

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

2-28-1991

Faculty Senate Chronicle February 28, 1991

Heather M. Loughney

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.

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.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of February 7, 1991	2
Appendix to the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of February 7, 1991	
A. Report of the Athletics Committee	29
B. Report of the Student Affairs Committee	35
C. Approved Proposal from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.	36
D. Report of the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee.	37
D-1. Repeat for Change of Grade Policy	38
D-2. Graduate & Probation Dismissal Policy	40
E. Salary Allocation Resolution presented by the Faculty Well-Being Committee.	41

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

about ongoing searches for faculty.
?

that, as a part of the measures week, a hiring freeze had been put into effect. If we discovered later that a reduction of some significant amount in an issue to be examined as well. At the meeting applied only to positions between now and next year.

to ask two questions. The first was the President had sent to the faculty members. In it he had said that \$1.3 million due to incomplete funding and lost breakdown of what percentage or amount of funding as opposed to the lost subsidies? Something that occurred so routinely in our budget, or was it already?

that he did not have those numbers with him, but a bit about the incomplete funding. We had received 52% of the instructional enrollment growth which we had estimated that this was done during a tight budget, but it was difficult to predict how much was funded in terms of the amount of money as of October 1 of the year. It had been estimated that the Science building would be completed and that the Business School building would be completed, enabling us to capture some subsidy for either of those buildings was completed in the fall there. There was also a problem with the Regents. The Regents had a policy that said that a doctoral student could take a subsidy, could receive subsidy for, was 200 students. We had a number of students exceed that number whose hours were declared as ineligible. We had, and that was a issue with which we had more than half of the years in the past had not collected full subsidy.

question dealt with the net reduction of money in a December Beacon Journal article about athletics programs, there were statistics about football and basketball. The article had made a profit in football, and it, had made a profit in basketball. It also mentioned the women's athletics and described the NCAA meeting regarding cost reduction in scholarships, etc. He

meeting

1

University Council was called to meet by the Vice President and Provost, on Tuesday, February 7, 1991 in

Council were present. Those present were Dr. Janis Campbell, Dean of the College, Isaac Hunt, Dr. Orville Anderson, Mrs. Diana Sousa, Milton Bonniwell, Dr. Keith Cafani.

William V. Muse whose

bus and yesterday I spent with you that both trips were successful. As you has, obviously, the most important report to you about that meeting. I initiated a number of changes out of this year's budget of an order by the University by 3 percent and an increase of Regents that also cut the year. In total, the state is about \$3.7 billion and had been anticipated. Revenue in a few areas was left with a shortfall of \$100 million from this year's spending. From University reserves for administrative areas because number one, we had a deficit. Secondly, you might recall that there were already a short that had been anticipated. Secondly, we have to manage the institution in order to be able to deal with the needs of the University. At least one-fourth of the cost of the campus through the of this sort has to be necessary in order to that the state of Ohio

noticed that some of these steps were being taken here. For example, it had been reported in the Akron Update that there would be a reduction from 95 scholarships to 85. Were there any projections about what these reductions would amount to in the future. Were there steps being taken to reduce the overall shortfall in the athletics programs generally (one and half million for football alone)?

The President responded that the NCAA changes would have an impact on reducing expenditures. We would not be immediately affected because, at least in football, we were nowhere close to 95 scholarships. Actually we were below 85 already, so the reduction over a long period of time would help there as it would in basketball, where there would be a reduction from 15 to 13. There would also be some savings in terms of reducing the size of the coaching staff, and we would clearly take advantage of the opportunities to reduce our expenditures consistent with what the NCAA had adopted.

A Council member wanted to know whether the freeze in hiring would also apply to situations where, for example, a secretary might be going on maternity leave. Would this mean that it would not be possible to replace that person while she was gone?

The President answered that he did not want to try to give a specific answer to that question. What he had indicated to the Vice Presidents was that he was willing to consider cases of emergency. If there was a vacancy in a position between now and the end of the year, and there were reasons to think that failure to fill it right away would cause major problems for the institution, he thought that we ought to be willing to examine that and see if those conditions existed. Therefore, there would be a provision for reviewing those situations.

Dr. Griffin wondered whether the President had any idea about faculty raises in term of percentages.

The President replied that he thought he had already given the Council an idea about that. The governor would be reporting out his budget to the legislature around March 15. That would give us a firm grasp on what he was projecting to be the situation. There should also be some indication in the early spring whether or not the legislature was going to put a cap on tuition. Until we got that information, it was really impossible to say what kind of money was going to be available. There was the possibility that we would be dealing with fewer dollars next year than we were working with now. He thought that it would be premature to make any kind of definitive statement until we saw what the elements were.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of December 6, 1990 as printed in The University of Akron Chronicle dated January 24, 1991.

The Chairman asked Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary, whether there were any corrections. Dr. Oller had three. On page 7, Item No. 4, Special Announcements, in the valedictory statement in honor of Mrs. Julia A. Hull, where it said Julie, it should read Julia. On page 16, in the fourth paragraph from the top which began, "Ms. Ann Bolek suggested...." it stated that she moved to amend the motion. It should read that she moved to divide rather than amend the motion. Finally on page 17, in the second paragraph from the bottom, it read "Dr. Edward Wilson inquired" and should read "Dr. Edwin Wilson"

Since there were no other corrections, the minutes were approved as amended.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer.

The Chairman reported that upon the recommendation of the Provost's Ad Hoc Committee on ULLR Reorganization, President Muse had authorized a search for the Dean of University Libraries. A search committee had been formed, and its members were the following: Mrs. Onadell Bly; Dr. Diana Chlebek; Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter; Mr. Jack Hibbs; Mrs. Phyllis O'Connor; and Mrs. Norma Pearson. In addition to these individuals from the Library, Mr. William Haak, President of Associated Student Government; Dr. Jim Jackson, Department of Geology; and Mrs. Janet Purnell, Interim Assistant to the President and Director of Minority Affairs were also members of this Committee.

The Chairman then noted that last month he had set a deadline of February 15 to accept names of people who would be interested in serving on a newly-formed ad hoc committee to study University governance structure on campus. So far, he had received only two names and was therefore extending the deadline to February 25. He assumed that there would be more than two people who wanted to serve on such a committee.

The Chairman next stated that he had received a status report on February 4 from Dr. George Knepper regarding the search for the Senior Vice President and Provost. It read as follows:

By the close of the application period, October 31, 1990, 100 persons had applied for the position of Senior Vice President and Provost. The credentials submitted by each have been reviewed by each member of the committee. We have now reduced the applicant pool to a "short list" of 10 whose qualifications are being carefully scrutinized. On or about February 8 we expect to identify, perhaps 5 or 6 of these applicants

for a final review, with whom we expect to conduct additional interviews with the committee. From this group we anticipate that 3, or possibly 4 will be scheduled for campus interviews which will include a reception that members of the campus community will have an opportunity to meet with the candidates. Feedback from the campus interviews will be helpful to President Muse as he makes his final selection.

If all goes well, we expect to schedule campus interviews starting in late February and finishing no later than early March. Your elected college representatives can keep you informed of our progress and, of course, every faculty member will be informed about the scheduled receptions as the candidates come on campus.

The Chairman lastly responded to a memo from Dr. William McGucken regarding the status of recommendations made by Council in regard to Board Regulations and part-time faculty. All changes as recommended by Council had been approved by President Muse and sent to the Board of Trustees on October 24. They were approved by them on that date, and the Division of Human Resources was responsible for incorporating the changes into the appropriate documents. These changes should be reflected in the next regular printing of these documents.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements.

The Chairman announced that since Council had last met, Dr. Mary Maxwell, a colleague from the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences had passed away. Dr. David Buchthal then presented the following memorial resolution in her honor:

Be it resolved that we, the members of University Council, with the faculty, students, staff, and administration of The University of Akron, mourn the recent untimely passing of our colleague, Dr. Mary E. Maxwell, and express our deepest condolences to her family and friends.

Mary first came to this campus in 1972 as a student in the Masters Program in Mathematics. She had graduated from Ashland College in 1969 and was teaching in Jackson Local Schools. After obtaining her M.S. degree in 1974, she joined the Department of Mathematics and Statistics in 1975 as an Instructional Assistant for the Modern University Mathematics program. She was named an Instructor in 1981 and promoted to Assistant Professor in 1985. In that year she began a two-year leave of absence to pursue doctoral studies at Ohio State University. She obtained her Ph.D. in Mathematics Education in 1988.

Dr. Maxwell enjoyed a reputation as an excellent and caring teacher. She devoted herself to our freshmen-sophomore curriculum and was largely responsible for the development and implementation of the current university placement procedures in mathematics. She was very active with the Early Mathematics Placement Testing Program, a cooperative effort between Ohio colleges and universities and high schools. At the time of her death, she was involved with the implementation of modern graphical calculators into the curriculum. Her concern for the teaching of mathematics led to her developing and teaching a course in Contemporary Mathematics for prospective elementary teachers.

Dr. Maxwell will be sorely missed. Her colleagues will remember her as a model of the caring teacher. Although we mourn her passing, we will treasure her memory and always appreciate the time we had her with us.

Council then observed a moment of silence in memory of Dr. Maxwell.

Dr. B. Holland then wondered whether he might ask a question about the Chairman's remarks of the last meeting with respect to the issue of promotion of Instructors to Assistant Professors and the issue of whether or not a search was required. On page 6 of the Minutes of the Chronicle of that last meeting, the Chairman had suggested in the third paragraph of a policy statement on this issue, "however, promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor cannot be used to avoid a search for a new position as described in part 1, nor does it satisfy the requirements of our search procedures." That sentence has been unclear to some people, and he wanted to seek further clarification on it by asking two questions. Depending on the answers to those questions, he wanted to submit a rewording for the last sentence. The first question was "Must the decision to promote from Instructor to Assistant Professor, in every case, depend upon a search for a new position?"

