

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

10-21-1987

Faculty Senate Chronicle October 21, 1987

Heather M. Loughney
hl@uakron.edu

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

Recommended Citation

Loughney, Heather M.. "Faculty Senate Chronicle October 21, 1987." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 21 Oct 1987. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/294>

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, uapress@uakron.edu.

the university of akron
Chronicle

a report to the faculty of
the university of akron



1987-88, No 2.

October 21, 1987

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETINGS, 1987-88

Regular monthly meetings of University Council will continue to be the first Thursday of the month. For 1987-88, the remaining meetings are scheduled for November 5, December 3, 1987; February 4, March 3, April 7, and May 5, 1988.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, 1987-88

Two new members have been added to the Board of Trustees for The University of Akron. Charles E. Taylor, General Manager of marine transportation for Standard Ohio Company, Cleveland, and Richard W. Hinig, Attorney at Law, New Philadelphia, Ohio, have begun their terms of office.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, 1987-88

Dr. Gloria J. Harman of the College of Nursing is a new member of University Council replacing Dr. Jeanne Hoffer. Her term of membership is 1987-89.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Changes to The University of Akron Chronicle</u>	
September 24, 1987.....	2
<u>Minutes of Regular Meeting of University Council</u>	
October 1, 1987.....	3

Any comments concerning the contents of The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON CHRONICLE, September 24, 1987

The following changes should be noted to The University of Akron Chronicle, September 24, 1987:

On Page 5 under "University Research Council, 1987-88", Dr. Karen M. Mudry is returning as Director of Institute for Biomedical Engineering Research. Dr. Daniel Sheffer was the Acting Director while Dr. Mudry was on Faculty Improvement Leave.

On Page 8 under "New Members of the University Faculty", Dr. John C. Green should be listed as "Associate Professor of Political Science" instead of "Assistant Professor...".

On Page 9 under "New Members of the University Faculty", Dr. Paul R. Schattman should be listed as "Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science" instead of "Visiting Professor...".

On Page 13 under "University Council Membership, 1987-88", Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, the name of Dr. Allen G. Noble was inadvertently omitted from the membership as he is on Faculty Improvement Leave for the Fall 1987 semester. Dr. Noble will resume his University Council position in Spring 1988.

On Page 15 under "Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee" the representative from University Library is Mr. David R. Brink.

MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING
October 1, 1987

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chair, Senior Vice President and Provost Frank Marini, at 3 p.m. on Thursday, October 1, 1987 in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-four of the seventy-eight members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dr. Alice E. Christie, Dean Constance Cooper, Dean Louis A. Hill, Dean Lillian J. DeYoung, Prof. Forrest Smith and Dr. Allen Noble. Absent without notice were Mr. Jeff Borowy, Mr. Tony Brown, Mr. Roger Durbin, Mr. Jeff Ennis, Dr. Paul Merrix, Dr. Malcolm Railey, Dean Tyrone M. Turning, Mr. Andrew Venturelli.

The Chair presented President Muse to Council.

President Muse discussed the fact that questions had been raised about the appropriate process concerning actions by the President on proposals submitted by the University Council. He indicated that he shared the desire for a clear understanding of what that process is and that he was pleased that the matter would be considered by the Executive Committee as indicated at the last University Council meeting. He indicated that his interpretation of the Bylaws is that upon receipt of recommendations from this body he has several alternatives. The President agrees that the recommendations are needed and in the best interest of the University. He can either implement them directly if they do not require approval of the Trustees, or can submit them to the Board of Trustees with a recommendation for approval; if the President disagrees with the proposal he can either reject the recommendations and so inform the Council, or send the proposal back to University Council for further discussion and possible modification.

President Muse said there has been the suggestion that if the President should object to some parts of a proposal submitted to him, he could, and should, simply delete those provisions to which he objects and implement the rest of the proposal. He said he could easily work with that kind of line item veto procedure, but did not think it would be supportive of the sort of collegial and cooperative relationship that he thought should exist between the Council and the President. He said it seemed to him that we should communicate about the issues on which we disagree and attempt to affect an agreeable compromise.

