

## The University of Akron IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

9-7-2000

# Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting September 7, 2000

Elizabeth Kennedy  
[facultySenate@uakron.edu](mailto:facultySenate@uakron.edu)

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

---

### Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Elizabeth. "Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting September 7, 2000." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 7 Sep 2000. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/134>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

## **MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2000**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, September 7, 2000, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-nine of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Clark, Lavelli, Lyons, McKibben, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Gilpatric, Hebert, Kim, Pope, Purdy, and Sakezles were absent without notice.

### **SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* **APPROVED A MOTION CHARGING ACADEMIC POLICIES & CALENDAR COMMITTEE TO REVISIT RTP LEGISLATION PASSED BY SENATE IN APRIL-MAY, 2000.**
- \* **APPROVED A MOTION FOR THE ACADEMIC POLICIES & CALENDAR COMMITTEE REGARDING TRACKING SENATE LEGISLATION PASSED WITHIN LAST TEN YEARS.**
- \* **APPROVED A RESOLUTION HONORING DR. DAVID BUCHTHAL.**
- \* **APPROVED RECOMMENDATION BY CAMPUS FACILITIES & PLANNING COMMITTEE REGARDING REDESIGNATION OF SPACE IN THE POLSKY BUILDING.**
- \* **ELECTED NEW OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.**
- \* **SELECTED MEMBERS FOR THE PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - The Chair welcomed all members of the 2000-2001 Faculty Senate. He then called for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Chand Midha so moved, and it was seconded by Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh. The Senate then gave its approval.

**II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 6, 2000** - Senator Oller stated he had received no corrections to the minutes. None were presented from the floor. Senator Chand Midha moved that the minutes be approved, and this was seconded by Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh. The body then voted its approval of the minutes.

**III. CHAIR'S REMARKS** - The Chair introduced himself and welcomed all to the beginning of the academic year. He then stated he wanted to make several introductions. He began by introducing Marilyn Quillin, Faculty Senate Secretary, who had served Faculty Senate since its inception eight years ago. The Faculty Senate office (where Marilyn can be found) is located in Carroll Hall 326. She can be reached by phone at x7896 or by email at maq@uakron.edu. Senators will find Marilyn to be extremely helpful, particularly to those who will be chairing the standing committees and some of the ad hoc committees. The Senate greatly appreciates her work.

The second introduction the Chair wanted to make was of our Parliamentarian, Dr. Don Gerlach, who was

a Professor Emeritus of History. He had served for the past six years as the Parliamentarian of the Senate and had graciously accepted that invitation to do so (and to keep the Chair out of trouble) yet one more time this year.

The Chair then introduced the new Senators who included the following: from the College of Arts & Sciences: Kim Calvo, Elizabeth Erickson (former member), Michael Graham, Linda Saliga, Richard Steiner, and Matthew Wyszynski; from the College of Fine & Applied Arts: Pamela Garn-Nunn, Virginia Gunn, Robert Huff, and Susan Rasor-Greenhalgh; from the University Library: Aimee Dechambeau; from the College of Law: Willa Gibson. Representing students from ASG were Jennifer Zap and Andrew Keller. The Senate welcomed all with a round of applause.

The Chair then asked returning members to introduce themselves, which they did.

The Chair then stated he had a few announcements to make. First, when addressing the Senate, members were asked to please stand while speaking and to hold up their name cards so that individuals could be identified correctly for the meeting's minutes. Secondly, Senators unable to attend a meeting were asked to please notify Marilyn, who could mark the absences as excused. Without notification, absences would be noted in the Chronicle as unexcused, and, the Chair warned, colleagues from individual's colleges would figure that out. Thirdly, committee chairs from last year's Senate were asked to please schedule a first meeting in September as soon as possible in order to elect a new chair. They were asked further to please let Marilyn know who the new chair was. Newly elected committee chairs were asked to meet with the Executive Committee of the Senate to discuss some common issues. The Chair indicated that a meeting would be scheduled toward the end of September.

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - The Chair stated that he needed to bring to the body's attention the passing of three of our colleagues during the summer. First, was Jacqueline S. Hegbar, who died on July 26 after years of failing health. She was a graduate from The University of Akron with a BA in 1964 in Latin and Greek, and a MA in 1967 in Ancient History. After teaching for the Dept. of Classics part-time, she was appointed a full-time lecturer in 1967 and became head of the department in 1980. She was awarded the rank of Asst. Prof. in 1983 and continued to serve as department head until her retirement in 1992. A memorial service in her honor would be held on campus in a few weeks. Second, was William McGucken, who died on August 12. He was born in northern Ireland and studied physics and mathematics at Queens University in Belfast, where he earned a MA in the History of Science. In the United States he earned a doctorate in the History and Philosophy of Science at the University of Pennsylvania. He taught in the History Dept. at The University of Akron for 30 years and then became chair of the History Dept. at the University of

Southern Indiana. During his years at The University of Akron, Bill was a champion for faculty rights and shared governance and he ably served both as an Arts & Sciences representative on the University Council, and until his departure from the University two years ago as a Senator from the Arts & Sciences College to the Faculty Senate. He contributed much to this body, and we do mourn his passing. Third, was Samuel Goldman who died on August 25. He was an adjunct professor in Estate Planning in the School of Law from 1963 to 1980 in addition to maintaining a law practice in the Akron area. Senators then stood for a moment of silence.

## **V. REPORTS**

**REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY** - The Chairman then invited President Luis Proenza to address the body, and the President gave the following remarks:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me first add my welcome to all of you to this new academic year, now almost fully two weeks in progress, and let me add a particular word of welcome to some new colleagues that have not yet been introduced: Elizabeth Stroble, if you would stand - Beth, our new Dean of the School of Education, just joined us last week. Dr. Marlesa Roney, new Vice President for Student Affairs joined us a month ago, and Terry Hickey, who now begins his first full academic year as Provost, who's

been with us a little over four months. Terry, welcome again. I think the only other introduction I need to make is of Mark Auburn in his new role as Dean of the School of Fine & Applied Arts. I think you know everyone else.