The Chairman replied that it did not.

For his second question, Dr. Holland asked whether an application for promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor could be denied to avoid creating a new tenure track position.

The Chairman responded that it could not.

Dr. Holland then stated that he would submit to the Executive Committee a possible rewording of the last sentence in paragraph three which would clarify the matter.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee.

Dr. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on January 18. In addition to setting the agenda for today's meeting, its business had included discussion of a letter from Dr. George Knepper regarding Founder's Day, certification of two colleges' special elections for Council representatives, and the formation of an ad hoc committee to review University governance structure. Regarding that last item, the Provost decided to extend the deadline for nominations for service on that committee to February 25, as he had just announced at this meeting.

The Committee had three recommendations to make to Council. One was a motion containing a proposed policy for procedures on Committee Reports which would come up under New Business. The other two were referrals of items to Council Committees, and with the approval of Council, he would make them now.

The first referral was a proposal from Dean Russell Petersen from the College of Business Administration regarding the possibility of three-year contracts. His proposal and rationale had been circulated with the agenda for Council's information, and the Executive Committee was recommending that it be referred to the Policy Subcommittee of APCC. Dr. Oller then moved this, and it was seconded.

Dean Wallace Williams wanted to know whether this was just for the School of Business or was it University-wide.

Dean Petersen replied that his intent was a University-wide policy that would enable the election of up to three-year contracts. This would not be a requirement, but it would be an option for all units on campus.

Council then voted its approval of the motion to refer.

The second item for referral was the issue of the existence or lack thereof of a central file for material generated by faculty grievances. Was there a long-term file storage for letters and documents that came out of those grievances? This question had been raised at a meeting of the Executive Committee, and the answer seemed to be negative. Therefore the Committee was recommending that this issue should be looked into by the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee working with someone from the Office of Legal Affairs, Mr. Mallo's office. Dr. Oller then moved this, and it was seconded. Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

The Chairman stated that there was no report, but the SPARC committee would hold its first meeting tomorrow morning, and at that time it would discuss the future of this particular committee (APPC).

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee

Associate Provost Joseph Walton reported that the APCC report had been previously circulated and all action items were included under New Business.

D. Athletics Committee

Mr. David Brink, reporting for Mrs. Irene Glanville, the Chair, stated that since Council members had a copy of her report, which was a combination of two meetings on December 10 and February 4, he would mention briefly only a few items (for the complete report, see Appendix A). Under item 2, the Mid-Continent Conference was becoming co-educational, making women's sports a part of it, and this would occur and be announced on February 15. Changes would be implemented in the 1992-93 year.

Item 3 related to personnel resources for each sport, and a sheet was appended to the report stating how many coaches, assistant coaches, and graduate assistants there were for each sport. This was pretty well mandated by the NCAA.

The fourth item was the longest. At the December meeting the committee had heard what the NCAA convention was planning to do, and at the February meeting the committee heard what it had done. This was summarized on the second page of the report. The most important part was Section A, Benefits to the Student-Athlete. The primary benefit here was that there were limits placed on the amount of time that would be demanded of the student athlete. Section B related to cost containment for the institution (as mentioned earlier in the meeting), and Section C contained more tightly defined requirements for membership in each of the divisions of the NCAA.

Finally item five was the report on the Athletics budget as requested by Council. This was also attached to the report, and Mr. Brink wanted to point out that the figures in the first four columns were actual. The final column was what had been budgeted for the current year. Given the announcements earlier in the week and in today's meeting, those figures would be reduced downwards.

E. Campus Facilities and Planning Committee - no report.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Mr. Brink, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on January 28 and February 4, 1991.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee

Mr. Paul Richert, the Chairman, reported that during its meetings last semester, the committee had discussed the definitions of merit used by various state universities in Ohio. The primary focus of the meetings was making recommendations in terms of the methods of determining salary increases. The committee had a resolution on the process which he would be presenting under New Business.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee

Dr. Oller, reporting for Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair, stated that there would be a report at the next meeting of Council.

I. Reference Committee

Vice President Faith Helmick reported for Mrs. June Patton, the Chair. She stated that the Committee had completed its annual review of the Faculty Manual and had considered various items of business that Council had referred to it, including clarifications needed to reflect the revised definitions of University faculty and regular faculty. A copy of these revisions had been distributed today, and she was requesting that a motion to approve these be placed on the agenda for the March meeting.

In addition the committee discussed the organization, readability, and cost of the Faculty Manual and suggested that, in the future, Council might want to consider separating the Manual into two documents to enhance the readability--one for policies; one for procedures.

Finally Dr. Helmick mentioned that last month the Executive Committee had advised the committee to consider a footnote regarding promotions from Instructor to Assistant Professor. The committee did consider it and decided that a footnote was not appropriate. The Manual was clear on promotions, and the footnote referring back to the Chronicle of some past time might lead to more confusion than clarification.

Dr. Don Gerlach wanted to make a point about that last item. On his motion, Council had directed the Reference Committee to incorporate the proper statement regarding the promotion of Instructors in the Manual. He did not care whether it was a footnote or not, but something was definitely needed there. The Reference Committee might think that it was clear enough, but the

whole issue would not have arisen if it had not been questioned by certain people to be to the contrary. The Council's motion to instruct the committee to incorporate this proper provision into the Manual still held. If the committee had failed to do that in the packet we had just received, Council would have to make it go back and come forward with the proper provision for inserting a statement of explanation very clearly outlining what Council had decided so that no one in the future could possibly misread it, as had happened in the recent past.

The Chairman asked Dr. Bruce Holland whether this related to his earlier question regarding the issue of Instructor's promotions, and he replied that it did somewhat.

Dr. Gerlach suggested that what Dr. Holland was going to send to the Executive Committee regarding clarification of the Provost's statement might be past on to Reference. He also reiterated that until Council's motion to the Committee was revoked, the Committee was bound to do what Council had directed it to do.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - No report.

K. Student Affairs Committee

Dean Robert Dubick reported that the Scholarship Subcommittee of the Student Affairs Committee had met and its minutes had been distributed to Council (See Appendix B). The Extra Curricular Activity Subcommittee would begin its budget hearings for allocating student activity funds among registered student groups on March 25.

Dr. Robert Holland asked whether the 75% a piece mentioned for Honors Scholarships in the report was meant to include both instructional and general fees.

When Dean Dubick replied that he believed it was just instructional, Dr. Holland wondered why that had been separated from the Presidential and National Merit Scholarships where the 75% included both the instructional and general fees.

Dean Dubick stated that he had not been at the meeting, but he would check on the matter.

L. General Studies Advisory Committee

Dr. Tom Vukovich, reporting for Dr. Eric Birdsall, the Chairman, stated that the committee had met last Wednesday and had two areas left to finish. There would be a full report in March.

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.

The FAC Committee met twice since the last Council meeting. On December 11 we resumed meeting at the State Office Tower. The morning session was devoted to a discussion of the topic "The Subsidy Model" with Vice Chancellor, Mat Filipic, and spent the whole morning talking about the model.

Filipic gave us 4 points concerning changes in the subsidy to report to our home institutions. Some of these may be good news to Akron.

First of all, the lag in the FTEs in the formula will become a true lag. This relates to Dr. Holland's question about the underfunding of lagging and so forth. The 14 million in protection will be eliminated. If your enrollments are now protected you will lose this, if not, you won't. The rationale for this is to give more attention to growth in the future. In a sense, it is taking one step back from 1980 when the lag was initiated.

The second point that he gave us to report is, he said "here is a dirty little secret of the new system," so you'll want to take note of it, I suppose. He said that everything collapses if we were inconsistent in the level of courses across the state. These decisions tend to be made one at a time at an institution so OBR looked at the baccalaureate general studies level and tried to develop decision rules under which all campuses must operate. In effect, this is recalculating the models without changing total reallocations. The outcome, he claimed, will be more equitable. I don't know whether it will be because I've never gotten to see the decision rules, yet, to see any kind of judgement about it.

The third point that he reported is that the subsidy for graduate work, which has been limited arbitrarily to 200 quarter hours will be raised to 260 quarter hours. Since he said earlier that the cost of doctoral education is being reported on the Faculty Activity Forms as less expensive than Master's degree work, it seems not to be excessively costly to raise the number of graduate hours that may be subsidized to 260 quarter hours. So this relates to the message that the President sent you about the fact that we were limited to funding 200 and many students were taking beyond the 200 and that certainly will continue to be the case this year but in the next biennium they intend to change that.

The fourth point he wanted reported is the calculation of the fee assumption will change to what the Regents think is fairer method. At the time they decided to make the change the change they had 14 million to fix it.

Other remarks made by Filipic during the morning session included the following:

The Faculty Quarterly Activity Forms that we all fill out are quite important. This form is to desegregate the cost of teaching 1 FTE. OBR looks only at the hours spent in the categories of teaching and advising. Research and Public Service are ignored. This information is presented by levels and OBR takes the fraction of the teaching time spent at each level. He said that there is no maximum number of hours a person may report. In fact, the total is meaningless because only the fraction matters. But he said if we were to add extra hours to our doctoral level teaching or advising, we'd get a bigger subsidy. Likewise, if we add hours to our general studies teaching, we get less. For years, he said, faculty have been overemphasizing the amount of time spent on undergraduate education and de-emphasizing doctoral level work because the data suggests that doctoral education is cheaper than even master's level work to produce and this isn't logical, he said.

