

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

4-30-1990

## Faculty Senate Chronicle April 30, 1990

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](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).



---

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of 4/5/90.....	2
Appendix to the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of 4/5/90	
A. Team High Grade Point Averages, 1989 Fall Term.....	27
B. Report of the Library and Learning Resources Committee of University Council on Space Problems of the University Libraries.....	28
C. Report of the General Studies Advisory Council.....	37
D. Recommended Actions of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance.....	40

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



**MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING  
April 5, 1990**

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Senior Vice President and Provost, Dr. Frank Marini, at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 5, 1990 in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-four of the 83 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dean Patricia Carrell, Associate Provost Robert Dubick, Dean William Klingele, Dr. Jacqueline Anglin, Dr. Mary Ellen Atwood, Dr. John Bee, Mr. Dean Carro, Dr. Larry Focht, Dr. Roger Keller, Mr. Arthur Pollock, Dr. Dudley Turner, and Non-Traditional Student Government Representative Betty Rogge. Absent without notice were Dr. Roger Creel, Dr. Nathan Ida, Dr. Paul Lam, Mr. Forrest Smith, Non-Traditional Student Government Representative Kevin Grimes, and Associated Student Government Representatives Edward Hopson and Paula Parker.

Item No. 1 - Remarks of the President. The Chairman introduced President Muse, whose remarks were as follows:

I'll only be able to be with you for a few minutes because I'm supposed to be in another meeting that started at 3:00, but I wanted to take just a minute to give you a brief summary and update on the Provost search process. The search committee has been appointed, elected, and it has met and at its first meeting made two major decisions. The first was to elect Dr. George Knepper, Distinguished Professor of History, as the Chairperson of the committee; and, second, they decided to delay the search until next fall. The advertisements will be initiated in late summer, early fall. The screening of applicants will begin at that time, interviewing in late fall or winter, with the hope that the new Provost can assume that position on or before July 1, 1991. Now that decision was made in order to permit the maximum amount of faculty involvement in the interviewing process, and to expand both the size and to enhance the quality of the applicant pool. If the search process were started now, it would necessitate that interviews - the campus visits and interviews - would take place during the summer sessions or, certainly, would take place after the spring semester had ended. And the committee felt that that wouldn't be the appropriate time to have the campus visits occur, and, second, there was some feeling that the number of applicants and maybe the quality of the applicants might be restricted or diminished by a search that would occur at this time. So, that is the plan that will be pursued there. This will necessitate the selection of an interim Provost for the next academic year, and I have sent a memorandum that you should be receiving within the next few days soliciting nominations and applications for that position. It will be my intent to use the existing search committee to help screen and evaluate candidates for that position, and to recommend to the Board the appointment of someone prior to July 1 of this



year to assume that position for next year. That's the only item that I have to report to you. I would entertain any questions before I depart and let you get to the agenda.

Dr. Don Gerlach reminded the President that at the last meeting of Council he had reported that he had approved certain of Council's actions regarding changes in the Faculty Manual on departmental head review and was still considering others. Had he made any further decisions on those or were they still up in the air?

The President replied that he had not yet reached a decision on those remaining items, but he planned to do so before this academic year was over.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of March 1, 1990, as printed in The University of Akron Chronicle of March 28, 1990. The Chairman asked Dr. Gary Oller, the Secretary, whether there were any corrections. Dr. Oller noted that there were four. The first was at the end of Item No. 1, the Remarks of the President. Dr. William McGucken had asked the President a question and two paragraphs dealing with this had been inadvertently omitted when the final version of the minutes was typed. Copies of the two paragraphs had been passed out at the beginning of this meeting and Dr. Oller then read them.

Dr. William McGucken had a question for the President regarding the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances which Council would be considering later in this meeting. He wondered whether the President had looked at it and was curious to know whether he had any reaction to some of the statements in it which had surprised him (McGucken). One statement was that part-time faculty comprised 31 percent of the full-time faculty equivalence teaching 26 percent of total student hours and 80 percent of General Studies courses. There was also a graph in the report where comparisons were made between The University of Akron and other state institutions. It showed our University with the already-mentioned 31 percent, the next institution - which he suspected was Ohio State - at 22 percent, and the lowest at six percent. Those figures surprised him because, if he had been asked about this, he would have guessed that only five or 10 percent of our faculty were part-time. Did President Muse have any reaction to these figures?

The President replied that he had not seen the report and would be hesitant to react to it. Since he had not studied it, he also was not sure about the accuracy of the figures.

The second correction was on page 17, paragraph two, line four, which read "the Association of University Professors" and should have read "The American Association of University Professors."

The next correction was on page 19, the last full paragraph, line six, where it read, "Mr. Jalbert that it...." What it should have read



was, "Mr. Jalbert said that it should read..."

Finally on page 27 in the section of Curriculum Changes relating to AS-90-1: a course addition to this proposal - 3980:714 Seminar in Policy Analysis and Evaluation - was listed on the top of the next page. That was inadvertently included here and was not being offered as an additional course in this program. It should be crossed out.

These were all the corrections which the Secretary had.

As a point of information, Dr. Dale Jackson wanted to give Council members advance notice of an item of business which would be forwarded to the Executive Committee with the request that it be placed on the May agenda. The current provision in the Faculty Manual which dealt with an additional probationary year for tenure was due to expire in June of this year. Council would be asked at the May meeting to consider retaining this provision. He thought that it would be useful at this time for members to know that this item would be coming up.

Dr. Faith Helmick indicated that on page 21, the fourth paragraph started "Dr. Helmick noted that the office of Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services no longer existed." The next sentence refers to new language describing the new position of Assistant Vice President for Human Services, and she believed that it should read "Vice President for Human Resources" for the paragraph to make sense.

Since there were no additional corrections, Council voted on the minutes as amended, and they were approved.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman had a few remarks relating to items which he had discussed at the last meeting of Council. He had reported last time that the Honors Council had been reviewing the recommendations of the Honors Task Force and considering other issues related to the program in consultation with Professor Holland, Master of the Honors Program. On February 21, the Honors Council had unanimously recommended to him that the position Master of the Honors Program be renamed Director of the Honors Program. He had mentioned that to Council before and had since done some research on how the title was first established. It appeared that the title Master had been included in the original report of the Faculty Committee on Planning a University Honors Program, presented to Council on February 27, 1975 and adopted in April of 1975. Since action of Council had created the position and the name, it seemed appropriate to him that Council should take action on or at least be consulted in the possible renaming of that. This reminded him of a second point on which he had gotten much advice to the effect that the Master should report directly to the Provost. This was agreeable to him. Both of these changes were the kinds of things which he would be most comfortable seeing University Council action to endorse or at least acquiesce in. If Council wanted to take action on these either later or at the May meeting, he thought it would be helpful.

The Chairman also wanted to speak briefly about the General Studies



Advisory Council and the changes in General Studies. As he had reported last time, the courses in Freshman Composition and Oral Communication were going to be transferred to the respective departments of English and Communication. He had wanted to consult with the Acting Dean of University College before formalizing that and before considering other changes which might be desirable. The Acting Dean had been hospitalized until just recently, but they had talked and he believed that there were no problems with transferring those courses. There was a considerable question as to whether the course renumbering would occur with the Fall list or with the Spring list. He preferred that it occur with the Fall list, but it was not clear that this would be possible. There were also other mechanics of budgeting which needed to be worked out, but he thought that these would be no problem. It was his intention that these courses would be transferred effective with the Summer Session. Dean Grant would work with the appropriate coordinators, department chairs, or deans to make sure that whatever budget she had requested or allocated for these purposes would be moved over there, and that communication remained steady between the units so that crises as to how many sections there should be or from whose resources they should come would not occur.

