

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

10-3-1991

Faculty Senate Chronicle October 3, 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.



1991-92, No. 2

29 pages

October 14, 1991

Executive Committee Meeting Dates

The Executive Committee of University Council has scheduled its meetings for the fall semester for October 17 and November 14, 1991 and January 17, 1992. Any committee wanting to have new items of business formally placed on the Council agenda for consideration must notify the Executive Committee by those meeting dates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Corrections and Additions	2
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of October 3, 1991	3
Appendix to the Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of October 3, 1991	
A. Report of Library User Survey, Spring 1991	12
B. Proposed Amendment to <i>Faculty Manual</i> , Section 3359-20-03(A)(4)	27

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

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS

The following corrections and additions should be made to University information printed on pages 3 through 20 of *The University of Akron Chronicle* of September 20, 1991:

Corrections:

New Members of the University Faculty, pp. 7-8

Dr. Andrew S. Rancer, Associate Professor of Communication

Dr. John K. Summerville, Visiting Assistant Professor of Mathematical Sciences

Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee, pp. 15-16

Dr. Joan E. Baumgardner, College of Nursing (1989-92)

University Library and Learning Resources Committee, pp. 17-18

Change of committee name to University Libraries Committee

Reference Committee, p. 18

Dr. Faith Helmick, Vice President for Human Resources and Information Services, has been elected as Chair of the Committee for 1991-92.

Additions:

New Members of the University Faculty, pp. 7-8

Dr. John Markulis, Visiting Instructor of Mathematical Sciences

Dr. David A. McConnell, Assistant Professor of Geology

University Council Membership, pp. 11-13

Mr. Terry Haas, Associated Student Government (1991-92)

Ms. Alicia Tabet, Associated Student Government (1991-93)

Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee, pp. 15-16

Ms. Elizabeth A. Reilly, School of Law (1991-92)

(completing the unexpired term of Mr. William Jordan)

Athletics Committee, p. 16

Mr. Mark DeVinney, Student Representative (1990-93)

Mr. Todd Schmitz, Student Representative (1990-93)

Research (Faculty Projects) Committee, p. 19

Dr. Martha Leyden, Emeritus Faculty Representative to University Council (1991-94)

Dean E. Jane Martin, College of Nursing (1991-94)

Student Affairs Committee, pp. 19-20

Mr. Samir Yebaile, Student Representative (1990-93)

University Libraries Committee, pp. 17-18

Ms. Amy Florin, Student Representative (1990-93)

Dr. Avraam Isayev, College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering (1989-92)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL
October 3, 1991

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Senior Vice President and Provost Mark S. Auburn, at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 3, 1991, in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-six of the 84 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Vice-President Kathy Stafford, Dean Claibourne Griffin, Dean William Klingele, Dean Russell Petersen, Dr. Jacqueline Anglin, Dr. Martha Collins, Dr. Patricia Edwards, Dr. C. Frank Griffin, Ms. Carol Olson, Mr. Paul Richert, Dr. Bruce Simmons and Mr. Samir Yeballe. Those absent without notice were Dr. Diane Ahnberg, Dr. Elizabeth Beach, Dr. June Burton, and Dr. Avraam Isayev. As of October 3, the names of two members from Non-Traditional Student Government were yet to be announced.

present at meeting
Item No. 1 - Remarks of the President. The Chairman introduced President William Muse whose remarks were as follows:

First I want to report to you on several committee appointments that I either have made or am in the process of making. As you requested, I have appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Allocation. I met with that committee on Monday, and the Committee elected Diana Chlebek from the Library as its Chairperson. I've asked the Committee to submit its report to me on or before the 31st of December.

Secondly, I've appointed a task force to look at the mission and the organization of CEPSCO—Continuing Education, Public Service and Outreach—and have asked Dr. Marion Ruebel to chair that committee.

Thirdly, I will shortly be appointing a task force that will look at the issue of assessment—assessment of student achievement and institutional effectiveness, a set of issues about which we have been hearing a lot and about which we will hear a lot more in the future. We'll be expected to report on our progress in documenting the effectiveness of the institution in achieving its stated goals as to student achievement as a part of our next North Central accreditation visit that will take place in the late 1990's, I believe 1997-98. But we need to begin early to design a system, a model for assessing those outcomes, so that we will have adequate data to respond to that question in our next review. Dean Bill Klingele from the College of Education and Associate Provost and Dean Robert Dubick from Student Services will serve as the co-chairs of that task force.

Another matter I want to discuss with you is the selection process for awarding the title of Distinguished Professor. Two years ago this body adopted and the Board of Trustees approved at my recommendation a change in our *Faculty Manual* to clarify and establish a process for selecting Distinguished Professors. At that time this was a designation which had previously been bestowed on a very small number of our colleagues—three, I believe, to be exact; and there wasn't a clear basis established in the *Faculty Manual* as to how one was selected for that title.

Last year was the first year of operation under the revised *Faculty Manual* guidelines. Several people were nominated, and two persons were granted the title of Distinguished Professor by the Board of Trustees this spring. After the process was completed, several faculty members contacted me to express concerns about the process. These concerns were largely concerned with whether the process that we had followed had given due weight to the expertise of the

faculty within the colleges making the nominations, whether the standards or criteria used by all colleges were consistent, and whether all persons nominated were adequately considered. The concerns were serious enough in my view that I wanted to get faculty advice on their merits.

Accordingly, this summer I asked the faculty members who had constituted the initial Distinguished Professor Review Committee last year to convene and to reconsider the entire process of nomination and review. That committee has just completed its assignment and has presented to me a recommendation that we amend the *Faculty Manual* to modify the process. As a member of Council I've agreed to present their recommendations to you. These recommendations will be distributed to you as a proposed amendment to the *Faculty Manual*.

These recommendations have my full support for three reasons. First, they place responsibility for developing criteria for review within the colleges. Second, they provide for selection of a University-wide Distinguished Professor Review Committee from among only those faculty members who have already attained that rank. Third, they provide that all recommendations made by the Distinguished Professor Review Committee will come to me along with the Provost's recommendation, whether it be positive or negative. I think that this revised procedure would clarify that this is a faculty-driven process, and it would result in the fairest possible assessment of our colleagues' credentials.

I'm also persuaded by another recommendation of the Committee, and that is that we try as a Council to act on this matter as rapidly as possible in order that we might have nominations during this school year go forward under these new procedures. Therefore I'll ask that this amendment be presented under New Business, and that it be considered at our November meeting. Hopefully each Council member can review it and be ready to act on it at that time.

Lastly, I want to comment on a couple of articles that have appeared in the press since the last Board of Trustees meeting on September 25. One of the articles discussed a special appropriation to selected universities, including The University of Akron, of funds that had previously been set aside for use in the Ohio Instructional Grant Program. This appropriation resulted after Governor Voinovich had vetoed legislation that was described as the "hold harmless provision," that would have ensured that all State universities receive at least a subsidy this year equal to that received last year after the mid-year cut.

Akron's share of this pool that was created from the OIG program was cited as being \$1.16 million. Well, first of all, we have not received that money and, second, we're not clear exactly how much of that we will receive. The appropriation is based upon the Ohio Board of Regents funding formula and will depend upon both our final fall semester enrollment and upon the fall semester enrollments at other State universities. It's possible, and it would appear likely, that we'll receive an amount less than the \$1.1 million. Whatever money we realize from this additional appropriation, I have pledged to add that to the \$865,000 that was set aside by the Trustees in June to be used for faculty salary increases once we have a better picture of what our revenues are going to be this year.

