council representatives?

SENATOR ERICKSON: Yes, I can give a report, such as it is. On -- two days ago we had the last meeting of the University Council. Well, actually we didn't. Because there was not a quorum. We were short of a quorum by one person. But what we had was an informal meeting where at the Budget Committee presented a Senator from here and University Council Sastry presented, and Nathan Mortimer, the issues relating to the budget and how that the budget would not be -- that there would not be a budget going to the Board of Trustees. That it would only be only an interim budget going to the June meeting. That because of the enrollment issues it was not -- would not be, would be going to the meeting they said -- they said September. The September meeting of the Board of Trustees. And that we, over the summer, University Council Budget and Finance Committee would be thoroughly involved in the decisions on the budget allocations, and the issues related to the budget over the summer. Other

than that the CFO talked about how, on a one-off basis we had finally taken out the money that had been sitting there not being as deficit relating to ERIP. Those of us who have been here a long time know that ERIP goes back to 2000. And that that money that there was not money really, it became a deficit that went on and on that didn't cover it and now we've actually paid off that. Taken money out to pay off several of those deficits. There was a discussion of IDC and startups as well, as part of that discussion. And I think we've had it talked about already that the startup money is supposed to go over three years. Again, this was an informal discussion of the budget that took place because we didn't have enough for a quorum. I think people will absolutely notice but I guess there were notably I think most of the faculty representatives were there; the student representatives were not. It is the end of the semester. It is an issue at the end of the year because University Council, for whatever reason, starts its year starting May 1st, so there are people who are representing, please if you'll let me use those words, SEAC and CPAC and I'm sure not we're not sure which representatives they had. We were short on Vice Presidents. And we only needed one more to make it a quorum. But that is what happened at the last University Council meeting, and it is that the-as was mentioned when we begged you to become Council members, that the budget committee is in fact involved in the whole decision-making -- at least the recommendations, not the decision-making, but the recommendations with respect to decision-making over the summer. I'm open to any questions ....

CHAIR RICH: Are there any questions concerning the extensive report about the non-meeting that took place?

[Laughter]

Okay. New Business. Is there any New Business to come before the body?  
Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Ah, yes. I take this step very seriously. I want to introduce a motion to censure the President. And the reason that I'm doing this is that three months ago today, this body voted overwhelmingly, 50 to 2, to indicate that we had no confidence in his leadership and direction. And we laid out an extremely detailed set of specifics. He has yet to answer these. He has yet to even acknowledge publicly that this exists. The first month after this, he came to the Senate meeting and a Senator asked him if he had a response. His answer was that he could not respond to such serious issues in Senate. The second month, last month, he did not come to Senate at all. Today he came and spoke about completely other issues. The only thing we heard about the No Confidence motion was Secretary Schulze mentioning that he had said perhaps during the summer, which would be like six months later, he might discuss it with the EC of the Senate. And I think it is time for this body to make it clear that we take these issues extremely seriously. We do not want there to be treated as though we hadn't made this No Confidence vote. As though we're happy now. And I think, in some ways, what we have been seeing, his statements or suggestions that are coming out that are trying to imply that these problems are behind us now, or if the problems aren't behind us now it's the faculty's fault. So for example, last week, when there was the announcement that after all, we're not going to join up with ITT. Which is -- read The devil Strip today, guys. Just saying. That it started off talking about now that the union has a contract, which was very clearly a restatement of the point that was made immediately after our vote in February, that somehow our Vote of No Confidence had something to do with the union contract. Which of course it had nothing to do with. As you pointed out, Chair Rich. And yet here it is back again. And then saying, okay, now that we have decided not to go forward with ITT, the implication that that was the only thing that bugged the faculty, and then he used the word continue -- we will continue to look for new things. And the single biggest issue which we raised in the Vote of No Confidence was that we did not have shared governance. That extremely important issues were being addressed by the

Administration, single-handedly, without involving the faculty. All of which have pretty much been disasters. I've got this list. We need to go down the list.