The Chairman also commented on some other sections of the General Studies curriculum - Institutions, Western Cult and Eastern Civ, and Physical Education, all three of which had been considerably clarified recently with statements from given departments as to their position or willingness to accept and/or modify these programs. He did not speak at length on these because Dr. Elaine Nichols, the Chairman of the General Studies Advisory Council, would be making a report to Council later in the meeting.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements. The Chairman wanted to remind Council that the Faculty Representative to the Chancellor would be elected to a two-year term at the May meeting. Only members of Council who were elected faculty members of Council might vote for this representative. Other Council offices would be filled at the September meeting of Council.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Oller reported that the Committee had met on March 15 and had set the agenda for today's University Council meeting. As requested by Dr. Elaine Nichols, time was allotted for her to report to Council on behalf of the General Studies Advisory Council. A substitute motion from Dr. William McGucken regarding one of the recommended actions from the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances was also attached to the agenda. In regard to the other matter, the Committee agreed to change the deadline for receiving requests for University Council Committee assignments from May 4 to May 11. It also approved the format for reports of Council election results within the colleges, by which the validity of those results could be certified by the Executive Committee. Dr. Gerlach was charged to send a memo about this to all college deans.



carrels were the recommendations which the Committee thought might be feasible.

Dean Martin then concluded that number one really referred to the lobby, and then number two to the study carrels. Dr. Kent answered in the affirmative.

Dr. Noble was still not reassured that the culling process was going to be conducted the way the majority of the faculty would like to see it conducted. Some of his best friends were librarians, but they did not always have the same objectives in mind that he had and they viewed materials in a different way than the way he viewed them. He viewed them from the perspective of their value as research materials and was less concerned about the amount of money that it cost to store them, the amount of space they took up, and so on, which were quite legitimate concerns. He thought that a policy which addressed all of these concerns was necessary, and he certainly would hope that there would be a large number of faculty involved in such a process to be sure that we did not cull materials that later on would have turned out to be useful or valuable.

Mr. Billions was concerned that there was no mention in the report about moving music books and scores from Bierce to Guzzetta Hall. The members of the School of Music had been told that this was going to be done.

Dr. Kent said that the Committee did not find out about this until its last meeting, and the report had already been completed. If the Committee had been aware of it, it would have very strongly recommended against the move as being very costly and adding to cost at a time when the Library was under very severe financial stricture because there would have to be some added personnel. The Committee did discuss it briefly, and his understanding was that there had to be some architectural changes in the School of Music's facilities to handle these things and a number of other problems. The consensus of the Committee was that it would perhaps compound some of the problems.

Mr. Billions noted that it did free up space in Bierce.

Dr. Chlebek replied that it really would not, because there would be a required duplication of the collection. She added that she was on the committee that was charged with studying the feasibility of establishing a music library in Guzzetta Hall. Therefore, this was still only at that stage.

Mr. Billions responded that the people in Music had been told that the move would certainly happen.

The Chairman said that he could probably clarify this issue for members of Council. As a result of the accreditation visitation which the School of Music had undergone, as a result of a meeting with the exit committee and, subsequently, a meeting with the Dean, the Director of the School of Music, and the Director of the ULLR, he made a



commitment that over the next few years the University would move to have a music library in the School of Music, and that there would be some duplication of the collection, but that we would move this. This was after some detailed discussion of the costs and the accreditation problem it presented for the School of Music. Now, someone had said that an oral contract was not worth the paper on which it was written. He would probably have to enter something into the memos saying that he had made the commitment. That commitment, as with all other commitments, was subject to reevaluation. He did, nevertheless, make one.

Dr. Gerlach wondered whether, in view of what has been said about the constraints of the Board of Regents on library space, this proposal for the School of Music would be in line with those regulations. Perhaps Council should ask our faculty representative to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents to make some discreet inquiries along those lines.

The Chairman said that this was possible, but he used to work in a Chancellor's office and would not advise it. The general philosophy was not to ask questions unless you knew for sure how they would be answered, but faculty could pursue its own wisdom on that one.

Since there was no further discussion, the Chairman called for a vote on the motion to accept this report and adopt the four recommendations that appeared on the bottom of page one. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

I. Reference Committee - No report.

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

K. Student Affairs Committee - No report.

L. Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances - Mrs. Linda Weiner stated that the report would come up under Unfinished Business.

M. General Studies Advisory Council - Dr. Elaine Nichols, the Chairman, stated that what she was about to report on was the first meeting of the group for this year and, therefore, much of the content of that meeting dealt with organizational matters (Appendix C).

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.  
Dr. June Burton presented the following report:

The FAC met yesterday (April 4) at the Fawcett Center for Tomorrow. Most of the meeting was devoted to the agenda item--consideration of the Draft of 3/14/90 of the Commission on Articulation and Transfer's Executive Summary of the Proposed Policy. The FAC formally voted to withhold endorsement of this draft, before we discussed our specific concerns with Elaine Hairston and Ann Moore.



As drafted, the policy says that students with A.A. or A.S. degrees and completed modules of transfer credit can transfer "Ds" as well as As, Bs, and Cs--provided their GPA is 2.0 or above. The Pass/Fail grade of D also transfers. Furthermore, it says that the sending institution (the 2-year program or school) determines what the transfer module will be--not the accepting institution. In another place it says that students transferring with A.A. or A.S. degrees and/or completed transfer modules will get "preferential treatment" over native students. This could mean that if enrollment were capped, the transfer students with completed modules would have to receive preferential treatment over native students in their third year who do not have their general education modules completed. The Legislature is pushing completion of two-year degrees before students even think about transferring, which may be a good idea in most cases but might be bad in others. (An example of the latter would be a student wishing to major in Japanese.) Elsewhere in the draft, developmental courses may sometimes be applicable to a degree program (see p.17).

A section toward the end (I., p. 19) describes an "Articulation and Transfer Appeals Review Committee appointed by the Presidents, and the Presidents also appoint the Chairperson and establish the rules of procedure." This section says nothing about any teaching faculty having to be appointed. When Hairston said she thought the Presidents naturally would jump to appoint faculty and not administrators, members of the FAC disabused her of this naive notion. If the intent for the Presidents to appoint only administrators is unclear on p. 19, it is clarified by the last line of the body of the draft, which is on p. 20, where it says that "the Advisory Council is encouraged to seek advice of faculty...."

The FAC also told the Chancellor that the Regents need more data about whether the present system really works or not, they simply don't know, but the Legislators think it doesn't. Hairston said that the Legislators, nevertheless, are determined to charge ahead hell bent for leather, so to speak, and so must we.

Besides all of the above, the central objection to the draft is the concept of "transfer modules." The committee suggested that the best way to fix this document would be to discard the three pages incorporating this notion. It only creates double the work for administrators and doesn't cut it, as the Commission believes it would. I can't discuss the notion because it hasn't yet been defined.

The FAC was urged to urge faculty, in turn, to lobby their state representatives to improve the Commission on Articulation and Transfer's document and to tell them not to rush too quickly into this without fuller consideration of the consequences, even if the deadline has to be extended beyond early June.

On another subject, Hairston gave the group additional information



on the Educational Enhancement Program that I detailed to you last time. She is putting it back into the next operational budget.

Near the end of the meeting, the Rep. from Bowling Green said that he and others had a copy of the Akron Report, a product of our Institutional Research organ, and that he thought the Chancellor ought to send it to all of us since it is treated as though it's a secret document. This was agreed upon, so I look forward to receiving it since it would help the Faculty Well Being Committee complete its present charge from University Council. Nobody had volunteered it, to my knowledge. Since I haven't seen it, I don't know what it contains.