Let me also remind you that, contrary to some impressions that may have been left by the article, our projected 1991-92 base subsidy is still \$2.3 million less than our reduced 1990-91 appropriation. Even with the additional subsidy, whatever that amount might be, we will still be considerably behind where we were about 15 months ago.

The other article bore the title "UA Showing Good Budget Management for '90-91," with a subtitle, or sub-headline, "More Than \$13 Million To Go In Reserve Accounts." I don't have any

quarrel with the main headline, because I think we in fact have shown good budget management to have survived the mid-year cuts and still have some monies that we can bring forward into this year's budget. But the article leaves the impression that we have \$13 million in reserves, and that impression is false.

The money discussed by the Trustees is called Transfers Out, a term used in fund accounting to describe money that is taken from one budget and put in another. In fact, during 1990-91 we did transfer out of the General Fund \$13.6 million. Approximately \$4 million of that has already been spent. It was transferred out for various purposes, the largest purpose being a transfer to a reserve for the Early Retirement Incentive Program, \$2.7 million that was due to the State Teachers Retirement Fund.

The money that has not been spent, which is \$9.9 million, is transferred in—transferred out of last year's budget into this year's budget. But of that amount, approximately \$8 million is already allocated. \$800,000 is in encumbrances, which is a way to describe something for which a purchase order has already been issued but the money has not yet been paid, but clearly it has been obligated. \$7.2 million is in what we call departmental carryovers, monies that are remaining at the end of the year in various accounts across the University. \$4 million of that is in various academic department budgets that are carried forward. Of the remaining amount—about \$1.9 million—there is about \$1 million that we would describe as true contingency funds, monies that we are bringing into this year's budget that were not spent and are available to be used in this year's budget and which, in some cases, may have already been allocated as a part of the commitments that have been made for various activities this year. But, in any case, whatever monies are unobligated are one-time funds; they're not a source of continuing funding, and therefore are not monies that could be used for permanent salary increases. In many cases the monies that remain at the department level do represent prudent management by the department head and by the faculty involved. To try to reallocate them across the campus would obviously send some negative messages to persons who have done a good job of managing their funds.

Now, the University does carry some permanent reserves. These permanent reserves amount to about \$2 million. \$1 million of that is designed to cover emergencies; it's called a Reserve for Changing Enrollment, the idea being that if we had a drastic drop in enrollment we'd have some monies to draw on to meet obligations that we could not avoid. Another \$1 million is set aside to cover insurance claims which are not insured. We have about a \$1 million deductible on our insurance policy—try that on your automobile—and would need monies to draw on if we in fact had claims against the University. Well, those reserves are very small indeed for an institution operating on a \$200 million budget; quick mathematics would tell you that's about one percent. Dr. Auburn tells me that in Indiana it was a requirement that each campus carry a permanent reserve of approximately eight percent of its annual budget.

Well, this a very complex matter that I hope I haven't confused in your mind even more today; but I wanted you to not be left with the impression that there are \$13 million in University reserves that are unallocated and ready to be spent. I will be sending to all the faculty and staff, hopefully by tomorrow, a memorandum on this subject in an attempt to try to clear up any confusion that may have existed.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of September 5, 1991, as Printed in *The University of Akron Chronicle* of September 20, 1991. Dr. Gary H. Oller, Secretary, reported that all of the corrections were to the first part of the *Chronicle*, and they were as follows:

On page 7, Dr. Andrew Rancer is listed under New Members of the University Faculty as Assistant Professor of Communication. The correct title is Associate Professor of Communication.

Also, Dr. James Teeter, Acting Head of the Department of Geology, pointed out that Dr. David A. McConnell, Assistant Professor of Geology, was omitted from the list of New Members of the University Faculty. This was due to the fact that at the time the *Chronicle* went to Printing Services the listing that was used was based on new faculty hired prior to 8/22/91.

On page 16, in the list of APCC members for 1989-92, Joan Baumgardner's title is incorrectly listed as "Mrs." The correct title is Dr.

On page 18, Dr. Isayev's first name is misspelled as Avraasm. The correct spelling should be Avraam—there's no "s" in his first name.

On page 19, Dean Jane Martin was inadvertently omitted from the list of Research (Faculty Project) Committee members for the term 1991-94.

And, finally, there were a few people—Linda McPherson from the Office of the Vice President for Human Resources and Information Services, and also David Brink of the University Libraries—who pointed out that the name of the Library and Learning Resources Committee of University Council should now be listed as the University Libraries Committee. The name of that branch of the University has been changed from University Library and Learning Resources to University Libraries, including all references in the most recently filed version of the *Faculty Manual*.

Dr. David Buchthal added corrections to page 7: The correct title for John Summerville was Dr., not Mr. Also, Dr. John Markulis was another one who, like the Geology professor, had been hired late, and he had been appointed as a Visiting Instructor of Mathematical Sciences at the recent Board of Trustees meeting. He, too, should be added to the list of New Members of the University Faculty.

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

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman stated that with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, he was appointing Mr. David Jamison as Parliamentarian for the academic year 1991-92. After Dr. Don R. Gerlach had caught his fumbles last month, he had thought of asking him to serve in this capacity. When he was informed that Dr. Gerlach would have to give up his elected seat to do this, he suspected that he would not be interested.

The Chairman made announcements in regard to two reports which would be made later in the meeting. First, the Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance had met and begun to put together a description of its charge. He did not want to say anything more about it now, but he hoped that this information would relieve the confusion about that committee. Second, in his report from the Executive Committee, Dr. Oller would be noting that the Chairman had asked the Committee to consider relocating the site of University Council meetings. While this room was large enough and the acoustics were not bad, the seating arrangement was not conducive to discussion. Often members must have felt like they were talking to the back of other members' heads. Since these meetings were for all of us to share information with one another and to debate vital issues of University policy, we could benefit from being

able to see one another's faces. The Executive Committee would keep Council informed with regard to progress in finding a better room.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements. The Chairman announced that the Executive Committee had scheduled its meetings for the fall semester for October 17, November 14, and January 17. If any committee had new business it wanted to introduce and have formally placed on the Council agenda for consideration, the Executive Committee had to be notified by those meeting dates. These dates would be published in the October *Chronicle*, but the next meeting on October 17 was just two weeks away.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on September 19, with all members in attendance. It first made additional appointments to Council committees, but decided not to add members to APCC. Next it set its meeting schedule for the rest of the semester, as just reported by the Chairman. It also discussed the possibility of a room change for Council meetings. Finally, it set the agenda for today's meeting of University Council.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - No report.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Associate Provost Joseph Walton, the Chairman, stated that there was no report, but the Committee was scheduled to meet on October 8.

D. Athletics Committee - No report.

D. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Dr. Harvey Sterns reported that the Committee had met that morning, and he had been elected again as Chairman.

E. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Mr. David Brink reported that the Committee had met on September 17, and he had been elected Chairman for the coming year.

