

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

10-4-1990

Faculty Senate Chronicle October 4, 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, uapress@uakron.edu.



1990-91, No. 2

34 pages

October 30, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
The University of Akron Academic Calendar, 1990-91.....	2
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of 10/4/90.....	3
Appendix to Minutes of the University Council Meeting of 10/4/90	
A. Faculty Well-Being Committee Report to University Council of 9/6/90.....	24
B. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Clarification and Modification of the <u>Regulations of the Board of Trustees</u> and <u>Faculty Manual</u>	26
C. Recommended Actions of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance.....	30
Curriculum Changes.....	32

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON - ACADEMIC CALENDAR - 1990-91
FALL SEMESTER

Day and Evening Classes Begin	Mon.....August 27
* Labor Day (Day and Evening)	Mon.....September 3
Veterans Day (Classes Held, Staff Holiday)	Mon.....November 12 (in lieu of Sun, Nov. 11)
** Thanksgiving Break	Thrs-Sat..November 22-24
Classes Resume	Mon.....November 26
Final Instructional Day	Sat.....December 8
Final Examination Period	Mon-Sat..December 10-15
Spring Intersession	Mon.....December 31 thru Fri.....January 11
Commencement	Sun.....January 6

SPRING SEMESTER

Day and Evening Classes Begin	Mon.....January 14
* Martin Luther King Day	Mon.....January 21
Spring Break	Mon-Sat..March 18-23
Founders Day	Fri.....May 3
*** May Day	Fri.....May 3
Final Instructional Day	Sat.....May 4
Final Examination Period	Mon-Sat..May 6-11
Summer Intersession	Mon.....May 13 thru Fri.....June 7
Commencement for Law School	Sat.....May 18
Commencement	Sat.....May 25

SUMMER SESSION I

First 5 and 8 Week Session Begin	Mon.....June 10
* Independence Day	Thrs.....July 4
First 5-Week Session Ends	Fri.....July 12
8-Week Session Ends	Fri.....August 2

SUMMER SESSION II

Second 5-Week Session Begins	Mon.....July 15
Second 5-Week Session Ends	Fri.....August 16

*Classes cancelled

**Classes cancelled from Wednesday at 5 p.m. through Monday at 7 a.m.

***Classes cancelled from noon to 5 p.m.

**MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING
October 4, 1990**

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Interim Senior Vice President and Provost, Dr. Marion Ruebel, at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, October 4, 1990 in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-six of the 84 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Associate Provost Hilton Bonniwell, Dean Claibourne Griffin, Dean Russell Petersen, Mr. William C. Becker, Dr. June Burton, Dr. Bridgie Ford, Dr. John Frederick, Dr. Avraam Isayev, Dr. Allen Noble, and Dr. G. Edwin Wilson. Absent without notice were Dr. Jacqueline Anglin, Mrs. Kathleen Davis, Dr. Kathleen Endres, and Mrs. Rose Kleidon. Two members from the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and two Nontraditional Student Government representatives were still to be named.

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

I assume all of you are aware that Homecoming is scheduled this weekend at the University and a lot of different activities will be going on. I would encourage you to participate in some, if not all, of those activities. I had the pleasure today of attending the reunion of the class of 1940. They celebrated their 50th anniversary and I was impressed with their enthusiasm and their pride in their alma mater. They're a lively group. As I reflected on some of the tales they were telling about the pranks they pulled when they were here, I decided I should keep that group away from our present student body so they wouldn't learn something from them. But they're a nice group of people.

I wanted to comment on one matter that I know is of interest to the University Council. A number of individuals and groups, including the Library and Learning Resources Committee of University Council expressed concerns about library resources. I think those concerns are well placed, and I'm hopeful that we will be able to address those problems. Dr. Ruebel, Mr. Bierly, and I have conferred about what we might be able to do this budgetary year in that regard. Although it appears that our enrollment for this fall will be down slightly from a year ago and we won't be generating any kind of surplus from that source, we intend to use some of the unallocated balance from last year to supplement this year's Library budget. I should also tell you that funds have been allocated for some renovations to the Library, including new carpeting and floor coverings, new doors--both external and internal, and a new fire alarm system, which should improve the environment there.

The issue of Library space is an issue that is complicated and will clearly be influenced by both State and Board of Regents policies. The strategy that is being pursued at the Regents' level for the storage of library materials is the construction of several high-

density remote storage facilities to house books and other materials that are infrequently circulated. You may be aware of the fact that funds have already been appropriated for the construction of such a facility at Rootstown on the NEOUCOM campus to serve Akron, Kent, Youngstown, and Cleveland State. When this building is finished, we will move a number of our books and other library materials to this particular location, freeing up space on our campus for materials that are more frequently used and providing space for expansion of our holdings.

Another initiative of the State and of the Board of Regents is to link all of our university libraries electronically to allow for access to materials wherever they may be located within the State system. For these reasons, the policy of the Board of Regents has been that funding for the expansion of traditional library space is highly unlikely. We know that we have some particular problems here, however, with simply study space within the Library; and we hope that there might be ways that we can address that, particularly with types of space that might be freed up. We are getting some additional relief here on our campus in that we plan to move a number of our archives to the Polsky's building when that facility is finished, and that will provide a little more flexibility for additional space in our present system.

Finally, I would like to note as we begin our planning for the 1991-1992 budget, I am certainly willing to consider placing the Library in a priority position for increased funding if that is the collective opinion - collective conclusion - of all of us as we debate through that process.

With that, Mr. Chairman, this concludes my comments. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions that you might have.

Ms. Ann Bolek asked whether the President could give a time frame when the Library might expect to get a supplement this year, as well as a dollar amount for that supplement.

The President replied that he could not give a dollar amount. He and Dean Ruebel had already discussed this, and he hoped that a decision on the amount could be reached in the next couple of weeks or so. There had first been the intention to wait and see the fall enrollment figures in the hope that there would be some additional revenue from tuition. However, the figures which would probably be released next week were going to show a slight decline in enrollment (100-200 students), so there would not be additional revenue from that source. There were some monies that were unallocated at the end of the year that would be used. He repeated that he hoped to have a response within a couple of weeks, but he could not yet provide a number for the amount of the supplement.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the Meeting of University Council, September 6, 1990, as printed in the University of Akron Chronicle of September 28, 1990.

Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary, stated that there were a number of

corrections, but almost all of them were in the first half of the Chronicle. The one major correction related to the 1990-91 calendar as it appeared on page 10. It was incorrect and corrected copies had been handed out to members of Council at this meeting. The correct calendar would be printed in the October Chronicle. The explanation for the mistake was that the previous year's September Chronicle had been used as a base for this one and, in the process of updating information, somehow this calendar ended up as a composite of two different academic years - 1989-1990 and 1990-1991. Additional corrections were as follows:

Page 2 - Under Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, Dr. David Weis' name is incorrectly spelled Weiss. The correct spelling is Weis.

Pages 2, 9, and 17 - Mr. LaVerne Yousey's name is included on the membership lists for the Hearing Board Pool, Department/Division Heads and Reference Committee. In each instance his first name is spelled incorrectly. It should be LaVerne.