Let me first thank all of you for your service to The University of Akron. It has been our practice during the last year and a half to make this forum one for enhancing the communication with our campus community, and that has worked exceptionally well. Your Executive Committee also deserves a word of praise and thanks, because they begin the process of dialogue which then enables us in this forum to dispel rumors and address issues before anybody has a chance to get angry about it. That always helps a great deal, and I truly thank you for the spirit of cooperation which is so integral to the process of shared leadership that I'll talk about in a moment.

I want to take a few moments to give you a progress report. This is a work in progress, and first I need to know how many of you were yesterday at the Convocation. A little redundancy never hurts, so let me tell you a little bit about that. Over the past 18 months our University has been engaged in the process of strategic thinking. We began, as you well know, early last year with the deans, directors, department chairs and others, and many of you here in the Senate reading some material, talking about some issues, most importantly early in the process informing me and each other of a great many things. In that process the first thing we discovered is just how very little any of us knew about The University of Akron. And importantly in that discovery is how much exceptional excellence was here that none of us had celebrated.

During this past year we have shared with you most of those examples which I'll not bother to reiterate today, as in that list handed out were superlatives that have appeared in various letters and communications that I've sent to you; they've appeared in part in some of the commercials we have aired in the various television programs. In short, documentable excellence that have not been celebrated, that none of us seem to know about clearly signaling that the University had a very clear destiny before it, things to achieve. That it was without question already the leading university in northern Ohio, never mind just northeast Ohio. But again, none of us seemed to know it, and that as such we could begin to chart a course which we have been metaphorically saying is very much a 'yellow brick road' that lies ahead, but we're going to be paving it one brick at a time beyond those bricks that are already clearly in place beyond those points of excellence.

I just want to reiterate one or two things because there are some things you need to know. You saw some of that in my message to the campus last week and in an email that I sent to you. We're the only public university in northeast Ohio with two graduate programs ranked in the top 10 by US News and World Report. In fact, we're the only university in all of Ohio, public and private, to have a science and engineering program ranked in the top 5 anywhere - not Ohio State, not Case Western, not Cincinnati - only your University of Akron. And there are so many other things that are excellent.

The most recent report of any kind of documentable assessment published by the Lombardi Center at the University of Florida showed us at The University of Akron with five indicators of excellence in the top 100 public universities. No other public university had more than one in northern Ohio. So, again, many exceptional things and so many of these things representing student excellence.

What I would like to do this afternoon much more briefly than yesterday is walk you through again that sense of where we are, so that we can begin to digest it, begin to get the big picture, as Gary (Oller) reminded me last year when I began to articulate some of what I was hearing. So if you feel you understand it, take a nap; if you don't, come along for another ride here.

What we have done is to think about a framework to summarize our thinking in a fairly simple fashion, and we will circulate this after our retreat with the deans and some others so that we can make any final tunings. This will always be a work in progress, so when you get a copy of it we still want your input; we still want to see where else we go. What we have here are some enabling strategies that serve as the foundation for where we're going, a vision and strategic intent that I'll enumerate for you, a way of describing the

University that is simpler, as I've said over and over again, not to mean to exclude anyone but because, ladies and gentlemen, if we list 10 college and schools and 73 departments and 158 other centers, laboratories, institutes, programs, we lose everybody, including ourselves.

So we need to find a way to communicate what this University is in some simple terms, and the strategy we have approached to describe the University is in terms of clusters of excellence. From knowledge of excellence and the enabling strategies we've developed a series of priorities, a list of five strategic strategies, and a series of initiatives that have begun to unfold. I'd like to fairly briefly go over that with you, so if I could start with the enabling strategies, what we found is a great deal of documentable excellence, and yes, Katie (Byard), you may quote me, 'We do not have to imagine what is here; it is documentable objectively in [US News and World Report](#), in the [Lombardi Report](#), in countless other publications that say this University is objectively rated very well in a number of things and we can be very proud of it. They are the things that constitute the first set of yellow brick road bricks that are in place.

Secondly, we discovered in everything we discussed last year and you told me as we asked about what were our core competencies, that there is something magical about this place in what it enables our students to do. We have two very fine students here who can attest to that, but just three days ago from the College of Business I got an email, and one student just very simply said, 'The difference by being now in a top-5 accounting firm and my maybe not having had a very desirable job, has been The University of Akron.' I've listed for you the other examples - people like Peter Burg and Tony Alexander and Justice Deborah Cook, and so on - people that you know in this community who got their roots right here at this University, and it made a difference for them. Our ability to focus on students and provide for the students' success with cooperative programs, as I found at Keithley Instruments last week, that said we are their no. 1 school for recruiting. Among their professionals, they have more University of Akron graduates than from any other university, and they are very proud of the experience that our students bring to them. So students' success is something that we do very well; it's a foundation of excellence; it's an enabling strategy, and we're going to continue with that as something that we want to uphold and hold out very brightly for future students.

Community engagement - we are in Akron; we are in northeast Ohio; we are in, of and for this community and don't make any mistake about it - that is the most important source next to our students of our competitive advantage, of our future, of how we can build our future. It's that relationship to the community which will sustain us, and as you'll see, it becomes a priority in a few moments.

Shared leadership - we've talked about it. There's a May 10, 1999, memo to the faculty which you can find on my website that simply says that this is something we're in together and there's nothing we cannot accomplish if we work together toward a common vision. From this base of enabling strategies, from that base of documentable excellence that we have been so very pleased to discover and to begin to tell the story about, we not only believe that we are already the leading university in northern Ohio, but we are destined to become the public research university for northern Ohio, acquiring over time a regard and importance comparable to what Ohio State has long enjoyed in the central part of the state and what Cincinnati has begun to acquire over the last ten years in particular. The University is without question already the leading university in northern Ohio and has that sense of destiny, and that is our strategic intent - to capture that sense of place for The University of Akron.