F. Faculty Well-Being Committee - No report.

G. University Libraries Committee - Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair, presented a summary of the Final Report of the Library Survey of the Faculty, Spring 1991 (for this report, see Appendix A) and for reference purposes handed out a sheet with copies of Tables 1 and 2 from the report. She stated that last spring the Committee had surveyed the faculty for their assessment of the Library and its services. The results showed faculty dissatisfaction with the Library and their wish for improvement in its quality. Seventy-six percent of the respondents thought that the Library should be a higher priority in the present budget, and 86 percent thought there should be a high budget priority on improving the quality of the Library in the future.

The Faculty from disciplines using the Science and Technology Library were essentially unanimous in stating that there was a severe study space problem in that library. This was one of the strongest messages in the report that one could find by college and discipline (90 percent of the respondents in Engineering and over 75 percent in Natural Sciences).

Dissatisfaction with holdings of specific types of materials varied by discipline or college. Over 40 percent of respondents in the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and Education considered that there was a lack of books for teaching, and a similar percentage lacked journals for teaching in Education and the Social Sciences. More than two-thirds of the respondents in the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and

Education were concerned with lack of books for research. Lack of journals for research was a problem for more than 50% of respondents in Engineering, Natural Sciences, and Humanities.

Interlibrary Loan could offset lack of Library holdings but (a) over 50 percent of the faculty in most colleges had to use it for teaching; (b) a significant percentage of users (50 percent in Engineering and 33 percent in Natural Sciences and Polymer Science/Polymer Engineering) had problems with timeliness; and (c) 33 percent of respondents in the Social Sciences could not obtain materials through Interlibrary Loan (probably because they were reference materials that could not be sent through ILL).

A large majority (over 80 percent) of the faculty considered the services provided by Library professionals were of high standard.

Finally, a majority of the respondents (52 percent) did not have office access to computer hardware which was needed to access computerized services of the Library. This percentage was as high as 70 percent in Education and 80 percent in Nursing.

These points represented a summary of the results contained in the report. The Committee had some comments to present on the survey. It considered these results indicated widespread concern with the status of the Library and a willingness to accept the tradeoffs a commitment to improvement would involve. The present percentage of the University budget going to the Library (3.8 percent average over the '80's) was considered insufficient in comparison with sister institutions spending over 5 percent, and the Association of American College Libraries recommendation of 6 percent. The results supported the Committee's earlier findings of the low performance (11th or 12th) of UA Library among State universities.

In light of this, the Committee viewed with concern that The University of Akron had not received funds from Columbus for an addition to the S&T Library, and that there had been a cut in funding for materials and materials access in this year's budget of the University of effectively 15 percent after allowing for inflation—4.5 percent in actual nominal terms, but, given the inflation rate in library materials, which ran in varying degrees to where the sum of it was 15 to 20 percent, but certainly 10 percent, the Committee figured that it would come to effectively 15 percent after allowing for inflation.

Finally, the Committee recognized that some problems might be solved by access to technology, but there was as yet no integrated plan for that technology, and technology was not cheap.

After concluding her summary, Dr. Erickson asked for questions, and stated that she would be presenting recommendations coming from this report under New Business later in the meeting.

The Chairman noted that he had met with the Committee, and he understood that it had shared this report and recommendations with the Dean of the University Libraries Elect Del Williams. Dean-Elect Williams would be on campus next week and would be talking with the Committee.

H. Reference Committee - Mrs. Kathleen Davis reported that the Committee had met on September 25 and had elected Dr. Faith Helmick as the Chair.

I. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - Dr. Daniel Sheffer, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on September 16 at the request of Dean Claibourne Griffin, who was the Interim Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. At that time, it made revisions to the guidelines for the faculty grant and research procedures and review process. Those changes had been made and had been mailed to the faculty in time for the October 25 deadline for the fall competition. In addition, the Committee had elected him as Chairman.

The Committee met a second time on September 23 at the request of the Provost to discuss search procedures and the scope of the search for a new Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Dr. Auburn informed the Committee that he planned a similar meeting with the Graduate Council and then would proceed with the formation of a search committee.

The Committee met a second time on September 23 at the request of the Provost to discuss search procedures and the scope of the search for a new Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Dr. Auburn informed the Committee that he planned a similar meeting with the Graduate Council and then would proceed with the formation of a search committee.

J. Student Affairs Committee - Mrs. Sandra Emerick reported that the next meeting of the Committee would be on October 18 at nine o'clock. Dr. Robert Dubick was serving as the Chairman.

K. General Studies Advisory Council - Dr. Eric Birdsall, the Chairman, stated that there was no report.

L. Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance - In the absence of Dr. Rita Saslaw, who had been elected Chair, the Chairman reported that the Committee had begun the process of developing a charge to describe what it thought was its work. That was not yet complete, and he believed that the Committee would be meeting again in another week to work on it and to study the nature of its own membership.

Dr. William McGucken wanted to comment on this. Since he was the member who had asked questions about this committee at the last Council meeting and because people seemed to be confused, he had gone back to the minutes of Council for November of last year where the whole issue had started. At that time, a motion had been made to form a committee, and then there was an active search for members. People were reluctant to volunteer, and the Acting Provost kept referring to this committee at meetings, perhaps in shorthand, as a committee on University governance. However, if one went back to the November 29, 1990 issue of the *Chronicle*, page 25, it said:

Mr. Terry Haas then moved that the Chairman form an ad hoc committee to study the issue of greater student involvement in University governance as well as the possibility of a different governing body which would include both students and faculty. This was seconded.

This was then passed. Reading that, it seemed to him that there were two issues that the Committee was empowered to address: one, to study the issue of greater student involvement in University governance and, two, the possibility of a different governing body which would include both students and faculty.

The Chairman replied that it was precisely because of the lack of information in the minutes of University Council that the Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance had chosen as its first task to try to define what that task was. He invited Dr. McGucken to share his information with the Committee. It was his understanding that the next task of that group would be to bring their sense of the task back to Council and ask whether they met its expectations.

Dr. McGucken said that from the minutes it was clear that the Committee had been formed to study two matters.

Dr. Gerlach added that if the Committee developed a different charge it had better have a good rationale for persuading Council to adopt it. As Dr. McGucken had stated, the charge was clear enough as it now stood in the minutes. He did not know that Council wanted to open a can of worms and to allow its governance to be examined in every direction.

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

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business. There was none.

Item No. 8 - New Business. On behalf of the University Libraries Committee, Dr. Erickson wanted now to present the recommendations that came as a result of the survey which she had discussed earlier. She wanted these to be placed on the agenda of the next Council meeting on November 3. By that time, members would have had an opportunity to read the entire report. These recommendations (with preamble) were as follows:

The Committee considers that, given the position of The University of Akron Library among State university libraries and given the dissatisfaction of its faculty users, the University should be committed to the goal of significant improvement of the Library. We therefore recommend the following:

1. That the University immediately increase space for the Science and Technology Library. Every effort should be made to obtain the addition recommended by the Library Space Committee and Campus Facilities Planning Committee. The University should also work for the long-term increase in space at Bierce Library.
2. That in the short run (i.e., from the next budget) the Library should receive funds to at least maintain the level of purchases of materials and access to materials (i.e., maintain spending in real terms).
3. That a long-term plan for the development of the Library be prepared by the new Dean of University Libraries, with the commitment of the University to not less than a 5 percent share of the budget and the achieving of at least upper-third status among State university libraries.
4. That there be a study under the Dean of University Libraries to assess the extent to which it is feasible for electronic information services to satisfy the information needs of Library users (and at what cost).