The President indicated that apparently the issue that prompted this discussion was University Council's recommended controlled smoking policy. He spoke about that policy as follows:

"As reported at the last meeting I have returned that proposal to you for further consideration. While I could support the proposal for designation of smoking and non-smoking areas, I did not feel, and do not feel, that the banning of the sale of tobacco products under those conditions was warranted or wise. In addition, I felt that the input of the staff employees who were not represented in your discussions here should be obtained since they would be substantially affected by any policies that would be adopted. That input has now been received and forwarded back to the Council and further consideration would now seem to be appropriate for that particular measure. The process that we have in place does not provide for any input from me on any proposal that you are considering until that proposal has been adopted by the Council and has been forwarded to me for action. It should not be surprising that there will be occasions when we disagree. I may see the implications or the impact of an issue differently than you do. My responsibility is, to the best of my ability and my judgment, to evaluate proposals from the perspective of the total University. That may not be identical to the perspective of the faculty or the students or the professional staff or the administration or the alumni or any other particular constituency, but I don't think that disagreements should be in any way destructive of our relationship, particularly if there are mechanisms for the resolution of the points of disagreement."

"On each of the other campuses where I have worked, there has been a University Council or some body similar to it in composition and in function. It has been my observation in the three years that I have been here that the Council of The University of Akron works as effectively as any that I have seen. I feel that the Council is assuming and can assume an even more important role in the future as you consider issues of greater substance. I want to assure you that I want the University Council to be an effective organization and I would welcome clarification and discussion of what this process ought to be by your Executive Committee."

The President addressed the Early Retirement Incentive Program:

"At the last meeting I informed you that I was favorably disposed toward the implementation of an Early Retirement Incentive Program, and subsequently announced at the Faculty Convocation that I would be recommending to the Board of Trustees that such a program be approved. I am hopeful that the Trustees will act upon that recommendation at their October meeting. I know that those members of the faculty who would be eligible for the buyout are anxious to know when and whether that option will be available and under what specific conditions it will be provided. However, until the Board approves the program I don't feel that it is appropriate to describe any detailed features of it. When that approval is given you can be assured that all the details will be provided and that there will be opportunities for individuals to receive counseling from representatives of the University and from the respective retirement

systems as to the specific facts for their individual cases. I am, however, willing to share with you some conclusions that I have reached on several factors relative to what will be proposed to the Trustees. Earlier this week I met with representatives of the University Council committee that was appointed to study this issue. This meeting was at the request of Dr. June Burton, who chaired that committee, and it was designed to clarify and discuss the committee's recommendation. I felt that discussion with the committee was helpful and at the urging of the committee I am sharing with you the substance as well as the rationale of my recommendation. The committee's report, which was endorsed by University Council, recommended to me the adoption of a five-year buyout plan available on a continuous basis. An acceptable, though less attractive, alternative that was recommended, was a five-year buyout available for a fixed period of time. After considering this issue from several dimensions I plan to recommend the five-year buyout available for one year available on July 1, 1988 through June 30 of 1989. In my judgment this alternative would provide ample incentive for those individuals interested in early retirement and it offers more advantages to the institution. Providing this benefit on a continuous basis would, in my judgment, be more costly, would not provide the same level of incentive for early retirement as a one-time buyout, and would make the financial impact more difficult to contain. All of the state universities, according to information that I have, who have adopted the early retirement incentive programs, have gone with the one-time buyout provision with the exception of the University of Toledo. The adoption of a one-time buyout does not preclude reconsideration of this issue at some future time. It would be my recommendation that reconsideration occur not earlier than 1993. The current federal regulations allow compulsory retirement of tenured faculty at age 70 but prohibits compulsory retirement, based on age, after 1993, at which time it will either expire or it will be extended for some future time. It may be appropriate to provide another window of time for a buyout after the issue of the federal law is resolved.

On a second point, it will be my recommendation that we continue to offer phase-down as an alternative to the buyout option. What that means is that individuals who want to take early retirement would have a choice of electing a buyout for up to five years or phase-down for up to five years. They would not be able to elect both. To permit this would substantially increase the cost of the program for each individual, and, equally important, would not provide the University with the flexibility in staffing that is a principle feature of the program that makes it attractive to the institution. Electing the buyout, in my opinion, should not preclude retired faculty from being considered for part-time teaching assignments. Such assignments would be at the option of the University and would be on a semester-to-semester, or on an annual, basis and would have to be determined by the need for part-time faculty.

I have looked at this issue from several perspectives and I feel that under these conditions an early retirement incentive program could be attractive to a significant number of individual faculty and staff members and would provide the institution with an opportunity for reallocation of resources with the financial impact that can be managed. It is my hope that the Trustees will act upon this recommendation soon."