What are we? We are today composed of four clusters, and please understand that each and every one of you is engaged in one of these clusters regardless of the program, regardless of the school you are associated with. We're trying to sharpen our language, so please help us in doing that, but those four clusters are all of those things we do to advance our community through outreach and service programs, whether it be in speech or hearing or education or business or community and technical college or nursing, and so many other things we do - public administration and urban studies and sociology, and so forth - all of those things that we do to enhance the well-being of our community.

Secondly, all of those things that we do to advance the cultural well-being of our community through fine

and applied arts and humanities, and so richly exemplify through the performances at EJ Thomas Hall and every other classroom and recital hall and theater on our campus. And, yes, frequently when our faculty go out and do their thing in front of our community in so many other venues. We, in large measure and with the partnership that we have with the Civic Theatre in very large measure, define the cultural landscape for Akron and in many ways for most of northeast Ohio.

Thirdly, all of those other things we do to advance the economic well-being of the community through business, through law, through our intellectual property portfolio by working and providing a work force that goes out and captures additional economic value for our society and advances the economy. Yesterday's conference in Brecksville at the Regional Business Council pointed that out and we've shared with you the value of education to the economy of Ohio. We do a great deal of that and we're very proud of what we do in those arenas.

Fourth and last but not least, all of those other things by which the University advances the innovation in our community through science and engineering, and through that science and engineering enhance the opportunities in business, in culture, and of course for the community as a whole. If you think about those four clusters, each of you is at least in one of them and more than likely you've participated in two, three or even four in important ways. Already an important sideline and benefit to the clusters concept is that Provost Hickey is finding that as we've talked about this, it has begun conversations among department heads, among deans, among faculty members. Synergy and leveraging opportunities are coming forth from those conversations for us to think more about what we can do collectively among units than individually within units. From these discussions of enabling strategies, vision and clusters to describe our University, we have arrived at three very important priorities and they are that we must make our students first, we devote our energies and attention to continue to do those things that has made our students so proud having been at the University and so able to contribute to our communities having been here at The University of Akron- that's the no. 1 priority.

Secondly and importantly, because if we didn't know about such excellence we had, imagine what other things we didn't know about ourselves. So we've made a second priority, of developing the kind of information resources that will enable us to make very good decisions and that ultimately, as we said in the shared leadership concept, will enable each and every one of you at the end of the day to know that what you did that day has made a difference to The University of Akron.

Thirdly, in keeping with the clusters concept, that we're going to build on our strengths and we're going to build on strengths in a way that generates synergy, leveraging opportunities and our ability to differentiate ourselves from the competition. Our other sister institutions are fine institutions but they're different institutions, and we want to make The University of Akron the university of choice for very explicit reasons that people can understand.

Five strategies, and we discussed these last year - I'll enumerate them very briefly. They begin to derive from the very simple fact that in ten years we have not built a new building. During that time other universities have been putting in place student services buildings, student centers, student recreation buildings, other things on their campuses and we have not done that. It's a competitive necessity; it's something we want to do not only because it will add value to the University, but it will make it a much nicer place in which to work and live and track those students and faculty. And you know the litany - a new landscape for learning, six new buildings, closing of two streets, remodeling made to 14 other structures, removal of surface parking lots into parking decks, the recapturing of 30 acres of green space, walkways, terraces; in short, an exceptionally beautiful campus for all of us to be even prouder to be a part of. Competitive necessity is something that will make our University just that much more valuable and excellent a place in which to work.

Secondly, enrollment management - it is imperative that we have a process for managing our enrollment, and we've asked Vice President Roney to lead that effort, but the one thing I said yesterday and I need to tell you again today, is that this is something in which each and every one of us at The University of Akron,

whether the President, faculty, student, staff, friend, has a role. It is not just the role of the admissions office, not just the role of the academic counselor - it is your role; it is my role; it's Dr. Hickey's role; it's everyone's role. Everything that we can do to enhance the student experience is our job, and job 1 it is.

Thirdly, recognize that most public universities in Ohio regrettably are woefully funded in this state. You've heard me talk about it, and I'll talk about just two things. They use pejorative language called 'subsidy.' Fortunately, they're changing it, but the subsidy mentality continues to be alive and well. It is not a subsidy; it is an investment, because every student that you educate, that graduates from this University is going to wind up paying back the state of Ohio just in the added taxes those students pay adjusted for inflation, a full \$1.84 for every \$1 that the state put in to help them with their education originally, and that is nothing but a good investment. A \$1.84 return on investment, just on the added taxes, never mind all the value they're going to create with that added education.

Also, the state of Ohio is 47th in the nation in its per capita support for higher education. The average tuition in Ohio is a full \$1,000 more than anywhere else in the nation. Thirty years ago Governor Rhodes and the Board of Regents promised that no Ohio student would ever pay more than 30 percent of the cost of their education. Today our students are paying more than 50 percent of the cost of their education, and you say that seems like a fair bargain, 50/50, half from the state and half from the student. It sounds good, except the national average is 20 percent. Ohio was promised 30 percent and are being charged 50 or 60 percent. That's not a fair bargain; that's more than our students bargained for. You need to know that because we have to communicate that vigorously and ably to everyone in Ohio.

It also means in that third priority that we have to look for other sources of revenue. It means that we have to indeed go forward with our bold ambition to increase the revenues from federal grants and contracts and to look elsewhere. For example, we're doing something with the Department of Development and other state agencies and other partnerships with organizations throughout Ohio. So we have to look for enhancing the revenue stream from the state at the same time we diversify our revenue stream into increasing sources from the federal government, other state agencies, and to continue the wonderful enhancement that has been coming in the last three years in record numbers from private fund giving.