After some discussion and confusion regarding proper procedure, Council passed two motions which postponed, first, approval of the University Libraries Committee's report (Appendix A) and, second, consideration of the recommendations coming from that report (as noted above) until the November 3 meeting, at which time they would be taken up as the first items of Unfinished Business.

As a second item of New Business, Dr. Faith Helmick presented the recommendations to change the *Faculty Manual* section on selection of Distinguished Professors, which President Muse had discussed earlier. These were handed out to members along with a rationale (see Appendix B). She moved that these be approved, and this was seconded. She then moved that consideration of them be postponed until the next meeting in November, and this also was seconded.

The Chairman then asked the Parliamentarian whether there was a need to discuss these items today, if Council wished to act on them in November. The Parliamentarian replied that since these were amendments to the *Faculty Manual*, not to *Council Bylaws*, Council was not required to debate the issue today in order to resolve it entirely in November.

In discussing the motion to postpone, Dr. Gerlach wanted to propose a slight amendment, which would make clear that this would be taken up as the second item of Unfinished Business, since item one had already been delegated to the University Libraries Committee report.

Dr. John Bee thought that Dr. Gerlach's clarifying amendment was fine, but it would have been automatic based on the order in which the items had been introduced.

The Chairman then repeated that Council would first take up the matters presented to it by the University Libraries Committee at the next meeting under Unfinished Business, and, if it approved the current motion, would take up second the proposed amendments to the *Faculty Manual* regarding the selection of Distinguished Professors. He then called for a vote, and the motion to postpone was approved.

Dr. Gerlach had another item which he wanted to raise. Since the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Allocation had originated in this body, or by this body's action, and with due regard to the President's own comment that he expected a report from them by the end of the year, he wondered whether it would not be appropriate to have this sort of ad hoc committee added to the list of committee reports. In this way, Council would hear how the Committee was progressing in November and early December. If this was agreeable to Council, would the Chairman so order it.

The Chairman replied that he would not, although he would be happy to take that request to the President. It was his understanding that while this committee was a recommendation of Council, it was a creation of the President. Hence, it worked as an advisory committee to the President and not to Council. If he erred in this interpretation, it was not the interpretation of the presiding officer but that of the Provost, in which case he would be happy to be instructed otherwise. He certainly thought that this was something in which the President would concur with him on being of sufficient interest to Council that the Executive Committee should certainly request a report, if the President and that committee were willing to come before this body.

The Chairman asked Dr. Gerlach whether the understanding on this was clear, and was there a desire to move some new business to direct him to tell the President.

Item No. 9 - Adjournment. Since there was no further new business, the Chairman called for a motion to adjourn. There was a motion to adjourn, which was seconded. Council then voted its approval, and the meeting ended at approximately 4:00 p.m.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF LIBRARY USER SURVEY, SPRING 1991

RESULTS

1. Last Spring the LLR surveyed the faculty for their assessment of the Library and its services. The results showed faculty dissatisfaction with the library and their wish for improvement in its quality. Seventy-six percent of respondents considered the Library should be a higher priority in the present budget and 86 percent that there should be a high budget priority on improving the quality of the Library in the future.
2. Faculty from colleges and disciplines using the Science and Technology Library (S&T) were essentially unanimous in stating there was a severe study space problem in that library.
3. Dissatisfaction with holdings of specific types of materials varied by discipline or college. Over 40 percent of respondents in Humanities, the Social Sciences and Education considered there was a lack of books for teaching, and a similar percentage lacked journals for teaching in Education and the Social Sciences. More than two-thirds of respondents in Humanities, Social Sciences and Education were concerned with lack of books for research. Lack of journals for research was a problem for over 50 percent of respondents in Engineering, Natural Sciences and Humanities.
4. Interlibrary Loan (ILL) can offset lack of library holdings but (a) over 50 percent of faculty in most colleges had to use it for teaching; (b) a significant percentage of users (50 percent in Engineering and 33 percent in Natural Science and Polymer Science) had problems with timeliness; and (c) 33 percent of respondents in Social Sciences could not obtain materials through ILL.
5. A large majority (over 80 percent) of faculty considered the services provided by library professionals were of high standard.
6. A majority of respondents (52 percent) did not have office access to computer hardware needed to access computerized services of the Library. This percentage was as high as 70 percent in Education and 80 percent in Nursing.

COMMENTS ON SURVEY

1. The Committee considers these results indicate widespread concern with the status of the Library and a willingness to accept the tradeoffs a commitment to improvement would involve. The present percentage of the University budget going to the Library (3.8 percent average) is considered insufficient, in comparison with sister institutions spending over 5 percent. The results support our earlier findings of the low performance (11th or 12th) of the UA Library among state universities.
2. In light of the above, the Committee views with concern that UA has not received funds from Columbus for an addition to the S&T Library and that there has been a cut in funding for materials and materials access of effectively 15 percent after allowing for inflation.
3. The Committee recognizes that some problems may be solved by technology, but that there is yet no integrated plan and technology is not cheap.

October 14, 1991

Page 13

RECOMMENDATIONS

*These are formal
pass a resolution
made.*

The Committee considers that, given the position of The University of Akron Library among state university libraries and given the dissatisfaction of its faculty users, the University should be committed to the goal of significant improvement of the Library. We therefore recommend the following:

1. That the University immediately increase space for the Science and Technology Library. Every effort should be made to obtain the addition recommendation by the Library Space Committee and Campus Facilities Planning Committee. The University should also work for the long-term increase in space at Bierce Library.
2. That in the short-run (i.e., from the next budget) the Library should receive funds to at least maintain the level of purchases of materials and access to materials (i.e., maintain spending in real terms).
3. That a long-term plan for the development of the Library be prepared by the new Dean of University Libraries, with the commitment of the University to not less than a 5 percent share of the budget and the achieving of at least upper-third status among state university libraries.
4. That there be a study under the Dean of University Libraries to assess the extent to which it is feasible for electronic information services to satisfy the information needs of library users (and at what cost).

FINAL REPORT OF LIBRARY SURVEY OF FACULTY, SPRING 1991

1. INTRODUCTION

The LLR Committee surveyed the faculty last spring for their assessment of the Library and its services. We wanted to know how well the Library met faculty needs and their evaluation of its priority for resources. An initial report of the overall results of the survey was given at the May Council meeting (see Appendix 1 to this report for questionnaire and summary responses). Over the summer the Committee looked at breakdowns of the data and reviewed the written comments.

The aggregate results of the survey showed that faculty consider that resources for the Library are inadequate. Seventy-six percent of survey respondents felt that the Library should have a higher priority in present budgets, and 86 percent felt that there should be a high budget priority on improvement of the Library over the next 10+ years. Specific areas of concern differed among faculty, but insufficient availability of books and/or journals (up to 56 percent of total respondents, dependent on the question) and space in the Science and Technology Library (up to 46 percent) were important even in the aggregate figures.

On the positive side, over 80 percent of faculty felt that Library personnel were helpful and effective.