The second point that he made was that an Ohio Uniform Information Act exists but OBR doesn't have the money to administer it, so it doesn't, so that data gathered by OBR isn't necessarily consistent from institution to institution.

Another point he made, I was going to leave out but when Bruce asked the question, I thought maybe I should put it back in because it relates to it. It's about chronic underfunding. To understand the formula, you must realize that 1979 was originally thought to be the peak year in enrollments. But the 1979 peak was, nevertheless, exceeded in the summer and fall of 1980 (due to a drop in the economy more people who were jobless went to school). But this rise continued so enrollment lag became an average of the base numbers and the current enrollment. The bad part of this system is that in recent years an enrollment increase could cause you to lose subsidy dollars. So OBR is going back to the original formula and using a 1-year lag again instead of the average of 1980 and the current year so this is why we've had a lag since 1980. It is chronic, I would say, after 10 years.

At another point in the meeting, Filipic explained how he tried to sell the education budget to the Legislature. He said they talked about the increasing connection of adult population and the ability to earn income. He also pointed to

the decennial census and reports published on all states showing earnings of people correlated to education but the copies of these that he distributed to us, that he said he had been showing to the Legislators, showed us that he was supplying them with the data based on the 1980, not the 1990, census. So he's 10 years behind in what he was trying to tell them. Furthermore, he said, American Society is divided between rich and poor. Jobs that pay well requiring little education are disappearing. By 1970 Ohio incomes were half the national average, and by 1980, Ohio fell farther behind. The major point that Filipic tried to make is that the educational community needs to open a dialogue with the Legislature and the public about its needs if it is to assure the future economic development of the State and this, of course, is the argument that the Governor did not buy.

That afternoon we met with Bill Napier and Chancellor Elaine Hairston. Napier opened up with this: "What would you think of a piece of legislation that tied your salary to the number of hours you actually teach in the classroom?" Legislators have read the book Profscam. Faculty think productivity is a big issue with legislators these days and they think faculty don't do anything between classes. He explained that somebody's office had just phoned in with that question which was why he had the question ready for us. The FAC Committee's response was "How do you define 'classroom'?" We do a whole lot of informal teaching in labs and in offices with doctoral dissertations, for example.

Hairston noted that her new budget has a line item to supplement the institutions' efforts at identifying and rewarding excellent teachers. She also said that she believes it is the responsibility of faculty to inform their Presidents that they want teaching to be given more acknowledgement and rewards.

Later the Chancellor was asked a question about whether she thought cuts would be less for higher education than for secondary education. We aren't competing with each other, she said; Medicaid and the prisons are our real competition. As the discussion continued, the FAC Committee advised her to tell the Legislature to think in terms of the top schools and not just Ohio schools, to compare our technical universities to major technical universities nationally.

Napier noted, in closing that the Board of Regents as well as the entire higher education community needs to bring the higher education agenda to the public debate on State funding.

At the January 22 meeting, this one was far less political since it focussed on the high school students attending the colleges under Senate Bill 140. From the lengthy discussion, it appears that this program is working well in most places.

The only glitch in the bill is the fact that high schools must report attendance to the federal government in order to get federal monies. But since college professors do not report attendance, nor are they supposed to know whether a student is still a high school student, ways of taking attendance have to be devised by the colleges whose responsibility the Chancellor says the law says it is to report attendance. The clever way they are doing this is to require the high school students to sign in somewhere at an administrative office near where they are going to class to report their presence on campus. The fact that they may then cut class is being ignored since the colleges have tried to meet their responsibility in a reasonable manner.

Ohio State reported that they are using this Senate Bill 140 as a recruiting program for their honors program. Kent State said that administratively they have placed this program under their Honors Program, too.

Chancellor Hairston said that she was somewhat surprised, yet pleased, to learn that the program is working out so well in most places. Next year there should be about twice the number of high schools participating as this year, she said. She doubted that it would be earmarked for cutting by the Legislature since it is a relatively low cost item because OBR does not subsidize what the school districts pay for the empty seats in the classrooms that the high school students occupy. Everyone there corroborated that the high school students are only taking up empty seats, as the Legislature planned.

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business.

The only item of unfinished business was a proposal relating to revisions in the Faculty Manual regarding department head review. The Chairman reminded Council that at the December meeting this item had been referred back to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee for further clarification to be presented at this meeting. He then recognized Mr. Brink who reminded Council that a copy of the proposal could be seen in the Chronicle of January 24 on pages 51 and 52.

The issue at the last meeting had been that in preparing the proposal the FR&R Committee had neglected the section on confidential interviews to be conducted by the Dean. Mr. Brink directed Council's attention to the bottom two and one-half words at the end of page 51 and the first line and a half on page 52.

Those contained a section on confidential interviews, and it was the opinion of the committee that this should be removed from the procedure. Its removal, however, did not preclude confidential interviews by the Dean, but it did not require them. The committee thought that the most important part of the process was a yes or no secret ballot to be advisory to the Dean. At its January 28 meeting, the Committee looked at this again and decided that this was indeed the position which it wished to take. It was therefore presented to Council once again without change as printed in last month's Chronicle. The proposal was then moved and Dr. McGucken seconded it.

Dr. McGucken wanted to speak in favor of the proposal and to explain to students and other members of Council who might not be familiar with department procedures what really was involved here. There were two intentions behind this proposal. The first was to bring the review of the department heads into line with all other departmental processes concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Whenever a new member of a department was sought, there was a search, a committee then brought a recommendation to a department, a vote was taken and then a recommendation was made to the Dean. This happened again the following year when the new faculty member was up for reappointment. A similar procedure was followed whenever the faculty member came up for tenure or promotion to Associate or Full Professor. Behind all of this was the idea that there was a department meeting and discussion, a vote, and then a recommendation followed.

The second intention in regard to this proposal was that the review process of a department head should be similar to the appointment process. When a head was appointed, as with other appointments, a committee was created, candidates were brought in, the department then met and discussed them, took a vote, and finally sent a recommendation on to the Dean. The current process of department head review after four years was quite different from that. Individual faculty members met individually with the Dean. There was no discussion by the department, and no vote was taken. The idea in this proposal then was to make the review procedure like all the other procedures. This was in keeping with the idea that the University of Akron was maturing as a professional institution. Also there was no reason why this procedure should be any different from the others.

There was another important point to consider here. This was not a new proposal. It had been dealt with by Council last year, and at that time the President had refused to approve what had been forwarded to him by the Council. His interpretation had been that the proposal last year "created a binding obligation on the Dean." In other words, if the department voted in a certain way, the Dean was obliged to follow that. It was possible that the original

proposal could have been read that way, but his objection was a sound one since in all the other instances what was passed on to the Dean was merely a recommendation. That was what was in the revised proposal, and so it was now in line with all the other procedures. For that reason, as well as the fact that it would further faculty governance, further the democratic process, and also further professionalism here at the University, he hoped that Council would support it.

Dean Claibourne Griffin also wanted to speak in favor of the motion, not only for all the reasons which Dr. McGucken had so thoroughly presented, but also because it would make life a lot easier on deans. Once one had been through the process of speaking in confidential interviews with every member of the Mathematics Department and the English Department in one semester, one would never want to do it again. It fell under the category of cruel and unusual punishment. He was glad to see the confidential interview stricken from the proposal.

Since there was no other discussion, Council then voted on the proposal, and it was approved. (For the proposal, see Appendix C)

Item No. 8 - New Business.

The first item of new business was a motion from the Executive Committee relating to procedures for committee reports. It read as follows: "All motions coming from committee reports will be placed at the end of the agenda under New Business to be taken up by Council in the order in which they are presented unless the Chairs can justify that their motions need to be dealt with immediately, not later. If Council then approves of the Chair's justification, a motion will be required to suspend the rules relating to the priority of business. Approval of this motion will require a two-thirds majority of the body." Dr. Oller moved this and it was seconded by Dr. David Buchthal.

Dr. Oller reminded Council that a slightly different version of this motion had been passed at the November meeting. The difference was the last sentence, "Approval of this motion will require a two-thirds majority of the body." When this was discussed back in November, Council had amended that language so that approval to suspend the rules could be by a simple rather than by a two-thirds majority, and that was what had been passed. At the December meeting, he had reported that Dr. John Bee had suggested that this action was improper according to Robert's Rules because Robert's required that a suspension of the rules must have a two-thirds and not a simple majority. If Council wished to have such a rule, it was necessary to amend the Bylaws of Council by the usual procedures. For this reason, the amendment to a simple majority was ruled out of order. When the Executive Committee discussed this again at its January meeting, it decided that the

whole motion had been tainted by the amendment because there may have been some people who had voted for the main motion on the basis of the simple majority amendment. For that reason, the committee decided that the whole motion should be discarded and re-presented to the body in its original form. This was why Council was discussing this again. There was no need to discuss the rationale behind the proposal because that had been thoroughly covered a number of times last semester.

Dr. Gerlach was upset and disagreed that Council could not vote on the simple majority rule by amending the motion. This is what he had tried to do the last time. Since Council was being told that this could not be done, he therefore moved that this be referred back to the Executive Committee to be presented in the form of an addition or amendment to the Bylaws of Council with a change from two-thirds to a simple majority and placed on next month's agenda. This was seconded.

Dr. Bee hoped that Council would not do this because it would be continuing to do something illegal under the rules by which it operated.

