

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

11-7-1991

Faculty Senate Chronicle November 7, 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

23 pages

November 22, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Minutes of the meeting of University Council of November 7, 1991 | 1 |
| Appendix to the Minutes of the meeting of University Council of November 7, 1991 | 18 |
| A-1. Continuing Enrollment Requirement (APCC) . . . | 18 |
| A-2. Transfer Module (APCC) | 20 |
| B. Report of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents . . | 22 |

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



3

4



4

2



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL
November 7, 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, November 7, 1991, in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-two of the 84 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dr. Elizabeth Beach, Dr. June Burton, Dean Patricia Carrell, Dean Claibourne Griffin, Interim Dean Donald Hall, Dean Isaac Hunt, Mrs. Rose Kleidon, Mr. Dale Lynk, Dr. Jesse Marquette, Mr. George Pope, Dean Russell Petersen, Mr. Roger Ryan, Dr. John Serafini, and Dr. Edwin Wilson. Those absent without notice were Dr. Darlene Ahnberg, Dr. Bridgie Ford, Dr. Avraam Isayev, Dr. Keith Klafehn, Mrs. Willeane Schrock, and Mr. Timothy Sheridan.

was present

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

As you requested, I want to report to you on the progress of the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Allocation that I appointed this past fall. Dr. Diana Chlebek, from Bierce Library, was elected as Chair, and the committee has had two meetings to date. They have reviewed reports on the procedures for salary allocation in various colleges here at The University of Akron. The committee reviewed a report of the Salary Equity Task Force that operated in the summer of '88 and has reviewed the results of the AAUP Faculty Salary Survey. Additional meetings of this committee are scheduled as follows: November 15, December 6, and December 13. Hopefully, at that time, they will present their report and recommendations. That is all I have to report to you. I would be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

Dr. Don R. Gerlach asked a question arising from an editorial in the October 17 Buchtelite entitled "Parking Issue Needs Remedy." The editorial alleged that the Board of Trustees were considering a change in the policy which permitted faculty to have parking without paying for it directly. He wondered whether the President could say anything about this to Council, since, when the body last discussed this, it had looked unfavorably on making such a change.

The President replied that he had not seen the editorial, but to his knowledge there had been no discussion by the Board of Trustees of this matter. There had been a discussion of a proposal that had come from the Management Improvement Task Force last spring to charge graduate assistants a parking fee. Currently, graduate students who had teaching assistantships had their fee paid by the University. The Task Force proposed that all graduate students be charged the same fee relative to the purchase of a parking permit. To his knowledge though, there had been no discussion of charging faculty for parking.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of October 3, 1991 as Printed in The University of Akron Chronicle of October 14, 1991. Dr. Gary Oller, the Secretary, noted that he had two corrections. First, Dr. Elizabeth Beach had been listed as absent without notice, but she had been in attendance that day. Second, Dr. Elizabeth Erickson pointed out that the end of a sentence had been omitted in the University Libraries Committee report. The last sentence on page 7 was a fragment that read: "More that two-thirds of the respondents in the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and," and should continue, "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."

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

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman introduced two people to Council members. The first was Dean of University Libraries-Elect Del Williams, who would be starting officially on December 2, and who had been kind enough to make two trips here since his appointment to begin the transition. Dean Williams was willing to answer any questions. The second individual was Mrs. Linda Turchan who had joined the office of the Senior Vice President and Provost as the secretarial colleague to the Provost. Mrs. Turchan was a native of Akron and the parent of a graduating senior. When she last worked in Akron, she provided the primary clerical professional support to the office at Goodyear Tire and Rubber responsible for all accounting and customer relations for Goodyear accounts. She came to the University most recently from a similar role for the public schools in Dartmouth, Massachusetts.

The Chairman noted that it was customary for the President to distribute in November statistics on faculty salaries for the current year. If there was no objection, this would be delayed until February. The statistics from last year had changed only slightly, since there had been no general salary adjustments except for promotion increments. There was still the expectation that there would be a mid-year adjustment to salaries, and so those statistics would be published when the adjustments were made. The Chairman asked whether Council was comfortable with this arrangement, and there was no dissent.

In regard to his remarks last month about the Executive Committee's looking for another location for Council meetings, it now appeared that Council would be meeting in the Goodyear Auditorium of the Polymer Science Building beginning in February. Whether that would become a permanent location would depend on how Council members liked it and the room's availability. There was a commitment for the whole spring semester.

Finally, the Chairman stated that the University, along with all state-supported institutions, had received a request from the State of Ohio to respond to a series of important questions about its internal management. We had a head start on this since President Muse had appointed a University Management Task Force last spring. The work of that group would now be folded into a new effort, a Managing for the Future Task Force, which would respond to the questions of the Legislature and the Ohio Board of Regents regarding our management. Two subcommittees were being created, one within SPARC, and one within the President's cabinet. They would be gathering information and drafting a report for consideration by the President's cabinet and the Council of Deans at their retreat in early March. The President would then give the report to the Management Improvement Task Force, chaired by Trustee Dr. Charles Taylor, and augmented by faculty representative Dr. John Bee. That group would make a final report to the Board of Regents in May. This was the way that the University was trying to handle its response to the State on the "Managing for the Future" issue.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements. - There were none.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. **Executive Committee** - Dr. Oller, the Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on October 17. It first discussed a question raised by Mr. Tom Smith, President of ASG, regarding the selection of Evening or Non-Traditional student representatives on University Council. The Bylaws stated that these individuals were to be selected by the Evening Student Council. However, this organization no longer existed, and, for the past several years, these representatives had been selected by Alpha Sigma Lambda, the non-traditional student scholastic honorary society. In regard to Mr. Smith's request that the ASG coordinate the choice of these representatives, the Committee decided to refer that request and the issue to the Student Affairs

Committee for a report and recommendation to Council as to how to handle this matter, whether it be by a change in the selection process or by a clarification of the language of the Bylaws section on the composition of Council.

The Committee next discussed additional requests from students for appointments to standing committees of Council. Final dispositions on some of these were withheld until additional information was provided to the Chairman, Dr. John Bee. Once he had that information, the Committee empowered him to make the appointments.

The third item of discussion was the status of the search for a new location for University Council meetings. The Chairman addressed this item in his earlier comments.

Next, the Committee discussed a memo from Dean Patricia Carrell regarding Graduate Council's power to initiate and legislate matters of policy and curriculum. While the Committee agreed with her conclusion that the language in the Faculty Manual did suggest broad legislative powers for Graduate Council, it thought that these would have to be interpreted in the broader context of the legislative powers given to University Council by the Board of Trustees. In general, University Council powers would still be primary. The Committee also noted that representation of Graduate School interests were provided for in the structure of Council. However, since Graduate School and graduate students did have particular interests, it was only prudent that they be consulted on such matters, and that Graduate Council be asked to speak and act on their behalf.

Since there was enough of an apparent clash of language on this issue in the Faculty Manual, the Committee thought that this should be referred to the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee of APCC, and a memo regarding this should be sent to Dean Carrell asking her office to consider initiating an amendment to the Faculty Manual that would set forth in more specificity the matters over which Graduate Council should have legislative input or which should come from that body.

Finally the agenda for today's meeting of Council was set.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to know who had made the decision to let Alpha Sigma Lambda choose the Evening student representatives.

Dean Robert Dubick stated that his office had made the recommendation, since it had been hard to distinguish between the membership on Evening Student Council (when it still existed) and in Alpha Sigma Lambda. The same people were in both organizations.

Dr. Gerlach stated that he understood, but the point here was that we had to attend to the rules of the body.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - The Chairman reported that this committee would be meeting on November 21.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Associate Provost Joseph Walton, the Chairman, stated that the first item of his report was approval of the tentative list of graduates for the midyear commencement. Dr. Bee then moved that the rules be suspended so that this matter could be taken up now. This was seconded and approved by Council. Dr. Bee then moved acceptance of the list, and this was seconded. Council then gave its approval of the list.

Dr. Walton then stated that the Committee had met on October 14 and November 7. There was one additional action item from the Committee for which he again wanted to request a suspension of the rules so that Council could vote immediately on it. The proposal read as follows: "Since the University is officially closed on December 24, 1991, APCC recommends that grades be submitted to the Registrar's Office on THURSDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1991 BY 5:00 P.M." This represented a modification of the original date of December 23 which was requested by Dr. Dubick.

Dr. Bee then moved to suspend the rules, and this was seconded and approved by Council. He then moved the proposal as stated above for submission of grades on December 26, and this was seconded.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester wanted to know when was the last day for finals, and the Chairman replied that it was Saturday, the 21st. Since there was no further discussion, the Chairman called for a vote, and Council gave its approval.

Dr. Walton then continued with his report and noted that at the November 7 meeting the Committee had approved a continuing enrollment requirement for Graduate students (see Appendix A-1) which he wanted Council to take up under New Business. In other business, the Committee received a memorandum from Dean Patricia Carrell requesting that any further consideration of a University Withdrawal Policy include referral to Graduate Council, since graduate students were also affected by such policy. This information was received by the committee. Also, in response to a request from Ms. Peggy Richards, the Committee reached consensus on a recommendation to the Executive Committee that it should feel free to appoint part-time faculty to University Council Committees at its discretion.

The Policy and Calendar Subcommittee also considered the proposed Withdrawal Policy submitted by G. Edwin Wilson to University Council on March 14, 1991. It did not recommend approval of this proposal, and the Committee voted to sustain the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee's position on this proposal.

The Committee also discussed minor changes in the Transfer Module that was approved by University Council in the Spring of 1991. The primary change was in the Speech requirement, since speech was disallowed for all universities by the Faculty committee. In addition, two math courses (1030:152 and 153) were removed from the required math listings. There were no other substantive changes to our module, which was approved by the Articulation and Transfer Council this past spring. (For summary of changes, see Appendix A-2).

There was consensus in the Committee that it would not forward these changes to Council for approval at this time, because the general studies program, upon which the current module is built, was now undergoing review. If changes were made in the present general studies requirements, additional changes would also be mandated in the transfer module. Therefore, it was the Committee's decision that it should wait until a decision was made about the General Studies report which was in the hands of the Curriculum Subcommittee before recommending modifications to University Council.

Finally, the Curriculum Subcommittee was seeking broad input on the present Report with Recommendations for a Revised General Studies Program, which was submitted to Council on March 29, 1991. Anyone who wished to address the Subcommittee on the topic was welcome to attend its next meeting on Tuesday, November 12, 1991 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of Gardner Student Center.

D. Athletics Committee - Dr. Joseph C. Latona, the Chairman, reported that the Committee met on October 17. The first item of business was the subject of committee membership which was thoroughly discussed and resolved. The second item was the Spring GPA Report. Mr. Jim Dennison introduced Mr. Rob Fournier, the University's Compliance Officer for the NCAA, who is in charge of academics. Mr. Fournier distributed copies of the Spring 1991 grades and a breakdown of GPAs by sport from Fall '87 through 1991. There was a considerable discussion regarding the scholastic achievement percentages, rate of retention, eligibility, and graduate rates. Mr. Fournier explained new NCAA rules which went into effect this Fall. Several members expressed concern about the retention rate and asked what they could do to help keep student athletes in school and made some specific suggestions regarding that.

The next item was recruiting. Both Dennison and Fournier explained the recruiting limitations which have been implemented. Among those were limitations to Proposition 48, students for individual sports, and also, in addition, all junior college transfers must be approved by a committee made up of Dennison, Fournier, Dawn Moore, and Dave Jamison. Also, coaches must submit a "Permission to Recruit" form for each prospect and prove that he or she has the potential to be a successful student. The Committee was told that MAC officials were impressed by our requirements, and that being affiliated with the MAC would demand that we recruit better student athletes.

The next item was student body commitment. Joe Dunn, Director of Marketing and Promotion of Sports at the University, was introduced and a lively discussion took place concerning the lack of student commitment to sports on campus and how they could be motivated to attend.

Dr. Latona concluded his report by noting that the next meeting would take place on November 14. Topics for discussion would include student body commitment, proposed legislation by the NCAA, budget comparisons pre and post I-AA, reforming college sports, and the role of the Athletic Task Force appointed by President Muse.

Mr. Elton Glaser asked for some specifics regarding retention of student athletes. Dr. Latona answered that retention of student athletes was somewhat better than that of the rest of the student body. The Committee was pleased with this and also impressed that the Athletic Department wanted to increase that retention even more. Comparisons from '87 to '91 did show improvement overall, although in some areas it was not so good. If anyone wanted more detail regarding not only individual sports but also the participants in each of those sports, he had that data and would be happy to provide it.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Dr. Harvey Sterns, the Chairman, began by noting that written reports had been ~~put~~ ^{passed} out and that he would present highlights of that report which summarized three meetings of October 3, 17, and November 7. The full report read as follows:

The University Facilities and Planning Committee met on October 3, 1991 in the McCollester Room of Buchtel Hall; October 17, 1991 in the Carnation Room of the Gardner Student Center; and on November 7, 1991 in the McCollister Room of Buchtel Hall. Each meeting was held at 8:30 a.m.

On October 3, 1991, Vice President Ryan reviewed the allocation from the Board of Regents for the 1992-1993 Biennium. It appears that \$16 million will be allocated. This will support the ASC Phase II, South Tower rehab and/or Electrical Engineering and Chemical Engineering and Greenhouse addition for Biology, Leigh Hall Rehab for Math Science, and some of Kolbe Hall addition and rehab. The request for the Science Technology Library addition was not approved. Remodeling of West Hall was not approved. Final allocation and project approval will be forthcoming. It appears the University Foundation will purchase the Girl Scout Building.

Vice President and Provost, Mark Auburn, addressed the committee. He stated that the committee could play an important role in advising university on policy regarding space and in setting priorities. Dr. Auburn pledged to work with the committee and take advantage of the representation in deciding issues. A major point of discussion by the committee was the planned move of Career Planning and Placement. There was much discussion about how the decision was made to move facilities and reasons for the move. Much discussion took place regarding the general planning or lack of planning approach that has been experienced. Dr. Auburn asked Vice President for Student Services, Dr. Dubick, to join the meeting. He explained to the committee the reasons for the planned move. After his presentation, no specific action was taken by the committee. On October 17, 1991, the committee reviewed The University of Akron Space Assignment Procedures Process. The committee discussed its role as a committee of University Council and by consensus affirmed as appropriate its role to offer advisory input on space allocation. It has been suggested that the committee be given an opportunity to provide comment on the Department of Physical Facilities routing slip.

The committee then responded to a memo from Gretchen Laatsch in which she suggested dividing the committee into two subcommittees—one to deal with short term space issues and the other to deal with long term space issues. The committee discussed this recommendation, but decided not to take action until the activities of the committee are further clarified. Assistant Provost, David Jamison, indicated that Provost Auburn planned to involve the committee in planning and space allocation decisions in the next few weeks.

Gretchen Laatsch, in her memo, requested discussion of 1) Use of space in Simmons when/if Career Planning and Placement moves. Dr. Harvey Sterns stated that the planning process was not being followed. Originally, Psychology was to move to Leigh Hall—according to earlier planning documents. If space was to become available in Simmons, first consideration was to be given to Psychology. This is a major Doctoral granting department with approximately 172 graduate students and over 369 undergraduate majors and actual space has decreased over the last few years (labs returned to classrooms, etc.). 2) Use of the old mail room between Gardner Student Center and Simmons. This was discussed. Roger Ryan stated that the possibilities of placing duplicating in this building were being considered. 3) Space for departments in East Hall, if they have to be moved because of the roof. Mr. Ryan stated that this is a serious issue and that the use of East Hall should be brought to a close as soon as possible. Eventually, a new library addition could go on this site. The purchase of the Girl Scout building could allow movement of the Child Care Center.

On November 7, 1991, the committee first heard a report from Vice President Ryan. He reported on the trip by President Muse, Vice Presidential Provost Auburn, Vice President Stafford, and himself to meet with representatives of the Ohio Board of Regents to request additional funding for projects. A major part of this presentation emphasized the fact that The University of Akron has the 3rd largest enrollment, but is 5th in allocation for construction. The University has asked for an additional \$4 million for renovation of West Hall and half of the money for Kolbe.

The committee then turned to Assistant Provost Jamison who presented a document, Space Issues Under Discussion (November, 1991) listing the following items:

1. IMDC/AV Removal from Bierce Library
 - timing of IMDC dismantling
 - relations of AV to meet needs of users

2. Career Planning/Placement/Co-Op to Grant Street Residence
 - Timing of move
 - Simmons Hall Space (2,542 sq. ft.)
 - Spicer Hall space (1,183 sq. ft.)
3. Relocation of units in East Hall
 - Black Cultural Center (2,491 sq. ft.)
 - Honors Program office (915 sq. ft.)
 - Day Care
4. Student Services
 - Orientation
5. CEPSO Renovations
6. Gardner Student Center
 - Hilltop
 - Bookstore/Chuckery
7. Mailroom Renovation and Usage

It was pointed out by Mr. Jamison that the only space available on campus was the result of other units moving until the Polsky building is complete.

Dean Sylvester requested that any space made available due to the closure of the IMDC/AV in Bierce Library be set aside for student space for students. The Science and Technology Library will be closed December 16 and study space will be needed during finals. The Science and Technology Library will be closed for two months.

Dr. Gary Frank raised the issue regarding handicapped doors for students going from the College of Business building to Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Concourse doors are not assisted.

Mr. Ryan stated that there is still unassigned space in Posky's and that unit's needs are changing as time elapses during the construction process.

Major discussion took place concerning relocation of units in East Hall and the current structural status of East Hall. It was suggested that the Black Cultural Center and Honors Program could be moved to newly available space in Simmons and Spicer.

Dr. Sterns asked Dean Thomas Vukovich to take over as Chair since Dr. Sterns wished to speak as a non-neutral committee member. Dr. Sterns then pointed out that space in Simmons is desperately needed by Psychology. The department has again and again been put off and promises have been made for years that when additional space was available it would go to Psychology.

The committee, after considerable discussion, unanimously passed the following motions:

1. That a complete evaluation regarding the cost of rehabilitation of East Hall be made before a final decision is made to tear it down; that costs be considered in terms of what it would mean not to have the building available for use. (This includes 3 offices, 5 classrooms, and the Child Care Center space.)
2. That priority be given to academic departmental space needs that are long standing.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Mr. David Brink, the Chairman, stated that the Committee had met on October 10, 1991.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - Mr. Paul Richert, the Chairman, stated that there was no report.

H. University Libraries Committee - Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair, stated that the Committee had met several times during the semester, most recently on November 1. Earlier in the semester it had met with Provost Auburn and the Dean-Elect of the Library, Dr. Williams. At present, the Committee was forming subcommittees to review the proposed sharing of materials state-wide through Ohiolink. It planned to be able to educate the faculty on what Ohiolink would and would not be able to, and on what problems it might or might not solve. The Committee had also recently received a copy of the Student Library Users Survey, and she understood that copies had also been made available to Council members. This survey had been done by the students, and the Committee had not yet had a chance to review it.

I. Reference Committee - Dr. Faith Helmick, the Chair, reported that the Committee had met on October 22 and had begun its review of the Faculty Manual as described in the Bylaws of Council. Recommendations resulting from this review would be presented to University Council in February as was customary. A motion was approved to request the Executive Committee to refer the Sexual Harassment Policy to a Council committee for a review of the policy's contents since this was outside of the purview of the Reference Committee. In light of the item of New Business on the agenda, this recommendation was not necessary.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - Dr. Daniel Sheffer, the Chairman, reported that a meeting to review the faculty project proposals from Fall, '91 was scheduled for November 11. The results would be reported at the next meeting.

K. Student Affairs Committee - Dr. Dubick, the Chairman, reported that the Committee met on October 18. The members divided themselves into the two standing subcommittees: the Extracurricular Affairs Subcommittee that deals with recognizing the registration of new student groups and the distribution of the student activity funds, and the Awards, Scholarships, Grants, and Loans Committee which deals with student financial aid on campus. The committee scheduled its next meeting for November 8 to discuss a number of issues including proposed restructuring of the Associated Student Government (to which ASG President Smith has been invited), a proposal for a registration fee to replace some of the many smaller fees such as withdrawal fees, class change fees, etc, and a discussion of the issue referred by the Executive Committee regarding the election of the Non-Traditional Student representatives to Council.

L. General Studies Advisory Council - Dr. Eric Birdsall, the Chairman, reported that the Council had met on October 24 and asked him to urge Council to expedite consideration of its proposal. As Council had learned from Dr. Walton's report, the APCC was working on it. Until the proposal was approved, the Council believed that it was inappropriate to perform the second part of its charge - overseeing courses in the curriculum - until it knew what the curriculum would be.

M. Ad Hoc Committee for University Governance - Dr. Rita Saslaw, the Chair, reported that the Committee had met four times, most recently on October 29. It agreed completely with the statements made by Dr. McGucken at the last Council meeting that the charge to the committee was very clear, and it planned to abide by that charge and investigate the adequacy of student representation in university governance and possible alternatives to this particular body. The Committee saw its role as a subfunction of this body, and all reports would, with or without recommendation, be brought back to this particular body. In order to do this work, the committee had done the following:

1. It was in the process of writing a history of governance at this institution.
2. It was completing an analysis of already collected data at institutions that resemble The University of Akron and on other Ohio institutions. There were a total of 14 in the sample currently. After doing this analysis, the Committee would determine whether it had to survey additional institutions to get a better picture.
3. It was also planning to set up hearings, focus groups, or perhaps survey faculty. A decision had not yet been made on how it was best to get information on the thoughts of this University's faculty, administration, and student body on university governance.

The Committee had developed a bibliography of current articles going back five years on university governance. It was available to anyone who was interested. The next meeting of the Committee would be on Thursday, November 14 at 8 a.m. in the McColester Room. All were welcome and the Committee was still open to new members.

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents. A written report was submitted by the alternate representative, Mr. Dennis Sullivan and accepted by Council for inclusion in the Chronicle (see Appendix B).

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business - The Chairman stated that the first item was consideration of the report of the Library User Survey, Spring '91 and acceptance of recommendations of the University Libraries Committee. He reminded Council that at the October meeting, it had postponed that consideration and acceptance until today's meeting. He then recognized Dr. Erickson, the Chair of the University Libraries Committee, who would speak to the acceptance of the report and the recommendations.

Dr. Erickson reminded Council members that a full report of the Committee was contained in the October 14 Chronicle. She wanted to review the major points from the survey as they related to the recommendations. This could be found on pages 12 and 13 of the Chronicle. When the Committee conducted this survey last spring, somewhere between 45 and 50 percent of the faculty answered, despite the small amount of time available to reply. The results here were the summary of those responses. 86 percent of the faculty thought that there should be a higher budget priority on improving the quality of the Library in the future, and 76 percent thought that it should have a higher priority in the present budget. There was unanimous response, essentially from the colleges and the disciplines using the Science and Tech Library, about the severe study space problem in that Library. There were considerable numbers of comments about satisfaction among certain kinds of materials, both for teaching and research by faculty. There were problems with interlibrary loans. The faculty did have positive things to say about our librarians who gave highly professional service.

The Committee considered that these results indicated widespread concern with the status of the Library and a willingness to accept the tradeoffs and commitment improvement would involve. It noted that, at present, the University only spent 3.8 percent on average of its budget on the Library. This was shown in the table on page 26 (Oct. 14 *Chronicle*), and it compared unfavorably with our sister institutions which spent over 6 percent. On the basis of all this, the Committee had the following recommendations:

1. That the University immediately increase space for the Science and Technology Library. The Committee recommended this in the full knowledge that this required approval from Columbus, and unfortunately, according to her most recent information, it had been turned down. Supporting this recommendation would at least emphasize that this was a crisis situation, and say to those who were able to do something about it that something really needed to be done.
2. That in the short-run, that is from the next budget, the Library should receive funds to at least maintain the level of purchases of materials and access to materials (maintain spending in real terms). In the report, the Committee noted that this year the Library had received a 15 percent cut in real spending. This forced a cut in serials, and journals had to be canceled. If the Library was going to be improved or at least maintained, spending in real terms had to be maintained.
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 to the achievement of at least upper-third status among state university libraries. The University might be in the upper-third in enrollment, but, according to data, it was 10th or 11th in a number of library performance criteria. The Committee considered the 5 percent share and upper-third status reasonable goals.
4. That there be a study under the Dean of University Libraries to assess the extent to which it was feasible for Electronic Services to satisfy the information needs of library users and at what cost. New technology might be of great use in solving many of the Library's problems. This sort of study would look into various options, their costs, the ease and effectiveness with which they could be used, etc. In connection with this, it had to be remembered that the survey showed that 52 % of the faculty did not have access to Library catalogues through computers, either because they did not own one or did not have a modem.

Dr. Erickson concluded by noting that we were not determinants of the budget of the University. All we could do was recommend, but at least these recommendations would represent our sense of concern on this issue and be of some influence.

In response to a question from the Chairman regarding procedure, Dr. Bee suggested that since Council had listened to Dr. Erickson's report, it had accepted it in the sense of having received it. The only thing that the body needed to act on would be the four recommendations, and he thought that Council could move directly to those. Since there was no objection to this, Council proceeded to consider the recommendations.

Mr. Tom Smith stated that on behalf of the student body he wanted to support the recommendations. They were clear, eloquently stated, and adequately forwarded the concerns which everybody had about the Library. He also wanted to mention the Student Library Survey, which had been passed out to Council members. This was a survey of 1000 students (not randomly chosen), and it complemented the results of the faculty survey in a number of ways. First, a large majority of the students considered the services in

the Library to be of high standard. Second, the students were concerned about the lack of space, especially in the Science and Technology Library. Third, there was a strong concern about the lack of journals and articles in the Library.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester wanted to know whether Council was going to take the four recommendations as a unit or vote on each separately. When the Chairman answered that the former was the case, Dean Sylvester moved that the question be divided into four parts. This was seconded by Dean Tom Vukovich. Council then voted, and the motion was defeated.

Dean Sylvester then noted that while he was obviously sympathetic to the needs of the Library, he did not believe that it had the number one priority on campus. The second and third recommendations certainly put it in that position. The second said that the Library budget should not be cut when everyone else's was. The third went even further stating that the Library's budget had to be substantially increased before any other unit on campus. He thought that there were other things on campus that would have a higher priority than the Library.

Dr. Allen Noble wanted to know what items Dean Sylvester would rank above the Library. What Council had here was an opportunity to express its concern about the Library. Council members were realistic enough to know that if the body voted to take all University funds and devote them to the Library that it would not happen. This vote would send a message about what the importance of the Library should be. By voting in favor of the recommendations, Council was saying that the Library was the heart of the University, and that it should be given support and always be a part of the considerations for decisions which were made on campus. By voting against the recommendations, Council would be saying that the Library was not that important, and let's worry only about our own individual budgets or some other items which might have higher priority in some people's minds. He suggested that Council support the recommendations.

Dean Sylvester replied that if the recommendations were of a general nature, he would certainly vote yes. The Library was central to the mission of the University, and he was in favor of the need to support it. However, these recommendations said much more than that to him. The specific wording implied that Council would be recommending that the Library's increased funding came before anything else. That was what he objected to. As to what he thought had a higher priority than the Library budget, the faculty/ staff salary raises would fall into that category.

Dr. Erickson said that the Committee's intention had not been to make the Library first priority in the budget no matter what. However, in the past its priority had been very low, and the intention here was to make it higher. A concern for the Library and its importance had often been honored in words, but not in fact. Therefore, the Committee wanted to put some specific goals forward and express concern in a clear and precise way.

Dean Sylvester replied that recommendation 2 specifically stated "do not cut our budget," but all other operating budgets were cut, and that implied to him top priority. Recommendation 3 said "let the Library's share of the budget be 5 percent." That turned out to be about \$1 million or an increase of the Library's budget of about 15 percent. Again that implied to him a priority which exceeded that of any other unit on campus. These specifics were what he was objecting to, not the idea that we needed to attend to the needs of the Library. Was University Council really endorsing a \$1 million increase in the Library budget?

Mr. Samir Yebaile understood what Dean Sylvester was saying and could point to the need for budget increases in his own department. However, in the four years that he had been a student at the University, he had heard the Library referred to not as the Library or Bierce Library, but as "that funky building over there that doesn't have the books that I need." These recommendations did not seem to him to say that the Library should have number one priority on campus, but they were a way that both students and faculty could say that something needed to be done. It also would show to the whole University that University Council was aware of the concerns and needs of this campus. Perhaps later on, Council could pass recommendations relating to other priority issues like increases in faculty salaries, etc.

There being no further discussion, Council voted on adopting the four recommendations, and they were decisively approved with only two dissenting votes.

The next item of unfinished business was a proposed amendment to the Faculty Manual, section 3359-20-03 (A)(4), Distinguished Professor. The Chairman reminded Council that at the October meeting it had been given copies of the proposed amendment along with a rationale presented by President Muse from the Distinguished Professor Review Committee (see October 14 Chronicle, pp. 27 -29). Council had voted to postpone consideration of this matter until today's meeting.

Dr. Helmick spoke in favor of the amendment. She reminded Council that the President introduced it as a result of a committee appointed to look into problems that were raised from the promotions to distinguished professor last year. The changes that were proposed generally focussed on two things. One, they clarified the requirements for distinguished professor, and two, they provided a further review to ensure that those people who received this honor were worthy of it.

Dr. Eric Birdsall had concerns about two parts of the amendment. The first was in paragraph (a) where the word "only" had been deleted from the original. The present wording in the Manual was (a) "The title of distinguished professor shall be awarded only to one who..." He wondered whether the omission of "only" was inadvertent or intentional. If it was intentional, he wanted to move to restore it.

Dr. Helmick commented that she did not know for certain whether it was intentional or not. When she had gone over the amendment, she had thought that it did not make a difference whether it was there or not. However, Council could assume that it was an accidental oversight.

The Chairman stated that, with the acceptance of the body, the word "only" could be reinserted as a correction to the material which had been presented without the need for a motion. There was no objection.

Dr. Birdsall's second concern was paragraph (d). In every other personnel item of which he was aware, it was not possible for any single administrator or committee to prevent the moving forward of a nomination. As he read paragraph (d), it was possible to interpret it to mean that if the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee did not recommend positively for a candidate, the matter would be at an end. If that interpretation was correct, he opposed it and moved the following amendment to paragraph (d): "The University Distinguished Professor Review Committee shall review all nominations made by the deans as set forth in section (b) above, MAKE A POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION IN EACH CASE, AND RETURN THEM TO THE PROVOST." His aim was simply to ensure that a single committee would not have the authority to derail a nomination sent forward by a department, dean, or college. The motion was seconded by Mr. Glaser.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval of Dr. Birdsall's amendment.

Dr. William McGucken opposed the motion and wanted to present his reasons within the context of the Council's recent history on the issue. In the Fall of 1988, President Muse presented a proposal to Council

which would have added an additional faculty rank above that of the distinguished professor. The ranks would be assistant, associate, full, distinguished, and university professor. The distinguished professor would then be a regular rank and be a part of the RTP process. The criteria for promotion to that rank would need to be high, and President Muse proposed that the number be limited to two percent of the full-time teaching faculty. The new university professor rank was to be particularly special and available to individuals who had already attained the rank of distinguished professor and had continued to be productive for a number of years. There would be only a small number of faculty at this rank, perhaps limited to one percent of the full-time teaching faculty. This proposal was forwarded to APCC which did not recommend to Council acceptance of the idea of the new rank, but it did recommend that the four ranks be maintained. It was during this discussion that the idea of one percent was emphasized for the rank of distinguished professor. Thus there would be fewer people who would attain the rank, and associated with this would be the idea that a distinguished professor would have displayed excellence in both teaching and in research. It was thought that to be more specific than what is currently in Faculty Manual was difficult.

Last year was the first year of operation for the new system. Over the summer he had heard that there were problems associated with it, but he was surprised when the President presented Council with a new proposal. President Muse mentioned three concerns of the faculty as reasons for the proposal (Oct. 14 Chronicle, pp. 3-4). The first was whether the process followed had given due weight to the expertise of the faculty within the colleges making the nominations. Dr. McGucken was not sure what this meant but thought that it might be interpreted to mean that what happened was that the Distinguished Professor Review Committee had turned down some college nominations. This was not unforeseen and happened with regular RTP procedures. The second concern was whether standards used by all colleges were consistent. Perhaps this had been a problem, but he had thought that one of the functions of the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee was to see that there be a consistency across campus. The third concern was whether all persons nominated had been adequately considered. Perhaps not all people had been. In light of these concerns, President Muse asked the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee to look into the matter, and this led to this new proposal.

Difficulties and disagreements were not uncommon in RTP deliberations. From Dr. McGucken's own perspective, one difficulty with the procedure last year was that it had not been administered properly at the University level. He illustrated this by describing experiences of one member of the University Distinguished Professor Review Committee. That member while teaching a class received a call that the first meeting of the Distinguished Professor Committee was in progress. By the time he finished teaching, received the message, and proceeded to the room where the meeting was being held, it was over. He did get notice for the second meeting, but he had a prior commitment in another state. He submitted his recommendations and asked that they be read at the meeting, but that did not happen. Since this procedure on selection of Distinguished Professors was established in the tenure of a previous provost and was implemented during the busy year of an acting provost, perhaps that was, in part, why it was not properly carried out at the University level. From what he could see, the procedure in his own college had worked quite well.

Dr. McGucken then discussed the difficulties of specifying criteria. The new proposal required that the colleges establish qualitative criteria but guided by what standard? Then the Review Committee would decide whether the college criteria was suitable, but what would be its standard? It seemed to him that the criteria for a position like distinguished professor which was a university-wide post should be decided by University Council. Perhaps the place to be more specific and cite criteria would be in paragraph (a). It would be here that departments and colleges would turn for assistance in nominating individuals for the rank

of distinguished professor. In the new proposal it read, "The title of distinguished professor shall be awarded only to one who, already holding the rank of professor at The University of Akron for five or more years, continues to excel in teaching...." The difficulty rested upon "continues" because the implication was there that after becoming a full professor, all one needed to do to be qualified for the next rank was continue to perform for another five year as one had before achieving full professor status. If "continues" were deleted, it would reinforce the idea of only one percent of the full-time faculty attaining the rank as well as excellence in teaching and research. Thus a possible amendment would be the following: The title of distinguished professor shall be awarded only to one who, already holding the rank of professor at The University of Akron for five or more years, EXCELS in teaching and scholarly activity....."

Dr. McGucken however did not want to offer this amendment now because he did not favor the proposal for a number of reasons. First, it made the Distinguished Professor Review Committee all-powerful, since it would decide what the criteria were. Second, in contrast to what was presently in place in the Faculty Manual, it ignored departments. Under the present situation, departments could generate nominations, but this was not the case in the new proposal. Third, it would eliminate elected college representatives on the Review Committee because some would argue that some colleges would never have distinguished professors, and so they ought not to have representation on this committee. This was really presumptuous. Others argued that only distinguished professors should be on the committee in parallel with regular RTP procedures which allowed only full professors to decide on which associates were promoted to full professor rank. Dr. McGucken saw the reasoning in this, but it was not necessary to abide by this practice since the selection of distinguished professor was not a regular RTP procedure. He was disturbed by the second sentence in the rationale presented by the committee which read, "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." To him, any full professor on this campus was as capable as a distinguished professor of recognizing a professor who excelled in teaching and in research. A further argument in favor of elected representatives was the Council's Faculty Research Committee. It was made up of people from all over campus who regularly made decisions on proposals from every college and department in the University.

Dr. McGucken concluded by stating that a reasonable process was already in place that if administered properly would prove satisfactory on the whole. He hoped that Council would vote down this proposal, and then if that were done, he would introduce his amendment to change what was at present paragraph (a) in the Faculty Manual.

Dr. Gerlach supported Dr. McGucken's statements and wanted to add one or two small points. In regard to the issue of cutting the faculty at the department level out, the current regulation allowed for nomination not only from the departments or divisions, but also from the colleges or the dean. It was much more flexible than what was proposed here. Under paragraph (b) of the proposal, the recommendation was only made by the dean upon recommendation by the faculty of the college. This could mean the entire faculty of the college or faculty in individual departments. It was not clear. The language as it now stood in the Manual was far better. He also objected to the idea that when one reached the level of the Distinguished Professor Review Committee of the whole university, there would be no more than seven persons holding that title doing the reviewing. If there were seventeen distinguished professors, all of them should be on the committee out of the principle that professors reviewed associate professors for entry into their ranks and so on. Perhaps this whole matter ought to be referred to the APCC for some reworking and reconsideration.

Dr. Bee stated that he had heard a great deal both for and against the proposal from the speakers with which he could agree. Dr. McGucken's presentation had unfolded something of the complexities of what had originally seemed like an innocently simple proposal, and it had suggested to him that he had not

thought sufficiently about some of the fundamental issues. Was there a problem that needed to be fixed? If there was a problem, was it inherent in the structure of the present circumstances? If there was an inherent problem, would the proposal, in fact, correct it without doing more damage? Because he had these questions in his mind and wanted to think more about the matter, he moved that action be postponed on this until the next Council meeting. This was seconded by Dean Sylvester.

Since there was no further discussion, Council voted and approved Dr. Bee's motion to postpone.

Item No. 8 - New Business. The first item of new business was a proposed amendment to the Faculty Manual, Appendix X, Sexual Harassment Policy. Before beginning, two minor corrections were pointed out in section (B) Definitions - first sentence which should have read, "Sexual harassment is the exercise or attempt to exercise the authority and power OF (not on) one's position to control, influence or affect the employment OR (not of) academic status of.." The Chairman then recognized Dr. Diana Chlebek who wanted to speak to proposal.

Dr. Chlebek wanted to begin by explaining how these amendments came about. In 1984, the National Office of the AAUP approved a policy on sexual harassment, and in 1987 the University of Akron adopted this policy, more or less, and added it to the Faculty Manual as an appendix. During the period of October 1990 through January 22, 1991, Committee W of the Akron Chapter of the AAUP revised the University of Akron Sexual Harassment Policy by adding some major points and ways to handle complaints along the line of the national AAUP's policy. Some of these points included the following:

- * That such conduct should be included under the heading of unprofessional conduct threatening to the academic freedom of others.
- * That the alleged offender be informed if a written complaint is filed.
- * The resolution of a complaint, if an informal solution is not possible, should be referred to the appropriate grievance committee, such as Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Contract Professional Grievance Committee, Staff Grievance Committee, or Student Disciplinary Committee.

The idea behind this was that the accused be allowed due process and that there be a provision for sanctions imposed by the President and Provost. On February 6, 1991, the revision was sent to the AAUP Executive Committee which then approved it and sent it on to Council.

Dr. Helmick wanted to move that the proposal be referred to the Faculty Well-Being Committee. Her reasons for this were that first this was the University Council Committee which had originally dealt with the policy years ago, and second that there had been no consultation with the University Counsel or with the Affirmative Action Officer. This had led to some problems. For example on page 2 under (E) (1) it said, "DON'T DELAY IN LETTING SOMEONE KNOW." It then listed a whole host of people that persons should contact if they think that they are being harassed. That was a major difficulty, and, in essence, opened up the complete process to however many people there were in the country. There had to be a review to make certain that all of the statements in these amendments complied with the Federal Law dealing with harassment. For that reason, she moved not only that these amendments be sent to the Faculty Well-Being Committee, but also that the committee be directed by Council to consult with the University Affirmative Action Officer and with the University's General Counsel to insure that whatever changes were proposed were in compliance with the law. This was seconded.

Dr. Lawrence Focht wanted to know why the Affirmative Action Officer had to be involved? Dr. Helmick replied that under university policy that office was charged with handling complaints that were violations of the law in regard to discrimination or sexual harassment.

Dr. Gerlach stated that he would support the motion, but he wanted to point out to the committee that in numerous places in the proposal the word "should" had been used instead of "shall." If the points in the proposal were to be mandated, then "shall" was the proper word to use.

Ms. Andrea Tabet thought that the Committee should look into the section on resolution of the complaint. It seemed to assume harassment was actually occurring without a trial happening. This was misleading, and was automatically assuming that someone was being harassed.

Council then voted and approved the motion to refer to the Faculty Well-Being Committee.

The next item of new business relating to the December 26 submission of grades had already been handled under the APCC report.

Dr. Walton then wanted to introduce as new business an item which he had already mentioned in his APCC report, the continuing enrollment requirement for graduate students (see Appendix A-1). This was moved and seconded. The requirement would read as follows: "All students admitted to doctoral programs must register for a minimum of one graduate credit as approved by their advisors during each Fall and Spring semester. Individual departments may exceed this minimum requirement. Doctoral students should consult their advisors about additional requirements. Master programs may require continuing enrollment. Students should consult their advisors about this requirement." Dr. Walton stated that this had been approved by Graduate Council and the APCC.

In response to a question regarding what would happen to graduate students who did not comply with the requirement, Dr. Walton, speaking on behalf of Dean Carrell who could not attend the meeting, assumed that warning letters would be sent and time given for the students to correct the situation. If they did not, they would be terminated from the program.

Some Council members including Dr. Noble wanted to know whether there was some mechanism in place to allow a student who had some good or sufficient reason for not registering, such as an illness, to come back into the program. Dean Vukovich pointed out that in the rationale for the proposal, it stated, "Student hardship cases may apply for a leave of absence from the program to avert the continuing enrollment requirement."

Dr. Gerlach added that certainly this was the sort of situation in which the principle, always in vogue with deans, called administrative discretion, or, as he like to call it, the royal prerogative could be applied.

The Chairman replied, "We certainly understand that!" He then called for a vote on the policy, and Council voted its approval.

In response to a final call for new business, Dean Sylvester, who hoped that this was not out of order, wanted to request that those members who had spoken against the Distinguished Professor proposal come next time with something in writing so that Council could vote on it and the University could have some new distinguished professors this year.

November 22, 1991

Page 17

The Chairman replied that Dean Sylvester was definitely out of order, and he called for a motion to adjourn.