2. MAJOR RESULTS BY COLLEGES OR DISCIPLINES

Faculty have a wide variety of library needs, and the materials available could differ by college or discipline, so the Committee looked at various cross-tabulations. There were some differences in the responses of those teaching only undergraduates and those teaching undergraduate and graduate students, but the major variations in the results were across colleges and disciplines. A summarized version of these results are shown in Table 1. Percentages are based on those agreeing or agreeing strongly with statements.

2.1 Books and Journals

Dissatisfaction with the book collection for teaching and for research was highest in Humanities, Social Sciences and Education, with over two-thirds of respondents expressing concern over the research collection and over 40 percent with even the teaching collection. Those colleges which were least dissatisfied (less than one-third expressing concern) were Nursing and Business Administration.

Journals were a problem for teaching, especially for Social Sciences (48 percent) and Education (38 percent); and for research for a majority of respondents (50 percent or above) in Natural Sciences, Humanities, and Engineering. Nursing, Fine and Applied Arts, and the Community and Technical College were least concerned (less than 30 percent dissatisfied) about journals for research. Engineering and Natural Sciences were most satisfied with journals for teaching purposes.

2.2 Interlibrary Loan

Interlibrary Loan is being used to augment collections for teaching. Nearly 50 percent or more of respondents in most colleges used it for this purpose, even though the Library has a policy of adding materials required for teaching purposes. ILL is least used for teaching by Business Administration. Humanities use the service most for research (45 percent), Business Administration, Library and Polymer Science (less than 20 percent) the least.

TABLE 1

**LIBRARY SURVEY RESPONSES BY COLLEGE AND TEACHING TYPE
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO AGREED OR STRONGLY AGREED WITH THE STATEMENTS BELOW**

	<u>PRIORITIES</u>			<u>BOOKS AND JOURNALS</u>				<u>INTERLIBRARY LOAN</u>				<u>SPACE</u>		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
ALL COLLEGES (457)*	7	76	86	31	56	28	40	28	35	23	8	46	35	34
UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING ONLY	11	63	82	24	44	18	21	29	38	15	5	38	24	27
OTHER FACULTY **	5	83	89	34	63	33	50	29	33	27	10	52	42	38
A & S—Humanities (73)	8	89	94	42	67	30	52	33	29	14	5	32	38	42
A & S—Nat. Sci. (46)	2	85	87	20	65	15	67	35	22	39	6	76	28	39
A & S—Soc. Sci. (42)	2	86	93	45	79	48	48	24	36	26	33	45	52	36
Business Admin. (33)	6	58	67	15	33	21	45	48	58	15	9	21	24	12
Community & Technical (44)	14	50	75	23	45	23	20	20	30	14	5	39	16	20
Education (47)	13	74	85	53	68	38	36	23	36	26	11	25	45	36
Engineering (30)	0	83	83	23	53	13	50	37	33	53	10	93	33	50
Fine & Applied Arts (62)	3	74	90	34	55	37	26	26	34	13	3	26	35	19
Library (14)	7	100	93	7	50	14	21	14	43	21	7	100	71	29
Nursing (26)	4	81	96	19	27	23	27	27	46	23	0	88	31	65
Poly.Sci./Poly.Engrn. (12)	33	66	75	8	42	25	42	25	50	33	8	83	25	33

* () = sample size

** Graduate teaching only, both undergraduate and graduate, or no teaching (research only)

- 1: The Library should only try to budget for additional materials for instruction, not for research as well.
- 2: The Library should have a higher priority in current University budgets.
- 3: There should be a high budget priority on improving the quality of the Library over the long term (10 to 20 years).
- 4: The book collection in my field is NOT large enough to meet all my teaching needs.
- 5: I can NOT find all of the books I need for my research in The University of Akron Library.
- 6: The Library does NOT have journals which I want to assign for my classes.
- 7: I can NOT get the Library to add any journal I need for my research.
- 8: I do NOT need to use Interlibrary Loan to obtain materials for my classes.
- 9: I do NOT need to use Interlibrary Loan to obtain most of my research literature.
- 10: Interlibrary Loan does NOT arrive rapidly enough to meet my research needs.
- 11: Materials I want for research or teaching can NOT be obtained by Interlibrary Loan.
- 12: There is NOT enough study space in the Science and Technology Library.
- 13: There is NOT enough study space in Bierce Library.
- 14: I do NOT spend the time I should in the Library because there is not enough space to sit and browse.

Use of ILL can be a reasonable substitute for library holdings—at least for research, as long as the material is available and timely. However, over 50 percent of Engineering respondents were concerned that material did not arrive rapidly enough, and over one-third of respondents in Natural Sciences and Polymer Science. These are all significant research areas at UA. Also, 33 percent of respondents in Social Sciences could not obtain materials through ILL (we assume because they were not available for loan).

2.3 Space

Faculty from colleges and disciplines using the Science and Technology Library were almost unanimous in considering there was an extreme space problem in the Library (Natural Sciences, 76 percent; Engineering, 93 percent; Nursing, 88 percent; Library, 100 percent; and Polymer Science, 83 percent. "Sci/Tech is so crowded that it appears threatening to students" was a typical comment.

Concern about space in Bierce Library was also voiced by over 40 percent of respondents in Education, Social Sciences, and the Library.

2.4 Priorities

Variation in the support of higher priorities for the Library in the budget is around a high mean. However, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Nursing and the Library had over 80 percent of respondents wanting higher priority in present budgets; and C&T, Business Administration, and Polymer Science had less than two-thirds. For the long-term budget, over 90 percent of Humanities, Nursing, Library, Social Sciences, and Fine and Applied Arts wanted high budget priority.

3. SEARCH MATERIALS

The questions concerning search materials relate to some of the new technology available to search more effectively for references, using the University's collection and materials elsewhere. CD-Rom's augment or substitute for paid on-line bibliographical searches. The Library's computerized catalogue is available via modem from faculty computers.

Use of CD-ROM's has resulted in both satisfied and dissatisfied faculty, with more complaints about discs than equipment. There are also 25-30 percent of non-users. Librarians note lines for machines. Education (more than 45 percent), Fine and Applied Arts (more than 42 percent), and Social Sciences (more than 40 percent) have most problems among users or potential users.

A majority of faculty (52 percent) lack computer hardware to access the Library's catalogue. The Committee notes that this may indicate a significant problem for the future. The Ohio Board of Regents is developing a computer network (OhioLink) to allow more inter-campus use of the State's library resources. Their plan is based on availability of hardware in faculty offices (information from Len Simutis, Executive Director of OhioLink). At the moment even the best colleges (Business Administration and Engineering) have 42 percent of respondents without hardware, while Education has 70 percent without access and Nursing 80 percent.

4. SPECIALIZED COLLECTIONS

A large percentage of respondents (40 to 50 percent) either did not use or did not know about AV materials, government documents, or computerized data bases. This may reflect their specialized clientele, or perhaps problems with coordination and systematic ordering. AV materials and data bases

often are the responsibility of individual faculty and departments. A look at college breakdown suggests that where AV collections were inadequate, loans provided adequately for many faculty. However, Education and Social Sciences still had problems (over 30 percent). Social Sciences had the highest complaints concerning government documents (38 percent). (See Table 2.)