Page 3 - Under Hearing Board Pool, Dr. William Frye's name is incorrectly spelled as Fry. The correct spelling is Frye.

Page 4 - Under Contract Professional Grievance Committee, the title of "Mr." was inadvertently omitted before Mardy Chaplin's name.

Page 5 - Under New Members of the University Faculty, Dr. Constance B. Bouchard is listed as Associate Professor of History. Her correct title is Assistant Professor of History.

Page 6 - Under New Members of the University Faculty, Mr. Davison Munodawafa is listed as Assistant Professor of Military Science. His correct title should read Assistant Professor of Education.

Page 12- Under the heading Holding Office by Virtue of Administrative Assignment, Dr. Patricia Carrell is listed as Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. The correct title is Dean of the Graduate School.

Dr. Tyrone Turning is listed as Dean of Wayne General College. The correct name of the college is Wayne College.

Also, under Administrative Appointments by the President, Dr. Walton's title is listed as Associate Provost and Director of Academic Services. The correct title is Associate Provost for Academic Services.

Page 14- The Contract Professional representative on the Faculty Well-Being Committee is incorrectly listed as Dr. Sally Brandel. Ms. Barbara Bucey should be listed as the representative on that committee.

Page 17- Under the Reference Committee membership listing, Vice President Helmick's office is listed as the Office of Human Resources. It should read Division of Human Resources.

Page 18- Under the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee membership listing, Dr. Wayne Mattice is listed as the representative from Polymer Science. It should correctly read College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering.

Page 34 - Paragraph 6, sentence 2 reads, "Mrs. Weiner noted that if there were no part-timers in the department..." It should read, "Mrs. Weiner noted that if there were no part-time faculty in the department..."

Dr. David Buchthal also noted that one of his new colleagues was elated to discover that he had been promoted so quickly. On page 5, Dr. Curtis Clemons was listed as an Associate Professor, but his correct designation was Assistant Professor. Also, a new faculty member, Dr. Robert Davis, had joined the Department of Mathematical Sciences as an Assistant Professor. He was omitted from the list of new faculty, perhaps through a confusion with Dr. Karen Davis, who was a new Visiting Assistant Professor in the Mathematics department.

It was also pointed out that on page 17 Dr. Larry Abel's name should be removed from the list of members of the Library and Learning Resources Committee, and that on page 11, Dr. Elaine Nichols erroneously was listed as still serving on Council as a member from the College of Nursing. She had finished her term and service.

Since there were no further corrections, the Chairman called for a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. This was given, seconded, and then Council voted its approval.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman requested that in the future he would appreciate it if the regular members of Council would move toward the front of the room. This will allow for a better dialogue.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements. On behalf of Mr. George Ball, the Chairman reported on the status of the United Way Campaign on campus. As of October 3, \$76,348.79 had been attained toward the goal of \$107,110. The number of donors had been 733, the number of refusals was 190, and the percentage of the goal attained was 71.3, with an average gift of \$104.16. He thanked the University for its support and hoped that this support would continue toward the goal.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on September 19. It first validated the election of the Polymer Science/Polymer Engineering faculty representative on the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. It then made two appointments to Council Committees: Dr. Wayne Mattice for Dr. James

Throne on the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee; and Dr. Richard Lutz for Dr. N. F. Davis on the Library and Learning Resources Committee. It also decided to send forms to the new student members of Council to allow them to indicate their committee preferences before assigning them to permanent committees.

The Committee then set the agenda for today's meeting of Council. It also considered a request from Dr. William McGucken in regard to the creation of a special committee to work with President Muse on some recommendations that Council had made last year in regard to the evaluation of department heads, which the President had returned to Council unapproved. Dr. McGucken had asked the President at the September 6 Council meeting if he would be willing to meet with a small group of Council members to try to iron out the differences in order to expedite the passage of these proposals. The Committee decided that, since the issue was already on the agenda (Unfinished Business, Item C), the whole matter could be discussed at that time.

Finally, the Executive Committee discussed an issue on which it desired some guidance from Council. This was the matter of how to handle motions which are presented during the reports of standing committees of Council. Should they be dealt with at the time of the Committee report, or should they be passed down to the end of the agenda as items of New Business to be treated later in the meeting or be placed on the agenda of the next meeting? Over the years, Council had done it both ways. If the latter approach were adopted, there would occasionally have to be exceptions when items would have to be handled immediately. This might be necessary in regard to certain matters coming from the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee which might need to be acted on right away. The former procedure, however, would help avoid the kinds of problems which arose when members were unaware that an issue was going to be discussed or when the actual wording of a motion being discussed was not before them. Placing the items on the next agenda or later on in the meeting would perhaps give members time to reflect on the matter. This was the basic issue.

Dr. John Bee added that when a committee makes a report containing motions or recommendations without the Executive Committee knowing about it in advance and having it scheduled on the agenda, this could unexpectedly take a great deal of time of Council. It could also put the items in that report automatically ahead of other items already introduced at earlier meetings and postponed until later in that meeting. This could create some uncomfortable feelings among people who had their business pushed back further by the introduction of a motion during the time of a report. He thought that it was the inclination of the Executive Committee that unless there was a pressing reason for motions to be introduced at the time of the reports, it would be best if they were placed under New Business and Council could take them up in order at that point in the agenda. Certain items which might have to be dealt with in a timely way would be calendar or curriculum considerations which were sensitive to certain deadlines or time constraints.

In response to Dr. Faith Helmick's support of Dr. Bee's statement, the Chairman suggested that she might put it in writing to the Executive Committee.

Dr. Keith Klafehn endorsed the position that the motions should be made at the time that the committee report was presented, and that way, if it was important, it could be taken care of immediately. If it was judged by the group not to be that important, then a motion could be made to postpone it until the next meeting.

Associate Provost Joseph Walton requested that if Council did decide to delay action on motions made during committee reports, the Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee be made an exception to this policy. This was because its matters (curriculum proposals, calendar items, etc.) were normally constrained by deadlines.

The Chairman asked Council members to submit their opinions and recommendations on this issue to the Secretary of the Executive Committee.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - No report.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee -
Dr. Walton, the Chairman, gave the following report:

The Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee met on Tuesday, September 18, 1990 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of the Gardner Student Center. The meeting began with general remarks by Interim Provost Ruebel on the topics of Post-Secondary Enrollment Options (Senate Bill 140), the General Studies Program, and the Document on Articulation and Transfer. Following introductions of committee members, individual assignments were made to one of two subcommittees, the Curriculum Subcommittee and the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee.

Under Old Business the following two items were reviewed and/or referred to the appropriate subcommittee: review of the application deadline, the University mission, the academic calendars for 1991-92 and 1992-93, the withdrawal policy, and the audit issue.

Extended discussion then ensued on the Articulation and Transfer Document. Dr. June Burton was present to participate in this discussion. The discussion of the Articulation and Transfer Document yielded the following recommendations:

1. APCC requests that our institutional response reflect that mandatory acceptance of the transfer module from the sending institution violates the principle of faculty control over curriculum and the principle of institutional autonomy. As a corollary to that recommendation it was recommended that the term "generally" on page 19 of the document in the phrase "generally not applicable" with

reference to developmental coursework be stricken. An additional corollary to the recommendation was that the "non-binding" decision making power of the state-wide review committee needs to be clarified.