Nothing could have spoken more clearly as a testament to the value being placed on The University of Akron by our sponsoring society than the wonderful gift given earlier this year by Jim and Bonita Oeschlager, which is a gift of \$10 million in case you didn't hear about it. In fact, later this week or early next week we'll be announcing over 60 initial scholarship awardees based on the fact that the Oeschlagers advanced the first year's money. They didn't want to wait for a year of accumulated credits, so we'll be awarding those scholarships within the next few days.

The fourth strategy is differentiation and synergy, and it's really a restatement of the third priority. It simply says that there are some things we do very good and that's what we're going to build on. We're going to differentiate The University of Akron as the public research university for northern Ohio; its strengths in these four clusters are going to define what we do, and we're going to play the strength, synergy, leverage and differentiation game.

Finally, a strategy you've become aware of and since I'm telling you for a second time, it's what we're doing - we're telling the story. You need to hear it; you need to learn it; you need to tell the story. Most of us didn't know what we had. Do you think the community knew? No, if we didn't know, how would the community know? Well, it now does, and we're going to tell it again because there are other things to tell about. So we're going to continue to develop in documentable fashion again. We're going to say what other people are judging us by objectively and put it out very vigorously and celebrate it with our community.

Some initiatives are emerging from this kind of strategic thinking process and the clusters concept of thinking. Of course, you relate the Foundation for the Carnegie Teaching Academy and the 'Carnegie II,' because as most of you now know, the Carnegie Commission has eliminated that previous classification

system. They have an interim classification system and they're going to revamp it in 2005, but the original goal remains intact and that is to enhance the federal revenues to The University of Akron from the current roughly \$7-8 billion to no less than \$15.5 million by 2006. I think we can beat that deadline well in advance, but it remains a very valid initiative.

The new landscape for learning I've already talked about, but I want to tell you about one that you're going to be hearing increasingly more about and it builds on the wonderful legacy that many of your units have of cooperative programs, of internship programs, on work-study programs, and it's what we're going to call a career advantage program or more broadly the Akron Advantage. And it is to each and every student who so desires, a guarantee to have an opportunity to have an internship work-study or internship program. Why is that important? Because our sponsoring society is telling us that that is what they value most from our University of Akron graduates that they interview. If they've had a work-study program, an internship experience, co-op experience, they hire them. Their education comes through their experience, and Dr. Hickey will be leading that effort.

An Honors Program enhancement - Bob Holland had done a superb job of getting our honors program to a very high level. Dale Mugler has come in and picked up and is wrapping up, and we're going to make this an honors university and an honors experience second to none in the state and certainly parallel to any other honors program in the nation, and we're very proud of that.

Information technology leadership - what does that mean? It goes in part with our priority no. 2 but it goes far beyond that. You undoubtedly heard that the Chairman of People Soft Corp. was here several weeks ago with a senior vice president for global education from IBM to signal our partnership with People Soft and the major arrangement that was included with IBM by which the enabling equipment will come to campus. It will give us three terrabytes of storage capacity, and a terrabyte is 1,000 gigabytes. We'll have 3,000 gigabytes, and will be able to provide for each and every one of you and each and every one of your students on the server 10 megabytes of storage capacity for email and for file storage that can be used routinely, because the environment is going to be wireless and already is largely wireless. We're not going to have any more hookups; we'll give you an antennae for your computer, and that's in a partnership with Cisco Systems. We've been designated by Cisco Systems as a beta test site for their wireless environment, and we're in good company there. We're the only university in Ohio to be so designated, and we're in the company of places like Duke, Princeton, Yale and Stanford. None of our other Ohio universities is in that company, and you'll be hearing more because we expect to work as fast as we can toward what we're going to call a ubiquitous computing environment. So we're taking a lot of steps there which should surface very well, not the least important of which is in our ability to know ourselves well and to interact comfortably with each other.

A couple of other things - urban redevelopment. This spins directly from the landscape for learning and from our community well-being cluster, but it extends into others. What we saw there very simply is that as we began to develop our new landscape for learning, we were faced with a situation in which we could not accept that it would end at Exchange St. or at Highway 8 or at the railroad tracks or at Market St. We found that our students in large numbers were living just south of Exchange, just east of Highway 8, north of Market St. in conditions that were less than desirable, and that for the future well-being of the University, of our ability to recruit staff and students, we needed to take a very active role in the future, so we applied to the Knight Foundation and they agreed and provided us a planning grant with every assurance that once our plan is done, it will continue to fund that implementation. It will require partnership and we'll be investing some money, but the private sector will need to come in in addition to the city and federal government because we expect that a 40-block area cannot be redeveloped with a couple million dollars - it would take \$200 or 300 million. We're not sure because the plan is not complete but is very important to the future of the University.

Equally and derived from our business and industry and science and engineering cluster and the strategy to diversify income, we went to the state of Ohio and the technology action fund that Governor Taft put in place just last year, and we said that we had the second largest intellectual property portfolio in the state;



we have converted the economy of Akron from a rubber economy to a polymer economy. We want to do more, and they agreed and gave us a grant to start the Ohio Polymer Enterprise Development Corp. which will involve not only polymers but business, law, and many other aspects of the University.

Two last things but no less important - we've also submitted two grants for Ohio Eminent Scholars and hope to gain at least one of those two. And we've been working with the Ohio Board of Regents and innovative programs to fund the University in ways that will speed our paving of that yellow brick road. Equally important is what we need to do internally, because if we did not know some of these things about ourselves, there's probably a lot of other things we did not know about ourselves including our history, our traditions, and things that we need to do once you pass a resolution here, once the Board acts on other things, to inform ourselves and work with each other to improve our RTP processes, to improve our business processes and remove some of the red tape and enhance good business practice throughout the University.