5. REVIEW OF WRITTEN COMMENTS

Another measure of the concerns of the faculty with the Library is the comment section of the questionnaire. It represents those faculty concerned enough to add statements of their own. Appendix 2 of this report provides a summary analysis of these comments. Separated out by topic, there were 498 comments reviewed. The three topics again occurring most frequently were (a) lack of journals, (b) lack of space (especially in S&T)—107 comments each, and (c) lack of books—81 comments. Inadequate funding was commented on directly 48 times.

As well as underscoring frustrations with journals, books, space, and priorities, a series of specific problems were mentioned: overworked and understaffed Library personnel, problems with shelving time, insufficient search and copying equipment, noise and smells, and insufficient Library hours.

Perhaps the best representation of the feelings of the faculty expressed in these survey results comes from the following example comments:

"I must refrain from sending undergrads to use the Library because severe limitations in holdings and access cause frustration. This leads to their discounting libraries as legitimate sources of information."

"the general pattern of administrative cuts in funding. Many books, so cut, are not bought, resulting in continued loss of relevant literature. When cuts are added to cuts, the U of A ends with a below average operation. For instance the problems cited by Phi Beta Kappa, which prevented the grant of a local chapter have not been resolved."

"using the Library is as frustrating as find a parking place—"

6. COMMENTS BY COMMITTEE

1. These results show that there is widespread concern among faculty on the priority of the Library, the lack of journals and books, and space for study in the S&T Library. Last year (*Chronicle*, May and August 1990) the Committee presented reports comparing the UA Library with other state universities in Ohio on a number of library performance criteria, on an FTE basis. UA ranked 10th or 11th out of 11 state universities in almost all available measures. The Committee considered this a matter of great concern. Clearly the faculty, using the Library on a day-to-day basis, share that concern. They consider the services which are able to be provided by the Library do not meet their needs adequately. They feel strongly enough to recommend higher spending priorities, with the tradeoffs that represents.

2. In light of faculty concern over the Library budget, the Committee notes that spending on the Library represented (on average from 1981-89) just 3.8 percent of the University budget. (See Appendix 3 of this report.) This is in comparison to University of Toledo (5 percent) and Kent State (5.9 percent), and the Association of College and Research Libraries recommendation of 6 percent.

TABLE 2

PERCENT DISSATISFIED	SEARCH MATERIALS			SPECIALIZED COLLECTIONS			
	S13	S14	S15	S20	S21	S22	S23
ALL COLLEGES n=457 44% response	34	31	52	26	15	15	12
1. Arts & Sciences—Humanities n= 73 15.97% of total	33	32	49	22	16	11	4
2. Arts & Sciences—Nat. Sci. n=46 10.07% of total	30	33	46	22	17	12	17
3. Community & Technical n=44 9.63% of total	20	27	57	30	7	5	9
4. Engineering n=30 6.56% of total	20	23	43	10	3	27	7
5. Nursing n=26 5.69% of total	34	31	81	19	12	19	5
6. Library n=14 3.06% of total	64	29	22	29	0	7	21
7. Arts & Sciences—Soc. Sci. n=42 9.19% of total	43	40	60	26	31	38	19
8. Business Administration n=33 7.22% of total	18	9	42	15	9	21	21
9. Education n=47 10.28% of total	57	47	70	35	30	11	17
10. Fine & Applied Arts n=62 13.57% of total	42	44	47	37	16	10	13
11. Poly.Sci./Poly. Engrn. n=12 2.63% of total	8	8	25	8	0	0	0

Percents above indicate strong agreement or agreement with the statements below:

- S13: There are not enough CD-ROM terminals for everyone to use without waiting long periods.
 S14: The library does not own enough CD-ROMs in my subject area.
 S15: I cannot access the computerized library catalog from my office because I do not have the hardware.
- S20: The Library has an inadequate collection of Audio Visual (AV) materials in my area.
 S21: The AV materials I need have been difficult for AV Services to obtain elsewhere.
 S22: I cannot get government documents (domestic and/or foreign) quickly enough for my research or teaching needs.
 S23: The Library does not have all the available computerized data bases (e.g., COMPUSTAT, CRISP, Social Science Survey Data) that I need for teaching or research.

3. The Committee also notes that this year spending by the Library for materials and access to materials has been cut significantly. About \$2.9 million was requested and only \$1.9 million received, which represents at least a 15 percent reduction from mid-July last year. In nominal terms, the announced reduction was 4.5 percent, but with inflation in books and serials being near 10 percent for U.S. sources and 20 percent or more for overseas journals, real purchasing power is reduced much more. This means that not only will the position of the Library not improve, it will likely be further eroded. Even in difficult budget times, the Committee views this situation with alarm.

4. The space situation in the present S&T Library represents a crisis problem for this commuter campus. This is the opinion of the faculty who use S&T and underlines the data the Committee presented last year showing The University of Akron a distant last in sq.ft./FTE. It is not a problem that can be solved with long-term storage facilities—students need study space and shelves for frequently used materials. To quote our April 1990 report, "No new Library space has been added to The University of Akron for nearly 15 years. Meanwhile, the faculty has doubled and the students more than doubled in numbers." The Committee notes that Columbus has not funded the requested addition to the Library this year.

5. The Committee is aware that the methods of providing library services are changing. Increasingly, materials may be provided by ILL, or via computer through access to networks like Internet. CD-ROM's may also be replaced by computer access to search data bases. Some consider that state-level planning with OhioLink will solve our problems. However, the Committee notes that faculty do not have access to PC's that are necessary for that plan; that equipment will cost money; that issues of fair sharing remain unanswered; that OhioLink is still in its initial phase. This leads us to believe that quality results will not come without greater resources. The Committee plans to look at issues relating to OhioLink this year, but they are also concerned that no overall plan for technical options exists.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee wishes to thank the Interim Provost, Dr. Marion Ruebel, and his office for their assistance with the survey and its distribution; Dean Petersen for the use of a graduate assistant in analysis; and past members of the Committee for their work on the survey, especially Dr. Richard Lutz for his work on the comments.

APPENDIX 1**Library User Questionnaire**

Please respond by circling the number which best describes your response to each statement:

1 = strongly agree 2 = agree 3 = maybe 4 = disagree 5 = strongly disagree
NA = do not use or do not know about

No. of responses = 487 (44% full-time faculty, 13% part-time faculty)

	Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Disagree/ Strongly Agree %	Do not use/ know about %
Services and Materials			
BOOKS (includes music scores, maps, etc.)			
1. The book collection in my field is large enough to meet all my teaching needs.	41	31	5
2. I can find all of the books I need for my research in The University of Akron Library.	16	56	4
JOURNALS			
3. The Library does not have journals which I want to assign for my classes.	28	38	21
4. I can get the Library to add any journal I need for my research.	15	40	23
INTERLIBRARY LOAN			
5. I do not need to use Interlibrary Loan to obtain materials for my classes.	28	48	13
6. I need to use Interlibrary Loan to obtain most of my research literature.	30	35	10
7. Interlibrary Loan nearly always arrives rapidly enough to meet my research needs.	36	23	18
8. Materials I want for research or teaching cannot be obtained by Interlibrary Loan.	8	56	18
RESERVE			
9. I can get materials on reserve fast enough, when I put orders in on time.	57	6	79
LIBRARIAN HELP			
10. Subject librarians seem too busy to consult with me about course materials.	8	63	20
11. Consultations with subject librarians about my research needs have always been helpful.	64	9	6
12. My interactions with Library personnel are courteous and productive.	83	3	4
SEARCH MATERIALS			
13. There are enough CD-ROM terminals for everyone to use without waiting long periods.	22	33	26
14. The Library does not own enough CD-ROMs in my subject area.	31	18	31
15. I cannot access the computerized library catalog from my office because I do not have the hardware.	52	23	19
SPACE			
16. There is plenty of study space in the Science and Technology Library.	5	46	43
17. There is plenty of study space in Bierce Library.	25	35	20
18. I do not spend the time I should in the Library because there is not enough space to sit and browse.	34	40	10
19. I do not have difficulty copying materials in the Library.	35	40	10