Phil Jastram reported on Ohio H.B. 663 and H.B. 780. Number 633 basically, would provide that any employee who knows how to use computers can be compelled by the university to do it, to learn to use new programs, etc. This would not be subject to collective bargaining, according to present form of the bill.

H.B. 780 contains a combination of things pertaining to elementary and secondary education and state scholarships, such as uniform testing. Originally, it would have provided an estimated \$100 million of education tuition and fees for math and science majors only. But all the specifics have now been removed so that it would apply to any major and cost \$300-400 million, which would require a tax increase.

The May meeting will continue discussion of the Articulation document's progress. Council should advise me how to treat the parts with which it disagrees.

Dr. Gerlach stated that in light of Dr. Burton's report Council should respond with some sort of expression of sentiment regarding the articulation document. He was disturbed in regard to the transfer of D's and made a motion that this be opposed. This motion was seconded.

Mr. Dan Buie pointed out that the University was already accepting D's toward General Studies. Dr. Marion Ruebel added that it was not limited to the General Studies program. The University transferred D's, unless the Registrar's Office was notified not to do so within specific programs. D's were automatically figured into the grade point.

Dr. Gerlach noted that a distinction could be made between transferring D's in and giving out our own D's. Dr. Burton emphasized that the idea of the articulation document was that transfer and native students had to be treated exactly the same way. If D's were okay here, then somebody else's D's were just as good. That was what the law was going to say.

The Chairman said that he understood Dr. Gerlach's motion to say that we advised the Chancellor that we did not want to transfer D's. Dr. Burton said that we could do that.



One of the student representatives to Council thought that it should be up to the student to decide whether or not he wanted to transfer a D. It would not look good on his transcript and was worth only one point.

Dr. Burton said that this document did not leave it up to the student. It was a legislative committee which was saying what our curriculum was going to be, what we were going to accept, and so forth. This was going very much against the tradition that faculty controlled curricula and standards.

Dr. Christie understood that transfer credits did not count in the GPA once the student had transferred those hours in - the hours counted toward the degree but did not count in the student's GPA. Therefore, the student could transfer in all D's and then start off with a clean slate in terms of the GPA, counting only the grades which he received here at The University of Akron.

Dr. Ruebel replied that this was not true in all cases. The Colleges of Nursing, Business, and Engineering all transferred grade point. The Chairman noted that Dr. Christie's point was that, if we did transfer D's, the grade point implication of those D's did not show on the subsequent calculation of grade point at Akron.

Dr. Burton said that if this document was passed, the underlying assumption was that the transfers and natives were going to be treated alike. This would create an inequity here which would cause us to lower our standards because we had to then treat our natives like the transferees. The legislative committee thought that at the present time the transferees were being discriminated against and were, therefore, saying that everything had to be equal. If you then transferred in these D's, and they then in a sense disappeared since they did not count in the GPA, you would then be treating your natives differently. You would be discriminating against them because they could not start over as the transferees were doing. This was why this was very complicated and very critical. We needed to take heed of this stuff now, or soon the Legislature would be controlling the things which we did here.

Dean Petersen agreed that the issue was broader than the problem of D transfers. What was embedded in all this was a kind of warping of the fundamental process by which degrees were granted. They were granted by the faculty who designed the curriculum and did the teaching. This articulation document was essentially reversing this in several very fundamental ways.

In response to a question as to whether the transferred D's did or did not figure in the GPA, the Chairman answered that once they were accepted they were not a part of The University of Akron grade point, which was entirely a calculation of the grades which a student received here. Mr. Buie added that many colleges did figure them in for admission purposes in the program.

Dr. Buchthal asked whether a student who transferred in with a 2.0



average and then received straight A's here in his junior and senior years would show a 4.0 GPA at graduation. The response was yes.

Dr. Buchthal also noted that in the summer he taught many students from other universities who told him that they had to get a C or better, because they could not transfer anything less than a C back to their home institution. If Council did pass this motion, which he intended to vote for, he would ask to refer the whole issue to Academic Policies to talk about the issue of transferring D's into this University.

Dean Petersen noted that a student here who had straight A's but who had not completed the module was the one to whom we said good-bye when someone with a much more modest academic record who had completed the module was allowed to transfer in.

Dr. Fleming thought that the problem was that the transferability or non-transferability was being taken out of our hands by the Legislature, which obviously knew best, of course. The Chairman replied that he was beginning to doubt it.

Dr. Burton added that as far as the transferability issue was concerned, a part which concerned her was that as this document was written, it was the sending institution, not the accepting institution, which said what the module was. This meant that the institution from which the transfers would come, not The University of Akron, would determine the module. This would apply to all State of Ohio schools and there was even an attempt to get the private schools to follow this as well as to make a uniform system for the state.

Dr. Ruebel's biggest concern with the document was this: It said that a student with an associate degree would transfer to the receiving institution with junior standing. This meant that a student could transfer from a two-year institution to The University of Akron with a 2.0 and an associate degree and automatically be eligible to go into the College of Business. On the other hand, there might be native students on campus with a 2.2 grade point average who were not qualified to transfer to the College of Business. This document said that The University of Akron would be mandated to accept that transfer student into the College of Business. So, as Dean Petersen said, it had taken this responsibility or authority away from the faculty of the receiving institution.

One of the student representatives said that this seemed to be saying that a transfer student would get preferential treatment over students who were already here.

Dr. Burton commented that the better part of the document, on which she did not report, did separate the issue of accepting the credit and applying the credit toward a particular program. So we had to accept these credits from students with a degree and the 2.0 grade point; but the document did make it clear that individual programs could determine whether they would apply it to their program or not. However, things could get really clouded because at the meeting people were saying that



even developmental programs could be made to apply toward programs elsewhere where those were not accepted at the present time. Also, since course numbering was not uniform around the state, a course which a student took at one institution at a 100 or 200 level might apply to a course at the 300 or 400 level at another institution, depending on the name and the description of the course.

Dr. Robert Holland moved to substitute the current motion on the floor with one which stated that this item be referred to the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee for study and recommendation.

Dr. Fleming stated that when Council had dealt with the current motions, he planned to propose a motion directing our representative to FAC to express to the Chancellor this Council's and this University's strong reservation about the proposed activity and suggest that the Chancellor convey this to the Legislature, asking them to go a bit more slowly until we have had time to consider this and resolve it. He thought that the Legislature had a tendency when it got hold of something to move rather quickly, without regard to what they did not conceive as a very active constituency.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester thought that there were two separate points here. The second one had finally been raised. One was to save the degree program requirements, and we certainly had to maintain that. The other was the business about a D is a D is a D. It seemed to him that what had been said here was that the Regents would not tell a degree-granting program what its degree-granting requirements had to be. The issue of the D was another story. It was discrimination for us to say that we would give our students D's, but we would not accept a D from Ohio State. It didn't make any sense. However, if the College of Business did not want to admit a student and give him credit for a course in which he received a D and which the College thought was important for its degree requirement, it should have the right to do that.

The Chairman wanted to point out that this was not something that the Legislature had hurriedly acted upon. There had been a commission working on this, and there had been a lot of legislative pressure and reflection and debate about this. He did not think that the Legislature would agree that this was something on which it was acting precipitously, but this would not prevent us from urging the Chancellor to tell them that in any case.

Dr. Jackson asked to have both the substitute and original motions restated. The Chairman replied that Dr. Holland's motion was to refer this whole business to APCC. The original motion was for Dr. Burton to inform the FAC and the Chancellor that Council deplored some of the specific things which she had mentioned in her report. That at least was the intent. He asked Dr. Gerlach to supply the exact language.