2. APCC recommends that the institutional response to the Articulation and Transfer Document reflect the need to seek clarification on whether appeals should take place at the receiving or sending institution. It is our view that the receiving institution should be the source of appeal.
3. APCC recommends the elimination of the state-wide appeals committee.
4. APCC recommends that the state-wide review committee should evaluate whether or not the 36-40 credit module is in the best interest of the student.
5. APCC also recommends that the review committee consider whether or not the requirement that a comprehensive university develop a single transfer module discriminates against students attending institutions containing two-year, four-year, and branch campus programs.
6. And finally, APCC recommends that the institutional response to the Articulation and Transfer Document reflect that the state-wide review committee should define in detail the composition (number of representatives, criteria for selection, and length of term), duties, responsibilities, and power of the advisory council.

Dr. Walton then moved for the adoption of these recommendations, and this was seconded by Mr. Dan Buie.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

As Dr. Walton was about to continue with the report, Dr. Don Gerlach rose to a point of privilege. He stated that when Council was favored in advance with a written report like this one, he found it unnecessary to have it read to the body. He therefore moved that on such occasions Council could receive the reports by title and then, as necessary, move on the specific actions that needed to be taken. Since there was nothing else in Dr. Walton's report which required action, the rest of the report could be received by title.

Council then proceeded to the next committee report. The following is the unread portion of Dr. Walton's report:

Under New Business the following items were referred to the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee: the Graduate Probation and Dismissal Policy; the Graduate School Grades Policy; the Founder's Day question; and the Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Proposal (Senate Bill 140). In terms of the latter

issue, the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee is requested to make a recommendation for a permanent policy to replace the interim policy now in place. Assistant Provost David Jamison was present to clarify various aspects of the Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Proposal.

Also under New Business the following items were referred to the Curriculum Subcommittee of APCC: the Doctoral Residence Requirement; and the Graduate Credit/No Credit for Thesis and Dissertation Hours matter. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next meeting of APCC is scheduled for Tuesday, October 16, 1990 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of the Gardner Student Center.

D. Athletics Committee - No report.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Dr. Oller announced on behalf of Mr. Art Pollock, the Chairman for 1989-90, that the Committee had met and was in the process of electing a new chairman by ballot vote via the mail. The results would be known by Friday.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Mr. David Brink, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on September 10 and October 1. He had been elected Chairman for the 1990-91 year, and a grievance had been received and assigned File Number 20-91.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - Mr. Paul Richert, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on September 21 and was continuing to analyze and collect data on University Council's charge regarding faculty, contract professionals, and part-time faculty salaries at Akron and, more specifically, what other universities in Ohio were doing. At this next meeting on October 12, the Committee would be meeting with Vice President Helmick to discuss certain aspects of our benefit package.

Dr. Gerlach asked Mr. Richert when he estimated that Council would hear a conclusive report regarding the just-mentioned charge from Council, which had been made last spring.

Mr. Richert replied that the Committee was just now receiving some state-wide data, and he believed it would have everything which it needed in about three weeks.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee - Dr. Charles Monroe reported for Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair, and stated that the Committee had been meeting twice a month at 8:00 Monday mornings. Its major task for the fall semester was a questionnaire to be administered to the faculty which concerned Library performance and needs.

I. Reference Committee - No report.

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

K. Student Affairs Committee - No report.

L. Ad Hoc Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance Committee - Mrs. Linda Weiner, the Chair, stated that there was no additional report.

M. Ad Hoc Committee on Clarification and Modification of Regulations and Faculty Manual - Dr. William McGucken, the Chairman, stated that Council had received the Committee's report and it would be dealt with later in the meeting.

N. General Studies Advisory Council - The Chairman stated that there was no report this month. However, Dr. Eric Birdsall had been elected as Chairman for 1990-91, and he would be attending meetings and reporting to Council starting with the November meeting.

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. - The Chairman reported that Dr. June Burton, the representative, was in Columbus today attending the October meeting of the FACCOBR. There had been no September meeting, so there was no report.

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business. The first item was a continuation of discussion of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances. Recommendations one through five and seven through nine had been dealt with, and only number six was left. However, Mrs. Weiner pointed out that this recommendation could be affected by the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Clarification and Modification of Regulations and Faculty Manual which would come up later under New Business, and therefore she requested that discussion of this item be postponed until after that Committee had made its report.

Dr. Gerlach so moved and this was seconded. Council then voted its approval.

The next item was consideration of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee report of May 3, 1990 with regard to promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor. The Chairman reminded Council that in February, 1990, it had voted to refer the question of eligibility for promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor to the FRRC for consideration. In his May 3 report, Dr. Tom Miles had stated that the Committee had concluded that Instructors were eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor, and that in the case of such a promotion, a national search to fill the position would not be required. At that meeting discussion of this issue had been tabled until the fall, and in September, the Executive Committee had received a written request from Dr. Miles that the report be taken from the table and placed on the agenda for discussion.

Mr. Brink, the Chairman of FRRC, asked for and received permission to address the body. He moved to take the report from the table. He stated that it was the Committee's position that something needed to be

done with this issue rather than just to let it be tabled. This was why Dr. Miles requested that it be brought to Council. The Committee based its conclusions regarding the promotions of Instructors on the following: that Instructors were members of the regular faculty according to the Faculty Manual; that currently employed Instructors certainly had not been informed of any prohibition imposed by their seeking promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor; that requesting a promotion to that rank should not put them in jeopardy. Should the University decide to prohibit promotions like this, then it needed to be spelled out and the Faculty Manual changed.

Mr. James Inman wanted to speak in favor of the motion. In the past, the President had come to Council and indicated that he was concerned that full Professors have opportunities for further promotion, and he had suggested having additional ranks like Distinguished Professor and University Professor to fill this need. Universities had a long history of hiring instructors and keeping them for a long time, way beyond seven years, where others were tenured after one year. The instructors then were here for years and were not allowed to go for any promotion. If they requested one, they would be told that there would have to be a national search and they could lose their position. That was a price that the rest of us did not have to pay when we asked for promotion. He therefore thought that an Instructor who had served a long time ought to be able to ask for a promotion without necessarily having a national search. If the Instructor had been told from the beginning that after five years he would have to leave, then it was understandable. However, when they were kept for considerably longer than that, they ought to be considered for a potential promotion without the sacrifice of the loss of their job.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester asked whether it was true that Instructors were not eligible for tenure. When the Chairman replied that it was, Dean Sylvester wondered whether this meant that when the Instructor was promoted to Assistant Professor, it automatically would mean a tenure track situation. The Chairman again replied that this was so.

In response to a question on how searches were conducted for Instructor positions and how they differed from searches for Assistant Professor positions, Mr. Brink replied that, on the basis of his experience in the Library, national searches were conducted just as they would be for Assistant Professors.

Dr. Walton added that there was some variation throughout the campus. In some units, Instructors were sought on a more local level. All Assistant Professor and above searches, however, were national searches.

There was some confusion regarding the exact wording of the motion which Council was discussing. Dr. Gerlach reminded Council that in the Chronicle for the May meeting the motion from FRRC had been that "Instructors were eligible for promotion, and also that it was unnecessary to conduct a national search." (see August 10, 1990

Chronicle, page 9. This was the motion which had been laid on the table and now had been taken up for Council's consideration.)

Dean Isaac Hunt asked whether, implied in the motion, there would be the necessity for changes in search procedures for Instructors, or whether it was assumed that there would be the same kind of searches that were conducted for Assistant Professors. The Chairman replied that the latter assumption was correct.

Dean Sylvester said that Dr. Walton had just indicated that there were some searches for Instructors which were not national, and now it was being said that apparently EEO regulations could be violated in promoting from Instructor to Assistant Professor. He had problems with that.

Mr. Inman then offered a substitute for the motion which read as follows:

In order to encourage and reward outstanding performance by faculty members with Instructor rank, University Council urges the President to permit the possibility of promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor rank when the candidate fulfills the departmental and college requirements for such promotion.

This was seconded.

Dr. Gerlach had no objections in general to the substitution, but it seemed rather odd that Council was dealing here with things which were already fixed in the Faculty Manual. The issue had been sent to the FRRRC originally to see whether there was any reason to believe the argument of the then Provost that these national searches must be conducted and that an Instructor was not automatically qualified to be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor. The judgment of that Committee was that there was nothing in the Manual which supported that point of view. If you looked in the Manual, you would see the ranks laid out - Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and now Distinguished Professor. One could begin one's ascent up the ladder at the bottom as an Instructor, and the concern was not to interpret by any stretch of the imagination that Instructors should be closed off from advancement. He remembered a colleague in the Department of History in 1962 who had not yet finished his Ph.D. degree and who was therefore appointed to an instructorship. The terms of the agreement were that when he completed that degree, he would automatically be promoted to Assistant Professor. He did not think that it was up to Council now to recommend to the President to do anything. We were not trying to change the Manual, but we were merely trying to confirm what was in it. Except for the language about recommending something to the President, he would support Mr. Inman's proposal.

Mr. Inman commented that his major concern was trying to get a sense from this body in directing to the President that Instructors should be eligible for promotion and there should not be an

October 30, 1990

Page 14

administrative ~~lock and key~~ of this body, departments, and college bodies. *block of departments, colleges, recommendations for promotion of instructor.*

After a rereading of the substitute amendment for the original motion, Council voted its approval of the substitute, which now became the new main motion.

After an attempt had been made to further amend the Inman substitute, Dr. Gerlach suggested that the whole business be referred to FRRC for a general rewording and rephrasing of Mr. Inman's motion with the proposed amendments so that members would have everything freshly laid before them by the next meeting. He then moved to postpone by referring it to the FRRC for additional work. This was seconded, and Council voted its approval.

The next item of Unfinished Business was consideration of the May 1, 1990 memo, Muse to Marini, concerning review of department heads. Council had approved changes to the Faculty Manual pertaining to the duties, responsibilities, and review of department heads. In his remarks to Council at its May 3 meeting, President Muse had indicated that he did not feel that he could make these recommendations to the Board of Trustees. His rationale, in the form of a memo to Provost Marini, was presented to the Executive Committee with a request that Council reconsider those changes. A copy of Dr. Muse's memo was circulated to Council members with the September agenda, as well as with today's agenda.

Dr. Bee stated that since the original proposal had come from the FRRC, he would move that it be referred back to that committee with the directive that they form the subcommittee to carry out the intent of Dr. McGucken's original suggestion. This was seconded by Dean Sylvester.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

The last item of Unfinished Business was consideration of four resolutions which were presented in the Faculty Well-Being Committee report at the September 6, 1990, Council meeting. Council had voted to postpone action on those resolutions until today's meeting.

Mr. Richert, the Chairman of FWBC, asked for and was given permission to address the body. He then proceeded to move adoption of each of the four resolutions in turn.

The first read:

BE IT RESOLVED that the University make possible for University employees to purchase additional life insurance at their own expense through our group insurer.

The motion to approve this resolution was seconded, and Council voted its approval.

The second resolution read:

BE IT RESOLVED that the University immediately initiate discussions with Kent State University and Youngstown State University for a mutual agreement to provide tuition waivers and similar benefits to all employees and their dependents seeking to attend the other institutions.

The motion to approve this resolution was seconded.

Dr. Gerlach wondered why the Committee limited this proposal to Kent State and Youngstown. Was it simply because they were in the vicinity? Why not Cleveland State or other state universities?

Mr. Richert replied that the rationale was based on the one consortium which now exists - the medical school - and the privileges which it has. He believed that Dr. Burton, our representative to FACCOBR was going to bring this up on a state-wide basis; but if something of this sort was going to get started, it was better to begin with the institutions with which an interrelationship already existed and see whether one could build on it.

Dean Hunt asked why the College of Medicine was not included in the proposal.

Mr. Richert responded that medical education was just too expensive to do that.

Dr. Dale Jackson asked whether there were other reciprocal arrangements among other state institutions in Ohio.

Dr. David Buchthal noted that he had been told that there was a reciprocal relationship between the University of Toledo and a corresponding state school in southern Michigan, but this was hearsay.

Dean Hunt offered a friendly amendment to the motion to include the Northeast Ohio Universities College of Medicine. Mr. Richert accepted this. Thus, the beginning of the motion now read: "BE IT RESOLVED that the University immediately initiate discussions with Kent State University, Youngstown State University, AND THE NORTHEAST OHIO UNIVERSITIES COLLEGE OF MEDICINE..."

Council then voted its approval.

The third resolution which was moved for approval read:

BE IT RESOLVED that the University not reduce further the health care benefits of its employees and their dependents during the calendar year 1991.

This was seconded, and Council then voted its approval.

The fourth and final resolution moved for approval was:

BE IT RESOLVED that the University Council urge the President of the University to make the necessary decisions to insure sufficient funds are available for next year to give the faculty salary increases well above those given the past few years.

This was seconded, and Council voted its approval. (For the final approved recommendations, see Appendix A).

Item No. 8 - New Business. The first item of New Business was an amendment to Council Bylaws, Section 3359-10-03 Composition of Council, (D), which read as follows:

~~EIGHTEEN~~ NINETEEN student representatives comprising ~~four~~ FIFTEEN students from the undergraduate day enrollment selected in such manner as determined by Associated Student Government, two ~~evening~~ NONTRADITIONAL students selected in such manner as determined by the ~~Evening Student Council~~ NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT, one student selected from the Graduate Student Council in a manner agreeable to such Council, and one student selected from the Student Bar Association in a manner agreeable to such Association.

Mr. William Haak stated that this amendment had been made because students felt that there was a serious lack of representation on Council of undergraduate students. He also noted that a packet of materials relating to the amendment had been passed out to Council members. Dr. Gerlach then assisted Mr. Haak in the proper procedure and moved that the amendment be adopted by the Council. This was seconded.

Mr. Terry Haas then spoke in favor of the amendment. He thought that Council Bylaws Section 3359-10-02 Powers and Duties of University Council gave the most powerful and favorable argument for this amendment. In subsection A of this section, it states Council is empowered to formulate suitable rules, requirements, and procedures for the admission, government, management, and control of students. He thought that the best way to do that was just get more student involvement, and that way Council could get more expression of student views and be better prepared to control and manage the students. Subsection B dealt with proposals for the creation, abolition, or rearrangement of colleges, departments, or divisions of instructions, etc. With more student representation, Council could get a better view of what students of the University need and want in relation to the creation of different colleges, departments, and divisions. Finally, subsection C was concerned with University-wide committees. By putting more students on this Council, students would be able to belong to and contribute to more committees. He concluded by pleading that Council seriously consider this amendment as a basic need of the student body of this University.

The Chairman noted that according to Council Bylaws, this matter could not be voted on this month. It would be taken up again at the next meeting in November.

The second item of New Business was the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Clarification and Modification of the Regulations of the Board of Trustees and Faculty Manual. Dr. McGucken, the Chairman, began by presenting some background. The formation of his committee arose from reactions to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances. Some Council members had reacted to statements such as the one on page 11 of the report, which said that part-time faculty were, first and foremost, University faculty members. This seemed to imply that part-time faculty members had all the rights and responsibilities of full-time faculty. There were passages from the Faculty Manual and the Board Regulations and Bylaws for support of that view. Some people were concerned about this, especially in regard to the question of governance. There also was a concern about the title Lecturer as it was used now in reference to part-time faculty and what it may have meant when it was originally used in the Faculty Manual, etc. In order to deal with these concerns, his committee had been formed. It had worked during the summer and now was offering six recommendations to Council with the unanimous approval of its members. In making its recommendations, the Committee had confined its attention to what it considered to be the substance or policy relevant to its charge and, if Council approved these recommendations, it would necessitate editorial changes in the Faculty Manual. One member of the Committee had made a list of 100 such editorial changes, but the Committee decided that it would be best to leave these for later and have them dealt with by the Reference Committee.

Dr. McGucken then made some general remarks about the recommendations. The first two related to sharpening the definitions of the regular and auxiliary faculty. The next two related to the use of the term "Lecturer." The fifth dealt with a further change relating to the definition of full-time faculty in recommendation one, and the last concerned voting rights within a college. Since Council members had the report and an opportunity to read it, he proposed to move from recommendation to recommendation, placing them on the floor for discussion and possible approval. (For the full report, see Appendix B).

Dr. McGucken then moved the first recommendation which read as follows:

That the definition of Regular Faculty in Section 3359-20-03 (A)(1)(a)(i) of the Faculty Manual be amended to read:

Comprised of all ~~persons~~ FULL-TIME FACULTY with titles of Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Members holding these ranks, with the exception of the rank of Instructor, are eligible to be awarded indefinite tenure.

This was seconded, and Dr. McGucken explained that the amendment was designed to make explicit what was already implicit in the Manual.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval of the recommendations.

The next recommendation related to the definition of Part-Time Faculty as found in the Manual Section 3359-20-03 (A)(1)(c)(iii) to be amended as follows:

The designation of Lecturer is ~~normally~~ used for part-time faculty members. Part-time faculty are appointed by the Board, for a particular session, upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the Dean of the college.

This was moved and seconded, and Dr. McGucken explained that this definition was one that had caused a great deal of concern. The Committee did not understand the need for the use of the word "normally" here, and, since it seemed unnecessary, they were recommending its removal. In researching the use of the term "Lecturer" it was discovered that it had at one time been a full-time position, but it no longer was (see Manual Section 3359-20-039(F)(5) which referred to "the now non-existent position of full-time Lecturer"). From the October 20, 1960, University Council minutes, since that time the title has meant part-time faculty who were currently employed as Lecturer I, II, III IV, or V.

Dr. Gerlach commented that the motion made eminent sense, since "normally" was a weasel word which allowed people to get around things.

The Chairman then called for a vote, and Council gave its approval.

The third recommendation was:

That University Council recommend to the Provost's Office that it ensure that, in compliance with the Faculty Manual, the designation "Lecturer" be no longer used in any form for a full-time position.

This was moved and seconded. Dr. McGucken noted that this related to the already mentioned statement in the Manual Section 3359-20-039(F)(5).

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

The fourth recommendation was "that University Council recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the Board amend Section 3359-1-06 (A) of its Bylaws in regard to University Faculty as follows:

The University Faculty shall consist of the President of the University, Vice Presidents, Deans, Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors, and ~~Lecturers~~ **ALL OTHERS GIVING INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE CREDIT.**

Dr. Robert Holland spoke against this amendment because he thought that it created ambiguity by removing the term "Lecturer" from the list of titles of the University faculty. It would no longer be explicit that Lecturers (part-time faculty) were part of the University faculty. Therefore, he wanted to retain the term here.

Dr. Helmick pointed out that the proposed language change of the motion "ALL OTHERS..." was exactly the language that now appeared in the Faculty Manual. This was merely making the Board Bylaws match it, and it was intended to be an all-inclusive definition of the University faculty.

Dr. Jackson commented that in reality you could strike some or all of the designated titles in addition to Lecturer and say "everyone giving instruction for college credit." He preferred to retain the term.

Dr. McGucken stated that he did not entirely follow the logic of Dr. Holland's argument. The Committee's intention here was in keeping with the earlier recommendation, which defined the part-time faculty as just one category of auxiliary faculty. The phrase "ALL OTHERS GIVING INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE CREDIT" would include them, as well as graduate teaching assistants, etc., and be a comprehensive term to cover everything.

Dr. Holland replied that the members of the faculty known as Lecturers taught an enormous number of students and was no small category. It should be made absolutely clear in the definition of University faculty that these people, who provided a major share of the instruction in General Studies, were a part of that faculty.

Dr. Gerlach noted that he was a bit uneasy about the expression "ALL OTHERS...", because he did not view graduate assistants as University faculty or as his colleagues, but as students or his assistants. He moved to reinsert the word "LECTURER" and ~~strikeout~~ "ALL OTHERS GIVING INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE CREDIT," and this was seconded.

Dr. McGucken disagreed strongly with this amendment because it eliminated a good number of individuals who did give instruction. The definition of faculty included all those people who taught, and that included graduate students and undergraduate students who gave instruction. Also, with this amendment you would be omitting people with visiting, research, and adjunct appointments who could also teach in the classroom. They were certainly part of the faculty. There was no intention to slight Lecturers, but the Committee had been looking for a neat way to bring in everybody who was an instructor, and that was why the expression "all others giving college credit" had been used.

Dr. Helmick noted that the definition which Council was dealing with here was for University faculty. It might or might not be the same as regular faculty. Also, Dr. Gerlach's amendment in essence left the paragraph as it was originally. Therefore, there was no need for the motion.

Dr. Bruce Simmons asked whether describing graduate assistants as University faculty made them employees of Ohio and eligible for the STRS retirement system.

Dr. Helmick replied that they were currently State of Ohio employees and under Federal regulation definitions paid taxes and the like.

Council then voted on Dr. Gerlach's amendment, and it was defeated.

Dr. Bee now attempted an amendment which reinserted the word "Lecturers" and read: "...Instructors, Lecturers, and all others giving instruction for college credit." This was seconded by Dr. Jackson.

Dr. Bee explained that he saw this as a compromise.

Council then voted its approval of Bee's amendment to the main motion. It then approved the main motion.

Dr. McGucken then moved the acceptance of the fifth recommendation which read as follows:

The University faculty shall consist of the President of the University, who shall be its presiding officer, the Vice Presidents, the Deans, all persons giving instruction for college credit in the University, and such members of the administrative staff and contract professionals as may be assigned thereto. It meets at the beginning of each academic year and at other times as may seem desirable. Voting power shall be limited to **FULL-TIME** administrative officers, Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors.

This was seconded, and Dr. McGucken noted that this, again, was a matter of making explicit what had been implicit.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

The sixth recommendation read as follows:

Each degree-granting college shall be governed, subject to the rules of the Board and the University Council, by a faculty consisting of the President of the University, the Senior Vice President and Provost (ex officio), the Dean and ~~such~~ **ITS FULL-TIME** Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, **AND** Instructors/ ~~Lecturers and others as may be appointed thereto.~~

(For a rationale of this recommendation, see the last two pages of the Committee report in Appendix B).

The recommendation was moved and seconded. Council then voted its approval.

Dr. Gerlach now moved that Council congratulate this committee for a job well done and dismiss it from its charge with the Council's great thanks.

Dr. Holland wanted to remind Council that earlier Dr. McGucken had mentioned that, in relation to the recommendations which Council had just passed, there were over one hundred editorial changes of a slight nature which would be required in the Faculty Manual and that these could be handled by the Reference Committee. Dr. Holland thought that many of these were of a rather substantive nature and deserved careful consideration and thought. Therefore, it should be noted for the record that when the Reference Committee had made the needed changes and submitted them to Council as was normal at the February meeting, Council members ought to pay particularly close attention to them.

Dr. McGucken expressed surprise that Dr. Holland had seen a copy of the report which included all those needed changes, because the Committee had decided not to disseminate it until it saw what happened to the just-discussed recommendations. It was decided that by leaving all the changes out for the moment, it would cut the report down to its bare essentials for discussion here. The Committee was willing to cooperate with the Reference Committee, and he assumed that, as was always the practice, the Reference Committee would bring all its suggested changes to the Manual before Council.

Council then took up discussion of the last recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances which had been postponed to this point in the meeting. This was item six from its report which read:

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.

Mrs. Weiner stated that there were important reasons why there should be one manual for all faculty. As far as the students were concerned, it made no difference whether their instructors were employed full time or part time - that is, they saw no distinction. A large portion of our faculty taught less than full time. This had been noted by the North Central Accreditation Agency. Since it would not be financially possible to replace many of these part-time faculty with full-time, the aim of the University should be to utilize these faculty in the best way it could. This could not be carried out by emphasizing the distinction between the two groups, but rather they should be treated like colleagues in order to create an atmosphere that would maximize their performance. Since performance was a matter of attitude as well as of expertise, the University should be taking steps to enhance the way in which part-time faculty viewed their role here. For these reasons, she hoped that Council would support this final recommendation. Ms. Peggy Richards then moved acceptance of the recommendation, and this was seconded by Dr. Klafehn.

Dr. Helmick did not disagree with what Mrs. Weiner had said. However, until all of the changes which had just been approved by Council regarding the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Clarification and Modification had been passed by the Board and the

Reference Committee had dealt with the hundred or so changes required in the Manual, she recommended at least postponing this proposal. Then Council would have a Manual which was consistent in regard to what pertained to full-time faculty and part-time faculty, and this issue could then be taken up again.

Mr. Samir Yebaile rose to speak in support of the motion and agreed that from the student perspective it did not matter whether the instructor was full time or part time. What was important was the education.

Mr. Inman agreed with Dr. Helmick and stated that he hated to vote on something which he had not yet seen - that is, the revised Manual.

Dr. Holland said that what was at issue here was whether the Faculty Manual would apply to all University faculty or whether there would be a separate manual or handbook for certain groups. He supported the former idea that there be one manual.

Dr. McGucken stated that he was a bit uneasy about voting in favor of the motion. He thought that there were some things in the Manual which did not apply to part-time faculty, such as information about promotion, tenure, etc. There were other issues as well, and he wanted something more specific. Was he correct in assuming that there was a manual for part-time faculty?

Dr. Helmick replied that there was a manual which had been revised, but it had not yet been distributed, primarily to wait to see how this recommendation turned out.

Dr. McGucken stated that his preference would be to wait and see what parts of the Faculty Manual truly pertain to the part-time faculty. In the end, it might be better to have two documents.

Dr. Holland pointed out to Mr. Inman that the Faculty Manual was always in a state of flux. It was always open for additions and interpretations. This was not a reason for postponing a decision on this issue.

Dr. Jackson reminded Council that the part-time faculty bore an extremely large part of the teaching load University-wide. The idea that these people could be replaced with full-time faculty was clearly erroneous. Given the financial problems both on the state and federal levels, the University was going to have to rely on very substantial numbers of part-time faculty for a long time to come. There was no reason why these people should be treated differently from full-time faculty teaching the same courses. They should be treated like other faculty members and be included in the same manual.

Dr. Helmick did not understand the argument that, by providing information collected to aid a specific group, this somehow put that group into a lesser position. The purpose of the part-time handbook was to pull out those things that applied to a part-time faculty member from

all of the other information and policies and to put it in a form that was easily obtainable. It was supposed to be an aid and not something that labeled them as second class citizens.

Dr. Jackson agreed that the idea of a handbook was a good one, not only for the part-time faculty but for full-time faculty as well. The full-time faculty would probably welcome a condensation of all the rules and regulations which governed it. However, the main document, the manual, should cover everybody.

Dr. Buchthal was in favor of the principle of one manual for all faculty, but he was concerned about the hundred or so modifications that needed to be made. Not knowing what they were made him very uncomfortable about voting for this. He suggested that perhaps a good solution to the problem at hand was to amend the motion to read as follows:

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

This was seconded by Dr. Bee, who thought that it was a good way of endorsing the principle of a unified document and also going on record as supporting the work necessary to bring it about.

The Council then voted its approval of the amended language. It then proceeded to vote on the main motion, and it was approved. (For all final approved recommendations, see Appendix C).

Item No. 9 - Adjournment. - It was then moved that the meeting be adjourned, and this was seconded. Council voted its approval, and this meeting ended at 5 p.m.

APPENDIX A
Faculty Well-Being Committee Report
University Council
September 6, 1990

(as amended and approved by University Council, 10/4/90)

The Faculty Well-Being Committee met on August 31, 1990 and chose Professor Paul Richert of the School of Law as the Chair for 1990-1991.

The Committee is unable to report on the methods used to determine pay raises at the various colleges and universities in Ohio. We are proceeding to analyze data obtained to date and seeking to obtain other data. I do not know when our report will be ready.

The Committee took positive action on the following resolutions. I would propose favorable action by University Council on these same resolutions.

1. BE IT RESOLVED that the University make possible for University employees to purchase additional life insurance at their own expense through our group insurer.