		Strongly Agree/ Agree %	Disagree/ Strongly Agree %	Do not use/ know about %
SPECIALIZED COLLECTIONS				
20.	The Library has an inadequate collection of Audio Visual (AV) materials in my area.	26	20	39
21.	Audio Visual Services has easily obtained from elsewhere the AV materials I need.	17	15	52
22.	I cannot get government documents (domestic and/or foreign) quickly enough for my research or teaching needs.	15	20	53
23.	The Library has all the available computerized data bases (e.g., COMPUSTAT, CRISP, Social Science Survey data) that I need for teaching or research.	22	13	48

Priorities

1.	The Library should only try to budget for additional materials for instruction, not for research as well.	7	79	4
2.	The Library should have a higher priority in current University budgets.	76	4	5
3.	There should be a high budget priority on improving the quality of the Library over the long term (10 to 20 years).	86	2	3

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS BY FACULTY

Number of written comments: 498

In analyzing the written comments we tried to identify the basic concerns which seemed to be repeated most often. These concerns about the Library are presented below in terms of

- a. a general statement which seems representative for the purpose of categorizing;
- b. a frequency count indicating how often a statement was made which reflects that category; and
- c. a list of representative comments.

- A. THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH JOURNALS/PERIODICALS IN MY TEACHING AND RESEARCH AREAS AND IT IS DIFFICULT/IMPOSSIBLE TO GET NEW JOURNALS. (107 comments)
- B. THERE IS NOT ENOUGH SPACE IN THE MAIN LIBRARY AND THE S&T LIBRARY. (107 comments)
- C. THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH BOOKS IN THE LIBRARY. (81 comments)
- D. THE LIBRARY IS INADEQUATELY FUNDED AND SUFFERS FROM A LACK OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT. (48 comments)
- E. LIBRARY PERSONNEL ARE OVERWORKED AND UNDERSTAFFED. IT NEEDS MORE QUALIFIED STAFF AND EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP. (35 comments)
- F. THERE IS NOT ENOUGH EQUIPMENT, CD-ROMs, COPIERS, ETC., AND WHAT THERE IS DOESN'T WORK THE WAY IT SHOULD. (28 comments)
- G. BOOKS, JOURNALS AND DOCUMENTS ARE VERY SLOW IN BEING RESHELVED AND THEN IMPROPERLY RESHELVED. IN ADDITION, NEW ACQUISITIONS TAKE FOREVER TO BE SHELVED. (20 comments)
- H. THE LIBRARY IS TOO NOISY AND SMELLY. (19 comments)
- I. A-V AND INTERLIBRARY LOANS ARE A REAL PROBLEM. (12 comments)
- J. THE LIBRARY IS NOT OPEN LONG ENOUGH DURING THE DAY, WEEKENDS, AND BREAKS. (7 comments)
- K. SPECIFIC COMMENTS (on other topics)

A. THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH JOURNALS/PERIODICALS IN MY TEACHING AND RESEARCH AREAS AND IT IS DIFFICULT/IMPOSSIBLE TO GET NEW JOURNALS. (107 comments)

Inadequate journals.

Lack of publications for our specific area.

For government documents, not enough journals, and some holes in secondary source collections.

Current periodicals and newspapers are about the worst I've ever seen—inadequate space, poorly shelved, terrible newspaper storage.

Difficulty in finding journals due to "missing," not reshelved, or we don't subscribe.

There are journals important for my research which are not available.

Difficult to order new journals, must drop existing journals to buy new ones.

I must refrain from sending undergrads to use the Library because severe limitations in holdings and access cause frustration. This leads to their discounting libraries as legitimate sources of information.

Lack of appropriate articles/journals, thus requiring interlibrary loan.

Concern that the quality of resources available may decline rather than improve.

B. THERE IS NOT ENOUGH SPACE IN THE MAIN LIBRARY AND THE S&T LIBRARY. (107 comments)

Lack of space.

Study and shelf space.

It's difficult to research in journals due to the physical placement of carrels & shelves and copy machines.

We should have a large room where I could read newspapers and the latest periodicals. The current set-up is a "joke."

Adequate study areas for faculty who need space & time for study/research.

Sci/Tech Library is so crowded that it appears threatening to the student.

Carts of books crowd the area between the circulation desk, elevator and photocopy machine.

NO DAMN FACULTY SPACE.

C. THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH BOOKS IN THE LIBRARY. (81 comments)

They don't have many current books in my field of research.

Too few books!

Library holdings are old and few.

General pattern of administrative cuts in funding. Many books, so cut, are not bought, resulting in continued loss of relevant literature. When cuts are added to cuts, The U. of A. ends with a below average operation, for instance, the problems cited by Phi Beta Kappa, which prevented a grant of local chapter, have NOT BEEN RESOLVED.

Should allow more money for holdings related to faculty research.

The quality and accessibility of the collection.

D. THE LIBRARY IS INADEQUATELY FUNDED AND SUFFERS FROM A LACK OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT. (48 comments)

Low budget.

Underfunded.

Inadequate resources.

Lack of funds.

In short, an hour in Bierce Library leaves me in just about the same state of frustration as attempts to find a parking space. Apparently the University has the idea it's going to be a big-shot research institution: but its library isn't even up to decent undergraduate standards, much less research standards. Perhaps they should be reminded once again, of exactly why Phi Beta Kappa refused to establish a chapter at the University.

Lack of any long range commitment to catch-up, build, improve.

We need a major commitment from the President and Board of Trustees to develop a truly excellent library system. The commitment must be long term and backed by high budget priority.

Historically no growth and a mentality which perpetuates that lack of growth.

To be at all useful as a research library, it should have started intensive buying 30 years ago.

E. LIBRARY PERSONNEL ARE OVERWORKED AND UNDERSTAFFED. IT NEEDS MORE QUALIFIED STAFF AND EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP. (35 comments)

Overworked staff.

Short staffed.

Not enough staff and too many student workers.

Qualified reference librarian (i.e., possess an M.L.S.)

Number of knowledgeable personnel not sufficient.

Library administrators may have more concern with empire building than with student and faculty need.

We need a more capable and aggressive head for the library system.

F. THERE IS NOT ENOUGH EQUIPMENT, CD-ROMs, COPIERS, ETC., AND WHAT THERE IS DOESN'T WORK THE WAY IT SHOULD. (28 comments)

More on-line terminals to access books.

Lack of CD-ROMs.

Books listed as "available" on the terminal are NOT available in the stacks; this is frequent and infuriating.

The computer catalogue is just screwy; I frequently have to try both author and title to get a call number and sometimes can't find it even when I know it's there. Or there are two listings for the same author; if you try one it says this can't be used, so try the other. Then why is it in there in the first place? Or try a title, and you get "try again being less specific." How, in God's name?

A computer system for finding materials which is virtually worthless.

Not enough xerox machines that work.

Need more copiers throughout the Library.

G. BOOKS, JOURNALS AND DOCUMENTS ARE VERY SLOW IN BEING RESHELVED AND THEN IMPROPERLY RESHELVED. IN ADDITION, NEW ACQUISITIONS TAKE FOREVER TO BE SHELVED. (20 comments)

Library books once removed from the shelves, e.g., for copying are not reshelved in a timely fashion. Many books are improperly shelved and some are lying in disarray on the floor and shelves.

The incorrect reshelving of documents, there are documents that I've used and that I can't now find. This is most frustrating and impedes my research.

Poor shelving service.

I ordered a book on reserve and 9 months later still haven't received it.

Too slow in processing of orders and catalogs.

New orders don't get on the shelves for years.

H. THE LIBRARY IS TOO NOISY AND SMELLY. (19 comments)

Too crowded, dirty, run down.

It is noisy and messy. It is often crowded with students socializing rather than anything else.

It's a noisy, smelly environment for work and I limit my trips as much as possible.

Noise, especially by cleaning staff during peak daytime hours.

I hope I do not seem petty, but the Library is simply too noisy. It's impossible to work.

I. A-V AND INTERLIBRARY LOANS ARE A REAL PROBLEM. (12 comments)

Lack of A-V materials.

AV files are unusable.

Limit on interlibrary loans is a major problem.

Long response to Interlibrary Loan requests.

J. THE LIBRARY IS NOT OPEN LONG ENOUGH DURING THE DAY, WEEKENDS AND BREAKS. (7 comments)

It should be open longer hours, including on the holidays.

Short hours in summer; there are times when there are no professional librarians on duty.

Closure of the Science Tech Library for 2 months.

Hours—particularly weekends and during breaks.

Faculty access to the Science Library is poor. Faculty cannot get keys to the Science Library for after hours use. After hours access for faculty and graduate students is common practice at other institutions. This is particularly a problem during semester breaks when the open hours are very restricted. It is at these times when faculty have the most time for research and course preparation.

APPENDIX 3

% of University's Total Expenditures Spent on Library Operations							
	UA	CSU	KSU	Miami U	OU	UT	YSU
1981	4.52	4.66	5.94	5.33	4.41	5.68	4.55
1983	2.97	4.10	4.05	3.54	3.06	4.62	3.49
1985	3.68	4.30	6.48	5.15	4.25	5.69	4.18
1987	4.04	4.11	6.70	4.90	4.36	5.01	4.02
1988	4.24	4.11	6.31	3.21	3.75	4.61	3.29
1989	3.63	N/A	5.96	4.88	3.56	4.40	3.18
9 year Average	3.84	4.25	5.91	4.50	3.89	5.00	3.78

University expenditures 1981-87: OBR. *Basic Data Series: Ohio Education Systems.*
 Library expenditures 1981-87: State Library of Ohio. *Statistics of Ohio Libraries.*
 Both figures 1988 and 1989: Academic Libraries Report Forms copies of originals.

October 3, 1991

TO: University Council
FROM: Distinguished Professor Review Committee
RE: Amendment to the Faculty Manual

Charged by the President with conducting a review of the process for selection of Distinguished Professors, our committee recommends the amendment to the Faculty Manual set forth on the attached page and presents in its support the following

Rationale:

The Committee believes that several changes are necessary in order to increase faculty confidence in the process and to assure that only those persons truly deserving of the title are recommended for it. The overall philosophy of the changes recommended is to assure careful review of nominations within the colleges and at the University level by competent faculty reviewers.

A specific rationale for each section of the proposed amendment follows:

- (a) **Clarify that the nominee's minimum five years of service at the rank of professor must be at The University of Akron.** The Committee's rationale was that prior service at other institutions was not relevant to this particular title, which should reward attainment at our institution.
- (b) **Requirement that each college develop qualitative criteria and that these criteria be reviewed by the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee.** This year's committee was hampered by a lack of clarity and specificity as to the basis for review of nominations. The existing Faculty Manual guideline [in part (a) above] is not detailed. The Committee believes that specific guidelines within the colleges would provide a sound basis for college review and would provide a grounding for the University committee's review.

The Committee also believes that there should be some review of these criteria beyond the colleges to assure that they are neither unrealistically high nor too lenient. The Committee believes that this should be a faculty, rather than administrative review, and so recommends that the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee conduct the initial review.

- (c) The Committee believes that the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee, following the model of our other faculty review committees, should be (to the extent possible) drawn from among those persons already holding the rank to which a nominee aspires. The present procedure of electing a committee by college does not assure that. Limiting the committee to those who hold the Distinguished Professor title would.

- (d) **Review process:** The University Distinguished Professor Review Committee will not always include representation from all of the colleges. To assure that it receives the best advice and conducts the most thorough review of nominees' credentials, the committee may draw upon any faculty expertise it needs.
- (e) & **Recommendations:** The Committee believes that the President should have the benefit of the full review and advice of the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee. A separate recommendation from the Provost will also be helpful to the President, but the Committee believes that positive recommendations should reach the President even if they are not supported by the Provost.
- (f)

Respectfully submitted:

Orville Keister, Distinguished Professor of Accounting
Joseph Kennedy, Distinguished Professor of Polymer Science
George Knepper, Distinguished Professor of History
Richard Aynes, Professor of Law
Dolores Bower, Professor of Nursing
Tse-Yung Chang, Professor of Civil Engineering
Charles Dye, Professor of Education
Sharon Lesner, Professor of Communicative Disorders

Attachment

Amend Faculty Manual, Section 3359-20-03 (A)(4) by striking present section and replacing with:

(4) Distinguished Professor

Revised amendments

- (a) The title of distinguished professor shall be awarded to one who, already holding the rank of professor at The University of Akron for five or more years, ~~continues to excel~~ in teaching and in scholarly activity or artistic performance at a level significantly beyond the expectations for the rank of professor.
- (b) A nomination for distinguished professor shall be made by the dean of the nominee's college, upon the recommendation of the faculty of the college. Each college shall establish procedures for providing such a faculty recommendation, which shall include a college distinguished professor review committee. Each college shall also establish qualitative criteria for review. These criteria shall not be effective until approved by the faculty of the college and by the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee.
- (c) Recommendations made by the deans shall be forwarded to the Provost, who shall refer them to the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee. This Committee shall be appointed annually by the President and shall be comprised of no more than seven persons holding the title of Distinguished Professor.
- (d) The University Distinguished Professor Review Committee shall review all nominations made by the deans as set forth in section (b) above. In order to aid its deliberations, the Committee may seek the advice or, or add as non-voting members, any faculty of The University of Akron.
- (e) Upon receipt of the results of the Committee's deliberations, the Provost shall forward to the President with or without the Provost's endorsement, those persons recommended by the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee for appointment to the title of Distinguished Professor. The Provost may forward a separate recommendation to the President as well.
- (f) The President shall forward his recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

1950

1951

1952

1953

1954

1955

1956

1957

1958

1959

1960

1961

1962

1963

1964

1965

1966

1967

1968

1969

1970

