

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

11-4-1993

## Faculty Senate Chronicle November 4, 1993

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).



1993-94, No. 3

November 4, 1993

22 Pages

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 4, 1993	1
Appendix to the Minutes of the Meeting of Faculty Senate of November 4, 1993	11
A. Remarks of Faculty Senate Chair	11
B. Remarks of the President of the University	12
C. Report of the <i>Executive Committee</i>	15
D. Report of the <i>University Well-Being Committee</i>	15
E. Report of the <i>Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee</i>	16
F. Report of the <i>University Libraries Committee</i>	17
G. Report of the <i>Student Affairs Committee</i>	18
H. Report of the <i>General Studies Advisory Council</i>	19
I. Apportionment Cost of the Faculty Senate Budget	20
J. Resolution from Faculty in the College of Engineering	22

---

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Mr. David Brink (+1707).



Senator Clements said that if Senate voted for these monies today, did it mean that \$11,000, the estimated amount of released time, would be transferred into the Senate budget? Senator Green replied that it would go to cover the released time of the senate officers; that was part of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

Senator Clements continued, saying that if the History Department did not need to hire an instructor to teach classes that Professor Gerlach did not teach because he was serving as President of the Senate, and in fact the History Department did NOT need to hire instructors to cover those courses, then what did it mean when the Senate voted monies for this replacement that did not exist? President Elliott said that the stipend would go to Dr. Gerlach in that amount so that if he had to change other things to take on these extra duties he would not be penalized financially for it.

Chairman Gerlach said it was released time or the compensation thereof. As he understood it, money for the released time involved money that might or might not be in fact spent, depending on the circumstances, but the budget had to allow for it.

Chairman Gerlach noted that Senator Midha's sheet had been distributed and asked if there were a second to his motion. Senator Glaser seconded.

Senator Aupperle said that it would probably make more sense if the operating budget were looked at in proportion to the salary of the faculty involved. In the case of the Library, for example, most of the operating budget was for something other than salary. What he found interesting with both proposals, particularly the last, was that Law, Wayne College, and University Libraries would have 4 representatives and would pay much more money than Arts & Sciences with 16 representatives. The CBA was not going to get hurt too much whichever way this was played out, but it did look like A&S was going to be taking a chunk of all the other college's hides in the process, the small ones. If the Senate insisted on an operating budget process to be the base, it would probably be best to consider the salary structure part of the operating budget.

Senator Midha added that, looking at these elections, there were 11 Senators voted into the BPCC and the College of A&S was not getting any preferential treatment. All colleges were equally represented there and in light of that every college should foot the bill in the budget process.

Senator Ranson asked why Senator Green regarded this as an unfriendly amendment. Senator Green said that it seemed to him that the Senate had 2 very real choices. One was to apportion the cost of the Senate on a basis of ability to pay. Another was to combine that principle with some equal payment on the part of all the colleges. He thanked Senator Midha for bringing that amendment forward because now the Senate had a choice which way to go.

Senator Brink said that because the year was almost half completed and because most of the \$45,000 was for the salary of a secretary, the Senate was not talking about a lot of money. He said that Senator Aupperle's arguments appealed to him as did the remarks of Senator Clinefelter. He favored proportional assessment by the number of representatives.

Senator Jalbert stated that the C&T college had a fundamental problem with using the percentage of an operating budget for a couple of practical reasons: number one, they had no operating budget and number two, they generated the second highest number of student credit hours on campus and yet they had the lowest operating budget of the major colleges. It appeared patently unfair that the operating budget that was being divvied up was saddling the C&T almost two-fold with responsibilities.

Senator Gunn said that colleges had no money to do what they were obligated to do. University Council was funded last year, but the colleges were not part of that. They did not plan for that it last year and they had no money to use now. She thought that was why the Senate was having trouble deciding. Everyone was looking at their own situation and they knew they could not come up with this kind of money, plus the other cuts that were hinted at in the wings and get through this next semester.



Senator Aupperle thought that in the future the University President and Provost would have to rethink their complete attempt at decentralization because it was going to divide us so much. Perhaps, if some funds were withheld to allocate programs like the Senate, then Senators would not end up dividing themselves and becoming extremely political. Senator Green concurred and said that his second proposal dealt with that problem.

The motion to amend the original motion was defeated.

Senator Kimmell moved that each of Senator Green's points be considered independently. Seconded by Senator Dilts. Motion carried.

Chairman Gerlach called for a vote on item number 1: that the Faculty Senate accept the offer from President Elliott to fund the renovation in the amount of \$10,260. Motion carried.