Dr. Gerlach replied that at the last meeting the President Pro Tem (Dr. Bee) had advised that the only way to achieve the simple majority for suspending the rules was to amend the Bylaws. This was what he was moving, but Dr. Bee was now telling him that it was patently illegal. What kind of circular argument was going on here? Had Council not been told that to accomplish what he (Gerlach) wanted, the Bylaws had to be amended?

Dr. Bee responded that with respect the proposition which Dr. Gerlach presented to the body was a bit ingenuous. The question now before the body was not whether to have the standing rule, but how to handle reports of committees. This was the primary interest of the Executive Committee, and he hoped it would be Council's as well. If we needed to adopt a standing rule regarding the simple majority, it should be regarded as a separate matter and issue. It would certainly be proper to present and discuss it, but at this point it should not be confused with the basic question of how this body wanted to handle committee reports for action.

The Chairman then called for a vote on Dr. Gerlach's motion and it was defeated.

Dean Griffin then asked exactly what the main motion was doing. Were we establishing a standing rule or amending the Bylaws? According to what Dr. Bee had just said, anything we did was illegal.

Dr. Bee answered that any action which the body took would have nothing to do with the vote required for the passage of a motion to suspend the rules. That was prescribed in Robert's as two-thirds. The only thing which Council was voting on was whether or not to proceed with the policy of placing action items in committee reports at the end of the agenda unless Council, by a two-thirds vote, suspended the rules relating to the priority of business.

Dr. Dale Jackson remembered that Council's original intention in dealing with the issue was to establish an orderly method by which to do business. It also had wanted the leeway to be able to change that order of business in a reasonable way, and this was why Council had indicated an interest in a simple majority vote. He hoped that Council would vote this down because it would make it difficult for Council to make changes in the order of business if it wanted to. It was better to go back to the original system where there was freedom rather than artificially get boxed in with very tight regulations.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to point out one odd little thing in the middle of the proposal. It read: "If Council then approves of the Chair's justification..." If Dr. Walton wanted action taken immediately on business coming from APCC and Council approved of his justification, how was this to be decided. Would Council approve of his justification by a simple majority and then have to pass a motion to suspend the rules by a two-thirds vote? The whole thing was absolutely absurd, and he urged the body to vote it down.

Dr. Bee noted that he seemed to be picking up the slightest whiff of persiflage here. The idea that the parliamentary authority was an unwarranted imposition on our rights struck him as being rather new. The reason that it took a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules was for one of the cardinal and fundamental reasons of parliamentary procedure, which was to protect the rights of minorities. In this particular case, it was to protect the rights of someone who happened to have a topic or action item which was not very interesting, popular, or pressing who saw that topic or item consistently pushed back to the end of the agenda, while other more "popular" or "pressing" items were voted ahead of it by a simple majority. This was a very clear example in which there was a good rationale for being at least a bit cautious in circumstances under which we altered the order in which business was taken up. The aim of the Executive Committee here was to try to make sure that people were put fairly on queue and that items of business were treated in an orderly fashion unless there was some pressing reason. Pressing would be defined as an expression of approval by two-thirds of the body. This seemed eminently reasonable and fair, and rather than destroying or undermining the rights and rules of

this body, it was in fact protecting those rights. He hoped that Council would not make more of this than was necessary and pass the proposal.

Mr. Dan Buie wondered whether two-thirds of the body or two-thirds of the members present would be required.

Dr. Bee replied that it would be two-thirds of the members present to vote unless otherwise specified.

Dr. Gerlach sympathized with the remarks made so far, but wondered about Council's control of its own agenda. It was true that the Executive Committee had as one of its jobs setting the agenda. Could Council change the order on that agenda by an ordinary motion to rearrange things subject to a majority vote, or did that require some sort of suspension of the rules with a two-thirds vote?

The Chairman replied that it would take a two-thirds vote to alter the agenda.

Dr. Robert Holland pointed out that on the basis of what Dr. Bee had said to Mr. Buie about the vote being two-thirds of those present, the motion should be amended to remove the last three words "of the body" in the last sentence. Dr. Oller accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Dean Petersen wondered whether there was a two-stage approval process here. How did the Council approve the Chair's justification?

Dr. Oller assumed that the Chair would make his justification, and then Council would vote, and if two-thirds of those present gave their approval, the justification would be approved and the order suspended.

Dr. Bee noted that the wording of the motion in regard to this might be infelicitous. There really was less here than met the eye. The intent was that if two-thirds of the members agreed to suspend the rules, it would happen. It meant nothing more than that. There was no need for two actions.

Dr. Oller suggested a change in the language of the motion which might solve the problem. Change the sentence beginning "If Council then approves..." to read "For Council to approve of the Chair's justification, a motion will be required to suspend the rules relating to the priority of business. Approval of this motion will require a two-thirds majority vote."

Dean Griffin suggested that it might be even clearer if the motion read: "All motions coming from Committee reports will be placed at the end of the agenda under New Business to be taken up by Council in the order in which they are presented." Council could always make reference to the rule in Robert's regarding the two-thirds majority if it wanted to suspend the rules. This way avoided having to deal with language which we did not seem to quite understand. This was moved and seconded.

Dr. Gerlach hated to throw another monkey wrench into this, but he thought that he would. The way things would now operate would give an advantage to the people who had alphabetical order in their favor. This was because in the agenda after the Executive Committee made its report, all the others were arranged alphabetically, and there was never any variation. The lower you were on the list for reporting, the lower you would be under New Business. Was this necessarily fair?

Dr. Buchthal agreed but pointed out that under the system Council had used in the past, the tyranny of the alphabet not only allowed committees to make reports but to present motions and have Council act on them before the other committees even had a chance to say that they had something to present.

In answer to a question from Dean Petersen regarding the opportunity to suspend the rules, Dr. Bee emphasized that Council was always governed by parliamentary procedures and Robert's, and these made that provision very explicitly.

Council then voted its approval of Dean Griffin's substitute and then voted approval of the proposal.

Dr. Walton then presented the first of two action from the APCC (See Appendix D, 1). This was a policy dealing with the repeat for change of grade policy. He moved its acceptance, and this was seconded by Dr. Gerlach.

In answer to a question from Dr. Alice Christie regarding the omission of mention in the proposal of a one-year time limit, Dr. Walton indicated that this was one of the points of change here. The limitation was being removed.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to offer an amendment to the motion at the end of paragraph two. With his amendment, it would read: "With the dean's permission, a student may substitute another course if the previous course is no longer offered, BUT IN NO CASE MAY BE REPEATED AFTER A COURSE FOR WHICH IT IS A SPECIFIC PREREQUISITE HAS BEEN TAKEN AND PASSED." This was seconded by Dr. Oller.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to explain the point of this amendment as it had been pointed out to him by a colleague in the Modern Languages Department. On occasion there have been students taking German 101 who did not do well, but passed and went on to take 102 and did a little better. On the basis of that improved experience, they then went back and repeated 101 for a better grade. This seemed to him to be dishonest and certainly cheating against his fellow students in the original course. This amendment was designed to ensure that this sort of thing did not happen. While the matter came up too late to present this to the full APCC when they were discussing the policy, he had brought it up to the Policy Subcommittee at its last meeting, and its members seemed to agree that the amendment was a good thing to add.

Mr. Buie wanted to oppose this amendment for one very important reason. One of the problems which had been experienced in University College was the huge backlog of students who for one reason or another, particularly grade point reasons, were not making the grade to get into the programs they were interested in. For example, there may have been many instances where a student might have received an "D" in Accounting 1, gone on to get a "C+" in Accounting 2, and the only possible strategy that could be employed to make that student eligible for admission in a degree-granting program was to go back and repeat the course in which he had received the lower grade. He understood the intent of Dr. Gerlach's amendment, but he did not think it was what Council really wanted to do.

Dr. Bee commented that when this was first presented he was inclined to see the rationale, but Mr. Buie's point and another observation were tilting his thinking toward opposing it. Not all courses were directly sequential such as the given example of German 101 and 102. He was thinking of a case in which an entry level survey course might be both a prerequisite to courses later in a department sequence, although not directly related to them, and also might carry with it a required grade achievement for obtaining a degree. If a student were to take that survey course, pass it and then subsequently take another course which had that first course as a prerequisite, the student would not be able to take the first course over again if he needed a higher grade to satisfy the minimum grade requirement. This proposed amendment would not allow it, and the policy would inadvertently put students in a situation where they would not technically be able to meet the requirements of the curriculum. He did not think that Dr. Gerlach's intent was for that to happen. The case of the German courses was clear enough, but there were other cases of prerequisites to which subsequent courses were not as directly related and related in different ways to the requirements for graduation. Therefore he wanted to speak against the amendment.

Dr. Gerlach wondered whether changing the wording to read "the course for which it is a specific prerequisite" might help here. In the History Department, there were no prerequisites except at the graduate level in the seminar sequence. If you took a survey course in American History, there was no prerequisite whatsoever. You could take them out of order and go back and take them again. In the language courses or in Mathematics or certain sciences, it would be a different matter. Notwithstanding what had been said about students being able to go back and redeem themselves after a less than satisfactory start, he was still bothered because this whole business of repeating courses for a change of grade smacked of grade hounding. As he recalled, it was adopted during the furor of the Vietnam uproar when the University was knuckling under at every turn to students who were clamoring for this and that concession. When he was a student, there had not been such a policy. You simply went on and did other things and redeemed yourself by working up your course averages by other means. He thought that restraints were needed on this business in order to discourage this constant search for grades.