In closing, the President said a colleague observed recently that he never stayed for the entire University Council meeting. He indicated that, while he had heard that the sessions were quite stimulating and had undoubtedly missed a great deal by not remaining, he had assumed that Council would prefer to conduct its business in his absence rather than in his presence. He indicated that if that's not the case he would plan to stay for the entire meeting on some future occasion. He said, though, that today he had a 3:30 appointment, but would be happy to respond to any questions.

Two members of Council asked President Muse to clarify an action of the Board of Trustees regarding a resolution bringing University policies into conformity with federal legislation concerning involuntary retirement.

President Muse said that previously there were provisions in the Bylaws which indicated a retirement age and those provisions would be modified to remove any specific age.

Dr. Marini thanked President Muse and continued to the next item on the agenda which was the consideration of the minutes of the September 3 University Council meeting as printed in The University of Akron Chronicle of September 24. The Chair asked for corrections to the minutes. Having none, a motion was made, seconded and passed to adopt the minutes as printed.

Dr. Marini noted that at the September 3 University Council meeting only elected members were allowed to vote for the officers of Council. In fact, all members of Council should have been allowed to vote. The Bylaws indicate that the elections are from the elected members of Council not by the elected members of Council. Marini apologized for the error noting that the issue would be addressed under Old Business.

Under Special Announcements, Dr. Marini introduced Dr. Caesar Carrino, Chair of the United Way Campaign, to report on its progress. Dr. Carrino reported that on October 1 at 12:00 noon, \$66,406.50 had been collected (58.47% of the goal), representing 809 donors with 98 refusals with \$47,178.50 (or 41%) still to be collected. He also announced that 35 to 40 prizes were awarded from the drawing which was held several days earlier.

Dr. Elaine Nichols took the opportunity under Special Announcements to introduce Dr. Gloria Harman who was elected the fourth representative from the College of Nursing.

Moving on to the reports of the standing committees, Professor Blin Scatterday gave the report for the Executive Committee noting that at the September 17 meeting, the committee set the agenda for the October 1, Council meeting. After discussion the committee affirmed last year's criteria of the Procedural Committee (now Executive Committee) which included the principle of limiting Council members to service on one committee. The committee then made appointments to the standing committees of University Council to take into account the above principle. It also placed the three newly appointed Deans on committees and appointed the newly elected part-time faculty representative to the Faculty Well-Being Committee.

The idea of a University Ombudsman was discussed and assigned to the Faculty Well-Being Committee for its study and recommendation to Council.

The committee asked the Dean of the School of Law to recommend a replacement for David Kessler on the Library and Learning Resources Committee since he is currently on leave.

The Executive Committee discussed the handling of committee reports by Council. It was decided that there should be a distinction between reports and legislation, in that legislation should be taken up under New Business. An ongoing discussion centered on how the administration should respond to issues before Council.

A discussion of the election of officers at the September meeting resulted in a decision to bring the matter to Council in October.

Scatterday noted that the Executive Committee would propose amending Section 3359-10-06 (D) of University Council Bylaws under New Business.

A letter from Dean DeYoung from the College of Nursing concerning the appointment of the elected Council member to position of assistant dean was discussed. The committee instructed the secretary to inform Dean DeYoung that the Council member should be replaced pursuant to Section 3359-10-04 (B) of University Council Bylaws and a college election should be called to elect a replacement. The meeting was then adjourned.

Provost Marini, as Chair of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, reported that a meeting was held on September 28 to review program excellence proposals which may be submitted from the campus and to discuss the committee's role in reviewing plans of academic units and updates to academic units. The update-to-plans which Marini had requested of the deans sometime ago are in his possession and would be shared with the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee after current discussion between Deans and the Provost were concluded.

Acting Associate Provost Weyrick reported for the Academic Policies Curriculum and Calendar Committee. APCC is bringing before Council a proposal from the departments of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering to establish a College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering. As noted in the proposal this college would be a degree-granting unit of the University at a level with the other various colleges of the University and would be formed from the existing units of the Department of Polymer Science and the Department of Polymer Engineering in the Polymer Engineering Center.

Mr. Weyrick went on to say that the proposal, as circulated to members of Council, is in accord with the major thrust and commitment of the University in the field of polymers and is intended to provide single administrative and academic focus for polymers within the University. The proposal details the rationale of the organization of the proposed government for the new college. He also noted that Dr. Frank Kelley and Dr. James White, co-authors of the proposal, were present at this University Council meeting. The proposal had been referred to APCC by the Executive Committee of Council; APCC considered the proposal and unanimously recommended that University Council concur in the proposal. On behalf of the APCC committee Mr. Weyrick stated that he would like to make the motion in support of the proposal.