So this, ladies and gentlemen, is a work in progress, and I look forward during this year working very actively with you to filling in more of the details here, adding other initiatives, and sharpening our thinking about how we can advance the future well-being that is our common future to build. I'll leave you with just one thought: Our masthead, as you know, is a kangaroo that we affectionately call 'Zippy' - there's a serious version of Zippy on my lapel. I want to tell you that as a metaphor on financial markets, this kangaroo is bullish on Akron, Ohio. He packs quite a punch, puts quite a zip into Akron, Ohio, and is always one jump ahead of the competition. Thank you."

Chair Sheffer then asked the President whether he would be willing to entertain questions from the Senate. No questions were asked.

**REMARKS OF THE PROVOST** - The Chairman invited Provost Terry Hickey to address the body, and the Provost gave the following remarks:

"I always marvel when the President tells the story, because it's always such an exciting and fascinating one. After his talk yesterday we were at the reception and I noticed the people coming up to him and congratulating him on a fine presentation and asking him some questions. I knew my talk wasn't in his league, but I was a little disappointed that I didn't get any questions. Finally, one person came up to me and had this very eager look on their face, this really questioning look and said, 'I have a question.' I said, 'Great, what is it?' They said, 'Are you Zippy?' So I guess I have to keep working at it, but it actually didn't seem like a bad assignment. I told them no, but I'd be happy to consider it.

I do want to touch on just a couple of things today. This is not my first 100-day report; I wanted to give the President plenty of opportunity to talk today, and as I did promise the Senate back in the spring, I would like to come before you here in the next meeting or two and give you a more in-depth update on what transpired over the summer and where we're going.

There are a few things I wanted to tell you about here, and I'll take just a moment. One is that I know there had been some concerns expressed about the curriculum process and about our RTP guidelines and procedures. As I learned more about both, I had some questions and concerns as well. So in structuring my office I have decided to take the following approach: I am going to be appointing from the faculty a few and I don't know how many a few is, probably not more than two or three, individuals who are termed 'senior academic fellows.' These individuals will be half-time appointments in my office for a 12-month period of time, and their responsibilities will be focused on a very limited number of tasks. I'm trying to attack those issues that I view as the fundamental building-block issues that we need to deal with.

RTP and curriculum review are two of those issues, and I'm very pleased that Prof. Nancy Stokes has agreed to work with me over this year and to lead an effort to come up with a university-wide consistent RTP guidelines process and procedures. I've met with her committee and they have received their charge to do that and are well on the way, and Nancy, you're probably going to talk to the group some later today

about that. Nancy accepted that task with such glee and excitement that I slipped curriculum review in while she wasn't looking, so she will be working with the Curriculum Review Committee to try to streamline the curriculum review process and have one that operates efficiently and really does help us with all of the issues associated with curriculum review, so Nancy will be serving in that role as well.

I've also asked Chand Midha to continue in his role as assessment coordinator. I did this yesterday, and Chand agreed to do it. After I got him to agree to do it, I immediately last night wrote a complete memorandum to him which he probably hasn't received yet which gives him all his assignments for the summer, but you've already said yes so it's too late to change. But I believe we need a consistent assessment process across the campus, and I've asked Chand to implement that and have it in place by this time next year.

There will probably be one or two more individuals. Trust me, I could've used the help over the summer as it got a little hectic, but I really wanted to wait until the Senate was back in session and school was back in session before I announce the others and then I want to announce a university wide search and find individuals who are passionate about some of the other areas in which we are going to try to work. So over the next 2 or 3 weeks you can expect to hear about some other areas in which I think we'd like to find some individuals who want to act as senior academic fellows for a period of a year for half-time and really attack some fundamental issues here at the institution.

Now a more long-term appointment, and by the way, Chand's appointment extends more than a year because we have the NCA accreditation visit facing us and we do need assessment programs in place, so I'm going to nail one of his feet to the floor and not let him out of the office until we're completely ready for the NCA. We are searching for an Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning and Faculty Development. Trust me, if that name hadn't already been tagged onto this before I arrived I would've changed it, because I have to remember which words come after the other, but this is the individual who will take the lead in the Carnegie Teaching initiative. We are conducting a national search, and in fact the first ad should appear in the Chronicle of Higher Education and some other places probably within the next two issues, and we hope to find someone by January.

I was in a meeting this summer and went to the meeting specifically because the Carnegie people were going to be there and I talked to them about our initiative and our desire to fill this position, and they're going to be providing some nominations as well. I can tell you based on that meeting, I'm sure it wasn't a representative or it wasn't a complete representation of all of the Carnegie academies, but based on what I heard and saw there our efforts have got to be in the top five percent of all of the Carnegie teaching initiatives around the country. I can also tell you that when I told them the budget that this institution had given to the Carnegie Teaching Academy, there were several people in the room who almost fell off their chairs. They were going around the room talking about their budgets and people were talking about \$15 and 20,000, and I told them we do \$250,000 and they almost fell off their chairs. So I think we really do have an opportunity to be the leading Carnegie Teaching Academy in the country, and that's certainly my goal.

As a part of this, we are establishing a University Council for Teaching and Learning. This will be a parallel council to the Research Council that will be advisory to me and to the teaching academy, and the goal here is to elevate the teaching academy initiative to higher levels. Working with Devinder on the budget this summer, we have allocated a portion of the budget to matching dollars for grants being submitted for the teaching academy. So just as we have grants, we have matching funds for research grants through other mechanisms and we now have matching funds for grants being submitted through the teaching academy. And the matches don't necessarily have to be confined to just this pot of money; we want to support good scholarship and good grant applications wherever they come. So I think those are the key issues.