Dr. Buchthal was impressed by both arguments. The thought struck him that in the Mathematics Department there were students who were taking Calc 1, 2, and 3 in sequence, and there were others who were taking Calc 3 or Calc 1 just about at any time and repeating that or Calc 2 or Calc 1. He could understand taking a Calc 2 course and repeating Calc 1, but if he were looking out for students' welfare, he would probably tell them that if they did not do well in the first course of a sequence to repeat it at once before attempting the next one. Otherwise they were probably going to repeat both courses many times. If our goal was to get as much money as possible for each course from our students, then we could let them repeat courses willy nilly, hither and yon, forever and a day. Perhaps a better way to advise students would be to say that if you did poorly in this Accounting 1 course, you would be much better off taking it again now because you would not have the right to repeat it for a change of grade once you have taken Accounting 2.

Dr. Christie thought that this was a situation where one rule did not seem to apply to all situations. She recalled that this had been one of the problems with by-pass credit and prerequisites. For example, in Music, if you took Piano 4, a rule was enacted that you could get credit for Piano 1, 2, and 3. All of the courses in programs all over campus had to be looked at as far as prerequisites were concerned in relation to whether one could get by-pass credit for them or not. It ultimately was a departmental decision, and perhaps that would work here as well. Individual departments could decide whether the rule was applicable or not.

Mr. Terry Haas wanted to speak against the amendment and used the situation of a friend as an example. The friend was in the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and had taken an elective basic programming course. He did not do well in the course, receiving a "D-", because he had other things to worry about. If in the future, because Science was not his cup of tea, he decided to go to the Business College where that basic computing course was a prerequisite for computer applications, he would have the prerequisite and could take the other courses relating to computer applications for business. However, he might find that his GPA was not high enough, but, with this proposed amendment, he would not be allowed to go back and retake the basic programming course, which was basically easy and which under other circumstances he would have done well in. This was why he was against the amendment.

Dr. Alan Noble thought that so far the discussion had been very productive, but there were 61 people here who were agonizing over the wording of this proposed change. Since there did not seem to be a clear sense of how to proceed one way or the other, this ought to be sent back to the committee, and it could look at the issue again and propose a more suitable wording which would address the basic issue and allow Council to deal with it more rapidly later on. He would like to see that done with many things which were discussed in Council. Many things came either poorly drafted or drafted without a recognition of all the ramifications. Sometimes the ramifications were not obvious until discussion took place in Council, but too often things came to us poorly prepared. He therefore moved to send this back to the committee, and this was seconded.

Council then voted its approval.

Dr. Walton's next item of new business was the Probation and Dismissal Policy in the Graduate School (see Appendix D, 2). He wanted to reiterate a point which was noted at the bottom of the page of the policy for the information of University Council members only. "The old language contained herein was transferred from the "Grades" section of the 1989/90 General Bulletin, and placed into this new section, entitled "Probation and Dismissal." The "Grades" section of the General Bulletin was previously revised and approved by University Council on November 1, 1990. (See attachment.) If further explanation of this was necessary, he would be happy to provide it. He also noted that the Dean of the Graduate School had been called away on an emergency, but the Associate Dean was here to answer any questions. He then moved adoption of the proposal, and this was seconded.

Dr. Buchthal asked what would be the effective date of the limitations. Would it be applied to students already admitted or in the future--this summer, next fall?

Dr. Walton replied that it would coincide with the publication of the catalogue.

Since there was no further discussion, Council voted its approval of the amended policy.

Having asked for and been granted permission to speak, Mr. Richert now presented the proposal from the Faculty Well-Being Committee (For the complete proposal, see Appendix E). He then read the following resolution:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that Council urges the President to implement a new formula of salary allocation to the Board of Trustees -- a formula that includes across-the-board raises to offset cost of living increases in addition to "merit" for all categories of faculty, effective in the 1991-92 contracts.

We also recommend that the President appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of elected faculty representatives from all categories of faculty along with administrators to develop a more complex formula for use in subsequent years that includes "merit" as well as other methods of allocation designed to address major salary problems.

Mr. Richert reminded Council that this was coming to it as a result of last spring's request that the committee study how salaries were allocated, and how salary increases were allocated at the other universities in the state.

This resolution was moved and then seconded by Mr. Buie, who wondered whether contract professionals were included here. When Mr. Richert replied that they were, Mr. Buie, noting that it was not clear, made a friendly amendment which included the contract professionals here. This was accepted by Mr. Richert.

Dr. Bridgie Ford had a question about one of the sections of justification preceding the resolutions (page 2, first paragraph) which read: "Whereas, salaries are too low to recruit minority faculty in some areas without offering differential treatment that, in turn, creates gross reverse discrimination, which in reality, works against the goal of increased racial harmony and more diversity on campus." She thought that the document had several valid points on a number of issues, but she was concerned about this statement. She wanted to know why the committee had concluded this since it was such a strong statement - "gross reverse discrimination."

Mr. Richert responded that he might have to call upon another member of the committee who was more conversant with the details of this. Apparently in some departments where there were few minority

candidates, mainly ethnic, but perhaps also women - and the situation was very competitive, bidding wars would break out and to win such a war one had to pay big dollars and that created problems.

Dr. Ford once again asked how this created gross reverse discrimination. The concept of systematic reverse discrimination had not been covered. She thought that a strong statement such as this describing the situation as working against the goal of increased racial harmony, actually promoted racial disharmony. If an explanation as to why it was there could not be offered, she proposed that it be deleted.

Mr. Clifford Billions agreed and noted that unless there was some justification for the paragraph, it would seem to be based on nothing but hearsay. It was then moved and seconded that the paragraph be deleted.

Dr. Bruce Holland pointed out that only the last two paragraphs at the bottom of page two formed the motion on which Council was being asked to vote by the committee. All the rest was rationale.

Dr. Ford agreed that it was part of the rationale, but it should not be in it.

Dr. Holland responded that Council could very well exclude it if it so desired, but the point he was making was whether or not people approved the two paragraph motion did not necessarily suggest that everyone agreed with every one of the rationales that were included. There might be other rationales which were motivating us to vote for or against the motion. There really was no need to vote on the rationale. We were voting on the motion.

Dean Griffin thought that if Council passed the motion that all of the whereas clauses or paragraphs would have to go. There were quite a number of them with which he had some difficulty in terms of defining what the implications were in the minds of the people drafting this. For example, what did the statement mean which said "whereas the Salary Equity Committee only awarded one-tenth of the money set aside by the Board of Trustees for the purpose almost two years ago." There were various interpretations on this. Did the Board violently overestimate the amount of money that was needed? Did the Salary Equity Committee do a lousy job? Did the normal process work pretty well? There were all sorts of possibilities here. Some supported the resolutions, while others did not. If Council passed this, and he hoped that it did not, he would strike out all of the rationale statements so that if it went to the President, it would go with only the two resolution paragraphs.

Dr. Bee wanted to add another dimension to the discussion which was that each of those whereas paragraphs contained a very interesting and compelling story in and of itself. He was certain that this document had been arrived at by the committee with a great deal of research and thought. Before this body acted on it, part of the committee report ought to be a sharing of what that research was, what their thinking was, and an explanation, paragraph by paragraph, of all of those whereas statements. If necessary, Council could vote them up or down. Since that would take a bit of time, he moved that Council postpone action on this resolution until its next meeting, and request that at that time the committee be prepared to provide us with a more complete discussion of the thinking and research that went into the drafting of this resolution. Dean Williams seconded the motion.

Dr. Gerlach stated that he supported the motion with the amendment that the item be placed on the top of the list of unfinished business in the agenda for the next meeting. Dr. Bee accepted this amendment.

Dean Williams asked that on this issue of gross reverse discrimination, the committee be prepared to present positive evidence, not conjecture, supporting the inclusion of this strong statement in the rationale.

Council then voted its approval to postpone the discussion until the next meeting in March.

Item No. 9 - Adjournment.

It was then moved and seconded that Council adjourn. This was approved and the meeting ended at 4:45 p.m.

APPENDIX A

The
University
of Akron

DATE: February 4, 1991
TO: Gary Oller, Secretary, University Council
FROM: Irene Glanville, Chair, Athletic Committee
SUBJECT: February Report

1. The Athletic Committee has met twice since our last report to Council. This report is a composite of the business conducted at those two meetings.
2. The Mid-Continent Conference has officially made women's sports part of the conference and will finalize the arrangements on February 15, 1991. At that time the members of the conference, both full and associate, will be announced. The change will be implemented for the 92-93 season, as the North Star Conference will dissolve following the 91-92 seasons. Benefits expected include savings on conference dues and meetings, as well as enhancement of the women's programs by affiliation with a stronger conference.
3. The personnel resources for each sport was examined (copy attached). The only change anticipated for the 1991-92 academic year is the increase of one part time women's trainer position to full time.
4. At our December meeting the committee examined the proposals and amendments for the 85th NCAA Convention (known as "The Reform Agenda") and gave input into the decision-making process via Faculty Rep David Jamison. UA delegation was led by Dr. Ruebel and the official position of the University was determined at a subsequent meeting between Dr. Muse, Dr. Ruebel, Athletic Director Jim Dennison, Assistant Athletic Directors Rob Fournier & Dawn Moore, and our Faculty rep. One vote was allowed each member institution. At our February committee meeting the reforms adopted at the convention were reported and the anticipated effect to the University discussed. The changes fell into 3 areas:

APPENDIX A (cont.)

A. Benefits to the student-athlete

1. Limited hrs/week of practice to 20 (includes conditioning, game competition, team or individual practice, viewing films, etc.)
2. Decreased length of the seasons from 26 to 22 weeks for team sports, to 24 weeks for individual sports
3. Required one day off per week during the season for the athlete
4. Defined the first day of competition, to decrease early starting in the Fall
5. Required 50% of the course work toward the degree program selected by the athlete to be completed by the end of the 3rd year (as opposed to permitting enrollment in courses that do not assist the athlete toward achievement of a degree)
6. Specified maximums on travel time to and from events in order to minimize missed class time.
7. Required exit interviews with each individual athlete as eligibility is exhausted in order to collect required evaluative data.
8. Required proof of minimum SAT, ACT, or PSAT scores prior to eligibility of high school athlete for official recruiting visit to a university
9. New limits to protect the high school recruit: no phone calls to the athlete prior to the senior year; increasing the period of time when the athlete may not be approached by 1st person contact

B. Cost containment for the institution

1. Decreased the number of contests allowed
2. Decreased the maximum number of scholarships allowed by 10%
3. Decreased the number of coaches for all sports
4. Reduced recruiting budgets by decreasing the number of paid official visits permitted to the recruiting institutions by the recruit, and cuts in the number of evaluations and contacts permitted by the coach to visit a recruit

C. Requirements of Division I institutions

1. Increased the number of events required against Division I opponents to 50%
2. Required sponsorship of at least 7 men's and 7 women's sports
3. Required minimum amounts to be spent on scholarships for sports other than football & men's/women's basketball

APPENDIX A (cont.)

5. The committee examined the Athletic Department's budget from 1986-91. Brian Davis, Business Manager, was present to answer questions. The revenue to support athletics comes predominately (74%) from the general service fees paid by the student body. No tuition or general fund monies are used. Sixty percent of the expenditures in the budget are for the cost of athletic scholarships and coaching salaries. The cost per scholarship is expected to rise by 7-10% in the next academic year, a serious concern since the department must cover these ever increasing costs though faced with certain budget cuts. The number of out-of-state scholarships permitted was questioned since these scholarships involve an additional surcharge. No limits are placed on the coaches as to the number of these type of scholarships that can be offered, however the coaches are encouraged to recruit locally. Other expenses include: equipment, playing field preparation, travel expenses, and recruitment. Some savings may be realized when the conference changes occur in 1992 due to joint travel arrangements with the men's and women's teams. (budget analysis attached)
Please advise the committee of any further information needed or questions that should be raised.
6. The next meeting will take place on March 11, 1991, 1-3 pm. topics will include:
1. Fall GPA by sport, including frequency distribution within each sport
 2. Graduation rate for each sport
 3. Majors of current athletes by sport and present occupation of former athletes

Respectfully submitted, .

Irene Glanville

Irene Glanville, Chair

PERSONNEL RESOURCES
BY SPORT

Page 32

<u>Sport</u>	<u>Head Coach</u>	<u>Asst. Coach</u>	<u>Grad. Asst.</u>
--------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------------------

MEN

Football(97)	1	9 (+1 volunteer)	2
Basketball(13)	1	2	1
Soccer(20)	1	1	1
X-Country(9) & Track(32)	1*	1 P.T.**	0
Baseball(41)	1	1 P.T.	1
Tennis(10)	1 P.T.**	1 P.T.**	0
Golf(11)	1 P.T.	1 P.T.	0

WOMEN

Basketball(16)	1	2***	1
Volleyball (15)	1***	0	1
X-Country(9) & Track (26)	*	**	0
Softball(16)	1	1 P.T.	1
Tennis(9)	**	**	**

CO-ED

Riflery(7)	1 P.T.****	0	0
------------	------------	---	---

OTHERS

<u>Trainers</u>	1	1 F.T., 1 P.T.	3+
<u>Strength Coach</u>	1	0	1
<u>Cheerleaders</u> <u>& Dance Team</u>		1 P.T. assistant	1

() Number of athletes on team

*F.T. U.A. employee - also P.T. in P.E Dept.: coaches both men's & women's track teams

**Personnel shared with both men's & women's teams

***F.T. U.A employee - Volleyball + assists with Women's B'ball

****F.T. U.A. employee - also P.T. in UAPD

+ 20-30 students in the sports med program

APPENDIX A (cont.)

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON ATHLETICS
BUDGET ANALYSIS
FISCAL YEARS 1987-91

DESCRIPTION	ACTUAL				BUDGET
	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
REVENUE					
Transfer-In\Student Fees	\$2,985,000	\$3,155,989	\$3,533,153	\$3,672,754	\$3,997,250
Football	321,592	498,825	491,033	633,326	626,500
Basketball	237,794	241,223	229,523	181,573	199,000
Soccer	20,514	22,828	10,413	17,512	18,000
Unrestricted Gifts (ZAC)	180,697	172,486	111,874	136,431	250,000
Women's Sports	4,447	6,509	7,205	4,784	7,500
Other Sources (ex., tournaments)	44,519	9,880	82,346	155,218	277,020
TOTAL REVENUES	\$3,794,563	\$4,107,740	\$4,465,547	\$4,801,598	\$5,375,270
EXPENDITURES					
<i>* have to guarantee \$250,000 to football teams we play at the Rubber Bowl</i>					
Administration	\$643,784	\$441,820	\$524,418	\$560,728	\$605,106
Football†	1,493,474	1,572,624	1,984,649	1,986,432	2,248,591
Basketball	441,227	545,536	604,902	636,933	633,258
Soccer	141,297	184,311	196,623	222,054	254,982
Other Sports	285,582	293,935	323,169	329,954	366,051
Women's Sports (all)	460,744	505,315	525,325	561,402	670,161
Other	298,017	359,976	411,405	464,376	597,121
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (1)	\$3,764,125	\$3,903,517	\$4,570,491	\$4,761,879	\$5,375,270
NET SURPLUS\ (DEFICIT)	\$30,438	\$204,223	(\$104,944)	\$39,719	\$0
1) Included in above :					
Salary\Fringe Benefits	\$1,412,810	\$1,400,445	\$1,550,329	\$1,671,130	\$1,817,792
Scholarship Costs	805,727	986,995	1,047,328	1,125,244	1,373,940
Total	\$2,218,537	\$2,387,440	\$2,597,657	\$2,796,374	\$3,191,732
% of Total Expenditures	58.94%	61.16%	56.84%	58.72%	59.38%

The University of Akron
Athletic Scholarships
1990-1991

Sport	In State		Out of State		Total Scholarships	
	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount
Football (3-05201)	53	312,647	42	357,668	95	\$680,315
Misc.	3	17,697	0	0	3	17,697
Basketball (3-05301)	3	17,697	12	105,048	15	122,745
Misc.	1	5,899	0	0	1	5,899
Baseball (3-05401)	11	64,889	0	0	11	64,889
Golf (3-05501)	4	23,596	0	0	4	23,596
Riflery (3-05601)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soccer (3-05701)	0	0	11	96,294	11	96,294
Swimming (3-05801)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennis (3-05901)	2	11,798	1	8,754	3	20,552
Track/CC (3-06001)	9	53,091	0	0	9	53,091
	86	\$507,314	66	\$577,764	152	\$1,085,078
Women's BB (3-07001)	15	88,485	0	0	15	\$88,485
Women's Softball (3-07101)	9	53,091	2	17,508	11	70,599
Women's Tennis (3-07301)	4	23,596	0	0	4	23,596
Women's Vol'ball (3-07301)	9	53,091	0	0	9	53,091
Women's Track (3-07401)	9	53,091	0	0	9	53,091
	46	\$271,354	2	\$17,508	48	\$288,862
Total Athletic Scholarships	132	\$778,668	68	\$595,272	200	\$1,373,940

Scholarship Components	FY 90-91 Proposed		1989-90 Actual
Tuition (Inst.+Gen Fee)	\$2,398	\$2,398	2,278
Tuition Surcharge	0	2,855 (26 Hrs)	2,694
Room	2,044	2,044	1,884
Board	1,157	1,157	1,066
Books	300	300	250
Total Scholarship	\$5,899	\$8,754	\$8,172

APPENDIX B

Interoffice Correspondence

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE PROVOST AND
DEAN OF STUDENT SERVICES

DATE: January 29, 1991

TO: Dr. Marion Ruebel, Interim Senior Vice President and Provost

FROM: Dr. Robert A. Dubick, Chair, Student Affairs Committee

SUBJECT: Report to University Council

Extracurricular Activities Subcommittee

No report.

Awards, Scholarships, Grants and Loans Subcommittee

The Awards, Scholarships, Grants and Loans Subcommittee held a meeting on December 4, 1990. During that meeting, the scholarship guidelines for 1991/92 were approved. The Herman Muehlstein Scholarship for students within 100 miles of New York City was increased from \$5,000 per year to \$6,000 per year.

The committee endorsed the concept that music students could receive an academic scholarship from the University Scholarship Committee in addition to the music award given by the School of Music based on musical talent.

The committee endorsed the following scholarship recommendations:

Presidential Scholarships - 100 percent of instructional and general fees.

Honors Scholarships - 75 percent of fees. *Instructional & General*

National Merit Scholarships - instructional and general fees, room, and board for four academic years.

Ohio Academic Scholarships - 100 percent matching.