Chairman Gerlach called for a vote on item number 2: that the Senate accept the offer from the Provost to continue to publish the Chronicle for the remainder of the academic year. Motion carried.

Chairman Gerlach called for a vote on item number 3: the exact apportionment with percentages and dollar figures. Motion carried, 20 ayes, 18 no's.

Chairman Gerlach called for a vote on item number 4: that the Chair meet with the Deans regarding payment. Motion carried.

Chairman Gerlach reported the results of the elections and called for nominations for 3 Senators for the Shared Governance Council. Senator Kimmell nominated Kenneth Aupperle. Senator Jalbert nominated Paul John. Senator Webb nominated Marlene Huff. Senator Marquette moved that the nominations be closed. Seconded and passed.

*and a  
unanimous ballot  
cast for the nominee*

#### ITEM NUMBER 7 - NEW BUSINESS

**A. College of Engineering Resolution** - Senator Cheung read the resolution that was passed by the College of Engineering and forwarded to the Senate. (Appendix J) He moved that the Faculty Senate censure Dr. Don Gerlach for inappropriately associating the Faculty Senate with the 17 October 1993 letter of the UAFPA to President Elliott. Seconded by Senator Kimmell.

Chairman Gerlach ceded the chair to Vice Chairwoman Fleming.

Senator Webb asked what it meant to censure. Senator Cheung replied that as he understood it, it meant the Senate would tell Dr. Gerlach that he had been a bad boy. He did not believe it had any other teeth.

Senator Weber said that many of her colleagues in C&T had expressed their concern about this letter and Dr. Gerlach's signature on it. The concern was not that Faculty Senate should not have this information but it should not have been requested on the letterhead of the Steering Committees. There was support for this censure.

Senator Perry said that the faculty in the Chemistry department had a meeting in which this issue was briefly discussed. The faculty felt unanimously that the association of the Faculty Senate with that letter was inappropriate. However, he thought that many of the faculty would be happy if the Chair of the Senate would simply state that it was a misstep and apologize and not continue this kind of association. He would be happy to vote down the motion.

Senator Aupperle noted that one of the things that the Senate could consider was asking all Senators in the future regardless of their position to refrain from associating their title with any organization that was not officially associated with the university, rather than punishing Dr. Gerlach today or trying to make a case out of this. The wise thing was to move forward and to refrain from tying the title "senator" to anything that was not officially a part of the university.

*Chairman*



Senator Green moved to substitute the following for the motion offered by Dr. Cheung: The Senate directs that officers of this Senate not take any public position on potentially controversial issues using their senatorial titles without the expressed direction of the Senate. Seconded by Senator Marquette.

Vice Chairwoman Fleming stated that the question had been called. Chairman Gerlach asked to make a parliamentary point that did not bear on the question. He said that the motion before the Senate was to take a substitute motion. The question was shall the Senate proceed to consider that substitute. Having accepted it, then there would be discussion. Then there would be another vote as to its acceptance. If the Senate did not accept the substitute motion at this time, it would have to go back to the original motion.

Senator Jalbert asked Senator Green what his definition of controversial subjects included or excluded. Senator Green said that in his definition the controversial subjects would be matters to which Senate officers would not ordinarily, in the course of their duties, direct their attention. Senator Jalbert commented that this left it awfully vague. It would put the elected officials up to a wide range of criticism for their actions. Senator Green thought there was some truth to that if they used their senatorial titles. But if they spoke as individuals, they were free to say anything. The intent was to narrowly circumscribe the speech on the part of senatorial officers when they use their titles.

Senator Marquette noted that the Senate was a new organization. There were going to be some missteps. He believed, as did many of his colleagues, that this was a misstep on Dr. Gerlach's part because his senatorial title makes it appear that there was an alliance. Whether that was intended or not, the appearance was inappropriate. At the same time he agreed with Dr. Aupperle. He did not see a reason right now to proceed in quite so harsh a manner as censure. He thought the Senate should make it very clear that its officers are expected to act in its name after the body has taken an action; that its spokespersons were to be the spokesperson based on actions that the body had taken. That was the intention of the substitute motion. He wanted the Senate to make it very clear to all the officers exactly how the body felt about this kind of relationship.

Senator Glaser said that he could agree with that if Chairman Gerlach had recognized that this was a misstep. His comments earlier in the meeting were of a nature of defending his action, not apologizing for his action. So it seemed to him that without a change of mind on the part of Dr. Gerlach, that a censure would be in order here.

Senator Green commented that Professor Gerlach's comments at the beginning of the meeting did not have the conciliatory tone that he would have liked. But he believed he made two points that were of importance to this discussion. The first was that he did not intend to associate the Senate with another organization, that it was inadvertent, and that he understood that problem. And secondly, that he felt that the President's criticisms of him were not warranted. Now, whatever were one's feelings about those two things, it seemed to him that there was a recognition on his part of the problem of associating at least symbolically a deliberative body such as this with an organization that has quite different purposes. So in his view, a censure was far too severe. He thought the Senate needed to get beyond this and to make sure that it never happens again.

Senator Cheung stated that it was patently inappropriate for the Faculty Senate in any way to be associated with the UAFA. In lieu of documentary evidence that a technical blunder was committed, he did not see how Senate's very oblique approach could send any message other than one that could be misconstrued, that this body had in some strange way aligned itself with UAFA when the body had not even talked about it. Having sat here, he knew that this was not so, but someone on the outside could very easily be mistaken. Therefore, he would speak against the substitute motion.

Senator Aupperle said that the fact that the body would be voting on this substitute motion after the misstep that had been taken by the chair would indicate that Senate was concerned and had taken direct action. He did not think the body had to proceed to humiliate any one of its members when the ground rules had not been clearly established to begin with. He said the university had been going through considerable turmoil over financing and given the atmosphere that has existed, he thought an act of kindness rather than an act of revenge was called for at this point.

Senator John asked that when the motion says officers, did it refer to the senate officers and the executive committee or to all faculty senators. Senator Green said all faculty senators who serve in an official capacity.



Senator Clinefelter spoke in defense of Professor Gerlach. She thought that he did explain himself, his quest for information at the beginning of the meeting. That was what he wanted, information to which all faculty members were entitled. There was no stationery for the Faculty Senate. Perhaps he should have used a blank sheet of paper. He has been a very strong advocate and defender of faculty rights for over 31 years. He has stood up in the legislative bodies of this university and he has asked the hard questions whether they have been popular or unpopular that other people wished to ask but did not feel they were able to ask. He has worked very hard for this Faculty Senate in setting up all the different arrangements for the rooms, the equipment, conferring with different people, having had 3 meetings of the Executive Committee by this time. She knew that he wished the Faculty Senate to succeed. She hated very much to see things brought up that were divisive and that might hamper the Senate in its efforts to go forward. Surely there had been misunderstandings but she would most certainly favor the substitute motion, if one was to be passed at all.

Senator Jalbert suggested that censure was a much more formal remedy, more designed to fix blatant violations of the Bylaws or rules. In this case he saw no outright violation of Bylaws or rules. He thought that a censure was an inappropriate remedy and would support much less.

Senator Glaser said that this would not be a vote on the entire career of Don Gerlach. It would be a judgment by this body on a specific action and it was a public action associating this body with UAFPA. He thought some sort of disassociation was needed. Whether censure was the right way, he did not know. But he thought the body needed to go on record saying that it did not believe that signing as Chairman of the Faculty Senate in a letter sent by UAFPA was a correct action.

Senator Ranson offered to speak as the uninvited co-conspirator, one whose signature appeared on this page. This was an idea which developed in the steering committee of UAFPA and he thought it would have a special authority if it was co-signed by the chair of the Faculty Senate. Therefore, he approached the Chairman and he agreed to sign. So to whatever extent blame was apportionable, he thought the Senate should take into account the way in which the supernatural soliciting, which may or may not have been good, took place.

Senator Oller thought that the Senate had to consider that when it elected someone the chair of this body, it was entitling that person to be its spokesman. The Senate also had to assume that that person had some latitude in doing what he thought was important to further the desires of this body. Dr. Gerlach thought that this was something that the body needed to learn; that this information was important. We had a long discussion at our last meeting about finances. Many people pointed out that they thought that the amount of money that was being spent on the Faculty Senate was too much in our financial difficulty. This was something that the Senate was obviously concerned about and Dr. Gerlach, as its officer, felt this was a way of getting the information. His own feeling was that the Chair had worked very hard for this body so far and though he might see this as a misstep, as a member of the Executive Committee I could point out numerous actions that he had taken that have been very beneficial to this body. He thought that rather than citing Dr. Gerlach in this way, the Senate should commend him for what he had done--working tirelessly for this body.

The previous question was moved and seconded. The motion to close debate passed without opposition.

The motion to accept the substitute motion was passed: 22 aye, 14 nay.

Senator Green moved the adoption of the substitute motion. Seconded by Senator Marquette. Motion passed.

#### **ITEM NUMBER 8 - GOOD OF THE ORDER**

**ITEM NUMBER 9 - ADJOURNMENT** - A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Senate voted its approval and the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Gerlach at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
David R. Brink, Secretary



## APPENDIX A

## Remarks of Faculty Senate Chair, