

University of Akron Faculty Senate

March 6, 2014

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The regular March meeting of the Faculty Senate is called to order. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as distributed? Senator Raber moves. Seconded by Senator Sastry. We need to add one committee report that was distributed recently, that's the Part time Faculty Committee. As I understand, it's just an informational report. Are there any other additions to the agenda? All those in favor of adopting the agenda with that addition, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The agenda is adopted. The next item is the adoption of the minutes of the February meeting. Is there a motion to adopt those minutes? Senator Clark moves. Is there a second? Senator Saliga seconds. Are there any corrections to the minutes? All those in favor of adopting the minutes, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Minutes are adopted. Next item is the chairman's remarks.

On the agenda for this meeting we have a proposal from the Academic Policies Committee to increase the grade point average required for Dean's List from 3.25 to 3.50, and create a President's List for full time students who earn a GPA of 4.0. We also have a number of curriculum change proposals from the Curriculum Review Committee. A report from the Computing and Communications Technology Committee that includes a recommendation about the university's licensing of web conferencing software. The final report of the ad hoc Clicker Committee which includes recommendations concerning the adoption of a new student response system for the university, and a report from the Athletics Committee recommending that the Faculty Senate join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics.

Let me just report briefly that the Academic Policies Committee has been meeting weekly to review the provost's proposed suspension of 55 academic programs, examined the relevant data and the provost's rationales for his proposals, and to consider written submissions from interested faculty members. APC will present its recommendations to the Faculty Senate in the senate's April third meeting. I should add if there are faculty members who have not yet but wish to make written submissions to the committee concerning any of these proposals, they should do so soon, because we don't have a lot of time left.

The administration has released its proposed budget for fiscal year 2015 which begins July 1 of this year. The proposed budget, including the specific cuts for each of the colleges, was developed by a leadership team that included, unfortunately, no academicians. In the course of developing the budget, there was no meaningful consultation of the University Council Budget Committee.

I understand there have been some efforts recently to consult with the Budget Committee, and I hope that those efforts continue.

The administration is projecting a four percent decrease in enrollment and a four percent decrease in revenues from fiscal year 2014 to 2015, so total budget cut for fiscal year 2015 is \$14.9 million, which represents a cut of 6.5 percent from the fiscal year 2014 budget.

Academic units collectively are being cut by \$9.1 million which is a 6.7 percent decrease in their budgets. Nonacademic units collectively are being cut \$5.7 million, which is a 6.2 percent decrease in their budgets. As a result, the academic units' collective share of the budget will be further reduced and the nonacademic units' share will be further increased.

The College of Arts and Sciences, which is the heart of this university, has had its budget cut by 14 percent over the last two fiscal years. It should be unnecessary to state that the primary mission of this and any university is academic instruction. It's academic instruction for which students pay tuition and the state provides subsidies. The 6.7 percent budgets cuts on the academic units for fiscal year 2015 on top of those for last year and the years before that will impair those units' ability to provide academic instruction and thereby reduce enrollment and student success resulting in a further loss of revenue. Continuation of this trend can only result in a fiscal death spiral for the university.

The priorities reflected in the proposed fiscal year 2015 budget are backwards. In lean fiscal times expenditure cuts have to be made, but those cuts should not be concentrated most heavily on the units that provide the services that directly generate revenue.

Recently we learned that in the last year the university spent almost a half million dollars on promotional novelty items such as T shirts, pens and backpacks. The Athletics Department has just ordered almost \$13,000 in Bobblehead likenesses of the president in celebration of his having, in the words of the athletics director, quote, "ensured that the university provides our student athletes and coaches with first class facilities and other resources necessary to compete for championships." The Athletics Department, it should be noted, does generate significant revenue, but it nonetheless costs the university two to \$3 million more in expenditures than it generates in revenue.

A decrease in revenue owing to dropping enrollment was probably inevitable, given the demographic fact that the population of college age students is decreasing. What caused our fiscal crisis, however, was the university's, the administration's failure or refusal to recognize the

implications of that demographic fact and its failure or refusal to recognize that the federal fiscal stimulus spending programs were coming to an end. The administration is taking a fiscally conservative approach in proposing the fiscal year 2015 budget, they say. And this in itself is not a bad thing. It is regrettable that it was not done in prior years when it would have been possible to take a more strategic, less crisis driven, less opportunistic approach to reducing expenditures.

What in my view is wrong with the administration's approach to budgeting for fiscal year 2015 is that it has not only failed to give priority to funding the academic units which directly fulfill the mission of the university and generate its revenue, it has actually done the opposite, given budget priority to the nonacademic units. I urge the administration to correct this strategic error before it finalizes the fiscal year 2015 budget, otherwise we'll be eating our seed corn. This concludes my remarks.

(applause)

The next item on the agenda is the remarks of the president. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Your colleague's not reporting today?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Oh, I'm sorry. I did skip over that.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Good afternoon, senators and guests. As a reminder, we're in the midst of senate election season. The deans and other facilitators have been notified with the relevant information to carry out senate elections for each constituent group as well as an elected faculty rights and responsibilities representative when appropriate. The election reports are due back to the Faculty Senate Office by March 15.

During the month of February, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee met three times as a committee and once with the president and the provost. On February 13th the EC met for regular senate business. The committee discussed the charge to APC and CRC regarding the proposal to suspend 55 academic programs. The data presented to the senate did not include specific rationales from either the Academic Program Review Committee or the Office of Academic Affairs. Chair Rich returned to the administration and acquired the appropriate documents.

The EC next met on February 20 for regular senate business and to prepare for the meeting later that afternoon with the president and provost. The president informed us of the current initiatives to build a conservative fiscal year 15 budget with an expected four percent decrease in enrollment and a two percent tuition increase.

The EC expressed concern over the UC Budget and Finance Committee not being actively engaged in the current budgeting process. The president ensured the EC that he will clarify and reinforce the role of University Council committees with all of the vice presidents.

The EC last met on February 27 for regular senate business and to prepare the agenda for today's meeting.

Finally, lastly, Richard Bennett was appointed to the CRC. And that concludes my report.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any questions about the Executive Committee report? Thank you. Mr. President, now your remarks.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you, Senator Bove, for remarking on what I asked my colleagues to do, and thank you Mr. Chairman, for noting that that discussion has begun, and I hope it will continue very actively.

Well, here we are in March. It's perhaps too soon to declare that we have spring. Tomorrow may be a little warmer. But I have been reminded a little bit too often lately that my term as your president is coming to an end.

As we speak, the board of trustees is meeting with their search consultant and proceeding forthwith to the next stage in the search. And I received an invitation from one of our student organizations to talk with them, and they asked me to use the metaphor that some of you have heard, what would you say in your last lecture? So that's happened. And then Bill, your colleagues have invited me to give their commencement address. And you know your term is coming to an end when lawyers start being friendly to you. No offense.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I make that [inaudible]

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: I appreciate that. I just wanted a little lightness in the midst of all of these concerns which are serious, and I will touch upon one in just a moment, because I have just a few items to review with you this afternoon. Provost Sherman will provide some details on the relevant issues that you are considering in his remarks.