I do look forward to coming back to you and telling you what we're about. It's been an exciting and hectic time; as I told someone the other day that it's either been four months or four years I can't remember which, but it has been a very exciting time. I should point out that working with Marlesa is an absolute

delight, and this is not to get back in your good graces after yesterday. But Marlesa and I are working very closely together on a variety of issues that really involve the students and student success and learning, and I think it's really going to be a very exciting few years here while we make some things happen, and with your help I'm very much looking forward to it. Thank you."

Chair Sheffer asked whether there were any questions for the Provost. None were posed.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Senator Oller reported that the Executive Committee had met on three occasions in May, June, and August to handle those curriculum proposals still in the process during the school year as directed by this body at its May meeting. At those meetings, the committee made appointments for 2000-2001 standing Senate committees, certified the elections of new Senators, and set the agenda for today's Senate. It also met with President Proenza and Presidential Asst. Becky Herrnstein on August 31 to discuss matters of mutual interest.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Mrs. Nancy Stokes, chair, began her report with an update on the status of several items of legislation passed by the Senate at its April and May 2000 meetings. Grade distribution, home-schooled admission policies, the revised academic calendar, and the Physical Health & Education Dept. name change all passed the Board of Trustees at their August 23 meeting. The changes made to the composition of the RTP committees and the RTP procedures were returned with questions and suggestions from the office of the Provost and the office of General Counsel. Mrs. Stokes then presented the following motion to the Senate: **APCC requests that Senate charge APCC to address the concerns raised, to draft changes, and bring the revisions back to Senate for approval.**

The Chair asked for questions and whether there was any discussion on this motion. Since no one had questions or points of discussion, he called for a vote. The motion was approved.

APCC Chair Stokes then stated that two other items - the question on salaries and questions of merit and the creation of the Faculty Manual section on joint titles - had not yet cleared the office of the Provost and the office of General Counsel for Senate consideration. Therefore, she presented a second motion: **APCC requests that Senate charge it with a project to track Senate legislation passed through the last ten years. Such a project would result in a report to the Senate of when each item was passed by the Board and where it is in the system.**

The Chair asked whether there were any discussion of this motion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote. The motion passed.

Mrs. Stokes then asked the Chair whether she should present the report from the RTP Task Force at this time since the task force is a part of APCC. The Chair indicated she should do so. Mrs. Stokes began by reiterating Provost Hickey's remarks which stated he had requested that a task force of APCC members and others be created to develop revisions to the Faculty Manual concerning the RTP process. The task force would include members of the APCC and others so that all ranks and colleges were represented. This process was the direct result of the WOW Committee for Faculty Assessment and Development. Mrs. Stokes reported that the task force had been meeting since early August (currently meeting weekly) and that a draft of the complete revision of the Faculty Manual RTP guidelines was under development. The ultimate goal of this process would be to create university-wide standards and procedures. Once the working draft had been completed, it would be brought to the colleges for discussion before its presentation to Faculty Senate.

Mrs. Stokes stated that the purpose of this new RTP policy was to ensure that the process at The University of Akron was fair, consistent, and faculty-driven. The policy would be designed to ensure that faculty in tenure lines were aware of the guidelines under which they were working, the procedures, and the evaluative measures which were part of the process. She also stated that another important purpose of this policy was to ensure that both formative and summative evaluations were part of the process. The desired

result of this process would be that the actual retention, tenure and promotion decision would not be a surprise to either the candidate or the administration. Criteria for retention, tenure and promotion would be made by each college or department as was appropriate. The policy was meant to provide a constructive framework for faculty success in RTP.

She then stated that the goals of this effort were to create an RTP system that would do the following – be viewed by the faculty as a mechanism to attain professional goals as well as identifying capable and proficient faculty whose efforts permit the University to attain its goals; produce credible decisions efficiently; not allow for decisions to be made that were detrimental to students; meet the needs of the faculty and the University; hold its participants to the highest professional standards and personal integrity; have the faculty, as owners of the system, accept the commitment to improvement in both the system itself and the outcome; demand constant attention and openness to change.

Mrs. Stokes said that the system must be regularly assessed to determine its effectiveness and must include a process to monitor both faculty and administrative satisfaction with the RTP system. The stakeholders would have to be satisfied with the process, its time load effectiveness, and the effectiveness of its feedback mechanisms. That would be a consistent indicator that performance expectations had been met given the level of investment and opportunity. Diminution of the faculty voice would not be allowed; each stage within the system would have a clearly defined purpose.

Mrs. Stokes indicated that the task force considered the duty of a faculty member to involve a combination of teaching, research, and service. Service, the most difficult to evaluate, should be represented not by the number of hours of effort but in terms of its significance to the teaching and research mission of the local unit, the college, and the University. Quality of service should be rated and considered. Also, the departmental committee or the equivalent should provide feedback to the faculty member both on his/her progress toward an RTP goal as well as on any future plans presented to it by the faculty member.

Mrs. Stokes concluded her report by stating that the task force looked forward to meeting and working with faculty and their departments to meet these goals. Senators with questions or comments were encouraged to contact Mrs. Stokes. Mrs. Stokes stated that a list of the other members of the committee in each college would be posted.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns indicated that his remarks would be brief and referred Senators to a more summary document (**Appendix A**). Senator Sterns reported that the CFPC had held three meetings - May 11, August 18, and their first meeting of this semester on Sept. 5. He wanted to call to the body's attention one of the committee's major accomplishments which was the resolution orchestrated between the Dept. of Chemistry and the College of Nursing related to the use of Knight Chemical Laboratory 314. This had been an issue in terms of instituting new computer recitation sections but also allowing the use of those facilities by the College of Nursing. All were able to come to a resolution internally without specific action outside of the committee. Senator Sterns wanted to commend all parties and thank them for their cooperation in that regard. Senator Sterns reported that the committee had commented on various developments and aspects of buildings and so forth in the May meeting and had looked at issues regarding the Guzzetta Hall addition. The committee had discussions regarding the availability of adequate theatre space. Senator Sterns again invited Senators to look at the more extensive report. One concern of the committee was the availability of space for student productions. A personal concern of Senator Sterns was the usability of EJ Thomas Hall. He mentioned that when EJ Thomas Hall was built, there were plans for it to be used not only for the general community but also for students and for instructional purposes. Senator Sterns said that over the last few years we have not had access to that facility and the committee would revisit that as an issue.