Rationale: It is the Committee's understanding that our insurer no longer requires a minimum participation level by University employees to offer this coverage. If our understanding is in error, the University should at least solicit employees to see if we can reach the minimum participation level required by our group life insurer. Clearly it is a benefit that the University can provide at a minimal cost but one that would be appreciated by many employees.

2. BE IT RESOLVED that the University immediately initiate discussions with Kent State University, ~~and~~ Youngstown State University, **AND NORTHEAST OHIO UNIVERSITIES COLLEGE OF MEDICINE** for a mutual agreement to provide tuition waivers and similar benefits to all employees and their dependents seeking to attend the other institutions.

Rationale: It is the Committee's understanding that the employees of the jointly run Northeast Ohio Universities College of Medicine have this benefit already. Many faculty and certainly many staff are finding it increasingly difficult to pay the cost to obtain the further education they need. Many programs and degrees are not offered at Akron; similarly, each of the other universities does not offer all the programs their employees and dependents wish to take.

Faculty are frequently reluctant to send their dependents to their own institution. Faculty wish to encourage the development and maturation living away from home can encourage. This would be an attractive recruiting device for new faculty. Concerns about faculty teaching and grading their dependents would be decreased if more dependents had the option to attend neighboring institutions.

This reciprocity benefit would encourage a group of able Ohio students to stay in Ohio for their higher education and later employment. This pool of talent is critical in the economic development of Ohio business and industry for the sharply more competitive world of the next century.

It is our understanding that other states as well as private universities have such reciprocity agreements.

3. BE IT RESOLVED that the University not reduce further the health care benefits of its employees and their dependents during calendar year 1991.

Rationale: Given the University's poor showing vis-a-vis other state universities in Ohio regarding faculty pay scales for each rank, it would be even more detrimental to recruiting and retention to make further cuts to our health care benefits package. Health care inflation cost projections do not appear to be rising as rapidly as forecast last fall.

4. BE IT RESOLVED that the University Council urge the President of the University to make the necessary decisions to insure sufficient funds are available for next year to give the faculty salary increases well above those given the past few years.

Rationale: Since our position relative to other state universities in Ohio is so poor in terms of faculty pay scales, it is imperative that decisions be made to increase the money available for raises. Recruiting and retaining faculty will become more difficult if our relative position remains the same.

Faculty morale and effectiveness will be adversely affected by continuing the present trend. Our institution will have a difficult time retaining or increasing its prestige if such a key indicator of institutional quality, faculty pay scales, remains so low.

The President's long-term goal of pay raises of cost of living plus two percent reflects the reasonable goal for the institution which, however, is not being met.

Paul Richert
Chair, Faculty Well-Being Committee

APPENDIX B

**Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Clarification and Modification of the
Regulations of the Board of Trustees and Faculty Manual
(as amended and approved by University Council, 10/4/90)**

The Committee has studied the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Manual with an eye to, first, the use of the word "faculty" and, second, the depiction of the rights and responsibilities of members of the faculty. It submits this report with recommendations to University Council.

The Committee believes that its recommendations, if adopted, would help to clarify the definitions of, and the rights and responsibilities of, the various members of the University faculty. It noted that in several places the Faculty Manual should be amended to achieve greater consistency and clarity in regard to these matters, but it confined its attention to what it considered to be changes of substance or policy relevant to its charge. The Committee recognizes that it is the ongoing task of the Reference Committee of University Council to bring consistency and clarity to the Faculty Manual and will accordingly make its suggestions known to the Reference Committee should its recommendations be adopted. One member of the Committee, Dean Carro, has compiled a list of 100 such suggestions.

A. A clear distinction is made in the Faculty Manual Section 3359-20-03, (A)(1)(a) and (c) between regular and auxiliary faculty. The regular faculty comprises Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors. The auxiliary faculty is "Comprised of all faculty persons not on the regular faculty, including but not limited to those with visiting appointments, research appointments, part-time appointments, and adjunct appointments." Although the distinction is clear, the Committee recommends that it be sharpened by making two amendments:

1. That (**RECOMMENDATION #1**) the definition of Regular Faculty in Section 3359-20-03 (A)(1)(a)(i) be amended as follows:

Comprised of all ~~persons~~ **FULL-TIME FACULTY** with titles of Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Members holding these ranks, with the exception of the rank of Instructor, are eligible to be awarded indefinite tenure.

Various provisions in the Faculty Manual referring to "regular faculty" or "faculty," such as those pertaining to reappointment, tenure, and promotion, are based on the assumption that the appointment is full-time; however, this is not explicitly stated anywhere in the Faculty Manual.

2. That (RECOMMENDATION #2) the definition of Part-Time Faculty in Section 3359-20-03 (A)(1)(c)(iii) be amended as follows:

The designation of Lecturer is ~~normally~~ used for part-time faculty members. Part-time faculty are appointed by the Board, for a particular session, upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the Dean of the college.

At one time the position of Lecturer was a full-time position; however, the current Faculty Manual refers in Section 3359-20-039 (F)(5) to "the now nonexistent position of full-time Lecturer." The earliest assignment of the designation "Lecturer" to part-time faculty was found in the October 20, 1960 minutes of University Council. These minutes state (page one) that President Auburn reported that the Executive Committee "determined titles for part-time members of the faculty--to be known as Student Assistants (undergraduate), Graduate Assistants, and Lecturers (if part-time in day or evening), except Special Lecturers in Music." Currently a part-time faculty member is appointed as Lecturer I, II, III, IV, or V, depending upon qualifications and experience.

- B. The Committee notes that, although the previously quoted Faculty Manual Section 3359-20-039 (F)(5), referring to "the now nonexistent position of full-time Lecturer" was approved by the Board in October, 1975, since that time full-time faculty with the title of Lecturer have from time to time been appointed in the College of Education, the College of Engineering, and the School of Law. There are currently three full-time "Special Lecturers" in the College of Engineering. The Committee therefore recommends (RECOMMENDATION #3) that University Council recommend to the Provost's office that it ensure that, in compliance with the Faculty Manual, the designation "Lecturer" be no longer used in any form for a full-time position.

- C. The Committee further recommends (RECOMMENDATION #4) that University Council recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the Board amend Section 3359-1-06 (A) of its Bylaws in regard to University Faculty as follows:

The University Faculty shall consist of the President of the University, Vice Presidents, Deans, Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors, ~~and~~ Lecturers, **AND ALL OTHERS GIVING INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE CREDIT** who have been appointed by the Board upon recommendation of the President. It shall include, also, such administrative officers and staff members as may be assigned thereto by the Board upon recommendation of the President.

The Committee initially considered substituting the words "Auxiliary Faculty" for "Lecturers;" but understanding "Faculty" to mean the entire teaching staff of a college or university, including, for example, graduate teaching assistants, it agreed upon the amendment offered.