Provost Marini indicated that a motion would be in order under New Business. The Chair also noted that if there was no indication otherwise from members of Council he would assume that the body accepted the report of APCC as presented.

Dennis A. Kleidon, Chair, reported that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee met on Monday, September 28. In their initial meetings the committee will be involved in the review of past and current procedures used in the facilities planning process. At the September 28 meeting, Donald Bowles, Vice President for Administrative Services, informed the committee on a variety of activities currently taking place on campus. Mr. Bowles also discussed the processes used in making decisions regarding planning of campus facilities. He offered the planning committee monthly updates and reports on the activities taking place on campus pertaining to physical facilities, parking, etc. The Campus Facilities Planning Committee intends to review this information in future meetings and provide the administration with recommendations where applicable. Additionally, the committee members will channel this information through the individual colleges and departments.

Mr. Bowles shared information with the committee regarding campus parking, including details on parking fees, current spaces available, anticipated expansion of the facilities, peak hour loads in parking, and comparison with other state institutions.

The committee will continue its review of procedures and planning goals on campus. The committee Chair invited colleagues to offer the Campus Facilities Planning Committee their concerns and suggestions regarding facilities planning. He stated that the committee would be happy to review the recommendations and suggestions and study those areas of concern. Written concerns can be directed to the Chair, Dennis Kleidon.

The Athletics Committee report was given by Dr. George Prough, Chair. He stated that the committee met on September 21. Dr. Prough asked permission for David Jamison, the Faculty Representative to the NCAA, to speak to the body. Mr. Jamison stated that the University is attentive to NCAA regulations. He will be completely involved in all aspects of certifying the eligibility of the athletes.

Dr. Prough told the body that James Dennison, newly named Athletic Director, spoke at length relative to realignment of duties and various members of the department. Additionally, Dennison spoke of efforts relative to scheduling games as well as various promotional marketing techniques. Dennison informed the committee that the budget is finalized and the committee will have an opportunity to examine it at the next meeting.

Dr. Dale Jackson, Chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, reported that last spring the committee proposed amendments to the faculty manual concerning Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure. Those had been tabled to permit due consideration. He requested that they be voted on at the November meeting. Jackson invited Council members to pick up copies of the amendments from the table at the front of the assembly.

Dr. June Burton reported that the Faculty Well-Being Committee met on September 18 and reelected her Chair. Dr. Burton stated that several years ago Richard Kovach of the Law School prepared a memo for the faculty concerning tax shelter annuities. He was asked to revise that document to include information on the recent federal income tax revisions upon faculty savings for retirement plans. Professor Kovach agreed to do this and to review the other printed literature that faculty have received.

The Controlled Smoking Policy which was returned to this committee at the September meeting of Council also was discussed. After receiving the two negative letters about this that were sent to the President, one from Barnes & Noble and the other from the Staff Employee Advisory Committee Chairperson Onadell Bly, the committee decided to arrange for hearings where all interested University personnel and students could ask questions and express their opinions against and for adoption of a Controlled Smoking Policy. These hearings have already been scheduled for October 20 and 21 from 12:00 noon to 2:00 p.m. in Chestnut A. Dr. Faith Helmick will contact faculty, staff and students regarding this further opportunity to express themselves on an issue that was written up in the Buchtelite last year and endorsed by its editor.

Evaluation of the Employee Family Assistance Program will begin with Mr. Howard Baldwin and Mr. Greg Burgman, Director of Faculty Services in Summit County appearing before the committee to answer questions about their statistical reports. Comments should be sent to Faculty Well-Being Committee immediately. The Chair advised that the Part-time Faculty Subcommittee will meet with Martha Hoffman again to discuss the method of reporting part-time service to STRS. Finally the ERIP Sub-committee met with the President, Provost, and Dr. Helmick earlier this week for clarification of the draft resolution. She stated that the representatives of her committee are ready to serve Council to the best of their ability.

Dr. Michael Savage, Chair of the Library and Learning Resources Committee reported that the committee did not meet this month.

The Reference Committee Chair, Ms. Rebecca Marsh, advised that the committee held its first meeting on September 25. She stated that all full-time faculty should have received copies of the new Faculty Manual incorporating changes as approved by Council last Spring. Her committee will be reviewing the new manual during the current semester and suggesting changes, clarifications, and corrections by the February meeting. She advised Council that it could expect a proposal on the new retirement policy and that the Reference Committee has been asked by Dr. Helmick to assist in putting together an index for the manual. Marsh asked that suggestions for Faculty Manual changes be submitted in writing as soon as possible.

Dr. Carl McMillin, Chair, reported that the Research Faculty Projects Committee met on September 17 and the primary business of the meeting was to determine submission dates for research proposals. Faculty research proposals will be due Friday, October 16 (Faculty summer fellowship applications will be due October 30).

He said that review of the proposals normally takes two half-day sessions and that discussions were held to determine when in the busy schedules of the committee these meetings could occur. After much discussion, the committee moved that an all day meeting will be held on Saturday, October 31.

Associate Provost and Dean of Student Services Robert Dubick, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, said that the committee met on September 15, elected him Chair, then divided the membership as is the custom into the two subcommittees, the Extracurricular Activity Subcommittee and the Scholarships, Grants, and Loans Subcommittee. He said that per instructions from this body the committee began the review and rewrite of the interim procedures that apply to registered student groups.

Dr. Robert Deitchman requested permission to speak to Council.

Dr. Marini explained that the Bylaws were changed recently to allow visitors to speak with permission of the body. Seeing no objection to Dr. Deitchman's request, Provost Marini recognized Deitchman.

Deitchman expressed concern about the Annual Student Organization Statement that has been attached to all student group forms for registration. Deitchman noted that Council tabled the content of the compliance statement last Spring and requested that Items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 not be put into effect until such time as University Council passes upon an appropriate interim set of guidelines to be recommended to the President.

Dr. Marini stated that specific recommendation or action was out of order at that point in the meeting. Marini clarified that on March 5, when the President conveyed to Associate Provost Dubick procedures for registering student groups, he asked that two things be done. The President authorized Dubick, pursuant to his supervisory authority over extracurricular activities, to implement interim procedures respecting registered groups. The President also intended that these procedures be referred to University Council for its deliberation before being adopted as a policy. That was done. The interim policy is now in effect under the authority of the President and will be in effect until Council reports on its considerations about that policy.

Dr. Walter Arms reported as the Akron Faculty Representative to the Ohio Board of Regents Faculty Advisory Committee that the meeting was cancelled for September.

Moving on to Old Business, Dr. Marini reminded Council that, in error, only elected members of Council were allowed to vote for Council officers at the September meeting. In the selection of both the President Pro Tempore and Secretary, there was only one nominee. However, ballots for several nominees were cast for the Executive Committee. Marini suggested, as discussed previously with the Executive Committee, either (1) a motion be entertained for all members of Council to endorse the results of the earlier elections or (2) that a motion be entertained to hold the elections again. The Chair indicated a willingness also to entertain other solutions.

Professor Blin Scatterday moved for endorsement of the elections as held at the September 3 meeting. Dr. Carl McMillin seconded and the motion was passed unanimously.

Calling for New Business, Dr. Marini noted that in addition to the amendment to the Bylaws Section 3359-10-06 (D) as circulated on the agenda, a second printing was also available. This printing, which was distributed to Council, showed the original section of the Bylaws with strikeovers on the language to be deleted.

Dr. Marini called on Professor Scatterday who stated that at a previous discussion of the Executive Committee it was noted that there seemed to be a problem with this section in the Bylaws in that presently the wording indicates that three people have to be elected every September. This disagrees with the second part of the paragraph which indicates alternating terms. Professor Scatterday introduced a motion to amend the Bylaws Section 3359-10-06 (D) "to amend Section 3359-10-06 (D) in the Bylaws to be reworded as follows:"

"The Executive Committee shall consist of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the President Pro Tempore of University Council as Chair, the elected Secretary of Council, and three other members elected by Council. ~~at its September meeting from the elected members of council/~~ The President of the University is ~~a member ex officio of this committee/~~ The terms of office of this committee shall be alternating, ~~two of the elected members replaced one year and the other elected member being replaced the next year/~~ THE TERMS OF OFFICE OF THESE THREE ELECTED MEMBERS SHALL BE ALTERNATING, TWO OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS BEING REPLACED ONE YEAR AT THE SEPTEMBER MEETING AND THE OTHER ELECTED MEMBER BEING REPLACED THE NEXT YEAR AT THE SEPTEMBER MEETING. THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY IS A MEMBER EX OFFICIO OF THIS COMMITTEE.

Dr. McGucken seconded the motion.

A question was asked from the floor as to whether or not there might be a problem since University Council members are elected to two-year terms but the Bylaws refer to a three-year term. If the term is open for a two-year alternating membership, it would be restricted to University Council members in the first year of their two-year elected term.

Scatterday responded that there were always two-year terms and it wasn't the intent of the Executive Committee to revise the Bylaws to change that, just to improve the wording.

After additional discussion on this issue Mr. David Jamison moved to amend the amended section on the fourth line by adding the words "of Council" thereby changing the amendment to read:

"The Executive Committee shall consist of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the President Pro Tempore of University Council as Chair, the elected Secretary of Council, and three other members OF COUNCIL elected by Council. The terms of office of these three elected members shall be alternating, two of the elected members being replaced one year at the September meeting and the other elected member being replaced the next year at the September meeting. The President of the University is a member ex officio of this committee."

Dr. John Bee seconded Jamison's motion and it was passed that the amendment be incorporated into the language. The Bylaws, as amended, were tabled and will be voted on at the next Council meeting in November.

Calling for additional New Business, Dr. Marini recognized Mr. Weyrick who moved on behalf of APCC that Council concur with the recommendation that a College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering be established. Dean Dunlap seconded the motion.

The question was then raised about the term "College". On page 4 of the rationale it appears other institutions refer to a similar unit as "school" so The University of Akron will be the first "College". It was questioned whether the term "college" accurately describes a body whose total faculty membership is twenty.

Marini reminded Council that the body would be acting in an advisory capacity in regard to the motion much as they did last year when the School of Art, the School of Music and the School of Human Ecology and Home Economics were renamed.

It was mentioned that the matter of the proposed name was discussed with the Executive Committee and they felt it was appropriate to refer to the proposed unit as a college. There was some discussion as to the size of the proposed unit in terms of the number of faculty; it was noted that the faculty at Wayne College is close to the number proposed in the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering.

Dean Dunlap suggested that it is very significant that this is the first College of Polymers. He said that the University of Pennsylvania's College of Business is very much a College of Business even though it is referred to as a school.

Marini noted that in the proposal there are presently four units that would be moved into the College - two academic departments, a center and an institute. He then asked if someone was present from the units to speak about the preference of "college" as opposed to "school".

The comment was made that "school" is a rather ambiguous term and that if the reference is made to the "School of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering", that many people would think it was just one academic department or part of a college. However, if it were called "The College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering", it would be clear that it would represent several independent units.

Also, the question was asked if these four existing units would retain their separate identify. Marini stated that each would retain separate identity.

The question was then asked as to what the body was voting on and it was clarified that the motion before Council states that Council concur with the proposal offered by APCC to establish a College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering.

Dr. McGucken thought it would be more appropriate to enter a substitute motion and his suggestion was: "The University Council supports in principle the formation of a College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering and recommends the idea to the President". The motion was seconded. McGucken felt that the APCC proposal conflicts with the Faculty Manual, that on page 6 it details "that a joint committee of the Department of Polymer Engineering and the Department of Polymer Science will decide upon matters of promotion and tenure", which violates the Faculty Manual and goes against tradition. McGucken went on to say that other parts of the eight-page proposal are in violation of Faculty Manual guidelines. For these reasons, McGucken would support the notion of the new college in principle but would not support the appended description of the collegial procedures.

The concern was expressed that the college would be at the graduate level only. It was noted that the rationale on page 4 of the document points out that this would not be unique to the area of polymers.

A suggestion was made to postpone consideration of the recommendation until next Council meeting. A concern was raised that a search was going on for a Dean of Engineering and the Search Committee needs to know what is going to be done while the search is being conducted.

The Chair reiterated that the motion before the body was to substitute language for the original motion.

Mr. Weyrick explained that APCC had followed the precedent established years ago when the College of Fine and Applied Arts was formed. He said that in a sense it was a bit different in that it was a simple change of name and did not involve many of the details of a reorganization that are included here. It would seem that the substitute motion is more appropriate.

At this point the Chair called for a vote to substitute the language offered by McGucken. The motion passed. A vote was taken on the newly substituted motion "The University Council supports in principle the formation of a College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering and recommends the idea to the President." The motion passed.

Under New Business it was mentioned that usually there is a list of absentees in the minutes and this was left out of the last set of minutes. Dr. Marini answered that there had been no intentional change and that the practice of listing both persons "absent with notice" and those "absent without notice" would be followed in the future.

There was no additional business to come before the meeting so, upon motion made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.