Senator Sterns asked the Senate to endorse a resolution in honor of David Buchthal: **Whereas, Dave Buchthal has served with diligence, insight and enthusiasm on CFPC for many years, thereby influencing for the better the overall physical structure of The University of Akron, and whereas, Dr. Buchthal already rightly has a building named after him, although spelled incorrectly, the CFPC**

**directs the Faculty Senate to express its deep gratitude for his work on behalf of the faculty, staff and students of The University of Akron. The University community will sadly miss his expertise.** Since there was no discussion, the Senate voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns then reported that the committee held an emergency meeting on Aug. 18 which then led to a further meeting on Sept. 5. At that time Senator Sterns was luckily once again re-elected as chair of CFPC. The main focus of attention was, however, the ability to convert Polsky M150 into a new computer lab which would be used for the Cisco Systems project. This once again caused the committee to deal with the issue of removing a classroom from on-line and taking it off for special purpose usage. As a result of that discussion, however, and in cooperation with the Provost's office, we were able to identify additional rooms, and, through the diligent work of Phyllis Parker in our scheduling office and the assistance from the Registrar's office, we were able to relocate the classes involved in that. This particular laboratory would serve as a hub for Cisco-related activities and would be connected to as many as 10 or 15 other sites. Senator Sterns stated there was certainly great merit in supporting this. He then offered his second formal resolution which was: **The Faculty Senate supports the redesignation of Polsky M150 as a computer laboratory.** There was no discussion, and the Senate voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns then stated that the other major discussion point was the existential richness of the parking situation on our campus which was a test of many persons' personal philosophy, self-control and so forth. He told Senate that the CFPC basically had supported the all-permit situation currently in operation. He referred to minutes from a previous CFPC meeting which stated: "Campus Facilities Planning Committee and Faculty Senate acceptance of open parking. Jim Stafford has referred to such acceptance in his memo to the College of Education. I want to point out that the Senate did not pass any motion on the topic. CFPC has agreed not to oppose open lots as a temporary emergency measure to deal with the 1-year loss of 1,200 parking spaces. The CFPC chair, as a member of the Parking Task Force, had supported the 1-yr. open lots. CFPC continues to support faculty/staff parking lots." The committee saw this as a temporary issue. It recognized the difficulty and felt that the campus needed to share in this transitional period. Senator Sterns thought that Mr. Stafford deserved great credit, but, at the same time asked that Senators direct concerns or comments or specific situations to Mr. Stafford or himself.

The Chair then stated that Senator Sterns would be wearing the bull's-eye.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - Senator Huff reported that the Ohio Faculty Council met on May 19, the final meeting of the year. It was an unusual meeting in that our chair contacted all members via email and announced that she would not be attending the meeting. Our vice chair also was unable to attend, so we were left to devise our own agenda if we wanted to have a meeting. We had one of our best meetings.

Senator Huff was able to get copy of the mission statement for the Ohio Faculty Council, which he found to be very informative (**Appendix B**). He had been asking for one of these throughout the year but didn't see one until the last meeting. He was surprised to learn a number of things that the Council was supposed to be addressing but was not. He stated that election and representation was correct and that the Ohio Faculty Council addressed concerns common to faculty members at 4-yr. institutions. Last year that would have been the domestic partners issue that was discussed and voted on by the Faculty Senate. Another issue that Council began to look at toward the end of the year was the impact of distance learning programs. These issues were certainly part of what the Council was supposed to be doing but was not very effective. He said that the domestic partner issue probably took up more than 50 percent of all of meeting time throughout last year.

The Ohio Faculty Council did not maintain any representation or contact with the Ohio Faculty Senate of community and technical colleges that he was aware of. Senator Huff reported that the Council did have contact with the Ohio Board of Regents but that they had been visited by a different representative of the Ohio Board of Regents at each meeting. While OBR representatives had been very informative, it meant that half of each of Council meetings had been our representatives listening to what the Ohio Board of Regents were involved in or what they cared to share with us. The Council had no representation at their

meetings except for an occasional invitation to the chair; she did attend some meetings. Council had not participated in any of their committee activities, so he didn't think that the Council was fulfilling its mission on that issue.

Senator Huff stated that the Council had no representation to the Interuniversity Council, the council of university presidents. He further stated that the Council had no contact with the state government in any way, the legislative branch. He mentioned as an example that there was a piece of legislation that Council learned about at its last meeting that seemed to have some potential significance for all of us. However, no one on the Council was aware of it until we got a call from the Ohio Education Assoc. who asked whether someone in the 4-yr. schools didn't care about this? He stated it was very difficult for Council to address issues 5 and 6 when members had so little contact.

In fairness to the organization, Senator Huff reminded the body that this was a group made up of people who drove to Columbus once a month. Council members spent the better part of the day there and then tried to get out of town before the traffic got too heavy. He said it was very difficult to move any sort of agenda forward when meetings were so infrequent and issues such as the domestic partner issue consumed a great deal of energy.