CHAIR RICH: Before we start on the list, is there a second to the motion?

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay, I've got a motion.

CHAIR RICH: Seconded by Senator -- I thought you made a motion. If that wasn't what you meant to make, then please --

[Overlapping voices]

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I'm explaining my motion before I read it. It has --

CHAIR RICH: Well, that's backwards.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: In parliamentary procedure, you state your motion and then there's a second, or if not the motion dies, and then there is debate.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Does it count as debate if I'm explaining my motion?

CHAIR RICH: It is debate.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: So shall I read --

CHAIR RICH: Presumably in explaining it, you are advocating its adoption.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: Okay. I'm sorry. Let me read this. Whereas the Faculty Senate overwhelmingly voted a Motion of No Confidence in the President

three months ago; and whereas he has neither responded to the detailed concerns spelled out in that motion, nor made any changes in accord with them; therefore, we hereby move to censure President Scott Scarborough. That's my motion.

CHAIR RICH: You're actually moving the adoption of that resolution. The inclusion of the word "move" in the resolution doesn't quite make sense. You want to remove it. You're moving the adoption of the resolution. The way you've written it, the resolution itself is moving something. And that doesn't make sense. We'll just take out the word "move." Okay is there a second? Seconded by Senator Mitchell. Yes, now you may continue debating the motion that you just made.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: What I fear is happening now is that we're getting two or three different narratives being handed to us, and I think it's time for the Faculty Senate to fight back. One is the narrative that all the problems that the University is having, which we certainly understand, which the freshmen enrollment is certainly a pretty clear one, are somehow the faculty's fault. Which is certainly not the case. I made we deplore the loss of faculty -- lack of freshmen more than anybody. They're our students. We want them. And yet we were not the ones who tried to rebrand the University which was certainly not anything that the students wanted to have happen. We were not the ones who twice tried to impose fees, extra fees on students, which the state ruled illegal. We were not the ones who got rid of the baseball team. We were not the ones who decided that it wasn't worth hiring tenured -- tenure track faculty to replace those who were leaving. We are not the ones who announced that grant funding was going to be cut, even though eventually it was not. The list just goes on and on. And yet we are somehow being blamed for it. And the Chairs were told by Nathan Mortimer two weeks ago that the only problem the University is facing is rhetoric, and The Akron Beacon Journal. And I think the reason for my motion is to make it clear that the faculty has genuine concerns about shared governance.

We want to help make this University right. It doesn't count as leadership for someone to be doing things in secret, without consulting the faculty, and expecting us to pick up the pieces. And then ignoring us when we say this has to stop.

CHAIR RICH: Is there debate on the motion? Further debate? Senator Matejkovic.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: Exactly what is the effect of a censure of the Present of the University? Is he not allowed to talk to us?

CHAIR RICH: Not "censor", "censure." It is a condemnation. It is just an expression of disapproval. That's all it is. And ordinarily one would think that it would be a step that one might take before a Vote of No Confidence.

[Overlapping voices] after No Confidence, but you heard the rationale for it.

Further debate on the motion? Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: With all due respect to my colleague Senator Bouchard, I speak against the motion. I think it's the wrong action at the wrong time. We all have frustrations but, as the President mentioned, the Executive Committee has scheduled tentatively the first meeting with the President to discuss some of the issues in the original No Confidence resolution. As you recall, the No Confidence resolution came through a Committee that was -- it was carefully crafted. Part of the impact that it had at the University and the Community was because it was a very rare, very carefully constructed resolution. I think we risk demeaning the value of that by taking further action without more careful consideration. And really, that resolution was directed to the Board of Trustees who should've been the ones to respond to us. So I would think that, if anything, we would be asking the Board of Trustees to respond. We also heard this week that Bill Lyons has been appointed into the President's Office, as a further voice of the faculty to maybe bring things around to a more careful faculty

consideration. So I would say that, as has been indicated, a censure vote at this point is really without teeth, and has a possibility of standing in the way of open communication with the Senate Executive Committee. I understand that the Committee of Chairs is also to be meeting with the Trustees and the President over the summer, and I think we'd be better served if those communications could be open and forthright.

CHAIR RICH: Further debate on the motion? Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY: As you know, obviously, I was the Senator who proposed the No Confidence resolution and I chaired the Ad Hoc Committee. I cannot speak more strongly in favor of the censure vote. First of all, at this meeting with the Executive Committee will be -- and this is the whole reason I support it -- we had our names read out loud. Where the meeting was here, students were here, and all the administrators were here. So we had to go on record, in public, where people who can make decisions that affect us, saw us say, after our name was called, give a vote. The President is the President of the University. I would expect a six hour -- for six hours for him to stand at the podium if he wants to be a leader and wants conf -- think of what's the resolution: "confidence." How do you earn back confidence? You get up as a leader and how uncomfortable, how embarrassing, how tough it is, you stand at that podium for six hours, ten hours, all night if you have to. We've done it. We've done our work. That ad hoc -- we wrote a tough resolution that was policy-based. It wasn't personal, and there were issues where we specifically disagree with the President, where we thought changes could be made. Now as we have heard, the budget will be formulated this summer. Remember last summer? Faculty were consulted on the budget. Faculty were present, apparently, on campus when the budget was put together so that constitutes our involvement, right? There's a budget about to be crafted and we may hear the same thing again next year. This is our last chance to say something. He has had three months to come here and talk to us and he hasn't. Now I had a faculty member the other day say to me, he was a senior faculty

member, that this is his last stop. And he's scared. I've had faculty members who were 15, 20 years senior to me, who have been here for a long time, and they are scared about the health of this University. These are not people who read a Beacon Journal editorial and got confused. He owes us a response, and this Executive Committee meeting -- the Executive Committee didn't write the resolution, and they're not the only ones who voted on it. The meeting should occur here, in public, where it's being transcribed on the record. There have been enough breakfasts and lunches. The graduate students met with him this week, and they said that they were totally dismissed. Completely and totally dismissed. Now you do that to a graduate student, you don't do that to the Faculty Senate. People on this Committee -- or in this Senate have 20, 30, 40 years of experience. You know higher education backwards and forwards. This is the place to have that discussion. So the censure vote is to make it very clear, whatever comes out of the budget summary, we disagree with the policies now, and this is our chance to say that in the August meeting or September meeting you're going to come in here; you're going to talk to us about this. So I vote -- I stand in favor of the motion.

CHAIR RICH: Further debate on the motion? Senator Arter.

SENATOR ARTER: If that's what you want to do, then why don't you state that? In other words, why don't you put the censure in a form that says we want you to come here and talk with us. Rather than just say we censure you, which just leaves it open, and now what do we do? I think that we should specifically say please come in and talk with us.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiment behind this. I am incredibly frustrated that we spent as much time as we did on that Committee and as the body of Faculty Senate to write a very detailed Vote of No Confidence

resolution. And I think we really did an outstanding job. And it's incredibly troubling to me that he has not responded. However, I am not in favor of a censure vote at this moment, primarily due to the time period between this meeting and the next opportunity that he would have to talk to us. I do agree, and I like the suggestion, that would make a formal motion that he come to this body at our next meeting and address the No Confidence resolution. And if he doesn't, then I think, even at that meeting, we could vote to censure him. But again, given the fact that it's going to be three or four months before we see him again, I don't think this is the right time for it. That's my only concern

CHAIR RICH: Senator Nofziger.

SENATOR NOFZIGER: Senator Rich, I do believe that at the meeting directly following the Vote of No Confidence we did ask him to speak to it, and he dismissed it. And so I would also speak in favor of the censure, just because I think there have been multiple opportunities for him to speak to this body, and he has dismissed us and seen us as important.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Allen, do you wish to address the body?