Item No. 9 - Adjournment - Dr. Bee made a motion to adjourn, and this was seconded by Dr. David Buchthal. Council voted its approval, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

APPENDIX A-1

April 26, 1991

TO: Joseph M. Walton
Associate Provost

FROM: Patricia L. Carrell
Dean of the Graduate School

SUBJECT: Continuing Enrollment Requirement

At its meeting this afternoon, the Graduate Faculty unanimously passed the following continuing enrollment requirement. I am herewith forwarding this to you and request that you refer it to the appropriate additional bodies for approval (i.e., University Council and the appropriate committee of University Council).

Continuing Enrollment Requirement

All students admitted to doctoral programs must register for a minimum of one graduate credit as approved by their advisors during each Fall and Spring semester. Individual departments may exceed this minimum requirement. Doctoral students should consult their advisors about additional requirements. Masters programs may require continuing enrollment. Students should consult their advisors about this requirement.

History and Rationale

Such a policy has long been under consideration by the Student Policy Committee of the Graduate Council and the Graduate Council. This version was passed by the Student Policy Committee early in the Spring Semester 1991, and unanimously passed by the Graduate Council in February 1991 (cf. Graduate Council minutes, February 25, 1991).

The main rationale and intent of the requirement is to facilitate time-to-degree by providing a mechanism whereby students keep in touch with their programs and vice-versa, so that students do not drift away from their programs and studies. Especially critical is the ABD status, after students complete all course-work and other degree requirements, and are working on their dissertations. Often, competing demands of employment deter students from making progress on their doctoral dissertations. This requirement will ensure that students maintain at least minimal contact with their advisors, and, conversely, that their advisors will feel responsibility toward them.

Studies show that students take their studies more seriously when a continuing enrollment policy is in effect. Data from the University of Chicago, which has such a requirement, indicate that students complete their degree programs in a more timely fashion when there is such a policy in effect.

Many of the doctoral programs on campus already have a continuing enrollment requirement: History, Psychology, Polymers, and Education.

If the student is using any university facilities (e.g., laboratories for research), it is necessary for the student to be officially enrolled in order for the institution and the student to be covered by insurance.

This proposal will primarily affect unfunded students who are not actively taking coursework. Departments will administer this requirement.

Student hardship cases may apply for a leave of absence from the program to avert the continuing enrollment requirement.

APPENDIX A-2

November 5, 1991

TO: Joseph Walton, Chair
APCC

FROM: David Jamison
Assistant Provost

SUBJECT: Transfer Module

The following summarizes the changes in our module as mandated by the statewide faculty transfer module review committee.

Area I: English

As Approved by Council: 11 credits (8 English, 3 Speech)

**As Revised to Conform
to State Guidelines:** 8 credits

- (a) Faculty committee disallowed speech for all universities. Speech was removed from the module. Requirement reduced to 8 credits.
- (b) On transfer module grid, clarified that 2020:121 or 1100:111 meets the state minimum requirement. 1100:112 meets UA transfer module requirement.

Area II: Mathematics

As Approved by Council: 3 credits (various course options)

**As Revised to Conform
to State Guidelines:**

- (a) Removed 2030:152 and 153 as not being at required math level.
- (b) Clarified that 2030:142 is the course that meets the requirement (2030:141 is a prerequisite).

Area III: Social Sciences (No changes)

As Approved by Council: 6 credits

Area IV: Natural Sciences

As Approved by Council: 6 credits

No changes in coursework options; grid required to show division into lecture and lab hours for laboratory courses.

Area V: Arts/Humanities (No changes)

As Approved by Council: 10 credits (8 Western Cult.; 2 Eastern Civ.)

Overall Total and Effect

- (1) In order to have total credits reach state-mandated minimum of 36 semester credits, since Speech was disallowed, module was amended to include three (3) additional credits of coursework drawn from the courses listed in the module.**
- (2) Students transferring into The University of Akron will now need to complete six (6) additional credits (3 credits of Speech, 2 credits of Eastern Civilizations, 1 credit of Physical Education) as originally passed by Council.**

APPENDIX B

**FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR,
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS**

October 10, 1991

The Committee convened at 10:30 a.m. Chancellor Hairston was introduced to the new committee members. Following the introductions, Chancellor Hairston addressed the Committee. In her remarks she noted that:

1. Enrollment at State schools has remained steady or is up slightly.
2. Enrollment at private schools is up.
3. Challenges facing Higher Education (concerns of the Federal Government):
 - a. Increasing fees
 - b. Defaults on student loans
 - c. Campus crime
 - d. Abuse of research dollars
 - e. Development fund dollars
4. Higher education is on the defensive. Schools have been under a microscope, now it is higher education's turn.
5. State will be looking real close at how the money is being spent. When money is tight, accountability goes up.
6. Issues facing Higher Education in Ohio:
 - a. Faculty accountability--hours on the job and how they are spent.
 - b. Current Budget Bill--money for Excellence Programs is being held in abeyance
 - c. Management for the Future Task Force--requested by the Governor's Office, called for by the OBR. Will be asked to look at how the current resources could be better spent. People from the outside will be looking at what we are doing. We must somehow protect the quality of education.
 - d. Budget - a long-term problem, we will be fighting for dollars. The reasons given were:
 - * The aging population will put pressure on the public budget for the next 10 years. Nursing care costs are increasing 20% a year.
 - * Ohio's drug problem
 - * Federal Government passing problems on to the individual states
 - * Lawsuits on how state money is being distributed to school districts

- * Public concern over crime
 - * Pressure to hold down fees at State schools
7. Public is not concerned over the state of Higher Education--they think that we can take care of ourselves.
 8. OBR will sponsor a state-wide meeting with Boards of Trustees from all the State schools. It is hoped they will then lobby for Higher Education.
 9. A State-Wide Task Force will look at the overall situation in Ohio.

During the afternoon session election of officers took place. The new officers are:

Chairman - Greg Rose, Ohio State-Marion
Vice Chairman - Ray Rowling, University of Cincinnati
Secretary - Polly Owen, Columbus State Community College

The Committee agreed to the following agenda for the year:

- I. Look at Selective Excellence Programs (the State wants to know if there is a good return on the investment)
- II. Part-Time Faculty
- III. Management Task Force
- IV. Retirement Issue
- V. How often should the committee meet?
- VI. Transfer Modules

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