D. The paragraph on University Faculty and Contract Professionals in the Regulations of the Board of Trustees Section 3359-2-02 (B)(1) states who has voting power:

The University faculty shall consist of the President of the University, who shall be its presiding officer, the Vice Presidents, the Deans, all persons giving instruction for college credit in the University, and such members of the administrative staff and contract professionals as may be assigned thereto. It meets at the beginning of each academic year and at such other times as may seem desirable. Voting power shall be limited to administrative officers, Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors. (emphasis added)

The Committee believes that it is assumed that the individuals referred to in the underlined sentence all have full-time appointments. It further believes that this status should be made explicit, and at the same time the sentence made consistent with the proposed amended definition of Regular Faculty in Recommendation #1 above. The Committee therefore recommends (RECOMMENDATION #5) that University Council recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees that the Board amend Section 3359-2-02 (B)(1) of its Regulations as follows:

The University faculty shall consist of the President of the University, who shall be its presiding officer, the Vice Presidents, the Deans, all persons giving instruction for college credit in the University, and such members of the administrative staff and contract professionals as may be assigned thereto. It meets at the beginning of each academic year and at other times as may seem desirable. Voting power shall be limited to **FULL-TIME** administrative officers, Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors.

Although auxiliary faculty do not have voting power under Board Regulations, the Faculty Manual does make provision in Section 3359-20-03 (A)(1)(c)(i) for permitting auxiliary faculty to participate and vote in departmental affairs:

Participation and voting in departmental affairs by auxiliary faculty is not permitted unless special approval is given by the departmental faculty, department head, and Dean.

The Committee is aware of two departments, both in the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, which have granted such approval. The University of Akron Bylaws for the Department of English (Section I.A.1.b) reads:

A representative of the part-time faculty, elected by that body, shall be a voting member at all regular meetings of the Department, except where explicitly excluded elsewhere in these Bylaws, or in the Department's Guidelines on Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure.

On May 5, 1989, the Department of Sociology approved a document concerning "Auxiliary Faculty definitions, selection procedures, review procedures, and privileges." The document states (page three) that Auxiliary Faculty:

...shall have one voting representative, whom they shall elect, at the regular faculty meeting. This vote shall not include personnel issues and may be excluded from other issues as determined by a vote of the regular faculty.

E. Although the situation in regard to the participation of auxiliary faculty in departmental deliberations thus seems clear, the Board Regulations create some ambiguity in speaking of college governance. Bearing in mind that only those with the power to vote can truly be said to participate in governance, the Committee recommends (RECOMMENDATION #6) that University Council recommend to the President and the Board that the Board amend Section 3359-2-02 (C)(i) of its Regulations as follows:

Each degree-granting college shall be governed, subject to the rules of the Board and the University Council, by a faculty consisting of the President of the University, the Senior Vice President and Provost (ex officio), the Dean and ~~SUCH~~ ITS FULL-TIME Distinguished Professors, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, AND Instructors/ ~~lecturers and others as may be appointed thereto.~~

J. Dean Carro, Law
Faith Helmick, Vice President for Human Resources
Keith Klafehn, Business Administration
William McGucken, Arts and Sciences, Chair
Peggy Richards, General Studies

September 4, 1990

APPENDIX C

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

(as amended and approved by University Council as of 10/4/90)

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~~ 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.

3. (a) University Council recommends that, SO FAR AS FEASIBLE, instructional support (typing, photocopying, audio-visual services) SHOULD 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~~ ALL faculty and that it make recommendations to be ~~incorporated into the University's space allocation and construction plans~~ TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

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

Our Committee recommends that the ~~Salary Equity~~ FACULTY WELL-BEING 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 of 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~~ FALL. 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 **MODIFIED TO 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 **AND INSTRUCTION**, 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~~ **RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE COURSES THEY TEACH.**

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.

CURRICULUM CHANGES

The following curriculum changes, in accordance with the Curricula Change process adopted by University Council on December 12, 1974, have had final approval by the Senior Vice President and Provost, or through specific vote by University Council, all effective September 1991 (unless otherwise noted).

COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

T-91-1

Public Service Technology (effective Spring 1991)

Title	2260:264	Adult Children of Alcoholics. 3 credits. <u>TO</u>
Description		Children of Alcoholics. 3 credits. Prerequisites: none. Didactic and experiential indepth study of the characteristics, behaviors, problems and programs of recovery of children/adults who have lived in an alcoholic home.

T-91-2

Engineering and Science Technology (effective Spring 1991)

Prerequisite	2820:121	Technical Computations. 1 credit. <u>TO</u> Prerequisite: 2030:151; corequisite for drafting technology students only: 2940:150.
--------------	----------	---

T-91-3

Engineering and Science Technology (effective Spring 1991)

Description	2820:153	Basic Physics: Heat, Light, and Sound. 2 credits. Prerequisite: 2820:151 and 2030:153. <u>TO</u> Topics include thermal behavior of matter, thermodynamics, wave motion and sound, light, geometric and physical optics. Introduction to atomic and nuclear physics. Laboratory.
-------------	----------	--

T-91-4

Engineering and Science Technology (effective Spring 1991)

Prerequisite	2820:152	Basic Physics: Electricity and Magnetism. 2 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisites: 2820:151 and 2030:153.
--------------	----------	---

T-91-5

Engineering and Science Technology (effective Spring 1991)

Description	2820:151	Basic Physics: Mechanics. 3 credits. Corequisites: 2030:152, 153. <u>TO</u> Principles of mechanics. Topics include force and motion, work and energy, properties of solids and liquids, and simple harmonic motion. Laboratory.
-------------	----------	---

CT-91-6

Engineering and Science Technology (effective Spring 1991)

Description 2820:210

Fortran for Technologists. 2 credits.Prerequisites: 2030:153 and 2030:121. TOIntroduction to structured Fortran 77 programming and Hewlett-Packard computer systems. Emphasis on programming of technical problems. Limited to students in Engineering Science Technology Division.

COLLEGE OF FINE AND APPLIED ARTS

FAA-91-14

School of Music

Title 7500:340

General Music. 3 credits. TOTeaching General Music. 3 credits.FAA-91-19

School of Music

Description 7510:104

University Band. 1 credit. Prerequisite: none. TOIncludes Symphonic Band, Wind Ensemble and Concert Band as major conducted ensembles; Marching Band, Varsity Band and Concert Band II. Membership is by audition.

COLLEGE OF POLYMER SCIENCE AND POLYMER ENGINEERING

PS-91-3

Department of Polymer Science

Add 9871:499

Research Problems in Polymer Science. 1-3 credit.Prerequisite: permission. Faculty-supervised undergraduat research problems in polymer science, culminating in a written report.PS-91-4

Department of Polymer Engineering

Add 9841:425

Introduction to Blending and Compounding of Polymers. 2 credits. Prerequisites: 4200:321; 4300:341; 4600:310 or permission. Nature of polymer blends and compounds and their application. Preparation and technology using batch and continuous mixers, mixing mechanisms.

S-91-5

Department of Polymer Engineering

Add 9841:499 Polymer Engineering Project. 3 credits. Prerequisite:
none. Individual research project pertinent to polymer
engineering under faculty supervision.

S-91-6

Department of Polymer Engineering

Add 9841:427 Introduction to Molding Technology. 3 credits.
Prerequisites: 4200:321; 4300:341; 4600:310 or permission.
Molding methods to manufacture polymeric products.
Machinery, materials, molds, equipment, computer-aided
design.