In addition, the committee reviewed the policy regarding satisfactory academic progress and suggested no substantive changes.

dh

APPENDIX C

Proposal Approved by University Council on February 7, 1991

Presented by the Faculty Rights and
Responsibilities Committee
David Brink, Chair

3359-20-02 (B) (5)

(a) Department heads are appointed by the Board upon recommendation of not less than two-thirds of the faculty members of the department or division, the dean of the college, the Provost, and the President; hold office at the discretion of the President; and are responsible to the deans of their colleges; AND ARE RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF, AND ADVOCATES FOR, THEIR FACULTY. They are the administrative heads of their respective departments, divisions, or schools (hereinafter referred to as "departments" and are charged with the general supervision of all departmental interests in accordance with policies established by the Board, the President, their dean, their faculty, and the University Council. Both administration and faculty will bear in mind that department heads have special obligations to build departments strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

(b) (iv)

The dean shall assess annually the performance of department heads. At intervals not to exceed four years, or upon the specific request of the majority of the full-time faculty members in the department, the dean shall make INITIATE a substantive review of the department head to include confidential interviews with all full-time members of the departmental faculty FOLLOWING PROCEDURES SIMILAR TO THOSE USED IN THE INITIAL APPOINTMENT OF A DEPARTMENT HEAD, INCLUDING A YES-OR-NO SECRET BALLOT OF ALL OF THE DEPARTMENT'S FULL-TIME FACULTY ON THE RETENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD AS HEAD. THE BALLOT SHALL BE TAKEN AND TALLIED AT A MEETING OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY CALLED TO CONSIDER THE RETENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD AS HEAD. ABSENTEE BALLOTS ARE PERMITTED. A RECOMMENDATION REPORTING THE TALLY OF THE VOTE SHALL BE SENT BY THE FULL-TIME FACULTY TO THE DEAN. If IN THE JUDGMENT OF THE DEAN this review reveals that the interests of the department will be better served by a replacement because of a manifest lack of confidence in the department head, or of unresolvable departmental problems, or for other sufficient reason, a search for a replacement shall be undertaken by the procedures described herein. THE APPOINTMENT OF THE HEAD SHALL BE TERMINATED, AND A NEW HEAD SHALL BE APPOINTED ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE FACULTY MANUAL.



Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost
Akron, OH 44325-4703
216-972-7593 216-972-6990 Fax

APPENDIX D

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE**

January 24, 1991

TO: Executive Committee and Members
of University Council

FROM: Joseph M. Walton *JMW* Associate Provost
for Academic Services

SUBJECT: Report of the Academic Policies, Curriculum and
Calendar Committee for Thursday, February 7, 1991

The Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee met on Tuesday, January 22, 1991 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of Gardner Student Center. The following items, which will be presented under new business, were unanimously approved by APCC: 1) Repeat for Change of Grade Policy, and 2) Graduate Probation and Dismissal Policy. APCC also received a proposal for a permanent Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Program, which it will consider at its next meeting on Tuesday, February 19, 1991.

Please review the attached proposals prior to the meeting on February 7. You may wish to bring these materials to the meeting for your reference.

Attachments

APPENDIX D-1**REPEATING COURSES**

Any course may be repeated as many times as necessary by an undergraduate student subject to the following conditions:

- To secure a grade ("A-F") or a grade of "NC," "CR" or "AUD," a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was "C-," "D+," "D," "D-" "F," "AUD" or "NC." Registrations under the "CR/NC" option are subject to the restrictions in the "CR/NC" policy.
- ~~The student must repeat the same course within 12 months of the completion of the prior attempt.~~ With the dean's permission, a student may ~~extend this period or~~ substitute another course if the previous course is no longer offered. Courses must be repeated at The University of Akron.
- Grades for all attempts at a course will appear on the student's official academic record.
- Only the grade for the last attempt will be used in the grade-point average.
- All grades for attempts at a course will be used in grade-point calculation for the purpose of determining graduation with honors and class standing.
- For purposes of this section, credit for this course or its equivalent will apply only once toward meeting degree requirements.

APPENDIX D-1 (cont.)

Grades

Approved by Graduate Council, March 6, 1990

A student admitted to graduate study under any status at the University is expected to maintain a minimum 3.00 grade point average (A = 4.00) at all times. A minimum 3.00 grade-point average is required for graduation. No more than six semester credits of "C+", "C", and "C-" may be counted toward a degree. Grades of "D+", "D", and "D-" are treated as "F" grades. No grades below "C-" may be counted toward a degree.

Approved by the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee on October 11, 1990.

Approved by APCC on October 16, 1990

Approved by University Council on November 1, 1990.

APPENDIX D-2**PROBATION AND DISMISSAL***

Any student whose GRADE-POINT average falls below 3.00 is no longer in good standing in the Graduate School and ~~is considered~~ WILL BE PLACED on probation. IN CONSULTATION WITH THE COLLEGE OR DEPARTMENT, AS APPROPRIATE, THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL WILL DISMISS FULL-TIME STUDENTS WHO DO NOT RETURN TO GOOD ACADEMIC STANDING WITHIN TWO CONSECUTIVE SEMESTERS (EXCLUDING SUMMERS) AND PART-TIME STUDENTS WHO DO NOT RETURN TO GOOD ACADEMIC STANDING WITHIN THE ATTEMPTING OF 15 ADDITIONAL CREDITS.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME PROVISIONS OF THIS POLICY, FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME STATUS ARE DETERMINED BY THE SEMESTER IN WHICH THE STUDENT GOES ON PROBATION. FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT CONSTITUTES 9 OR MORE GRADUATE HOURS; PART-TIME IS LESS THAN 9 GRADUATE HOURS.

The Dean of ~~Graduate Studies and Research~~ THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, with the approval of the RELEVANT department head may ALSO dismiss anyone who fails to make satisfactory progress toward declared goals or who accumulates six semester credits of ~~C~~ "C+" or below. The accumulation of six semester credits of "F" will result in mandatory dismissal.

A student dismissed from the Graduate School for academic reasons may not be readmitted for one calendar year, and then only if evidence for expecting ~~improved~~ SATISFACTORY performance is submitted and found acceptable.

*(Note to University Council Members for information only: The old language contained herein was transferred from the "Grades" section of the 1989-90 General Bulletin, and placed into this new section, entitled "Probation and Dismissal". The "Grades" section of the General Bulletin was previously revised, and approved by University Council on November 1, 1990. See attachment).

APPENDIX E

RESOLUTION ON SALARY ALLOCATION FOR 1991-92 AND BEYOND
Prepared by Faculty Well-Being Committee for 7/2/91

Whereas, in 1990 both salaries and compensation are a smaller % of total budget than they were in 1988, the former being 3.1% less and the latter 2.2% less (see: Attachment I); and

Whereas, faculty load at the University of Akron is the highest among doctoral degree granting institutions in Ohio (see: Attachment II); and

Whereas, the average salary for all ranks at the University of Akron has fallen dramatically from 5th to 10th place among Ohio institutions over the last six years; and

Whereas, the average salary differential between the University of Akron and some leading national research universities is significant (see: Attachment III); and

Whereas the Salary Equity Committee only awarded one tenth of the money set aside by the Board of Trustees for that purpose almost two years ago; and

Whereas, large sums of money could be shifted from certain athletic programs into the educational programs, which are the *raison d'être* of a university; and

Whereas, on 4 October 1990, University Council expressed its opposition to further cuts in health care benefits and its wish for significant salary increments next year; and

Whereas, the Ohio Board of Regents is changing the method of subsidy allocation so that the state universities will no longer be underfunded due to the "enrollment lag" in the subsidy formula, which has been detrimental to the University of Akron; and

Whereas, the entire "cost" of funding the cash flow of the ERIP was charged off on the 1988-89 budget (pulling \$9,434,456. from educational and general funds and only \$278,267. from auxiliary enterprises; see Akron 1988-89 Financial Report, pp. 26-27) so that the savings and the interest on the savings from the ERIP has been made available in a separate fund every year thereafter to improve salaries more significantly than before ERIP, except this has not happened (see: Attachment I); and

Whereas, far more than half (specifically, 3 out of 4 general faculty/contract professionals and 3 out of 5 regular full time faculty) of both regular and general faculty have been receiving raises below the level promised in the the Five Year Plan for several years past; and

APPENDIX E (cont.)

Whereas, salaries are too low to recruit minority faculty in some areas without offering differential treatment that, in turn, creates gross reverse discrimination, which in reality, works against the goal of increased racial harmony and more diversity on campus; and

Opinion by certain members, who give in

Whereas, since undergraduate teaching ought to be strengthened across the board, putting our best professors there where they are most needed (President Muse in Akron Beacon Journal, 26 December 1990), we believe most faculty support the idea that undergraduate teaching must be rewarded on a level comparable with that of graduate teaching; and

Whereas, since the President has also said that we should strengthen the teaching of communication and math skills along with the study of history and culture, the salaries of those teaching these courses should increase as much as those teaching in graduate programs; and

Whereas, when the salary levels of the various colleges as a whole are compared, they reflect current market differences; and

Whereas, we believe that the majority of the faculty would welcome a change in the method of allocating raises; and

Whereas, while four of the state universities of Ohio continue to use the "merit" only method of salary allocation, with three of these having the lowest salaries, all those comparable to the University of Akron in size and mission use a combination of "across the board", "at the base" and "merit"; and

Whereas, salary compression is a serious problem for all faculty who are not recent hires (see Attachment III, footnote #1 at the bottom of the page: Akron Comparative Figures); and

And whereas, salary problems greatly contribute to morale problems;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT COUNCIL URGES THE PRESIDENT TO IMPLEMENT A NEW FORMULA OF SALARY ALLOCATION TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES-- A FORMULA THAT INCLUDES ACROSS THE BOARD RAISES TO OFFSET COST OF LIVING INCREASES IN ADDITION TO "MERIT" FOR ALL CATEGORIES OF FACULTY, EFFECTIVE IN THE 1991-92 CONTRACTS.

WE ALSO RECOMMEND THAT THE PRESIDENT APPOINT AN AD HOC COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL CATEGORIES OF FACULTY ALONG WITH ADMINISTRATORS TO DEVELOP A MORE COMPLEX FORMULA FOR USE IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS THAT INCLUDES "MERIT" AS WELL AS OTHER METHODS OF ALLOCATION DESIGNED TO ADDRESS MAJOR SALARY PROBLEMS.

APPENDIX E (cont.)

ATTACHMENT I

Data on Salaries as Percentage of Total Expenditures 1987-1990*

	1987	1988	1989	1990
Total	\$ 140,038,599	149,629,872	178,469,770	181,926,033
Total salaries: fac., admin., and staff	\$ 52,589,442	57,203,200	61,571,422	63,827,860
as % of total expense	37.5%	38.2 %	34.5 %	35.1%
compensation	\$ 56,096,877	61,210,257	67,004,443	70,331,195
as % of total expense	40.0%	40.9 %	37.5%	38.7%

*Source: Office of the Vice President, Human Resources

APPENDIX E (cont.)

ATTACHMENT II

Faculty Load * Analysis--Fall 1988

TABLE 7: (Cont'd.) FACULTY LOAD ANALYSIS, SELECTED RANKS - FALL 1988

UNIVERSITIES (EXCLUDES MEDICAL COLLEGES), CONT'D.

PROGRAM/LOAD	BGSU	CNTRJ	CLEVE	KENT	MIAMI	OSU	OHIOU	WRGHT	AKRON	CINCI	FLDHO	YTOWN	SIUAW*	AVERAGE
TOTAL GRADUATE-PROFESSIONAL														
CREDIT HOURS ASSIGNED	--	--	5.3	--	--	4.2	2.0	0.3	7.4	1.7	5.6	--	--	3.6
WEEKLY CONTACT HOURS	--	--	5.3	--	--	10.1	6.6	0.7	6.5	3.2	5.8	--	--	7.9
STUDENT CR. HRS. TAUGHT	--	--	234	--	--	56	178	36	258	92	245	--	--	77
TOTAL ASSOCIATE DEGREE														
CREDIT HOURS ASSIGNED	--	--	--	--	14.9	--	17.1	--	11.3	9.5	9.1	9.9	9.6	10.4
WEEKLY CONTACT HOURS	--	--	--	--	8.9	--	11.4	--	16.8	12.6	14.6	13.1	17.7	15.2
STUDENT CR. HRS. TAUGHT	--	--	--	--	128	--	299	--	257	266	223	207	174	227
TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS														
CREDIT HOURS ASSIGNED	8.4	11.9	7.7	10.1	10.3	5.5	8.4	6.2	12.3	6.2	7.9	10.5	12.4	8.0
WEEKLY CONTACT HOURS	9.6	12.9	8.9	11.2	11.0	9.7	9.9	6.5	11.0	8.9	9.8	12.2	16.4	10.0
STUDENT CR. HRS. TAUGHT	251	284	260	265	257	127	287	233	299	172	249	250	232	217

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

PROGRAM/LOAD	CLARK**	CSCC***	CCC-M	CCC-W	CCC-E	LAKEL	LRAIN	RIOOR	SNCLR	EDSN	SSC	
TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS												
CREDIT HOURS ASSIGNED	13.2	15.4	11.2	12.6	11.9	11.0	12.2	--	11.7	17.2	15.7	
WEEKLY CONTACT HOURS	17.0	18.8	11.5	12.2	11.5	13.8	18.2	--	15.5	17.2	14.9	
STUDENT CR. HRS. TAUGHT	254	283	233	313	269	242	305	N/A	249	297	280	
RANCHES & CENTERS												
PROGRAM/LOAD	FIRE	BOEXT	CNTX	CLEEX	LAKL	EDSN	WSUEX	WAYNE	AKNEX	WALT	CLRMT	UCEXT
TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS												
CREDIT HOURS ASSIGNED	11.5	13.2	--	10.0	10.5	--	10.6	13.0	30.0	9.0	9.9	9.9
WEEKLY CONTACT HOURS	12.9	13.6	--	10.0	12.1	--	11.2	15.5	23.3	13.7	11.8	9.9
STUDENT CR. HRS. TAUGHT	193	134	--	145	231	--	262	229	162	234	215	158

RANCHES & CENTERS, CONT'D.

PROGRAM/LOAD	ASITA	STARK	E-LIV	GEAUG	SALEM	TSCRW	TRMBL	KSUEX	MIDDL	HAML	MUEXT	UTEXT	YSUEX
TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS													
CREDIT HOURS ASSIGNED	11.4	13.2	12.4	14.2	13.1	11.6	13.1	10.9	11.2	9.4	--	13.6	13.6
WEEKLY CONTACT HOURS	14.7	13.8	14.7	13.0	13.5	13.4	13.5	13.5	14.8	12.0	--	13.3	13.6
STUDENT CR. HRS. TAUGHT	201	321	215	286	246	241	246	215	230	207	--	243	258

RANCHES & CENTERS, CONT'D.

PROGRAM/LOAD	LIMA	MANSF	MARIO	NEWRK	OSUEX	BELMT	CICTH	BRONT	LCSTR	ZANES	SIUAW	QUEXT
TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS												
CREDIT HOURS ASSIGNED	8.4	7.1	7.3	8.7	3.4	13.5	13.3	16.6	12.8	9.6	15.5	19.8
WEEKLY CONTACT HOURS	13.0	11.0	10.2	12.7	16.1	13.7	13.7	17.5	13.7	13.7	13.1	16.0
STUDENT CR. HRS. TAUGHT	282	236	255	386	190	264	264	296	227	220	289	356

*RECEIVED UNIVERSITY STATUS IN 1986, FORMERLY A STATE-ASSISTED COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

*RECEIVED COMMUNITY COLLEGE STATUS IN 1988, FORMERLY A STATE-ASSISTED TECHNICAL COLLEGE.

*RECEIVED COMMUNITY COLLEGE STATUS IN 1987, FORMERLY A STATE-ASSISTED TECHNICAL COLLEGE.

*Source: Ohio Board of Regents, (Draft) 1989 Edition, Basic Data Series, Ohio Higher Education System, p. 104.

APPENDIX E (cont.)

ATTACHMENT III
1989-90 SALARY COMPARISON--ALL RANKS--OF SOME LEADING
INSTITUTIONS¹

<u>Salaries² in thousands:</u>	<u>AR</u>	<u>Pr</u>	<u>As</u>	<u>Ai</u>	<u>In</u>
Harvard	62.3	82.7	44.6	42.0	29.9
Michigan (Ann Arbor)	53.7	67.3	50.0	41.8	----
Yale	58.5	77.5	47.3	36.8	31.7
Stanford	68.3	79.2	55.3	43.8	----
Chicago	59.9	72.5	47.4	41.4	30.3
Princeton	57.9	75.8	47.4	36.5	30.5
M.I.T.	62.4	75.6	53.6	43.9	27.3
Wisconsin (Madison)	48.4	56.9	42.1	36.4	27.0
UCLA	59.1	70.1	44.6	39.7	----
Columbia	57.3	71.6	51.6	38.4	43.7
Cal Tech	72.5	80.7	61.3	48.4	----
Minnesota	49.2	58.5	42.6	37.0	30.3
Pennsylvania	61.6	61.2	43.9	36.1	23.1
Northwestern	56.6	69.2	47.3	41.7	----
Illinois (Urbana)	51.7	61.8	44.6	39.2	----
Texas (Austin)	51.6	65.2	43.1	37.4	28.7
Washington (Seattle)	46.0	56.8	40.4	35.9	28.7
Duke	57.9	70.6	48.4	39.8	31.8
Brown	53.4	64.5	43.8	36.9	----
Indiana (Bloomington)	46.6	58.0	41.1	33.8	----
North Car. (Chapel Hill)	47.0	62.7	44.7	36.6	28.9
N.Y.U.	55.4	71.2	49.0	42.0	31.2
Purdue (Lafayette)	47.9	62.4	43.6	36.2	21.3
<u>Ohio State (Columbus)</u>	<u>49.3</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>45.4</u>	<u>37.6</u>	<u>26.7</u>
Virginia	54.1	70.1	47.1	38.0	26.8
Johns Hopkins	51.3	68.5	47.5	37.7	32.9
Michigan State	48.0	57.1	43.5	34.9	26.2
Washington (St. Louis)	50.1	63.5	45.6	36.4	28.7
Penn State (Univ. Park)	45.2	62.0	44.3	36.8	22.4
Carnegie-Mellon	57.2	70.9	49.3	43.5	42.9
Rice	55.4	67.3	45.8	38.4	29.3
Brandeis	49.4	61.9	44.5	36.5	----
Vanderbilt	51.5	67.8	44.7	38.8	35.1
Tulane	47.3	59.2	44.5	36.9	27.2
Kansas	44.0	51.5	39.5	33.1	25.8
Pitt. (Pittsburgh)	46.0	61.2	43.9	36.1	23.1
Rensselaer (N.Y.)	55.3	66.3	48.1	41.2	----
Georgia Tech	49.5	61.3	45.3	41.4	22.5
Rutgers (New Brunswick)	52.2	68.1	48.5	38.2	24.9
Case Western Reserve	47.1	61.9	43.5	36.0	28.1
SUNY (Stony Brook)	53.8	69.4	48.8	38.7	30.5
V.P.I.	49.2	63.2	45.0	37.9	26.2

¹The comparative figures for the University of Akron are:

43.5 54.3 40.9 35.7 30.3

²Academe, March-April 1990, pp.30-74 passim.

DR. JOSEPH M. WALTON

OFF: SENIOR VP & PROVOST -4703

BH 107