The final meeting of the last year was spent trying to redesign how this body functioned. Council decided that having a chair, vice chair and secretary who would be committed to serve more than one day a month was absolutely essential. The temporary chair elected that day would approach the Ohio Board of Regents about possible funding of release time for the chair from his/her teaching responsibilities so that he/she would be able to spend more time concerned with Ohio Faculty Council. It was recognized that since half of our representatives were themselves the chairs of faculty senates, they had more than enough to do without taking on the extra responsibility of taking a leadership role with this group. It was decided that the only way to approach this was if a small executive committee made up of 3 or 4 members was created. Each member would then be the chairs of small committees that would try to reach out to these different bodies with whom Council was supposed to be maintaining contact. The committees would actually be alternates who would be at a meeting if the chair could not. Future agendas would be concerned with reports so that all members stayed current.

Senator Huff stated that another idea was to get the OBR to fund an intern in Columbus who would help coordinate all communications. To him, these seemed like good plans but would require about 10 committed people from across the state who would be willing to go to Columbus 3 or 4 times a month. He stated that he personally was not willing or able to fulfill that but was willing to fulfill the 2-yr. position he was elected to. He indicated he would continue to attend the meetings and that the first meeting was to be held tomorrow. Senator Huff said he would be willing to step aside for any Senator or any other representative who had an interest in this and would like to play a leadership role. He thought Ohio Faculty Council could play an important part in education in this state. Anyone so inclined who had a schedule that would put him/her in Columbus and who would be interested in pursuing this was asked to please contact the Executive Committee on ways to proceed. If no one stepped forward, Senator Huff said he would continue serving through the year.

The Chair then stated that the individual in this position did not have to be a Senator. He asked members to keep this in mind if they knew of someone who might be interested in the position.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES COMMITTEE - Dr. George Prough commented on the strategic thinking initiatives on campus. He wanted Senate to know that this year would be a much more complicated year than last year. Last year the Strategic Initiatives Committee spent a lot of time thinking strategically, but this time they were going to continue to do the strategic thinking as well as start to do some strategic implementing. Some discussion of that had occurred already, so far more of the campus would be involved this year in both strategic thinking and strategic implementation of these issues. He stated that Senate would be hearing far more about this at subsequent meetings but hoped all would become involved in one form or another.

**VI. ELECTIONS** - The Chair announced that the body was ready to address the next portion of the agenda, the elections. Elections for officers of the Senate would be held first, followed by election of members to the Planning & Budgeting Committee. He also said that there were more positions to be filled within the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate - Vice Chair, Secretary, and two at-large members. He pointed out that Senators Filer-Tubaugh and Midha were in their second year of their terms on the Executive Committee which is why only two new at-large members were needed. He then opened the floor for nominations for the position of Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Senator Midha nominated Senator Elizabeth Erickson. Senator Erickson accepted the nomination. No further nominations were made. The Chair then called for the ballot to be cast for Senator Erickson. The body voted its approval and Senator Erickson was elected Vice Chair. The Chair called for nominations for the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Senator Edgerton nominated Senator Elizabeth Kennedy. The Chair then called for the ballot to be cast for Senator Kennedy. The body voted its approval and Senator Kennedy was elected Secretary.

The Chair then called for nominations for members of the Executive Committee. Senator Gran-Nunn nominated Senator David Ritchey. Senator Kennedy nominated Senator Jeffery Franks. Senator Foos asked whether Senator Oller could be nominated. Senator Oller stated that he was not a Senator but thanked Senator Foos anyway. Chair Sheffer stated that Senator Oller was serving through this first meeting just to keep us in line.

Senator Fisher nominated Senator Timothy Lillie. As no other nominations were made, the Chair closed nominations. He then stated that we would take a paper ballot and elect the two candidates with the highest number of votes, provided they had each gotten a majority.

Senator Oller asked the Chair whether he wanted to continue with the caucuses for the PBC members while ballots were being counted. The Chair said yes and asked the 15 constituencies to please caucus and select an individual to serve on the Planning & Budgeting Committee for the year. Senators did so with the following results: Senator Louscher (Arts & Sciences), Senator Laipply (Community & Technical), Senator Weaver (Education), Senator Qammar (Engineering), Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh (Fine & Applied Arts), Senator Hanlon (Business), Senator Franks (Library), Senator Kinion (Nursing), Senator Dhinojwala (Polymer Science), Senator Turning (Wayne), Senator Reed (Contract Professionals), Senator Filer-Tubaugh, Part-time Faculty), Senator Lee (Law), Senator Zap (Students).

The Chair stated that Senate needed to discuss the results of the election to the Executive Committee, which were as follows: Ritchey - 31 votes; Franks - 26 votes; and Lillie - 20 votes. Since none of the candidates had a majority of the entire Senate, the Chair proposed that the body could do one of two things - 1) take another ballot with all three candidates to see whether the body could get the vote count up to 33 for two of the candidates, or 2) the Senate could entertain a motion to take the two top vote-getters and then take a second ballot to determine whether there was agreement on those two candidates.

Senator Lillie then stated he would like to withdraw as a candidate to simplify the process and asked whether it were possible to do so. Parliamentarian Gerlach stated Senator Lillie could do so if he asked the permission of the house and they agreed to it. Senator Lillie then asked permission of the house to withdraw. Since there were no objections to Senator Lillie withdrawing, his name was taken off the ballot.

Senator Louscher then made a point of inquiry by asking whether it would be appropriate to now have a show of hands for each of the candidates rather than have the ballot.

The Chair asked whether there were any objections to Senator Louscher's point. Since there were none, the vote was cast. Both Senator Ritchey (36) and Senator Franks (37) were elected.

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - There was none.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS** – There was none.

**IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - Senator Filer-Tubaugh wanted to say that the Senate had been very fortunate to have had Senator Oller as our Secretary for all these years. She thought that it would be appropriate to give him a round of applause. The Senate responded enthusiastically.

**X. ADJOURNMENT** - The Chair called for a motion to adjourn, which was given and seconded. The Senate then voted its approval and the meeting ended at 4:37 p.m.

**Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin**