

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

4-2-1992

## Faculty Senate Chronicle April 2, 1992

Heather M. Loughney

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of April 2, 1992	1
Appendix to the Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of April 2, 1992	9
A. Report of the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee	9
B. Resolution on Salary Allocation Prepared by the Faculty Well-Being Committee in April, 1991	10
C. Amendments to the <u>Bylaws of University Council</u> : <b>Composition of the Council and Functions of Permanent Committees of University Council</b>	11
D. Recommendation for Appointment of an Early Retirement Incentive Program Study Committee	12
Curriculum Changes	14

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



.

6

1



v

0





## **Minutes of the University Council Meeting of April 2, 1992**

The regular meeting of University Council was called to order by the Presiding Officer, Senior Vice President and Provost, Mark S. Auburn, at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, April 2, 1992 in the Goodyear Auditorium of the Polymer Science and Engineering Building.

Sixty-three of the eighty-four members of Council were in attendance. Those absent with notice were Mr. Tom Andes, Ms. Karin Billions, Dr. Eric Birdsall, Dean Robert Dubick, Dean Claibourne Griffin, Mr. Terry Haas, Dr. Faith Helmick, Dean Isaac Hunt, Ms. Joyce Mirman, Dr. Allen Noble, Dean Russell Petersen, Mr. George Pope, Dr. John Serafini, Dean Nicholas Sylvester, and Dr. Edwin Wilson. Those absent without notice were: Dr. Darlene Ahnberg, Dr. Diana Chlebek, Dr. Martha Collins, Mr. Elton Glaser, Mr. Dale Lynk, and Mr. Frank Colarik.

**ITEM NO. 1 - REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT.** Dr. Auburn introduced Acting President Marion Ruebel whose remarks were as follows:

I'm sure that most of you read in the paper that this past week we lost a very dear friend in Dr. Ruth Lewis who passed away coming home from Florida, and on April 4 we are going to have a memorial for her in Knight Auditorium at 1:00. I would appreciate it if we could have good attendance at this memorial. Next month we will have a resolution presented from the School of Communications. However, I wonder, with your permission, if you would stand for a moment of silence for our former colleague.

(There was then a moment of silence in honor of Dr. Lewis.)

Thank you. Also I would like to announce that on April 11 at 7:00 we will be dedicating the atrium, the Wallace Williams Atrium, in Guzzetta Hall, and once again we would appreciate your attendance at this dedication.

I would like to update you a little bit on the budget situation from Columbus and bring you up to date as to what we are doing on campus. I have nothing new to report from Columbus. I talked to the Board of Regent's Office this afternoon and nothing has happened. I also talked to the IUC Office, and nothing has happened so the only thing that we can do is go ahead and continue to plan as we have and hope for the best. The closer it gets to July 1, the more nervous I get about the situation. As we go into the planning process, I want to dispel as many rumors as possible on campus because what we are doing is trying to come up with various scenarios depending on what the situation happens to be July 1. Keep in mind that as we plan we are not deciding. We are simply trying to come up with different scenarios depending on what happens and then we will go ahead and put the various plans or plan into operation. We will not do this until we look very specifically at what the consequences are going to be from the budget cuts. I am trying to get as much information as I can from the various factions on campus including the Council of Deans, SPARC, and various other groups. I am even getting some help from individuals through the mail and so on, and most of it is helpful; I want as much input as possible in this process. I want specifically to look at program duplications where we might have two or three doing the same thing and could get along with just one. I want to look very stringently at teaching loads and the scheduling process because, as I examine things, I might see courses that might be better offered once a year instead of every semester or possibly every three semesters depending on the situation. There are things that I want to stay away from as we go into this process. As I have mentioned before, we are going to avoid across-the-board cuts. We are also going to protect the revenue-producing programs as much as we can. It simply makes sense that we not cut off our legs there. Third, we want to protect our mission, especially in regard to the classroom, teaching, and the learning process.



I want you to rest assured that as I get information from Columbus I will share this information with you. When decisions are made, I will want to share them with you as well. In other words, I want you to feel that you are a part of it. Dr. Auburn and I need your input because we are facing some very serious times, and I think that we have to approach this as a unit. And last, I would like to say that I truly appreciate your patience and your understanding because these are difficult times. I remember that in 1982 we went through something similar to this, but it was not as profound as the one that we are in now. So I truly appreciate the efforts that you have put forth so far, and I will be calling on you in the future also. Thank you. Any questions?

Mr. Tim Sheridan raised the question which he had asked at the last meeting regarding the possible move of the Office of Student Services from Buchtel Hall to the Student Center.

Dr. Ruebel stated that his response was the same. If it would cost too much, then it would not be done. However, he still thought that the Dean of Students should be where the students are.

Mr. Sheridan noted that he had received some information from people in the Buchtel office that it would cost in the vicinity of \$100,000.

Dr. Ruebel replied that he did not know how much it would cost, but if it did require an expenditure of \$100,000 then it would not be done.

Mr. Sheridan asked Dr. Ruebel to inform Council regarding the cost, and he replied that, if the move took place, he would.

Dr. C. Frank Griffin gathered from some of the things that Dr. Ruebel had said that, at least in terms of worst case scenarios, he was considering reducing either staff or faculty in some areas or making shifts.

Dr. Ruebel replied that to do away with programs would require a declaration of financial exigency. This was the last thing that he wanted to do because if we declared financial exigency it meant that a bumpy process as far as faculty were concerned would be initiated, and he wanted to avoid this if he possibly could. Looking at the worst case scenario (a cut as high as 20 percent), this would put us in financial exigency. The situation had been examined with cuts of 6 percent, 10 percent, and then beyond. He thought that we could handle much of this by combining programs without letting faculty go.

Dr. Griffin asked whether this would then lead to a reduction of staff, for example, secretaries.

Dr. Ruebel replied that if we reached the position where faculty had to be let go and programs were done away with, this naturally would call for staff reduction because not as much support would be needed. However, he hoped that this point would not be reached.

Dr. June Burton wondered in regard to the problem of financial exigency whether The University of Akron Foundation could be used as a backup.

Dr. Ruebel answered that it could not.

Dr. Kathy Stafford added that at least 95 percent of the money raised on a yearly basis toward the University was on a restricted basis so that it was not available for general funds. There was a \$50 million endowment, but the same situation applied here. The endowed funds were for a specific purpose, and generally the money was not available for general expenses.

**ITEM NO. 2 - CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 1992 AS**



**PRINTED IN THE CHRONICLE OF MARCH 26, 1992.** Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary, had only one correction. Although listed as not attending, Pat Edwards did attend the March 5 Council meeting.

Since there were no further corrections to the minutes, Dr. Auburn called for a motion to accept them as amended. This was moved and seconded, and Council then voted its approval.

**ITEM NO. 3 - REMARKS OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Dr. Auburn wanted to add one note to what Dr. Ruebel had said about the memorial service planned for Dr. Lewis and that was that potted plants would be available at the service for sale to persons interested in purchasing them in memory of Dr. Lewis to keep for themselves or to give to the ill. Those interested in purchasing these plants should call the School of Communication and place an order.

**ITEM NO. 4 - SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.** Dr. Auburn wanted to beg the indulgence of the body for an event which might occur while it was meeting. He had received a note from Dr. Latona that stated that because of a meeting of the Presidential Search Committee, he and the other members would be unable to be here to make a report. However, Dr. Latona said that if it was possible, he would stop here on his way to class. If that occurred, Dr. Auburn asked Council's indulgence to vary the agenda at that point and to pretend that we had jumped ahead to Good of the Order so that Dr. Latona could make a report and respond to any questions. Council agreed to allow this.

**ITEM NO. 5 - REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.**

**A. Executive Committee** - Dr. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Executive Committee met on March 18 and set the agenda for today's meeting of Council. It also discussed questions raised by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee regarding its charge, composition, and responsibilities in light of the existence and activities of the Strategic Planning and Review Committee. The Executive Committee forwarded comments to the Provost and suggested that he discuss this matter with the new President, when the individual was in place, at the earliest opportunity to ascertain his or her thoughts on the long-range planning process.

**B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee** - Dr. Auburn stated that the Committee had wanted to ask the question just mentioned by Dr. Oller in his report because half of its membership overlapped with SPARC. He would take the advice of the Executive Committee and await the appointment of the new President to sort out the relationship of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee and the SPARC.

**C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee** - Associate Provost, Joseph Walton, Chair, first asked that a member of Council move approval of the tentative list of degree candidates for the May commencement. This was moved and seconded, and Council then voted its approval of the list.

Dr. Walton then stated that members had received a report dated March 25, 1992 (see Appendix A). There were some action items regarding degree curriculum change approvals which he would present under New Business. Two additional documents were appended to his report, one entitled "Procedures for Program Planning and Review", the other on the General Studies Program. These documents were being circulated in advance of approval by APCC and would be presented, if approved by APCC, at the May 7 meeting of University Council. He requested the Executive Committee to list those under the APCC report of the May 7 meeting.

**D. Athletics Committee** - No report.

**E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee** - Dr. Wolfgang Pelz, reporting for Dr. Harvey Sterns, Chair, stated that the Committee had met on March 12. Randolph Richardson, University Architect, presented the



current plans for the renovation of the Polsky Building. The project involved 264,000 square feet and was 50 to 60 percent larger than any other building presently on the campus. Major issues discussed by the committee included:

1. The need for a major conference room to replace Buckingham 201. Plans have not yet been modified to meet this critical need for Continuing Education.
2. The need to develop a planned approach to paying for temporary and permanent moves.
3. Concern was expressed regarding television capability in the building and how wiring of TV and other communications were to be carried out and paid for.

The Committee wished to establish what space would be available in the future on campus. It would establish what agreements currently existed and what expectations for campus space assignment currently existed. At this point, a new formal planning process for space assignment would be proposed.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Mr. David Brink, Chair, reported that the Committee had met on March 4 to consider a request from the President for clarification on the Committee's report on grievance 40-91. The Committee considered the request and submitted a new recommendation to the President.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - Mr. Paul Richert, Chair, reported that the Committee had met on March 20 (the Friday before Spring Break guaranteeing maximum attendance so that the Governor could be impressed with how hard we work). It was still examining the proposed changes in the University's Sexual Harassment Policy and planned to have a recommendation ready for the next Council meeting. Regarding early retirement incentive programs, a copy of an analysis done by Dr. Yoder and Dr. Durst was being passed out to Council members, and he would be presenting this under New Business.

Lastly, the Committee examined the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Allocation Report and found the recommendations wanting in several respects:

1. The AAUP Study indicates the faculty do not want to continue an all-merit salary system. Yet, the Ad Hoc Committee does not address this issue but leaves it up to the individual units to decide.
2. The recommendation that the same percentage of salary increase be provided to each unit perpetuates any existing inequalities.
3. If units are to decide procedures, they should not have to have approval all the way up to the Vice President.
4. There were no indications of how the University is to deal with salary compression. According to the AAUP survey, salary compression was viewed as a serious problem by many faculty.
5. The lack of elected representation on the committee is deemed to have been a problem. Basic faculty viewpoints are not reflected in the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations.

The Committee basically recommended to Council that it stand by its prior report enacted by Council (see Appendix E of April 25, 1991 Chronicle, p. 37; also Appendix B of this issue) and that these issues needed to be dealt with by the President of the University based on the faculty views expressed. The next meeting of the Committee would be on April 17 at 3:00 p.m. Room 123 of the C. Blake McDowell Law Center, and anyone interested could attend.



Since the Committee was recommending that Council agree to stand by an earlier action regarding the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Allocation Report, Dr. Auburn wondered whether any further action was necessary.

After some discussion, Dr. Gerlach suggested that this item be placed on next month's agenda under Unfinished Business. There would then be time to go back and see what the original recommendation on this matter had been and on this basis make a decision regarding further action. Members of the Executive Committee agreed that this would be done.

H. University Libraries Committee - Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, Chair, reported that the Committee had met since the last Council meeting, but the report on OhioLink was not completed and would be available for the next Council meeting.

I. Reference Committee - No report.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - Dr. Daniel Sheffer, Chair, reported that the Committee had met twice, March 16 and 18 to review and rank 44 proposals submitted for the Spring 1992 faculty research program. The Committee awarded 19 grants for a total of \$69, 872. The Committee would meet again on April 15 to review this year's activities.

K. Student Affairs Committee - No report.

L. General Studies Advisory Council - No report.

M. Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance - No report.

**ITEM NO. 6 - REPORT OF THE AKRON REPRESENTATIVE ON THE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS.** Dr. Burton stated that the next meeting would be on April 22 and if people had questions which they wanted her to take up with the Committee, they should contact her.

It was also announced that Dr. Frank Griffin, as our representative, along with Dr. Oller and Dr. Burton, would be attending a state-wide meeting of faculty representatives from Senates and Councils being held in conjunction with the State Conference of the AAUP at Miami of Ohio on April 10.

**ITEM NO. 7 - UNFINISHED BUSINESS.** There were two items of unfinished business which were amendments to Council Bylaws regarding the composition of Council (3359-10-03) and functions of permanent committees of University Council (3359-10-09). These were moved at the last meeting and, following the rules, had to be postponed until this meeting for final disposition. The amendments were printed in Appendix F of the March Chronicle on page 20.

Ms. Marybeth Mersky spoke in regard to the amendment about the composition of Council. Last month she had stated that she was against it, but in the intervening weeks she had talked with several people to seek their advice and a solution to the problem. In discussion with Tom Smith, ASG President, she was convinced that the ASG would be making a sincere, concerted effort to reach out to non-traditional students. She had decided that the solution to the problem did not lie with University Council but with the ASG. There was no longer an evening college or an evening student council, but there was one student government to represent all undergraduates and that was where the solution lay. Therefore she would not vote against the amendment or try to change it.

Dr. Auburn wondered whether he would be correct in inferring from Ms. Mersky's speech that she



would want the debate on this amendment to continue to show her sense that one purpose of the amendment was to assure that non-traditional students were indeed represented among those appointed by or elected by ASG.

Ms. Mersky responded that this was correct.

After Dr. Griffin pointed out some confusion regarding the numbers in the amendment, Dr. Auburn suggested the following change: "Eight student representatives comprising SIX students from the undergraduate enrollment (TWO APPOINTED in such a manner as determined by Associated Student Government, FOUR SELECTED THROUGH THE SPRING GENERAL ELECTION PROCESS)." This was accepted as a consensus amendment.

Dr. Gerlach wondered why, if in the rest of the amendment it stated that the Graduate Student representative would be selected in a manner agreeable to the Graduate Student Council and the student chosen by the Student Bar Association would be selected in a manner agreeable to that body, it was necessary to state how the representatives would be selected by the ASG. Why should the amendment not read "six students to be selected in a manner agreeable to the ASG?" He therefore moved to amend so that the beginning of the statement would read: "Eight student representatives comprising six students from the undergraduate enrollment, said six to be selected in such manner as determined by the Associated Student Government..." This was seconded by Mr. Dan Buie.

Dr. Auburn understood this to be a substantive change if Council approved this amendment, and therefore it was his ruling that Council could not act upon the amended document at this time but would have to allow everyone to see the document before final approval.

Dean Tom Vukovich wanted to know what the ASG constitution said about the elections of the members of Council presently.

Mr. Tom Smith that it only covered the currently existing four who were to be elected. Some sort of stop gap procedure would have to be created to cover the appointment of the two additional representatives until such time that the constitution could be amended to reflect the change in Council Bylaws.

Dean Vukovich thought that Council Bylaws should reflect what was currently the case, namely the four elected members, and therefore was against the amendment.

Since there was no further discussion, Council voted on Gerlach's amendment, and it was defeated.

Council then prepared to vote on the original amendment. Dr. Auburn reminded the members that a majority of the total voting membership of Council was required (41) for passage. A vote was taken and the amendment passed.

Council then took up the second amendment regarding functions of permanent committees of Council. Since there was no discussion, a vote was taken, and the amendment passed. (For both amendments, see Appendix C).

**ITEM NO. 8 - NEW BUSINESS.** The first items of new business were curriculum changes from the APCC (see Appendix A). Dr. Walton stated that there were three changes from Nursing and seven from the Community and Technical College. All were approved by APCC.

Dr. Gerlach moved for the adoption of all the changes, and this was seconded by Dr. Griffin. Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.



The next item of new business was the ERIP Proposal from the Faculty Well-Being Committee (see Appendix D ). Mr. Richert presented the recommendation from that proposal which read as follows: "that University Council request that the President appoint a broadly represented ERIP Study Committee, including some members from the elected FWB Committee, to make a thorough, but timely, study and recommendation for an ERIP that would be fair and reasonable for all aspects of the University."

Since this was a motion from Committee, it required no second. There was no discussion, and Council voted its approval.

As another item of new business, Dr. Gerlach had a motion to present which had been brought on by certain timely activities. He was reminded of what was once said about William McKinley in regard to his watching very carefully which way the bandwagon was moving before he hopped on, and he was doing the same thing today. His motion was as follows: "that the University Council request the Board of Trustees to suspend the search for a new president and that the faculty representatives on the Presidential Search Committee be instructed on our behalf to propose this suspension of the committee's efforts." This was seconded by Dr. Griffin.

Dr. Gerlach stated that his <sup>principal</sup> point in making the motion was that we were under crisis. The more many of us thought about it, the more we were convinced that this crisis might best be managed, at least for the next year or so, by our Acting President whom we regard with confidence as an insider thoroughly acquainted with this University, its needs and its conditions. This was no time for an outsider to come in and start grappling with the problem. That was the gist of his argument behind the motion.

There was no further discussion, and Council then voted. The motion was defeated 16 to 26.

**ITEM NO. 9 - GOOD OF THE ORDER.** Dr. Bee reported on behalf of the Presidential Search Committee. That committee had met this very afternoon and one of the items brought before it dealt generally with the concerns just raised by Dr. Gerlach and by communications that had circulated in that regard. Mr. Ammons, the Chair, reported that it was his sense that the Board was unanimous in their resolve at this point to continue with the search, and there were no plans to do other than move ahead with attempting to find a new president.

Dr. Jesse Marquette asked Dr. Bee if he had any sense yet of the quality of the people who were applying.

Dr. Bee responded that at this point there had been an initial review of files received. The general procedures under which the Committee was operating did not permit him to describe or characterize that set of files. It was his understanding that Mr. Ammons would be issuing as one of his communications from the Committee a description of the applicant pool. He was hesitant, simply out of deference to the agreed upon procedures for communication to attempt any further characterization, but that would be forthcoming.

There were no further questions for Dr. Bee.

Dr. Gerlach did not know whether this was for the Good of the Order or whether anyone was interested, but he wanted to apprise those present that given recent developments, he had written a letter to the Governor of the State of Ohio. In case he got into trouble, the members might want to know what he had written.

Dear Governor,

Your and the public's hostility to the universities of this state is misguided and reprehensible. As



April 23, 1992

Page 8

a lifelong Republican, I am ashamed of your attitude toward higher education. You might at least display a note of regret at the need to cut expenditures. As you proceed to cut and slash our universities you should know that there are some of us who are not paid what we are worth and that we neither can nor will produce more with less. As a teacher of some thirty years I shall continue to do my duty to my students, but you had better realize that ex nihilo nihil fit, "from nothing, nothing comes"

nihilo

**ITEM NO. 10 - ADJOURNMENT.** There was a motion to adjourn, which was seconded. Council voted its approval and the meeting ended at 3:53 p.m.



## **Appendix A**

### **THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Interoffice Correspondence**

**March 25, 1992**

**TO: Members of University Council**

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

**SUBJECT: APCC Report to University Council**  
**April 2, 1992**

The Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee met on Tuesday, March 17, 1992 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of the Gardner Student Center. The following actions were taken:

1. APCC approved the following curriculum changes:

NU-92-57	CT-92-5	CT-92-10
NU-92-58	CT-92-6	CT-92-11
NU-92-59	CT-92-7	CT-92-12
	CT-92-8	

These proposed changes are now presented to University Council for consideration under new business.

2. APCC also considered attachment 1, Recommendations for a Revised General Studies Program, but postponed final consideration until its April 21, 1992 meeting, pending a review of a possible revision in the Humanities section by the General Studies Advisory Council. Since this document, and the document entitled "Procedures for Program Planning and Review" cannot be considered by University Council until its May 4, 1992 meeting, I am circulating both documents to members of University Council with a request to the Executive Committee that both documents be placed on the May 4 agenda to be considered by University Council under the Report of the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee, if approved by APCC on April 21.

## **Appendix B**

Council-Approved resolution on Salary Allocation as printed in the April 25, 1991 *Chronicle* on page 37 (Appendix E):

"Whereas, the recent survey of faculty indicates that 77.5 percent of the respondents disapprove of the all-merit basis for salary increments and 64 percent of the respondents prefer a combination of merit/cost-of-living and flat sum by rank.

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

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



## **Appendix C**

### **BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

#### **3359-10-03 Composition of the Council**

- (D) Eight student representatives comprising ~~four~~ SIX students from the undergraduate day enrollment: TWO ~~selected~~ APPOINTED in such a manner as determined by Associated Student Government, FOUR SELECTED THROUGH THE SPRING GENERAL ELECTION PROCESS, ~~two evening students selected in such manner as determined by Evening Student Council~~, 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.

### **BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

#### **3359-10-09 Functions of Permanent Committees of University Council**

(K) Student Affairs Committee

~~(1) Plans and executes all University assemblies and convocations.~~

~~(2)~~ (1) Makes policy, subject to approval of University Council, regarding the granting of scholarships, awards, grants and loans to University students.

~~(3)~~ (2) Proposes regulations concerning all extracurricular activities (except Athletics) to University Council. Recommends to Council the extension of official recognition of student organizations.



## Appendix D

March 20, 1992

TO: University Council

FROM: Faculty Well-Being

SUBJECT: **RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF AN EARLY RETIREMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM (ERIP) STUDY COMMITTEE**

### Introduction:

Per the minutes (1/22/92) of University Council, the Faculty Well-Being Committee was asked to review a report by Professor Paul Chang entitled, "Cost Analysis and Benefits of the Early Retirement Incentive Program." While the Committee carefully reviewed the specific report, we interpreted Council's request in a broader sense and have made a preliminary analysis of the merits of an ERIP plan to be prepared for implementation within a reasonable time period given financial resources, a completed SPARC plan, a changing University administration, and a need for reasonable study.

### Recommendations:

That Faculty Well-Being Committee finds the conditions right to proceed with a study and implementation of an ERIP at The University of Akron. We recommend that University Council request that the President appoint a broadly represented ERIP Study Committee, including some members from the elected FWB Committee, to make a thorough, but timely, study and recommendation for an ERIP that would be fair and reasonable for all aspects of the University.

### Response to Dr. Chang's Report:

A review of the report finds the methodology to be accurate and to reflect a "best estimate" savings analysis from data collected from the 1989 ERIP. This model should provide the ERIP Study Committee an opportunity to make many assumptions and iterations in their attempt to assess the range of possible dollar and program implications of an ERIP. While the emphasis of the report was the dollar savings to the University, a more thorough study should emphasize and detail the many other implications of an ERIP, including: 1) resource reallocation throughout the University; 2) possible disruption of course offerings for students; 3) a means for effecting a possible reduction in employment; 4) impact upon the workload of remaining faculty and staff; and many other important implications of an ERIP. The experiences of the 1989 ERIP has provided a considerable resource base for future ERIPs. Our preliminary analysis supports the recommendation for a five year or longer term ERIP window. The disruptions created by the one year window in the 1989 ERIP would not likely be repeated with a five year or longer window.

The one year replacement lag assumed in Dr. Chang's study most likely reflects the inordinate delays and market factors that faculty search committees endured after the 1989 ERIP. While a one year lag certainly shortens the cost recovery and provides time for resource allocation throughout the University, such replacement lags or delays had considerable impact upon a few programs, course offerings, etc. We encourage the ERIP Study Committee to encourage implementation flexibility in this area where it might seriously impact student programs and faculty workloads.



Overall the FWB commends Dr. Chang for his report and we hope the ERIP Study Committee recognizes it as a basis for continued study and recommendations.

Preliminary Analysis of 1989 ERIP Compared to Conditions of Today:

Based on a preliminary assessment of the 1989 ERIP developed from interviews with University administrators, faculty, staff, and other information, we report the following:

1. The 1989 ERIP provided the greatest benefit to the retiring faculty, staff, and administrators, and was not without costs in the form of "change," shifting workloads, etc., to the remaining employees and student body. Any future ERIP program will serve as an effective means in a period of decreasing enrollments and resources.
2. The relatively tight faculty labor markets of several years ago, the present salary compression present in the University, and enrollment growth at the time necessitating replacement, lengthened the dollar breakeven point of the 1989 ERIP and reduced the cost savings to the University. On the other hand, replacement delays and nonreplacements had an opposite effect. Based on the 1989 ERIP numbers, future ERIPs are not likely to be implemented with dollar savings considerations alone. Resource reallocation programs from SPARC and other study groups, possible downsizing needs, and the end of a mandatory retirement age in 1993 will be the featured issues. ERIPs were originally developed as employment management programs for the economic conditions we are facing today, not just as a prerequisite for senior faculty.
3. The University achieved considerable affirmative action results from the 1989 ERIP. Future ERIPs are likely to further this cause.
4. The need or motivation for resource reallocation was not as pressing in 1989-90 as it is today. With SPARC's academic plan in place, future ERIPs will provide one less painful means for making resource reallocation and/or downsizing.
5. When implemented, the 1989 ERIP had a considerable backlog of near-retirement employees. Combine that with a short eighteen month window, and considerable disruption occurred throughout the University. A five year or continuous window will eliminate retirement surges, will provide a longer timetable for resource reallocation study, and will enhance a longer planning perspective for all involved. Departments will be better able to plan for replacements or resource reallocations. With a five year window, ERIP cash flows can be spread over many years. Finally, senior faculty will have a broader planning perspective.

## Curriculum Changes

April 7, 1992

The following curriculum changes have been approved:

AS-92-18

AS-92-29

BA-92-2

BA-92-9

AS-92-19

AS-92-30

BA-92-3

BA-92-10

AS-92-20

AS-92-31

BA-92-4

BA-92-11

AS-92-21

AS-92-32

BA-92-5

BA-92-12

AS-92-23

AS-92-33

BA-92-6

BA-92-13

AS-92-24

AS-92-35

BA-92-7

BA-92-14

BA-92-8

FAA-92-1

FAA-92-24

EN-92-1

CT-92-1

FAA-92-9

FAA-92-26

EN-92-6

CT-92-9

FAA-92-10

FAA-92-27

EN-92-7

FAA-92-13

FAA-92-28

FAA-92-14

FAA-92-31

UC-92-1

ED-92-8

FAA-92-23

UC-92-6

The final version of these proposals may be viewed in the Provost's Office.