First I want to thank the committees that are conducting the evaluation of our centers and institute and drafting your response to the recommendations of program suspensions. I have been advised by your chair and by others that the committee members are working vigorously and making real progress, and I look forward to that input.

There's one bit of unfinished business that I must ask that you please attend to. Two years ago this senate appointed an ad hoc Committee on the Criminal Justice Programs and the role of Summit College, and it was affirmed that both issues would be considered together. And we've taken certainly sufficient time for considerations. And circumstances relating to Summit College in particular now compel us to move forward.

The faculty in Summit College, for example, have devoted an extraordinary amount of time and effort to prepare a report that contains the recommendations for a criminal justice program, and the organizational role of that college. They've worked diligently and efficiently, and their final

draft will be ready soon. And this, as you may know, is the fourth report that they've developed over the past two years. And obviously as in so many things that we do in higher education, changes in personnel, changes in orientation, change in circumstances often delay various considerations, and certainly first reports are rarely ready in their first draft.

But we owe it to these colleagues and to the students that have made Summit College part of their career plans to complete this process and move forward. And therefore, I would formally ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Faculty Senate provide me with its recommendations on those two items, the Criminal Justice Programs and the role of Summit College by your May meeting, please.

In doing so, I ask that you not constrain yourself into considering just the existing nature of the college and instead just pondering what can we do with just that existing framework. I would also ask that you please consider how can this academic unit, Summit College, be configured to provide the very best benefit to the entire university and best serve the larger community in ways that enhance and strengthen the overall University of Akron community.

We are certainly, as you know and certainly as your chairman reflected, increased competition for students as a result of demographic changes as well as competitive forces. The state funding picture is not likely to improve particularly, although I'm optimistic given the governor's remarks in the state of the state address last week that he will at least keep us whole.

This summer, of course, my successor will need to hit the ground both listening and running. There's a lot to do, and all of that we're trying to do in these last few months is indeed to prepare the university best for that transition. So the results of your work on these issues will provide that individual, whoever that might be, with the firm ground and good traction to help move our university forward.

So I ask that you use your best efforts as the Faculty Senate to take the next action that will maintain and enhance our institution's viability in these regards.

Finally, in case you missed it earlier today, Dr. Sherman and Mr. Tressel issued a call for proposals for initiatives to improve student retention and completion. They intend to fund two or three of the best ideas for up to \$50,000 per year for a minimum of three years. You can learn more about this program and related initiatives in the E mail that they sent or certainly by inquiring when he gets up to make his report. But certainly we as a collection of faculty and expertise have an opportunity to share that expertise for the benefit of each other and the institution. So I ask please, for your assistance in that regard.

Finally, I wanted to call to your attention this week's issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education. There are several important articles that certainly merit all of our attention and reading and understanding and deliberation. Three or more are within the typical Chronicle and one of them is within the review portion of the Chronicle. It talks about under the rubric of an era of neglect

how public colleges got crowded out, beaten up and failed to fight back. And it's important that we all read these issues. I think they're quite well done. They're not exactly as I might have wished them to be written, but they're certainly a good place for us to begin considering these issues.

On the whole our country has gone through a period of time in which states for a variety of reasons, in many cases fiscal reasons, in some others ideological, and shall we just call it what it says here neglect, state funding for higher education in all but two or three states have significantly declined.

The State of Ohio is now 46th in per FTE support for higher education student in the country. That's four from the bottom, not from the top. In the meantime we're teaching 45,000 more students than we were about 8 or 10 years ago. I forget the exact statistic here. And we're doing it much more effectively and efficiently as is indicated by a statistic that I have referred to this body time and time again, and that is that our costs, our net cost, tuition plus state support for educating an Ohio student is below the national average.

And as Chand Midha will tell you, because he's analyzed those data very, very exactly, the net growth in income per FTE student has been at a, just wipe out any inflation or anything, and we haven't had in short any growth that would account for inflation.

So there's huge numbers of misunderstandings out there, not the least of which is the use of percentages. Just every time that you get out and read about it, such and such group faster in public higher education than private higher education. As I reflected to you again, it overlooks the fact that private higher education begins from a base that's three or four times higher than ours. And sure, it's no wonder that when they grow out by \$5,000 it's a smaller percentage of their base than, you know, \$500 is off our base. Make the adequate calculation. My mathematician colleagues and physics colleagues will do that.

But it's really a travesty. And it also goes with a point that I've made, and I'll end with this, unfortunately, we in higher education have had the wrong metrics as a proxy for excellence.

Since when does selectivity, in other words how many students you exclude, tell anybody that you have done anything worthwhile as an educator, as an institution for your students? Sure, it makes it a lot easier. Sure, they'll graduate much more likely than students who need help. But that cannot be the statistic that the president puts into place through the initiative that the Department of Education is going on.

Please read these articles. Let's have a deliberation of what we can do, not only as a university, but as a higher education collective to better inform our publics and regain the value of public higher education as a public good, not as a private gain.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Happy to take any questions you may have.

SENATOR HARVEY STERNS: The article on presidential transitions in this issue is very interesting. I hope you will find the right path of the many outlined there.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you. I hope so. And I'm looking forward to my next life, so to speak.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions of the president? Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: I think it was the last time you were here you said that our freshmen enrollments are running about 40 percent higher than they have been last year. Is that number hanging in, or has it dropped?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Let me clarify, because I did not say enrollments. I said applications.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Applications.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: And that is correct. And that is why in the budget message that Dr. Sherman and Mr. Cummins have issued, we've indicated that the present budget exercise is intended to be conservative while also doing all that we can to strengthen the opportunity to gain the appropriate revenues and the increase in enrollment that would keep us from having to make those cuts that are being discussed. Okay?

Still again, as Dr. Sherman I am sure will outline, we look forward to further discussion and input. And I personally have talked with all of the vice presidents and asked them to please be true to the intent of the charge to each of the University Council committees so that we have the appropriate opportunity to discuss and move forward.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Do we have an updated figure on how applications are running compared to last year?

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: We do. I don't have it in front of me, but okay, he'll address them for you. But it's staying up there in terms of percentage. It's obviously, anyway, he'll have them for you in a moment. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there any other questions of the president? Thank you.

PRESIDENT LUIS PROENZA: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item on the agenda are the remarks of the senior vice president and provost.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Thank you very much, Chair Rich. I too would like to echo my thanks to the Academic Policies Committee for their work with the faculty chairs, deans and administrators on reviewing programs proposed for suspension. I look forward to the Faculty

Senate feedback following the April third meeting. It's not an easy process, certainly, but it is well informed and really a necessary component, continuous improvement to improve academic excellence.

Now, the feedback from the Faculty Senate will be thoughtfully considered, especially recommendations related to data or informed by data or other external factors such as alignment with work opportunities or other relevant market factors and other data items that would be important to making a fully informed recommendation. Recommendations will be made to the board of trustees at their April 23rd meeting.

And as I mentioned at our last Faculty Senate meeting, academic program review is about alignment with the University System of Ohio expectations and the University of Akron, which I quoted, but an important component of it being a continued strong focus on areas that integrate basic and applied research, entrepreneurial education, intellectual property law, technology transfer expertise that is critical to the future of the city and northeastern Ohio and the state.

That brings me to comment as the president did briefly on Summit College. Summit College is clearly important in aligning the University of Akron with this charge from the University System of Ohio. And the president mentioned that he looks forward to receiving some recommendations from the Faculty Senate at the May first meeting.

For those who aren't familiar with Summit College, perhaps it's important to just note that in 1964 the University of Akron created the Community and Technical College. The Community and Technical College. That name has a purpose and a clear identity. In 2004 it was renamed Summit College. Obviously now with not a clear purpose and identity in its title. So certainly that needs to be considered as recommendations were made.

As you know, an ad hoc committee was formed, I think in around March of 2012, to consider reviewing criminal justice and the role of Summit College, and I'm sure that the informed recommendations from Faculty Senate will certainly consider the ad hoc committee's work, but importantly as well the work that the faculty and Summit College have so diligently undertaken.

We would anticipate having a discussion on those recommendations with the board of trustees in June, but one might consider various options for Summit College. Certainly an option is not to stay the same, because we do need to consider market conditions in Summit County, we need to consider that there's not a low cost option for career and technical education in Summit County. We know that there's market infiltration in Summit County by our sister colleague to the south. And certainly we need to consider changes in the legislation that relates to SSI redistribution, not only for developmental courses but in general.

An option might be to change the name of the college and grow the program, adjust the focus perhaps like the Purdue College of Applied Technology. Another option might be to eliminate Summit College as a college and move the programs of Summit College into the colleges on this

campus. It would present other opportunities but perhaps challenges, but certainly such an approach would save money because it would reduce infrastructure costs.

Another possibility would be to move the bachelor's degrees into the other colleges where bachelor's degrees reside and have an associate degree granting entity or division or college that could better serve the associate degree, technical degree requirements in the market in Summit County in this region.

As was mentioned earlier, the budget is of great concern obviously to all of us. We're anticipating a 15 million dollar gap that we need to fill. That represents about four percent of our total general fund budget. The process of balancing the budget last year did not include ongoing fixes to the structural problem that existed, because some of the balancing of last year's budget only used cash.

The board of trustees has asked that we bring them a budget for 15 where revenues will exceed expenses, that is from the perspective of cash flow. And they desire that we no longer tap into our limited reserves.

Certainly we've been conservative in estimating our revenues and aggressive in controlling our expenses so that we'll have resources in the future. If we can address the budget gap with a focus on improving efficiency and generating revenue with increased enrollment and other initiatives, we certainly will be better prepared to invest in growth.

Our budget assumptions are based on the realities that we face today. And if our enrollment increases beyond projections as the president indicated, that is, we bring in more students, retain more students, we will adjust our budget projections.

Again, I'll state it's a difficult process. Certainly while academic budgets are being reduced, as you know I have been committed to moving dollars to the academic side of the house. If one takes a look just at compensation perhaps, for the academic units, from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 13, we've moved about \$25.1 million into the academic side of the house, compared to compensation equivalent to \$11 million into the nonacademic side of the house for that same period of time.

So as I've indicated before, steps to shift institutional resources to the academic side of the house have happened, have been successful albeit in the meantime we have had to adjust budgets.

Certainly I agree and understand our interest in continuing to focus and identify ways to bring more full time faculty on staff at the University of Akron to improve the delivery of instruction and to advance our research agenda.

Clearly, if we invest in our students, we're investing in our university. And that in fact will be what will differentiate the University of Akron from its competitors, especially having

considered all of the great progress that has been made in changing the institutional profile of our students, as well as having invested in our faculty over the last four years.

It was mentioned that the president and I are very interested in and concerned about assuring the committees of the University Council are involved in significant ways, important ways with regard to recommendations related to all aspects of the institution. In fact, at the last meeting I met with CFO Cummins with the UC Budget and Finance Committee and pledged to remain involved with them as that process is duly considered and engaged the University Council Budget and Finance Committee in planning and developing a fiscal year 15 budget.

Relative to where we're at with applications and enrollment, you should know that at this point in time we have 16,000 applications. Last year we had a total of 13,000 applications. So, we're 3,000 applications ahead with still more time to receive additional applications.

Let's see here. At this point in time, we're pretty much even with confirmed admitted students. So we're not behind last year with confirmed admitted students. So I think that is a good sign. Certainly all the work that the faculty, the staff and everybody else has undertaken to greet potential new students on visitation days and remain engaged with them I think is bearing fruit.

And certainly our interactions with students in ways that support their success also are evidenced by this information. From this past fall to this spring, we had a seven percent increase compared to last year in the retention of preparatory students. We had a five percent increase compared to last year in college ready students.

So as you know, the preparatory students are being focused in specific ways with guidance and advice that's intentional, and intrusive advising is appropriate with intentional activities to improve their success. And certainly the improvement and retention of college ready students not directly admitted into a college indicates that we're doing a much better job in finding their way to their degree program.

I think given the institutional interest in this topic, I will work with our Office of Communications and determine what an effective way might be to update the university perhaps on these matters, maybe not every week but perhaps every two weeks, so that we don't have to wait in between Faculty Senate meetings to have these updates. That way as our progress is demonstrated, we can all be thankful for the success of our good work, and we can also have a better understanding of the good work we have yet to do.

So again, thank you very much for moving that agenda forward, for everything you do to advance the reputation of this great institution. And I think we will be turning the corner. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Mr. Provost, before I invite questions from the floor, I have a couple of questions related to the budget. The documents that you have sent out indicated that the

budget is predicated on expectation of a four percent decrease in revenues from this year to next. The cuts, however, are on the order of six and a half percent. Can you explain the difference between those two percentages?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I'm sorry. Say that again.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The revenues are projected to be four percent less. The cuts though, are 6.5 percent. So I wonder if you could explain the difference between those two percentages.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I will ask our CFO if he can do that if that's acceptable. Maybe we'll tag team if that's appropriate.

DAVID CUMMINS: The issue is, you have certain items, the four percent is on the whole base general fund budget, which is in the range of \$360 million. But you have a number of items in there that you cannot cut or we have chosen not to cut. So for instance, debt service is a very small number in the general fund budget, but we can't cut that. We've made the decision not to cut the scholarships and remissions. That's about \$50 million by itself.

The course fees, technology fees, those will be determined by whatever the enrollment is because they're driven by the enrollment. So how those numbers end up is yet to be determined. But they're not the base that we have everybody working on at the time being. So the main ones would be scholarships, remissions and debt. But there are a handful of items we have to back out of the equation to figure out how to get to 15 million.

When all said and done, it averages out to about six and a half percent of the base.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. My other question is that the letter from you and Vice President Cummins of March 4th indicated that in determining how much each college's budget would be cut or actually how much all of the vice presidents' units and colleges were to be cut, and one of the considerations was academic success. You wrote the priority that, the priority's on academic success. So programs that demonstrate continued opportunities for student success receive more support. That was in the context of explaining how you got to the percentage, the cut allocations.

I was wondering how was that taken into account? How, who was it who evaluated the various units' contribution to academic success, and the continued opportunities for student success?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Sure. Yeah, that's a great question in terms of how were those kinds of decisions made or those planning numbers arrived at. If one considers academic quality, market, demand for programs, alignment with the University System of Ohio statement of the University of Akron, you will see that the reductions were relatively lesser for programs that would be programs of focus.

So, Arts and Sciences could otherwise have been higher than it was. It was reduced. Engineering, health professions, the business administration could have been higher than they were, but they were reduced. As a result of those colleges having lesser reductions, other colleges obviously had to have higher reductions.

I think what I'd like to continue to point out is these are planning budgets. So basically these are budgets to plan from, to determine what gaps might exist otherwise without additional resources. So we can then quite clearly understand the resources we absolutely require to deliver the academic programs, and that we have built some flexibility into the budget to be responsive to those factors. As I indicated with the University Council Budget and Finance Committee, there is flex. I will work with them and consider that flexibility.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me just follow up. So, evaluations were made of the contributions to student success of each of the various colleges and other units. On the basis of what data were those evaluations made? Who was looking at the data and what data were they looking at?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: The Office of Academic Affairs was with the CFO with regard to the interactions with those colleges over those previous budget cycles.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: And the data concerning student success consisted of what?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: What one would consider in terms of demand for programs, throughput from programs, placement of students in jobs, those sorts of things. And an analysis of the dollars necessary to deliver the programs for sure at a rate that was required to keep those programs at a high level of reputation.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Are there questions of the senior vice president and provost? Senator Allen.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Chairperson Rich, that's great news to hear from Provost Sherman of the increase in funding from 2008 of \$21 million to the academic side. But just for clarification, would you be aware of the ratio of that, that went to, say, the colleges and down versus the ratio that went to Academic Affairs?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Ratio of the colleges?

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: In other words, I thought the academic side consisted of those two units, the, for example at that budget meeting that we went to, I think it was last spring we had heard that 19 percent of the budget went to colleges and departments, and 23 percent of the budget went to Academic Affairs.

And I was just wondering of that 21 million of increase in salaries, what percentage of that went to the 19 percent versus the 23 percent? Because of course individuals on Faculty Senate are looking at trying to estimate what percentage of that went to faculty.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: What percentage of this

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Of the 21 million.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I don't have this broken down right here by that, by answering that question, but we certainly can provide it. What this represented was total compensation to colleges as opposed to compensation to academic support units. We certainly would have the breakdowns otherwise for consideration.

SENATOR PHIL ALLEN: Okay. Thank you.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Anderson.

SENATOR TURNER ANDERSON: Chair Rich, I've heard rumors of programs being suspended that are not on the academic program review listing. Is this something that I should keep investigating further or is it up to, is it within the discretion of the colleges to sunset programs at will?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Well, first of all, the Academic Policies Committee, which is reviewing the proposed suspensions, will consider proposals from departments, schools, to suspend other programs, either in addition to or perhaps in some instances instead of programs that are being proposed for suspension. It is possible for a department, in fact not really abnormal for a department or school to propose the suspension of one of its programs. So I suppose the answer to your question is yes, we were pursuing. Are there questions for the provost? Senator Koskey.

SENATOR KRISTIN KOSKEY: I was wondering if the provost could comment on the additional factors contributing to the 15 million dollar gap in the budget aside from enrollment.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Yes. I think well, if you look at the Budget and Finance Committee website, there's a Power Point up there that clearly shows that in tables. I probably need to rely on our CFO to have a better recollection of the answer to that question, because I'm sure I will miss something if I attempt to. I have a pretty good handle on it, but I will let him address the question if that's okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Just to back up the question one step, it is how much of the projected shortfall is the result of projected enrollment decreases?

DAVID CUMMINS: If enrollment is in fact off four percent, it will translate to about \$9 million. Now, so what's the difference, 15 versus 9? This is a not a huge number, but I'm going by memory too, which I need to be careful not to be overly confident here. But somewhere in the four or \$5 million range if I remember correctly, are some reductions that we cannot keep in the base and we have to restore.

We did identify up to a couple million dollars for scholarships. There was a debt issue we have to deal with to the tune of about a million dollars. So there's a handful of items that when all said and done, the enrollment is 9 million, but there are these other things we have to add. But then on the positive side we add the tuition. If we do a two percent tuition increase, that's worth about 4 million. So it's a combination of all of those things.

And as the provost pointed out, they're spelled out not in great detail, but a list of numbers of what makes up each pot on the Power Point that was presented to the Finance Committee of the Board, the Council of Deans, the chairs and the VPs and the UC Budget Finance Committee.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You may have lost me in the arithmetic somewhere, but here's my understanding of what you just said. That \$9 million of the shortfall is the result of the projected decrease in enrollment. There's, that leaves about \$6 million to take us up to the 15 million. But then you are projecting an increase in revenues from tuition increase of, what was that number again?

DAVID CUMMINS: About four.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: About four million. So we're really accounting for a \$10 million [inaudible].

DAVID CUMMINS: Right.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: So you mentioned some of the things that can make that up. You are saying the things that you just mentioned account for approximately \$10 million?

DAVID CUMMINS: And some of those we're kind of stuck with. They're within our fixed costs. Some of those there will be a little room for discretion. So when the provost says that as we work through the budget process there is some flexibility, so for instance, let's pick on a specific item.

Let's assume two million for scholarships. Do we have to do that? Not necessarily. We know that we're under investing in scholarships relative to Kent State and most of the campuses that we follow. Do we have to do that? No. The allocation numbers that are out there are part of a planning exercise. And based on what we learned not only from the feedback we get VPs and deans, but also as we get further into spring or into spring, we get a better sense where we think enrollment is, all of these things come to play and allow us to revisit our number. We had to

start with some number. That happens to be 15 million, fairly conservative as both the president and the provost said.

Ideally as we go forward, we'll be able to ease up on that number, but we don't know that. I mean, one of the goals we set, you may recall, we went through two rounds last year of reductions. And one of the main goals we set very early was to avoid having to go through such an exercise again. If we're in a position where we can build up budgets, that is considerably easier than finding ourselves in April having to reduce budgets further which is exactly where we were a year ago.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there other questions of the provost? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I wonder Mr. Provost, I am addressing this to the chair, but of course in this case it's the chair's comments that I'm asking about. The chair in his remarks said that there was a 6.7 percent reduction in the academic side and a 6.2 reduction in the nonacademic side. And I, and given that you have been over the years saying that we needed to be putting more and more towards the academic, and of course that the quality we need to have that reduced to cut as least as possible, could you comment on the comment that was made by the chair on that whole issue? Because as I say, because that was not, you were talking about in general, but those two figures, that would be number one.

And number two, if the University Council Budget Committee having looked at this said that indeed they thought that the shift should be that for one example of the things they might recommend, is that there be less of a cut on the academic side and a larger on the nonacademic side, would that be something that you would in actual fact do or are highly likely to do if they provide some data that would suggest there would be a better way of making cuts?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: We're in a planning phase for the budget, so I've described it as we develop the budget, now we're consulting, and then next we have to adjust.

So, from the perspective of consulting, as I mentioned interacting with CFO Cummins and the University Council Budget and Finance Committee, I'm anticipating that we would engage and discuss those kinds of questions and determine, you know, the extent to which other minds or better minds might prevail in different ways as we finalize the budget. So the answer is I anticipate that we would engage that committee in significant ways to consider basically all of the points that you make.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Let me follow up. I think one of the questions that was raised was what's the rationale for imposing deeper cuts on the academic units than on the nonacademic units? I realize this could change, but there must have been some thinking that went into the, at least tentative decision to impose greater cuts on the academic units than on the nonacademic units.

I mean, you said that one of the your guideposts was student success. You know, I think most of us here would regard the academic units as having a great deal to do with student success. What is the rationale for imposing deeper cuts on the academic units than on nonacademic units?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Since the academic side has greater total dollars, the same percent gives you higher dollars.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I understand that more dollars are going to have to come out of there, but the percentages are greater.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: A number of factors. Basically in all the reductions in the past there have been very significant differences between the academic and the academic support side of the house. If you consider the shift of total institutional dollars to the academic side of the house over time, the academic side of the house has been favored. We really don't know where we're at with either side of the house, which is why for both sides of the institution it's a planning exercise. And CFO Cummins has another comment to make.

DAVID CUMMINS: I don't mean to be out of order, but there is a critical point you have to keep in mind. One of the things we evaluate is what might be some of our revenue options as well. There aren't really revenue options. I mean, there's a couple, but mostly on the administrative support side there are not revenue options, but there are on the college side, because they generate credit hours. We took that into account in setting the numbers.

If the plan was to go as I'm hoping it goes, we will pursue some of those revenue options, and in return the reductions will be, that actually occur on the academic side will be less. But to show how it would balance we put in a reduction amount that would probably be offset by some revenue enhancements we could do.

I've had that conversation with a handful of deans that I think have the most opportunity. They obviously have to concur. They, it's, you know, I'm not going to tell them you have to make this change and that change and that will generate revenue. We all need to be comfortable that it makes sense for their programs. But we are, that's one of the conversations that's going on. We may not do everything I've identified, but I feel pretty confident when all said and done, the reductions that will occur on the college side, the academic side will be less than the reductions you will see on the academic support side.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: When you talked about the academic programs and how cuts were being determined, thinking about the colleges that are more in line with the university's mission weren't being hit as hard as some of the others, anywhere in there was the idea that the general education courses are taken by absolutely everybody, and some of the programs, you

know, that are housed in these units, I'm going to say history, English, math, might not be programs that align with that, but as a department they are definitely critical to things.

Having cut, with this, I know in our department the math department, we're bare bones. There's just nothing other than positions, people, there's nothing else to cut. So if we cut those we're still, but we're at a point where a lot of our classes are offered by part timers, because we don't have enough full time people to cover classes.

How does this balance out? How can we be asked to, what's our, we're going to end up cutting people which is fewer classes that we can offer, which is fewer student credit hour revenue coming in. Were those type things taken into account?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Certainly. That's why it's a planning exercise. That's why units have to work with their deans to illustrate the gaps that will exist as a result of not having enough resources. Once that's clearly demonstrated, then we'll figure out how to flex the resources to not allow that to happen.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: So every year we have to go through and do this again and again.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, no. Yeah, that's why this is a pretty difficult exercise. I mean, I'm thinking of this as a planning budget. So in other words, we're planning to, you know, what potential distribution of resources should be eventually academic support and academic and within those two entities. And it's really an exercise to really understand where gaps exist in our resources so we can figure out how to redirect resources to those gaps. I really need to understand that, so that I can advocate for additional shifts and resources at the institution.

Likewise, on the academic support side, there's gonna be analysis of, you know, the investment in the vice presidential areas relative to higher education norms to determine how we compare on that side of the house with regard to the distribution of those resources.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Bouchard.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: Mike, I'm worried about you. I think you have abandoned Vision 2020. And you may not realize this, which is why I want to point it out, because it was a good vision back when it lasted. Okay. We never believed in the 40,000 learners, so we don't need to worry about that.

But when you came in you talked about increasing the size of the faculty. And originally it was gonna be 200. It shrunk to 160. Then it was 120. Started as 200 four years ago. We're actually below in terms of real faculty where we were then.

Obviously the only way we can do any sort of planning exercise is to stop hiring anybody. And if we suddenly decide in August, oops, we've got a few extra bucks, it will be way too late to hire

any real faculty. So what we're looking at is a gross reduction in the number of faculty, which is of course the exact opposite of what we were supposed to be doing in terms of increasing faculty.

A couple of years ago, both the university and the union did studies on how many faculty were likely to retire in terms of the changes in STRS. And it was either somewhere between a quarter and a third said they were out of here in the next year or two. As near as I can tell, the administration is in complete denial about this. There's been no effort whatsoever to plan for it, to figure it out, to say what are we going to do? We, maybe the goal is this will be the bonus way to balance the budget. No faculty. We don't have to pay their pesky salaries, we can just have, show DVDs in E.J. Thomas and have true/false quizzes and that will be very efficient.

I'm being over the top on this one, but that's the direction we're going if we don't get our act in gear. So okay. That part has been abandoned, increasing the number of faculty.

The research has also been abandoned. And this is what worries me. We're supposed to be a research university. I asked you I think it was a year ago, are we still a research university? You said yes, yes. You got very excited. And I think the clearest indication that we are no longer a research university is this year basically across the board nobody got their faculty improvement leaves or whatever they're called now, and that we had 32 people apply. 32 is a pretty pathetic number. This is five percent of the faculty. The suggestion, if only 32 people apply for leaves is that one gets a faculty improvement leave once every 20 years. Maybe once, or if you are really lucky, twice while you are a faculty member at Akron, that is if you hang on long like some people have.

This is not how you build a research university. For most disciplines you can't do research while you are teaching like a son of a gun, which all of us are, and are on way too many committees because a shrunken faculty needs faculty on committees. So, and then not only 32 people apply, but half of them were denied and given really insulting letters about how their research didn't measure up.

When a quote, "research university" can only fund 12 or 15 faculty leaves, this doesn't count as research.

And then finally, we've been talking about increasing student retention, student success, all of these things that all of us agree on. We have the Retention Summit last fall. One of which clear messages was that we needed to have more tenure track faculty, because every study has proved that's one of the best ways to increase student retention. And yet we're cutting faculty. As I was saying, not even worrying about that. And yet today this announcement came out \$50,000 for three years if you can imagine a way to increase student retention.

I can imagine a way. Hire some people in theater. Theater has been one of our most popular majors. We have just told 150 incoming freshmen including some who wanted to major in theater, that their program may not be here in fall. Okay. I understand why we had to tell them,

although I don't understand why we have to now suddenly decide, oops, we've got to start closing down programs. We've got to do this exercise. Why didn't we do it last fall? But having told them that, I can tell you that 150 people who have been told their program's not gonna be here in the fall are busily filling out their applications for Kent. We've just seen a million and a half dollars in tuition walk right back out the door.

People who are freshmen, sophomores now getting their transfer applications in. I mean, this is not a way that you retain people is by slashing programs. It's all over the Beacon, UA cuts half its programs. It isn't half its programs, but people see 55 programs down the tubes. This is not a way to retain.

So I think we're doing totally counterproductive. If you want to balance the budget, and I think it's really scary that even as a preliminary exercise we're talking about cutting more money out of the academics than anything else. I can tell you where to save some money. We're spending almost \$20 million a year in subsidizing the athletics. How much would it cost us realistically to get out of Division 1A Football? We would save a ton.

We have 42 vice presidents and associate vice presidents. And I was trying to figure out how much each one costs between their salary, their benefits, their secretary, their travel funds. Maybe a third of a million each. And yet somehow everything at this university goes through Vice Provost Ramsier. So since he's doing it all anyway, he doesn't need his 41 friends.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I don't know about that. He needs us all to be friends.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: So we've got vice presidents for initiative and vice presidents for outreach and vice presidents for thinking about stuff.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I haven't seen that title anyway.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: You can keep the CFO. That's okay. But if we're going to talk slash and burn here, I think there ought to be more serious looking on the nonacademic side. By far the easiest way, you want to save money on academics, the chairs are seriously talking about this. Shut down summer school. Save a ton. No part timers. No faculty salaries. Just nothing but savings. And oh wait, that pesky student success student tuitions, hmm, sure is a poser.

This is what we're looking at. There's no fat to be cut in academics. And anything we cut is going to cut them. That's why I am using the example of summer school, an extreme example. Anything we cut is going to cut out fat, not just the fat, it's going to cut out the muscle on this place. We aren't going to have students. We're already losing students through mismanagement. So I'm worried about you, Mike. You have gone to the dark side.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I don't think there was a question there.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I appreciate the points of view expressed by my colleague. You have to know that I don't think I've ever used the word pesky ever in my life, perhaps.

SENATOR CONSTANCE BOUCHARD: You can use it now.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: But I appreciate your expression of opinion and points of view, and certainly will take those into consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the provost could comment on whether or not the item that I asked him to correct in the Academic Program Report that was sent to us on February 4th, specifically the impression given that the Department of Curricular and Instructional Studies had indeed voted to terminate programs in foreign language education and Ph.D. programs in elementary and secondary education when in fact we intended to, given the encouragement of our administrators, we intended to temporarily suspend admissions in order to revise those programs. When I asked that question the last time the response that I think I heard was, I will take it under advisement.

To me, the reason why it's important for me to know whether or not you are going to correct this error goes directly to a matter of trust. Can we trust what comes out of whatever office a particular report comes out of? If, for example, we're asked in our college to consider whether or not we need three doctoral programs or two or one might be better, we're receiving very, very little solid evidence of support or direction.

We are having lots of rumors and lots of other kinds of methods that seem to be being used to try to define the intent of the administration.

So, I'm not only confused by this, what seemed to me to be misrepresentation, but also worried about the fact that as we're planning as a faculty ways to respond to changes in academics which are gonna happen whether we like them or not, we are not being treated seriously.

One other thing that we've heard, that I've heard at least, is that the role of the Faculty Senate, this actually I think, goes as well as something Senator Anderson asked. The role Faculty Senate has historically been one of overseeing and ensuring the academic integrity of the institution. And therefore under my understanding of the current board rule, all of the academic changes are supposed to go through the appropriate faculty and senate process in order for change to occur.

What we have been hearing more frequently, and what Senator Anderson maybe indirectly alluded to is that there really isn't any need for the Faculty Senate, because these decisions are gonna be made at a central location in terms of budget allocations. So if somebody in a central office doesn't believe that we need to have a Ph.D. program in medieval history anymore, that it doesn't really matter what the faculty feel. It doesn't really matter what the senate feels. It

matters what somebody in a centralized office that may have something to do with the budget thinks about that.

Therefore, I guess it seems to me that if that's the case, if indeed these academic program decisions are really being made at a centralized location and are based on who is gonna decide whether or not to fund them, what do we need the senate for?

So two questions. One, have you corrected that error from the last time? In other words, have you told people that it was wrong and that what you said was incorrect? Have you corrected the error that many of the news people made where you were quoted as saying that the faculty in the Department of Curricular Instructional Studies had voted to terminate two programs before the board had acted, when in fact that wasn't true, have you corrected that?

Number two, what do you see as the role of the senate in terms of actually directing and having a major substantive impact on the future of academic programs at this university?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: First off, I can't correct what a reporter reports, so if the reporter reported what the reporter reports, I do not agree with the interpretation of the relationship between those two phrases in that paragraph, and I believe the academic program review process input from the Faculty Senate will answer your question with regard to that paragraph, that we disagree in terms of how to read it.

Clearly we're involved with the Faculty Senate in advising on recommendations from an Academic Program Review Committee, input from Dean of the Graduate School, assessment out of the Office of Academic Affairs. I look forward to the input from the Faculty Senate through the Academic Policies Committee. I think I've said before that list probably is not the final list. There are other eyes, views and thoughts that I'm sure will come through that process, and perhaps additional programs will go on, I don't know, programs will come off, programs will remain. That's the response.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Let me follow up with that first that, yes, indeed I understand that you can't control what a reporter writes. But the report that we received in February implies, more than implies, it states that the faculty had voted to terminate programs. And I asked you then would you correct it, and you said you would take it under advisement. Now I'm asking you again will you correct that, that report that was incorrect but was submitted to the senate? Will you correct that? Because that is under your control.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I will look at it, but I don't believe that it's incorrect. But I will take another look at it.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: So you think that the faculty, despite our strong characterizations otherwise, somehow voted to suspend a program with the intent to terminate it rather than to suspend the admissions to a program with the intent to fix it?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I understand the faculty took action to suspend admissions to the program. That's what I understand.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: And I tried to the last time explain to you what the actual facts were, asked you to consider correcting it, and I've asked you again, and I apparently have asked in vain.

The, the other question about the role of the Faculty Senate, not the role of the Graduate School, not the role of the Office of Academic Affairs, but the role of the Faculty Senate as the elected representatives of the faculty, which has been the strength of this process up until recently, has been eroded by the principle that centralized budget planning will determine what the future academic offerings of the university will be.

Do you see that as continuing? And if you do, what is the role of the senate in that case other than to be a body that is peripheral to the main function of the university?

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: Well, I think you are intersecting two things that don't connect. And the answer to this question would take way too long to respond at this point in time.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Do you have something very brief, Senator Woods? Because we do have other business we need to get to.

SENATOR DOUG WOODS: I have a question for Mr. Cummins. You mentioned benchmarking against sister institutions, specifically mentioned Kent State. I wondered what the other institutions we benchmark against are, how comprehensively are we benchmarking against institutions, and is that data available to members of the university community?

I ask because I have unfortunately a son who goes to Kent State, which means he's not in our enrollment and my pocketbook is sad that he is there. And I have one at University of Kentucky, and two at Ohio State, that graduated from Ohio State. So nobody came to Akron. I tried to persuade them. I see what's going on at Kent firsthand because I'm on campus more regularly, and I see their enrollment go up every year and I see their buildings going, and I see their new entrance, and I see their city being rebuilt, and it's on and on.

So I wondered, the benchmarking that you did that you talked about, do we look and drill down into the budget far enough to see how much do they spend on the academic side versus the nonacademic side? How much has their faculty gone up or down in the same period of time, how much money have they moved from one side of the house to the other side of the house from 2008 to current? Because when you have a competitor who is doing obviously something right, it's a time for a real strong SWOT analysis and look at the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and figure out what they're doing and do some of those things here.

DAVID CUMMINS: That's a very good question, similar to a question I received from the provost recently. But I referenced the scholarships. There was a survey done of how much we're all spending on scholarships. I can get that to the chair, but the rest is really just at the beginning phase.

And we want to do more benchmarking on the administrative side starting with finance, administration, IT and facilities. That's a goal we've set. But we're at the front end. Those are very good questions. This last week the provost asked me something very similar, to start by taking a really good look at Kent State.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. I think we need to move on.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: If I could make one final statement if that's okay.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Sure.

PROVOST MIKE SHERMAN: I think you need to believe that I truly and firmly am convinced that the colleges where the academic programs reside drives the purpose of this institution, as I've said before, that the vice presidential areas are areas that support, enable and stimulate the success of the academic side of the house. And I fully intend to continue with that approach and perspective, and I believe that I've demonstrated that thus far, and I believe that what you will see coming forward will continue to support that perspective, although we may disagree on how that's illustrated and interpreted, but that is my commitment to you, the faculty.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you. Next we have committee reports, the Academic Policies Committee. Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Chair Rich. If I might take the liberty, Senator Bouchard, I didn't know I had 41 friends, but I'm going to go do a head count when I get back.

Academic Policies Committee is bringing forward a recommendation to alter one of our rules, Rule 3359 20 05.1. The intent of the suggested rule changes are two fold. One is to increase the GPA requirement for a student semester by semester to obtain Dean's List status from 3.25 to 3.50. This is in an effort to become more consistent with other universities in Ohio.

And the second part of the rule change suggestion is to add something we do not currently have, which would be a President's List for students who obtain a 4.0 in any given semester. So, this is a motion from committee and I'd like to present it to this body for consideration.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Motion is before the body. Are there either questions of Vice Provost Ramsier or debate on the matter? Senator McKnight?

SENATOR LYNN McKNIGHT: Does the raising of the GPA eliminate students who are in more rigorous programs? Will that reduce the number of students who make the Dean's List, and since engineering, they take rigorous course loads, they take a lot of courses, is there any

consideration of maybe going by the top 15 percent of GPAs in each college so you can get equal representation? Was that at all considered for Dean's List?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Those are good points. This was not considered by the committee. I can tell you that from my experience dealing with certain kinds of issues in the Office of Academic Affairs, we often once in a while do get complaints about scholarships going by overall GPA and not being discipline specific. So the institution has never utilized scholarship in discipline or GPA in discipline to be a metric that we've used.

So the change here would be consistent with how we do everything else. We don't have Latin honors with GPAs that differ by discipline, for example. We don't allocate scholarships that way. Honors students can be in different areas. They have to keep the same basic, base GPA to keep their honors scholarship. That's a good point. We didn't consider it. But I think if we were to consider it here for Dean's Lists it probably would open up a very large series of other items we would have to also consider disciplinary majors.

SENATOR LYNN McKNIGHT: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Other questions or debate? Senator Freely.

SENATOR APRIL FREELY: I have a question about scholarships. We just received information about possible, thinking about scholarships as a part of expenditures. Would this change to the GPA affect who could receive those? Like, would you be eliminated at a 3.25 now if we make the change to 3.5 for some sort of scholarship opportunity?

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Not that I'm aware of. The Dean's List is a rule based formal process. It has nothing to do with scholarship monies.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions or debate? Senator Sastry.

SENATOR SHIVAKUMAR SASTRY: How much work would it really be to go back and look at disciplinary specific recommendations, maybe top 10 percent, top 12 percent?

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I will answer that. Enough that it won't get done this year given what else is on APC's plate.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Chair Rich, I certainly agree. I would also add that we may then run into a problem with who's really a major? Are we gonna go by what they declared, the college, they're admitted to or by what courses they took? Because a student admitted to college A can really look like a major in college B from the transcript. So in essence you might actually have to go to the courses they took, not the major they were claiming to be in. But I think it would be a significant effort to get it nailed down accurately.

And then we would of course be an outlier in the State of Ohio and probably in the nation for having a Dean's List requirement that had all of these qualifiers. Students may not even know

that they're even close to obtaining Dean's List status until somebody calculated that they were able.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I do think it's clear this would be much more complicated than what we have. Any other questions or debate? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the proposals, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

Next we have the report of the Curriculum Review Committee and again, Vice Provost Ramsier.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you, Chair Rich. Curriculum Review Committee brings forward a list of proposals. It's about three pages long on paper. These are the proposals that came through the curriculum system without objection or comment or if there were comments, they have been resolved. These are brought to you as a motion for your consideration for approval from the CRC.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent. Thank you.

VICE PROVOST REX RAMSIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: We have a report from the Distance Learning Review Committee, which I believe is just an informational report. Is there an oral report? The Computing and Communications Technology Committee, Senator [inaudible] is not available. Senator Bove.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, Chair Rich. The CCTC in their written report included three recommendations. Two recommendations come from the Web Conferencing Committee regarding web conferencing software.

The first recommendation is that the CCTC recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the purchase by the university of a license for WebX web conferencing package in addition to maintaining the current licensing the university has for Blackboard Collaborate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: That comes as a motion from the committee. Is there a debate on the motion? This is to recommend the adoption of license purchasing of WebX as our web conferencing software. Any debate? All those in favor, Senator Saliga.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: Instead of or in addition to?

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Right now actually this would maintain the current licensing for Blackboard Collaborate, so WebX would be in addition to.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions or debate? All those in favor of Senator Loth?

SENATOR FRANCIS LOTH: How much does it cost?

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Fortunately, I have a couple of experts in the audience if the body doesn't mind, maybe we could ask John or Wendy to address that.

WENDY LAMPNER: Right now we pay 19,000 approximately annually for Blackboard Collaborate. So that's extremely inexpensive as a web conferencing solution. So that was the rationale for continuing to maintain that for the university, for the faculty that are depending on it. There were some faculty on the committee that did not want to make the change right now.

And then the, one of the IUC institutions adopted a really reasonable deal for WebX, so because of that, because the university's a member of IUC we're able to get that license for WebX for the campus. There are certain programs such as Law as a prime example, where Blackboard Collaborate doesn't scale high enough. It doesn't support the number of participants that they need. College of Business, taxation, there's another program where what we have does not meet their needs. But thankfully was it Miami or OU?

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: OU.

WENDY LAMPNER: OU was able to negotiate about a 60 percent price reduction to license WebX. Once, yeah, so, the next step will be if the Faculty Senate approves the motion, then we'll go into actually getting the actual license, but it's looking at approximately 70,000.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: 70,000 for WebX and maintaining 19,000 for Collaborate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Any other questions or debate? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you. The second recommendation is in regards to the one we just made. CCT recommends to the Faculty Senate that the Web Conferencing Committee continues its existence with the following additional charges. That the WCC will work with an, in an advisory role for IT and ensure proper technical and pedagogical training of the effective use of WebX as available for faculty and staff. The WCC will work with IT to promote and market WebX to the campus community, and it will also work with IT to ensure that the initial deployment of WebX is as smooth as possible.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there a debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: The third recommendation from CCTC regards online course evaluations, investigating that. So due to the cost of paper based evaluation systems, the CCTC recommends that the Faculty Senate either charges an existing committee or forms a new committee with the task of evaluating evidence from the other institutions that have adopted online evaluation systems, evaluating the evidence from UA faculty that have adopted online course evaluations already, quantifying the cost of the current system and making a recommendation to Faculty Senate on expanding the online course evaluation system at the university.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Chair will entertain a motion to refer this to the Executive Committee.

SENATOR LINDA SALIGA: So moved.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Saliga moves. Is there a second? Senator Clark seconds. Debate on the motion? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by the opposite sign. Motion carries without dissent.

SECRETARY FRANK BOVE: Thank you, very much.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item is the report, this is the final report of the ad hoc Clicker Committee. Chair Vacca.

RYAN VACCA: Given that we're running short on time, I will keep this brief. The Clicker Committee had met to establish fall of 2012. We've met many, many times since then and at our last meeting on February 25th we recommend that the university adopt Turning Technologies as the official clicker system for the University of Akron. And in addition, we suggest that the university pay the licensing fees for licensing virtual clickers, the virtual clicker technology, which in short allows the students to be able to use their cell phones or laptops or tablets or whatever it is, in class to respond to clicker type questions.

They also have under the Turning system they have the ability to use physical clickers as they always have, just a different brand. So we suggest that the university incur the cost of licensing

technology so that it won't discourage faculty from using this technology and adopting it for their classes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I believe the word suggest, to paraphrase it, is we recommended it.

RYAN VACCA: We did recommend it, yes.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Are there questions or is there debate on the motion? I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. Motion carries without debate. I want to thank all the members of the ad hoc Clicker Committee for putting in a lot of work on this and doing, I think, an excellent job of testing out the systems and evaluating them. And I especially want to thank Ryan Vacca for serving as its chair. He did a wonderful job.

(applause)

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Next item is the General Education Revision Committee report. We have an informational report. I'm not aware of an oral report. Is there one? Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Just perhaps an announcement that there will be a meeting tomorrow to further consider the implementation issues.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Good. Thank you. Next item is the report of the Athletics Committee. Chair Nicholas.

JOHN NICHOLAS: Thank you, Chair Rich. In the fall of this year, the University of Akron was approached by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and Chair Rich approached our committee to vet this organization. The Coalition, as the website says, is an alliance of faculty senates from NCAA Football Bowl Subdivisions, formerly Division 1A. So all the big schools. Its mission is to [inaudible] a national faculty voice on intercollegiate sports. Areas of concern include academic integrity, quality, student athlete welfare, campus governments of intercollegiate athletics, commercialization and fiscal responsibility. The coalition is committed to the development of effective strategies and proposals for significant long term reform of college athletics.

The coalition works with university faculty, administrators, trustee boards and national associations concerned with higher education to implement these strategies and proposals.

After talking to a number of faculty senates across the country, we have decided to recommend that the Faculty Senate of the University of Akron join for a trial period of two years. The reason being that this group that originally was considered to be somewhat controversial but they have

been given a seat with the NCAA, and there is no cost to the university to join. We can leave at any time.

Talking to the other Faculty Senate members across the country this seems to be a very good way of sharing information with FBS level schools about what's going on in athletics across this country.

The full recommendation from the Faculty Senate Athletics Committee is that we join with the understanding that we will reevaluate our membership after a two year period. The reevaluation process will occur during the 2016 2017 academic year. And the Faculty Senate Athletics Committee also recommends that the Faculty Senate representative to the coalition be from and elected by the Faculty Senate Athletics Committee.

And just for clarification the membership from the University of Akron will include the faculty athletic representative and one member from the Faculty Senate as a proposal.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The motion is before the body. Is there a debate? To the chair's knowledge, there is no other instance in which a representative of a Faculty Senate is elected by one of its committees. The practice has been that when the Faculty Senate has a representative to an external body, that the senate itself elects the member. Is there a motion to amend this proposal so that the representative would be elected by the senate? Senator Erickson.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I would make the recommendation. And I don't know if we've got the wording. You did a very good job of coming up with the precise wording, and I think that's what it should be, be from the senate.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Elected by the senate.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: Correct.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Is there a second? Senator Matejkovic. Is there debate on the motion to amend? All those in favor of the motion to amend, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed? Motion to amend carries without dissent. We're back to the main motion, which is for the senate to join the coalition. Is there debate on that motion? Hearing none, I take it you are ready to vote. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

MANY SENATORS: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Opposed by opposite sign. The motion carries without dissent. Thank you.

Our final report is an informational report from the Part time Faculty Committee. Is there an oral report as well or just the written report?

Next item is the report of the University Counsel representatives. Is there a report?
Make up your mind, Senator Lillie.

SENATOR TIMOTHY LILLIE: Given my earlier comments, I would say that I am probably not the best one this month to report on a, what appears to me to be a problematic instrument of shared governance. So I would defer to one of the other representatives for perhaps a less biased report. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Senator Erickson. I think that leaves you.

SENATOR ELIZABETH ERICKSON: I think it does, too. I don't see Senator Witt here. I would report only because you people have, you passed a, asked us at the last senate meeting, you asked that we pass on to the University Council a request to the University Council Budget and Finance Committee that they be involved in the discussion and development of the budget, which we did.

And I guess with that, and meeting with the president and various other aspects, we have not, as I understand it from Senator Hajjafar who is not here, is he? Senator Hajjafar who is the chair of that Budget Committee, that they have in fact got that budget that was mentioned today.

I will stop there, because I'm not making an evaluation of how effective and how late this was. I could make my own comment, but it was not made in the University Council, that it was clearly very late. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: Thank you, Senator Erickson. Are there any questions of the UC representatives? Chair's not aware of any unfinished business. Is there any new business to come before the body? Anything for the good of the order? Senator Anderson.

SENATOR TURNER ANDERSON: I just heard Senator Bouchard a long time ago talk about athletic costs.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: You mean a long time ago in this meeting?

SENATOR TURNER ANDERSON: In this meeting. Seems forever ago now. But Chair Rich, I believe in your report you said something to the effect of athletics was funded about \$2 million out of the university budget.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: I think I said two to three.

SENATOR TURNER ANDERSON: I wanted to make everyone aware that I believe that two to three number is from the general fund. If we look at general fees incurred on students overall, a conservative estimate is probably closer to 18 million, a more realistic might be about 23. So I

just wanted to put that out there. I know student government is working on that right now, and as it comes forward, I would like faculty to be informed.

CHAIR WILLIAM RICH: The chair thanks the senator for the clarification. Anything else for the good of the order? Are we ready to adjourn? We're adjourned.