Dr. Gerlach thought that in view of what we had been told, Dr. Burton was entitled to be informed of our sentiments so that she



could convey them at the next FAC meeting. He was much opposed to the substitute motion, which simply referred the business into a committee where it ought to go in addition to the point of telling Dr. Burton to express our views at the next meeting. The APCC might not have time before the next FAC meeting to take action. He thought that we ought to do both things. When he heard Dr. Holland's motion, he certainly sympathized with the idea that a committee ought to take this up, but not at the expense of preventing Dr. Burton from expressing our utmost concern over this.

Dr. Jackson said that in light of what had just been said, it would probably be helpful if Dr. Holland could move his amendment as a supplement to the one that Dr. Gerlach had just made. Dr. Holland agreed, and withdrew his substitute motion (which had never been seconded anyway).

The Chairman then reiterated that the original motion was that Council express, through Dr. Burton, serious concern in the direction of opposition with the question of the acceptance of D's. Although this narrowed the issue, Dr. Burton understood the broader sentiment brought out here in discussion, that this threatened our own control over our own curriculum, and she would convey this to the FAC when presenting the position of the motion.

Council then voted on the motion and it was approved.

Dr. Holland then moved that the subject be committed to the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee for its study and recommendation. This was seconded.

A discussion followed on what the exact charge should be for the APCC, especially in regard to speed in action. Dr. Burton stated that it would be very useful if the APCC could have some stance by the next meeting of the FAC on May 1. Dr. Ruebel pointed out that the two University of Akron representatives to the committee putting the articulation document together were Dr. John Bee and Dr. James Richardson. Dr. Walton added that they both were members of the APCC. The Chairman then asked the Secretary of Council to inform both of them of Council's position on these issues so that they could do whatever they thought was appropriate as members of APCC and the committee working on the articulation document. (It was later discovered by the Secretary that Mr. David Jamison, not Dr. Bee, was the second University of Akron representative on the articulation committee.)

The Chairman did not want to disparage the sense of urgency, but he did not think that this issue would be resolved as quickly as June or July. However, Council could use the reflections of APCC on this issue at some future date - even next fall.

Dean Claibourne Griffin pointed out that there was already substantial opposition to this whole move in the articulation document in Arts and Sciences, and the Chairman added that the Presidents and Provosts had also taken positions on this as groups.



Dr. Walton asked again about specifically what Council wanted APCC to do in regard to this issue. Was it simply to make a recommendation, or was there some action Council wished the Committee to take?

Dr. Gerlach answered that since Council would not be meeting again before Dr. Burton's next session with the FAC, APCC should act for this body and work with Dr. Burton to help develop further ideas and details, so that when she went to Columbus on the first of May she would be better armed. Council would trust the APCC to act responsibly, and whatever it came up with would be reported to the body later. Then we would either approve of what the Committee has done or censure it.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion to refer the matter to the APCC, and it was passed.

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business - The first item of unfinished business was the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance. The Chairman recognized Mrs. Weiner who stated that she would be working with the recommended actions from the report which all Council members had been sent. (A copy of the full Report to University Council from the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance is available in the Provost's office.) She noted that at the last meeting, Dr. McGucken had asked President Muse to comment on the large percentage of part-time faculty that, according to the report, constituted the faculty of the University. President Muse then questioned the accuracy of this percentage which was 31%. This percentage was based on the data given to the Committee by the University's Office of Academic Personnel Services, so the percentage was as accurate as the data which the Committee received. She wanted to say a few words about the Committee's charge. In addition to making a recommendation for a grievance procedure, it was charged with doing some defining of the rights of part-time faculty. In order to do this, the Committee went to the Faculty Manual and to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Trustees. The Committee's findings were in the body of the report. The Committee also gathered information from administrators at this and other universities and from full and part-time faculty at this University, and these findings were also reported. It was clear from them that complex questions were being dealt with here, and so the Committee decided to refer the first four of its recommendations to other committees of Council.

Mrs. Weiner then turned to the first of these recommendations (Appendix D). It came about because of the wide divergence in departmental hiring policies and the lack of information about reappointment and non-reappointment that the Committee found when it put together the results of its surveys. Some part-time faculty reported never having had to provide letters of recommendation, others were not required to provide transcripts, and so on. She then moved

that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee draft an amendment for the Faculty Manual, 3359-20-037, Guidelines for Initial Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, that will include part-time faculty where appropriate in these guidelines.



All common University requirements for the appointment, reappointment, and non-reappointment of part-time faculty should be included in the Faculty Manual, e.g., the filing of official transcripts before appointment, the maintenance of a personnel file for each lecturer, inclusion in department courses and instructor evaluation procedures.

This was seconded. Since there was no discussion, the Chairman called for a vote and the motion was passed.

Mrs. Weiner then moved on to the second recommendation. She stated that the general tone of the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Trustees was inclusion. It said that part-time faculty might, and should participate in department business, but page 27 of the Faculty Manual said that "Participation and voting by auxiliary faculty is not permitted unless special approval is given by the departmental faculty, department heads, and dean." While the Bylaws and Regulations encouraged inclusion, the Faculty Manual allowed for it, but its tone was exclusion. The Committee thought that this ought to be resolved, and so she moved

that the Reference Committee review the Faculty Manual to ensure that, as regards the inclusion of part-time faculty, it is consistent with the passages taken from the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Manual, cited on pages 11 through 13 of the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

This was seconded. Dr. McGucken then rose in order to move a substitute action for this proposal which had been circulated with the agenda for today's Council Meeting. It read as follows:

I move that Council direct the Executive Committee to appoint an ad hoc committee of five Council members to study those parts of the Regulations of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Manual pertaining to faculty with a view to proposing modifications and clarifications to Council, which shall decide which proposed modifications and clarifications it will request the President of the University to transmit to the Board for its consideration.

This was seconded. Dr. McGucken then stated that what had led to this was his disagreement with the statement on page 11 of the full report, which stated that part-time faculty were, first and foremost, University faculty members. The implication in that statement was that part-time faculty had all the rights and responsibilities of the full-time faculty. Passages were quoted from the Trustee's Regulations to support the claim of that statement. However, he found it curious that in none of these statements of the Board quoted on pages 11-13 of the report did the term "part-time faculty" appear. This suggested to him that the University had changed in a significant way since the cited passages had been written. He suspected that the passages had not been intended to mean what the Committee today interpreted them to mean. The Committee's interpretation seemed to point to situations which he would not now consider desirable, and he gave an illustration. In proposal



number eight of the report it was recommended that "in matters of academic governance and curriculum, all departments, divisions, or colleges shall do everything reasonable" - a tricky word, "reasonable" - reasonable to whom? - "to enable part-time faculty to share in the professional responsibilities of the University faculty as a whole." Now, the English department had a full-time faculty of 30, and there were also some 90 part-time faculty teaching English. Was this group to be combined to make 120? Would it then make decisions on adding or dropping courses in the English department, and make decisions possibly on appointing faculty to tenure-track positions, appointing department heads, and so on? What if this group were to appear in a College meeting along with a comparable group of part-time faculty in Mathematics? Would they have a vote like all the other faculty members? It seemed to him that from these illustrations there was a need to examine more closely where we were going and what we then proposed to do. From this came his motion to create this committee to look at the question and report back to Council.

Dr. Jackson agreed that the matter certainly needed clarification. He had been a member of the Ad Hoc Committee and came from a department which typically made use of very few part-time faculty members. He was really surprised at the number of part-time faculty which the University employed (around 30 percent). This was not unusual, and he noted a recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education which pointed to a figure of something like 40 percent of the undergraduate instruction in the United States being performed by part-time adjuncts and graduate assistants. Even so, he thought that most of us continued to regard part-time faculty as a relatively small part of the University and that this was something which would probably diminish. With a little bit of action by the administration, those numbers could be reduced and the part-time positions could be replaced with full-time ones. Unfortunately, this was not what the national experts were predicting. They suggested that the figures would continue to increase. We did need clarification, but we also needed to recognize that part-time faculty were here to stay and that they did perform a very important role in the institution's educational mission. It was necessary to stop viewing these people as disposable transients and start regarding them as fellow professionals with a similar but different appointment or role in the University.

Dr. Noble wanted to speak in favor of Dr. McGucken's substitute motion and thought that he could shed some light on how the problem had arisen. Originally the various ranks of faculty were professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, and lecturer; and these were, by and large, full-time faculty members. The Board of Trustees Bylaws were written in reference to these particular instructional ranks. Somewhere along the line part-time faculty began to be designated as lecturers, probably by some flash of insight on someone's part that this was a very wise thing to do because it gave them a little bit more prestige and status. Since we did not pay our part-time faculty very much, did not pay them what they were worth, did not pay them according to their preparation and responsibilities, we could at least call them lecturers in addition to part-time faculty.



From this the problem developed because these individuals - part-time faculty members - now were called lecturers and therefore could be associated with the term as used in the Board Bylaws; whereas, in reality, originally there was no intention to have this term apply to them. He agreed with Dr. McGucken that if we fell into the trap of using - or abusing - a term in a fashion in which we had not originally intended it to be used, we were going to create some situations which would make it very difficult in most departments that employed large numbers of part-time faculty.

Dr. Noble was particularly concerned about the question of governance. Were we talking about one person, one vote? Were we talking about a proportional vote based upon the number of hours that a part-time faculty member had taught, which gave them a certain say in matters of governance? This would be a very difficult area to resolve and, before we changed the Faculty Manual to allow part-time faculty the possibility of participating in governance, it was necessary to deliberate very carefully and especially consider the ramifications.

Dr. Noble shared Dr. Jackson's concern about the University's direction regarding staffing. The University had not added additional full-time faculty and seemed to think that one of the ways by which it could solve budgetary problems was by extending the number of part-time faculty. This could be done to a point, but one ultimately reached a point of diminishing returns. The concerns and orientation of the part-time faculty were not the same as the concerns and orientation and responsibilities of full-time faculty. They were two separate groups, and he thought that we had to be very careful to avoid losing that distinction. It would be harder to get full-time faculty if we agreed to a position in which part-time faculty became more like full-time faculty.

Dr. Gerlach wondered why it was thought necessary to appoint a special ad hoc committee to do this chore instead of having the Reference Committee do it - a regular committee of Council.

Dr. McGucken said that he had considered that possibility, but he had discussed it with certain people and had been told that the standing committees of Council were far too busy to undertake yet another task. This was the reason for a special ad hoc committee.

There being no further discussion, the Chairman called for a vote on Dr. McGucken's substitute motion, and it was passed.

Mrs. Weiner then moved on to the third recommendation. She stated that the Committee saw instructional support and also suitable office space as prerequisites for doing a good job of teaching. She therefore moved

that instructional support - typing, photocopying, audiovisual services - be available to all part-time faculty, as well as suitable office space for meeting with students and keeping instructional materials.



Dean Griffin pointed out that he was having trouble providing office space for full-time faculty, so if Council handed him a mandate to do this for the part-time faculty he would not be able to do it. It was a desirable thing, and he would love to be able to do it not only for the part-time faculty but also for the graduate students. He agreed with the objective, but the language of the motion sounded like a mandate, and he did not think that it would be possible.

Dr. Fleming noted that a major problem with the lack of office space was that the part-time faculty members found it difficult to meet with students outside of class because there was no real place for them to do it. For this reason alone, there certainly was merit in the proposal.

Dean Griffin replied that he did not deny the merit.

Dean Petersen wondered whether a similar mandate existed for full-time faculty with regard to suitable office space.

The Chairman responded that he did not think it was written down anywhere. The only comment which he could remember from the Faculty Manual or Board Bylaws was something to the effect that, whenever possible, the University would provide office space to emeriti.

Dr. Robert Holland, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, stated that although the wording seemed to indicate the instant creation of office buildings and so forth, this was not the intent at all. The intention of recommendation 3(a) was to include part-time faculty in the allotment of the space that was available and to include part-time faculty in the services that were currently being used for the purposes of teaching by full-time faculty. This had to be seen in conjunction with recommendation 3(b), which stated that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee should conduct a study of office space availability for part-time faculty and that it should make recommendations to be incorporated into the University's space allocation and construction plans. The problem at the moment was that the part-time faculty did not even make it onto the bottom of the pecking order as far as space allotment was concerned.

Dr. Gerlach noted that the language of this motion was strictly advisory. It merely recommended this action. It could not be considered an order or a mandate, and it only suggested that Council would like to go on record as saying that this was the best direction that we can take at the moment.

Dean Petersen thought that Council ought to be awfully careful, because there were implications here which might very well put part-time faculty out of work. If this became a requirement, then fewer part-time faculty might be hired in order to be able to implement the charge of finding office space, supplies, etc.



Mr. James Inman suggested amending the language to:

University Council recommends that, so far as feasible, instructional support - typing, photocopying, audio-visual services - should be...

This was seconded and briefly discussed. Council then voted its approval of the amended language.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the amended motion, and it was passed.

Mrs. Weiner then went on to recommendation 3(b) and moved that:

University Council recommends that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee conduct a study of office space availability for part-time faculty and that it make recommendations to be incorporated into the University's space allocation and construction plans.

Dr. Gerlach pointed out that the motion did not state to whom the recommendations which would come out of the study were to be made. He thought that it should be stipulated that they be made to Council.

Dr. Fleming said that Council very rarely reviewed the plans, architectural drawings, and things of that sort with the Campus Facilities Planning Committee directly. Asking the Committee to report back to Council might be sending it in the wrong direction. Perhaps it would be better to let the CFPC make those recommendations to the architects and planners.

The Chairman thought that the anxiety expressed was that you might very well come up with something that would make the architects and planners happy, but not this body.

Dr. Fleming replied that this had happened many times before.

Dean Petersen wondered whether such a study had been done for full-time faculty in recent years, and the Chairman replied that it had not been.

Dr. Gerlach's amended language for the motion then read as follows:

University Council recommends that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee conduct a study of office space availability for part-time faculty and that it make recommendations to be incorporated into the University's space allocation and construction plans to University Council.

This was seconded, and Council then voted its approval of the amended language.



April 30, 1990

Page 26

Dean Hunt then made a motion that the word "part-time" be deleted from 3(b) and replaced with "all." The motion was seconded.

Item No. 8 - Adjournment. It was noted that a quorum no longer existed, and Council then adjourned at 5:20 p.m.



**APPENDIX A****TEAM HIGH GRADE POINT AVERAGES  
1989 FALL TERM**

Women's Cross Country (10)	3.383
Volleyball (17)	3.043
Women's Track (25)	3.036
Women's Tennis (10)	2.744
Men's Tennis (9)	2.741
Men's Track (35)	2.723
Soccer (26)	2.690
Men's Cross Country (13)	2.685
Baseball (46)	2.667
Golf (12)	2.600
Softball (17)	2.489
Women's Basketball (15)	2.326
Men's Basketball (12)	2.234
Riflery (8)	2.208
Football (94)	1.990

**OVERALL STUDENT-ATHLETE GPA**

Fall 1989 (332)	2.513
Fall 1989 Women's GPA (84)	2.772
Fall 1989 Men's GPA (248)	2.416



## **APPENDIX B**

### **LIBRARY SPACE -- AN URGENT NEED: A REPORT OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL'S LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

#### **SUMMARY**

The ULLR Committee for University Council concludes that severe shortages of space exist in the Science and Technology Library and Bierce Library, and these will continue to exist for the foreseeable future. Several specific findings contribute to this conclusion.

- 1) Space shortages quantified in the UA Planning Department's report [1] for Fall 1987 document that roughly 260,000 sq. ft. of additional library space is necessary. This compares to the currently available space of 140,000 sq. ft. A comparison with other state universities in Ohio shows that The University of Akron ranks 10 out of 11 in terms of library space.
- 2) No new library space has been added to The University of Akron for nearly 15 years. Meanwhile the student population has more than doubled and faculty numbers have doubled.
- 3) No plan or plans currently exist to add library space on campus, and even if such plans were to materialize it would take several years for such space to be made available.
- 4) The Ohio Board of Regents moratorium on additional on-campus library space precludes new construction [2]. The only exception to this is the construction of additional library space for student study needs. The number of seats currently available for readers in both libraries totals 1,030. According to the "Standards for College Libraries" established by the Association of College and Research Libraries, for a library on a campus where less than 50 percent of the FTE enrollment resides on campus there should be one library seat for each five FTE students. Using these standards, the University of Akron falls 2,600 seats short.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1) Various minor adjustments in the use of library space will make approximately 3,000 sq. ft. of additional space available. These are detailed in the body of our report.
- 2) Reduce the amount of study space in the library to provide adequate space for shelving of frequently used material.
- 3) Convert other campus space to provide additional study space for students.



4) The extreme shortage of library space on this campus makes its situation unique. **THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON MUST TAKE AGGRESSIVE AND PERSISTENT ACTION TO EDUCATE THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS TO THE CRITICAL LIBRARY SPACE PROBLEMS OUR CAMPUS SUFFERS. ADDITIONAL ON-CAMPUS LIBRARY SPACE MUST BE FOUND OR NEW FACILITIES MUST BE BUILT.**

### **ISSUES**

The ULLR Committee has been examining the problems of space availability and utilization for Bierce Library and the Science and Technology Library during the 1988-89 and 1989-90 academic years. It has drawn on documentation provided by the Planning Department, documentation on plans for future library space, comments of senior library administrators and faculty, comments of university faculty, and independent observations by members of the committee.

All sources of data that the ULLR Committee consulted and that its independent observations provided, clearly demonstrated that Bierce Library and the Science and Technology Library suffer from extreme shortages of space for 1) reading and study; 2) stacks; and 3) study service. These space shortages are quantified in the Planning Department's Space Generation Data Report for Fall of 1987 for both libraries. The magnitude of these shortages is shocking, -227,665 sq. ft. for Bierce Library and -29,113 sq. ft. for the Science and Technology Library. Considering that student enrollment had increased nearly 6 percent since these data were generated and that the library's collection has grown, current calculations would demonstrate even larger shortages. A complete copy of the Planning Department's report is appended to this document.

### **POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS**

The ULLR Committee has investigated possible actions which could help resolve the library's space problem and solicited information from university officials concerning future plans to alleviate the library's space problem.

The ULLR Committee has evaluated a large number of suggestions to improve existing space utilization in the two library facilities. These are:

- 1) Relocating the Curriculum Center in a facility outside Bierce Library.
- 2) Relocating the Educational Research and Development Center in a facility outside Bierce Library.
- 3) Reducing stack spacing by 12" to 18", especially in the 1st floor of Bierce Library.
- 4) Increasing the number of shelves in the stack frames from the current 7 to 8.



- 5) Reorganization of space in the front lobby of Bierce Library.
- 6) Reducing the number of study carrels in Bierce Library.

#### **Comments**

In response to these specific suggestions, the ULLR Committee evaluated each one. Our suggestions are as follows:

- 1) The Curriculum Center should not be relocated. It forms an integral part of the library collection and is included in the electronic catalog. Relocation would result in reduced availability of materials.
- 2) The Educational Research and Development Center should remain in Bierce Library. However, the larger of its two rooms should be converted to a seminar/small lecture room with no office desks (which currently occupy this space) and the room should be shared with the Library for instructional use.
- 3) Aisle spacing on first floor should remain as it is to facilitate the higher patron-use these stacks experience.
- 4) Adding an additional shelf to existing stacks is not recommended. This would necessitate the purchase of many footstools so patrons could reach these higher shelves, would clutter the aisles, and could present liability problems for the University.
- 5) Reorganization of the lobby space would be feasible and is recommended. Card catalogs could be placed closer together and the information desk could be moved 10 to 15 feet closer to the door. It appears that the Library is currently planning some changes of this nature.
- 6) Reducing the number of study carrels is recommended especially in Bierce Library. Study space for students can be made available in other locations on campus, i.e. unused classrooms, hallways, and the student center, while frequently used books and journals must be kept within the confines of the library proper.

None of the proposed actions will help alleviate the space problem in the Science and Technology Library. The implementation of actions #2, #5, and possibly #6 would provide perhaps 4,000 to 5,000 sq. ft. of additional space for Bierce Library. But this represents only about 1 percent of the space the library needs according to the space standards established by the Ohio Board of Regents.

#### **PLANS, PROPOSALS, AND RUMORS**

The ULLR Committee has received information from a variety of sources on a range of plans, proposals, and rumors about how the problem of library



space is being addressed at the University. These are as follows:

1) A high density storage facility for Cleveland State, Youngstown State, Kent State, University of Akron, and NEOUCOM has been requested by the Ohio Board of Regents for Rootstown. This proposal is currently in the legislature with a request for \$2.5 million to construct the facility. This facility would be used for the storage of infrequently used materials and the intent is that these materials could be retrieved for patrons from the facility in one to two working days. Such a facility might be complete in three years.

2) At The University of Akron, there are suggestions that the library may be allocated between 20,000 and 30,000 sq. ft. of space for storage in the basement of the Polsky's building. If this is the case it is unlikely that this space would be available until the mid-1990's. Such space would also be dedicated to infrequently utilized materials requiring a one to two day period for patrons to retrieve them.

3) Some individuals report that a possible expansion of the Science and Technology Library has been "penciled in" for the second biennium when space becomes available in Auburn Science Center. It is suggested that perhaps 8,000 sq. ft. of additional space would be made available.

#### Comments

Additional storage space for infrequently utilized materials in Rootstown and at Polsky's will alleviate a small portion of the library's space problem. It will not solve it. These actions will not provide the space necessary for frequently utilized materials. As a library with few in depth research collections, the vast majority of the library's collection falls into the category of frequently utilized material. Consequently, it is likely that the limited space which is made available will be rapidly occupied by the library's expanding collection of serials and books. This will leave little or no additional space for study carrels or study service (UA Planning Department suggests that 90,000 sq. ft. of space are necessary in Bierce Library alone for these purposes). Any doubts about a space problem in Bierce Library can be eliminated by a visit to the Current Periodical Room -- a total of about 8 seating spaces are available there -- an absurd state of affairs for a university with a total student population of 30,000.

The addition of 8,000 sq. ft. to the Science and Technology Library would be welcome. It would relieve some of the acute crowding experienced in that facility, but only some. The UA Planning Department suggests that facility needs almost 29,000 sq. ft. of additional space. Any patron or visitor to that facility can readily discern a space problem even without such quantification.

The ULLR Committee is fully aware of the Ohio Board of Regents moratorium on building additional on-campus library storage facilities. It is the Committee's understanding that this moratorium does not apply



to reading and study space and study service space, categories in which the University of Akron has space deficits of nearly 120,000 sq. ft.

No new library space has been added at the University of Akron for nearly fifteen years. Meanwhile the student population has more than doubled, faculty numbers have almost doubled, and research productivity and obtaining research grants have been given greater emphasis by the university administration.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee feels that **THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON MUST TAKE AGGRESSIVE AND PERSISTENT ACTION TO EDUCATE THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS TO THE CRITICAL LIBRARY SPACE PROBLEMS OUR CAMPUS SUFFERS.** In this regard our situation is unique among other state universities. High density storage facilities and OLIS -- Scholar's Workstations may solve library space problems at CSU, YSU, or KSU, but they will not resolve the University of Akron's needs.

At the University of Akron, **ADDITIONAL ON-CAMPUS LIBRARY SPACE MUST BE FOUND OR NEW FACILITIES MUST BE BUILT.**

Without suitable library space, the faculty's ability to provide quality teaching and do quality research is severely handicapped. Equally important, the ability of undergraduates and graduate students to meet their basic educational and research needs is frustrated.

### **NOTES**

1. Department of Planning, University of Akron. Space Generation Data -- Main Library and Science and Technology Library, 1987. by Phil Bartlett, March 1988.
2. Ohio Board of Regents.
3. Standards for College Libraries. The Association of College and Research Libraries. 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611.



Table 1

## LIBRARY SPACE (NET ASSIGNABLE) AT STATE UNIVERSITIES IN OHIO

State University	Square Feet	Sq. Ft. /FTE	Rank
Ohio State University	432,000	9.12	10
University of Cincinnati	265,000	10.19	8
Ohio University	247,000	13.75	3
Miami University	223,000	14.23	1
University of Toledo	220,000	12.77	4
Kent State University	209,000	11.48	7
Bowling Green State University	194,000	11.84	6
Cleveland State University	170,000	14.09	2
Wright State University	144,000	12.22	5
UNIVERSITY OF AKRON	139,000	7.41	11
Youngstown State University	109,000	10.05	9

Source: University Planning Departments -- February 1990



## THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

## University Library &amp; Learning Resources - Main Library only (4201,4202,4230)

SPACE GENERATION DATA  
FALL 1987

	Head Count	F.T.E.	No. of Rooms	Assigned NASF	Gen. NASF	Differences (Assigned-Gen.)
I. <u>Reading &amp; Study Space</u>	--	--	127	<u>56,134</u>	<u>97,392</u> <sup>(1)</sup>	<u>(-) 41,258</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				56,134	97,392	(-) 41,258
II. <u>Stack Space</u>	--	--	48	<u>45,023</u>	<u>196,646</u> <sup>(2)</sup>	<u>(-)151,623</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				45,023	196,646	(-)151,623
III. <u>Study Service</u>	--	--	18	11,833	58,808 <sup>(3)</sup>	(-) 46,975
a. Library Adm.	1 <sup>(4)</sup>	N/A	1	227	(incl.)	227
b. Library Staff	56 <sup>(5)</sup>	N/A	25	3,930	(incl.)	3,930
c. Conference Rooms	--	--	1	234	(incl.)	234
d. Exhibit/Museum	--	--	2	<u>408</u>	<u>(incl.)</u>	<u>408</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				16,632	58,808	(-) 42,176
IV. <u>Miscellaneous Space</u>						
a. Lounge	--	--	1	1,292	0	1,292
b. Temp. leased space	--	--	2	<u>6,100</u> <sup>(6)</sup>	<u>(incl.)</u>	<u>6,100</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				<u>7,392</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7,392</u>
<b>TOTAL LIBRARY SPACE</b>				<u>125,181</u> <sup>(7)</sup>	<u>352,846</u>	<u>(-)227,665</u>

(1) 18,954 F.T.E. students (-) 453 F.T.E. law students (-) 3,503 F.T.E. students (representing 75% of 4,671 F.T.E. Science & Engineering students assumed to be using the Sci./Tech. library) = 15,016 F.T.E. students (main library) and 1,480 F.T.E. faculty (-) 37 F.T.E. Law faculty (-) 227 F.T.E. faculty (representing 75% of 303 F.T.E. Sci. & Eng. faculty assumed to be using the Sci./Tech. library) = 1,216 F.T.E. faculty (main library): 15,016 + 1,216 = 16,232 F.T.E. students and faculty x 6 (factor) = 97,392 NASF, reading & study space.



- (2)  $1,759,216$  bound volumes in main library  $\times .09$  NASF/Volume =  $158,329$  NASF;  
+  $1,266,520$  microforms  $\div 3$  (volume conversion factor) =  $422,173$  Vols.  $\times .09$   
NASF/Volume =  $37,996$  NASF; +  $28,500$  non-print and other materials  $\div 8$  (volume  
conversion factor) =  $3,563 \times .09$  NASF/Volume =  $321$  NASF. Total generated stack  
space =  $158,329 + 37,996 + 321 = 196,646$  NASF.
- (3)  $97,392$  NASF (reading and study space) +  $196,646$  NASF (stack space) =  $294,038$  NASF  $\times$   
 $20\% = 58,808$  NASF (service space)
- (4) From Department List of Employees: Hodowanec (faculty).
- (5) From Department List of Employees: Director's Office - Durbin (faculty) + Heath,  
Kraszewski, Sommerville, Underman (staff); + Access Svcs. - Berringer, Clark,  
Faulhaber, Fitzgerald, Gammon, Kopanic, Livingston, O'Connor, Voorhees (faculty) +  
Armstrong, Becker, J. Bell, T. Bell, Bly, Brown, Charlton, Farruggia, Ficken, Fox,  
Kluth, Lorenz, Loving, Nicholson, Pavkov, Sales, Stockwell, Thomas, Tuma, Witte  
(staff); + Info. Svcs. - Brink, Chlaybeck, Clinefelter, Guss, Hibbs, Joliat,  
Peterson, Robinson (faculty) + Clark, Evans, Forsch, Klinger, Lenart, Linberger,  
Mackey, Raben, Shiel, Wilson (staff); + Archival Svcs. - Miller (faculty) + Mann,  
May (staff) + Cherok (G.A.) =  $56$ .
- (6) Leased Archives space includes  $3,600$  NASF at the Summit Co. library and  $2,500$  NASF  
at Cotter Merchandise storage.
- (7) Total library space =  $119,081$  NASF (Bierce Library) +  $6,100$  (leased, as in #6) =  
 $125,181$  NASF. **NOTE:** Sci./Tech. library in ASC ( $13,697$  NASF) is excluded from this  
generation report. See separate generation data for Sci./Tech. library.

Prepared by:  
Phil Bartlett  
March, 1988



THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON  
U.L.L.R. (SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY LIBRARY ONLY) (4201)

SPACE GENERATION DATA  
FALL 1987

	Head Count	F.T.E.	No. of Rooms	Assigned NASF	Gen. NASF	Differences (Assigned-Gen.)
I. <u>Reading &amp; Study Space</u>	--	--	(Incl. below)	(Incl. below)	<u>22,380</u> <sup>(1)</sup>	<u>(-) 22,380</u>
SUBTOTAL					22,380	(-) 22,380
II. <u>Stack Space</u>	--	--	4	<u>13,421</u>	<u>13,295</u> <sup>(2)</sup>	<u>126</u>
SUBTOTAL				13,421	13,295	126
III. <u>Study Service</u>	--	--	--	--	7,135 <sup>(3)</sup>	(-) 7,135
a. Library Staff	6 <sup>(4)</sup>	N/A	2	<u>276</u>	<u>(incl.)</u>	<u>276</u>
SUBTOTAL				276	7,135	(-) 6,859
TOTAL SCI./TECH. LIBRARY SPACE				<u>13,697</u>	<u>42,810</u>	<u>(-) 29,113</u>

- (1) 3,730 F.T.E. Science & Engineering students and faculty (assuming 75% study time in Sci./Tech. library and 25% study time in main library) x 6 (factor) = 22,380 NASF.
- (2) 140,436 bound volumes in Sci./Tech. library x .09 NASF/Vol. = 12,639 NASF + 21,871 microforms ÷ 3 (volume conversion factor) = 7,290 volumes x .09 NASF/Volume = 656 NASF. Total generated stack space = 12,639 + 656 = 13,295 NASF.
- (3) 22,380 NASF (reading) + 13,295 NASF (stack) = 35,675 NASF x 20% = 7,135 NASF.
- (4) From Department list of Employees: Info. Svcs., Bolek, Pearson (faculty); Detweiler, Jones (staff); Rubber Division, Murray (faculty) = 6.

Prepared by:  
Phil Bartlett  
March, 1988



### APPENDIX C

#### REPORT OF THE GENERAL STUDIES ADVISORY COUNCIL MARCH 15, 1990

MEMBERS PRESENT: E. Nichols, Chair; D. Louscher, E. Birdsall, R. Taylor, C.B. Drennon, D. Hunn  
Members absent with notice: J. Minc, J. Switzer  
Members absent: D. Hansen

HANDOUTS distributed to members: Membership List, Communications from Dr. Bryant, GSAC Responsibilities, working drafts of administrative structure, eight areas of general studies program and goals and objectives synthesized from 86, 87, and 89 reports, and Comparison of the 1986 Task Force and 1989 GSAC report.

An organizational meeting of the GSAC was held March 15, 1990. David Louscher was welcomed as the new member to the GSAC since the February meeting with Dr. Marini. The representative from the Division of Natural Sciences still needs to be appointed to replace Roger Creel who is on leave this semester and whose term expires at the end of this academic year. The Provost's office is proceeding with filling this vacancy.

Chair reviewed the material mailed out to members prior to the meeting. The Chair also reported a meeting with Dr. Marini held March 2. The Provost stressed the need for regular communication from the GSAC to the University and the designation of departments to begin implementing the recommendations of the 1986 Task Force Report and the 1987 APCC recommendations. The GSAC has requested to be placed on the University Council agenda for April for the purpose of reporting meeting information.

The Chair reviewed 2 pieces of correspondence received from Dr. Bryant, Head of the Department of History requesting that the Department of History be given the responsibility for Western Cultural Traditions and Eastern Civilization and explaining the efforts currently underway in both courses for revision. The Chair also discussed a telephone conversation held with Dr. Adolph, Physical Education, concerning the discussions being held in Physical Education as to the inclusion of health and wellness components in all the physical education activities, the review of the physical education activities with the intent to streamline the offerings, and the development of a credit course for all students to emphasize wellness.

The Council discussed the handouts prepared by the Chair and distributed during the meeting: the responsibilities of the GSAC as approved in 1987 by University Council, a beginning attempt at a design for the administrative structure to be developed as departments are assigned responsibility for courses, and the initial drafts of areas to be included in the general studies program from which courses will be



designed. A synthesis of the 1986 Task Force Report, the 1987 APCC recommendations and the 1989 GSAC report served as the bases for the initial drafts of content areas. As a result of the discussion, each Council member assumed responsibility to further develop the eight areas from the prior documents.

For the next meeting, each member will have prepared recommendations for one or two program areas that speak to the following: the department to be responsible for the area, if the area is to be operationalized by one course or options, suggested content to be part of the course or options, and any title changes to the area.

Committee assignments are as follows:

Eric Birdsall -	College Writing Communications
David Louscher -	Western Culture Institutions
C.B. Drennon -	Natural Sciences
Richard Taylor -	Mathematics
Diane Hunn -	Eastern Civilizations
Elaine Nichols -	Goals and Objectives of the General Studies Program Physical Education

As part of the discussion of the Council responsibilities, members felt that meetings with department heads should be scheduled beginning this semester and continue into the Fall Semester. The Council will draft the components of the program areas, mail out the drafts to the appropriate department heads, and schedule meetings with the department heads to discuss the draft documents.

With changes already implemented in the Math department as of September, 1989, the Council will invite Dr. Beyer, Department Head, to the April 16 meeting.

Following discussion of the recommendations from the 1986, 1987, and 1989 groups that have studied the General Studies program, the Council is proposing to the Provost's office the following as a beginning structure to the revision of the program:

- (1) The 39 credits allocated for the present General Studies program should be maintained.
- (2) Courses developed within the areas are to be 3 credits.
- (3) The current practice of program areas being represented by



April 30, 1990

Page 39

one course or options should be maintained. A limit on the number of options for any one program area is yet to be decided.

- (4) The decision to include the 1 credit course University Orientation in the General Studies Program will be deferred until the pilot program is evaluated. Dr. Tom Vukovich will be invited to a future GSAC meeting to discuss the pilot project.

Meeting dates for the remainder of this semester were established for April 16 and April 30. GSAC will establish regular monthly meetings for the academic year 1990-1991.

Minutes submitted by Elaine Nichols, Chair.

3/28/90



## APPENDIX D

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

The findings of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance bring us to the following recommended actions:

1. University Council requests that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee draft an amendment to the Faculty Manual 3359-20-37 Guidelines for Initial Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, that will include part-time faculty where appropriate in these guidelines. All common University requirements for the appointment, reappointment, and non-reappointment of part-time faculty should be included in the Faculty Manual, e.g., the filing of official transcripts before appointment, the maintenance of a personnel file for each lecturer, inclusion in department course and instructor evaluation procedures.

2. University Council requests that the Reference Committee review the Faculty Manual to ensure that, as regards the inclusion of part-time faculty, it is consistent with the passages taken from the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Manual, cited on pp. 11-13 of the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

3. (a) University Council recommends that instructional support (typing, photocopying, audio-visual services) be available to all part-time faculty as well as suitable office space for meeting with students and keeping instructional materials.

(b) University Council recommends that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee conduct a study of office space availability for part-time faculty and that it make recommendations to be incorporated into the University's space allocation and construction plans.

4. University Council requests that the Salary Equity Committee be reconvened (or reappointed) to review part-time faculty compensation (both salary and benefits) and to make recommendations to Council.

Our Committee recommends that the Salary Equity Committee be guided by a comparison of this university's pay scale with that of other State universities and by the principle of equal pay for equal work.

5. Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws of the University Council.

3359-10-09 Functions of the Permanent Committees.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

2. New section (c)

For each grievance case submitted by a part-time faculty member three members of the part-time grievance



pool shall be selected to be members the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee for the duration of that case. These members will only participate in F.R.R.C. business involving the grievance case in question. These members will be selected by lot by the Chair of the F.R.R.C. but part-time faculty members from the same department as the grievant shall not be eligible to serve.

A Part-Time Faculty Grievance Pool shall be established by each college every three years. The pool will consist of part-time faculty members who have taught at least four semesters at The University of Akron and who have been nominated by the part-time faculty members of that College and who have subsequently confirmed to the College Dean their willingness to serve.

(Old "c" becomes "d".)

6. University Council recommends that the Faculty Manual be the manual of part-time faculty also, except in those passages where such interpretation would not be consistent with University rules and regulations.

7. University Council recommends that in all departments or programs employing part-time faculty, personnel guidelines be amended so that the primary responsibility for assessing the qualifications of part-time applicants be assumed by the faculties of those departments or programs by a process to be developed by each department.

8. University Council recommends that in matters of academic governance and curriculum, all departments, divisions, or colleges shall do everything reasonable to enable part-time faculty to share the professional responsibilities of the University faculty as a whole.

9. University Council recommends that the teaching of part-time faculty be evaluated using, so far as is practicable, the same procedures as those used to evaluate the teaching of full-time faculty.



DR. JOSEPH M. WALTON

OFF: SENIOR VP & PROVOST

-4703

BH 107

RECEIVED

MAY 22 1990

GR. VP & PROVOST