SENATOR ALLEN: Chair Rich, because of the gravity of this situation, if this is an option, what Senator Arter recommended -- could we have an emergency meeting next month, as the Senate, and discuss this?

CHAIR RICH: The answer is we could, and the question is would we have a quorum?

SENATOR ALLEN: I will be here.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: We only need 29 more.

SENATOR ALLEN: If it's this important, the same way with University Council, why can't we be here and talk about this?

CHAIR RICH: We could. Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: Could we have an emergency meeting next month and ask him to come and address this specifically? With that being the only purpose. Is that what you were --

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes. I'm sorry, I wasn't very clear.

CHAIR RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: I like the idea of telling him to come here and address us, but I still think we need to move to censure because I think we need to be on the record that this is not acceptable. Waiting three months, pretending as though it doesn't matter, and we have, for example, Dean David Gordon volunteered, he wasn't even appointed, he volunteered to be somebody who would listen to the faculty. I was with a group earlier this week who met with him. Extremely nice guy. Very good listener. But if -- what we're doing is that we're putting bonus layers between the President and the faculty. I mean we in Faculty Senate should be involved in all these decisions. We should have been involved in Trust Navigators, we should have been involved in the rebranding. Which I gather is now being walked back. We should have been involved certainly in ITT. I mean, who else, other than faculty, would know that it's a bad idea to get involved in an online for-profit institution that is losing its accreditation? I think sure, let's invite him to a meeting if we can get a quorum, but I think we still need to vote the censure to make it absolutely explicit that the Senate is not satisfied with putting this off. Allowing other people to listen for him. You can't listen for

somebody else. Any more than you can take a -- take a drink of water for somebody else. So I really would like to move with my motion.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: I'm sure we're all deeply moved. Further debate on the motion? I take it you're ready to vote. Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: I had a question. Senator Bouchard had said that she thought it was a good idea that we ask the President to come to meet with us. All these people have brought this up, but is this a separate motion that would occur after whatever we vote on on the censure, or should it be made part of the censure one? In other words, and a recommendation -- I just -- this is a point of clarity because all these people have for this up, and it is not clear to me whether you want it as part of the censure motion, or you want to have a censure motion and then ask, or what.

CHAIR RICH: Well, let me clarify. There is a motion before the body. It would censure the President. It says nothing about a meeting. Anyone is free to move to amend that motion, but in the absence of such an amendment we will proceed to vote on that resolution. After that resolution is voted on, either up or down, then it will be possible for someone to make another motion under New Business. That is where we stand. Is there anything further on the motion before us? Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: So now I have a question. Would be possible to table the motion, and then bring forward a motion about such a meeting, and then possibly go back and revisit? Part of my -- of the reason I asked that is that I would hate for a censure motion to go forward and fail. I think that would send the wrong message as well. But if we decided not to act on it right now, that would be different.

CHAIR RICH: As the options are to -- you have the option of moving to postpone, either indefinitely or to a date certain. The motion to table would not be in order. It is not what everyone thinks it is. It's just to take up something immediately in a meeting and you're tabling until later in the meeting.

SENATOR QUINN: That's kind of what I had in mind, actually. What I had in mind was talking about a special meeting, and then coming back to revisit to see if we want to continue with that motion today. Or if, at that point, we wanted to postpone it. Does that make sense? I think it would be better to figure out what we're going to do about a special meeting before taking any action on the censure.

CHAIR RICH: So I take it you are moving to table the resolution -- the motion that is before us now, so that we can take up the question of a special meeting. To return to the motion that is before us now after --

SENATOR QUINN: I could just draw a flowchart.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: I don't think that's necessary.

SENATOR QUINN: It's the only thing that works for me.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: Do you so move?

SENATOR QUINN: Yes.

CHAIR RICH: Second? Seconded by Senator Willits. All right. The vote will be on the motion to table, meaning postpone until we consider a vote on another motion, one concerning the holding of a special meeting. That's what we're voting on; we're just voting on taking up that matter before we resolve the matter that's currently before us. Everybody understand? Yes?

THOMAS GUARINO: Can I ask a question? I'm not a member of this body but I'd like to address -- my name is Thomas Guarino. I'm a graduate student at the University and I understand the idea of censuring the President. Unfortunately, I kind of wish some of these questions would have been posed to the Present when he was here earlier.

CHAIR RICH: Are you speaking on the subject of the motion to table?

THOMAS GUARINO: I think I'm speaking on the subject to have an emergency meeting.

CHAIR RICH: Then, if you were a member of the body, you would be speaking out of order.

THOMAS GUARINO: Okay, maybe I am.

CHAIR RICH: And since you're not, I would ask you to hold your remarks. Since you are both speaking out of order and not a member of the body.

The matter before us now is the question whether to table the motion on the resolution to censure, which meets just so that we can consider the other matter first and then we would return to it. Is there debate on that motion? Senator Feltey.

SENATOR FELTEY: Thank you, Chairman Rich. I guess I have a question that I need some clarification on what the goal of the emergency meeting is. What is it that we expect to accomplish --

CHAIR RICH: That would be debate on the motion that has not yet been made, and that will be made if the motion to table passes. All those in favor of the motion to table, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent.

Now, does someone wish to make a motion?

SENATOR ARTER: I guess I will. I don't know how you want to phrase this. I'd like to make a motion that we invite the President here to talk with us in a special meeting and specifically address the issues expressed in the Vote of No Confidence.

CHAIR RICH: Is there a second? Did you wish to say anything -- include anything in the motion that would indicate when this should occur? You're talking about a special meeting in May, or do you wish to leave it unspecific?

Some indication of the timeframe would be useful so that the Senate Executive Committee in scheduling the meeting will know when to try to schedule it for us.

SENATOR ARTER: May? I'm saying that with a question mark because, like you said, can we get a quorum.

CHAIR RICH: Does the seconder, and I forgot who it was -- Senator Allen, do you accept that?

SENATOR ALLEN: Yes. And I would recommend two weeks. For a date.

CHAIR RICH: Well, may I ask you to allow the Executive Committee to fix the actual date? Senator Franks.

SENATOR FRANKS: When do we fiddle with the wording of that? I don't like the wording "invite." Can we say something like "fervently request"?

[Laughter]

SENATOR FRANKS: I'm serious. I mean, we can't demand it. But something -- I would suggest fervently request.

CHAIR RICH: Well. I'm not sure if the body should go on record expressing its fervor. Senator Schwartz.

SENATOR SCHWARTZ : Would it be possible to take a very informal poll to see when people would be available?

CHAIR RICH: Yes, we can do that. But I think -- I think we should decide whether we're going to do this first, and then figure out when it's going to be. Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: I just -- I looked at my calendar. June 3rd is a Friday. First Friday in June, so that would be a date I believe you might want to keep in mind. Just in terms of -- you say late May. The last day of May is a Tuesday. So June 3rd is like the end of [Inaudible].

CHAIR RICH: You're suggesting that the meeting be held by June 3rd?

SENATOR QUINN: Yes.

CHAIR RICH: Anyone have any objection? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKON: I don't know if it's an objection, but --

CHAIR RICH: I'm asking only for objections.

SENATOR ERICKSON: All right. I object, then.

[Laughter]

Are we not employed until the end of May? The contract has us employed until the end of May. And so I think there is a point in having it before the end of May.

CHAIR RICH: I'll refrain from pointing out that I work all summer as your Chair. Senator Hausknecht.

SENATOR HAUSKNECHT: As a point of information, when the Executive Committee was trying to arrange a meeting with the President, the date of June 8th came up as an available date. So I just want to be sensitive to getting on the calendar of everybody.

CHAIR RICH: We know that was an available date for three high-level administrators simultaneously, and so I suspect that if you relax that requirement, there might be more open dates.

All right. Do we want to go back to May?

SENATORS: Yes.

CHAIR RICH: Because I heard substantial objections to meeting after May. All right, if there's no objection the motion is -- remains -- to hold the meeting during

May. So that's the motion that's before you. Is there further debate on the motion, preferably on its merits rather than the date? Senator Howard.

SENATOR HOWARD: I'm just wondering, since no one had -- you know, we had very few questions for the President. I wonder if he would be asking about that, you know. Now we want to meet with him, but when he asked for questions, not that many people had questions.

CHAIR RICH: After his remarks today. Senator Mitchell.

SENATOR MITCHELL: Asking why haven't you apologized or responded to us was -- I was sitting here vacillating, wanting to do it, but it felt -- it's a very difficult thing to do, to sort of say, oh, by the way -- an enormous thing all at once.

SENATOR HOWARD: Yeah, I don't have a problem with it, I'm just saying that he might -- I wonder if he might mention that. Question why we didn't.

CHAIR RICH: I think it should be clear that what the body wishes is responses to the points that were made in the Vote of No Confidence resolution. I don't think he'll have any difficulty understanding -- I don't think we'll have any trouble communicating that. Senator Matejkovic.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: Chair Rich, if I might suggest a friendly amendment to the motion, to state that the Faculty Senate would suggest the President attend a special meeting of the Faculty Senate, to be arranged at a convenient time for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, to respond to the issues raised in the faculty No Confidence vote, pending a consideration of a motion for censure.

CHAIR RICH: Well, first of all, there's no such thing as a friendly amendment. If you wish to move to amend, you may do that. Second of all, and I think it would

be a substantial change in the meaning of the motion. You're free to move to amend by substance. Would you please restate the motion.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: I move that the Faculty Senate suggest that President Scarborough attend a special meeting of the Faculty Senate, at a date as scheduled by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, to address the specific points raised in the No Confidence vote -- No Confidence resolution passed by the Faculty Senate on whatever the date was, pending the Senate's consideration of a resolution of censure.

CHAIR RICH: Okay is there second to the motion to amend? Seconded by Senator Nofziger. Debate on the motion to amend? Senator Arter.

SENATOR ARTER: Real quick question. It sounds to me like we're saying the same thing with more words.

[Laughter]

CHAIR RICH: Senator Matejkovic, I wonder whether you might explain what the substantive difference is between your motion to amend and the original motion.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: First, I like the idea of suggesting that he attend, as opposed to fervently requesting.

CHAIR RICH: Well, the motion was to invite.

SENATOR MATEJKOVIC: Oh. I -- I share Dan's concern, okay? He's been invited to every Faculty Senate and he has not addressed this. So I don't want to extend another invitation for him to come and not say anything. The suggestion is that he comes to attend a special meeting to address those particular things. The other specific language I put in: "pending a consideration of the vote of

censure" because I want him to understand that there is a consequence to saying I'm not going to talk to you. Whether he cares about it or not is immaterial, but I want him to understand that people are pissed off. And that his failure to respond is going to have consequences.

CHAIR RICH: Further debate on the motion to amend Senator Arter's motion? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR BOUCHARD: It sounded as though he's planning to put off the censure vote. I thought what we had been discussing was just putting off the censure vote for five minutes.

CHAIR RICH: Well, that motion may be logically incompatible with the censure motion. It does not mean we will not return in this meeting to the censure motion. I assume if this motion to amend were to pass then that would mean that we would end up not passing the censure motion in this meeting. Either that or people would be acting inconsistently. Which I suppose is not out of the question.

[Laughter]

If there's no further debate on the motion -- Senator Quinn.

SENATOR QUINN: I would like to move that we change the wording to request, although not fervently, I think request --

CHAIR RICH: You're talking about the motion to amend, now, right? Because that's what's before us. In other words, substitute the word "request" for "suggest". Is there any objection to substituting the word request for -- actually, I can't remember the exact words -- [Overlapping voices] Any objection to substituting request for suggest? Okay I hear no objections so it is so amended.

Any further debate on the motion to amend the motion? All those in favor of Senator Matejkovic's motion to amend please by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. We'll have a division of the house. All those in favor of the motion to amend, please raise your yellow tag.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR: What are we amending?

CHAIR RICH: All right. Hang on. You can lower your hands. There has been a motion to amend, offered by Senator Matejkovic, which would amend by substitution. It would just completely replace Senator Arter's motion. You've heard the debate. You've heard the motion. The question is, do you want to substitute the language offered by Senator Matejkovic for the language originally offered by Senator Arter. If you want to, vote yes, and if you don't want to, vote no. All those in favor of the motion to amend, please signify by saying aye -- yes?

SENATOR KLEIN: Chair Rich, would you please just clarify what the implications of voting either way on this vote are for the censure vote.

CHAIR RICH: The motion to amend Senator Arter's motion, if it passes, will essentially replace his motion. We will then vote on that motion. The question before us immediately is would you prefer the motion as worded by Senator Matejkovic to the motion as worded by Senator Arter. After that we will have a second vote on the question of whether you want either of those, okay? Right now you're just choosing between these two versions of the motion, and you're not necessarily going to adopt whatever version you choose. There'd be a second vote on whether to call for a special meeting at all. Everybody understand? So the vote is on the motion to amend that was offered by Senator Matejkovic which would substitute the motion that he offered, for that of Senator Arter. All those in favor of the motion to amend, please signify by raising your yellow cards. The motion is defeated. All those opposed. The motion is

defeated. We're back to the main motion, which is Senator Arter's motion. Could you restate it?

SENATOR ARTER: Oh, no. Not that. Okay this probably isn't verbatim, but I'll do the best I can. Okay, it's a motion to ask President Scarborough to come and meet with us in a special meeting, okay, which now we all agree will be in May, okay, to specifically address the items of the No Confidence vote -- the No Confidence resolution that we issued in the past.

CHAIR RICH: Okay, you've heard the motion; it was seconded. Is there debate on that motion? All in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. Motion is adopted without dissent.

Now we're back -- we return to Senator Bouchard's motion, which was the censure resolution. Is there further debate on that motion? I take it you're ready to vote. Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY: We are ready to vote on Senator Bouchard's motion to censure.

CHAIR RICH: Well, not necessarily, if you're debating it, then --

SENATOR COFFEY: I just have one more -- may I make one more? First of all, I thank my colleagues, especially Senator Quinn, who I think has really taught me -- I've worked with him a lot, not just on the Ad Hoc Committee and I respect him a great deal. For those Senators who raise the possibility of a meeting, that's a great idea. So I support that -- I think that's what we want, right? At the end of the day, we want open dialogue, but we want real dialogue. The reason I support the censure, though, is exactly what Chair Rich said. It's a statement of disapproval. What we are disapproving is his ignoring the Senate, which is the primary institution of the faculty on campus, for the last three months. So I'm,

again, I want to strongly say that we need to censure him so that this doesn't happen again. The Senate has -- we have to take this body seriously. So yes, we're having the meeting, but yes, we have to censure him, too.

CHAIR RICH: Further debate on the censure motion? I take it you're ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. Opposed by opposite sign. The motion is adopted. Is there any other New Business to come before the body? Anything for the Good of the Order? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ERICKSON: At the beginning of the meeting, the Chair read out a statement about John Kline but that particular statement did not include, I think, something that needed to be stated for the Good of the Order, and that is our sincere appreciation of all the work that John Kline did in this body, in this body on committees, in HLC, which he did for us. He represented SEAC, when SEAC was in this body, and he spoke bravely and openly because it's very hard for SEAC members to do that. And he provided a great deal of very effective input to the governance of this University, and I think that should be noted and appreciated by this body.

CHAIR RICH: Anything else for the Good of the Order? I take it you're ready to adjourn. I hereby declare this meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.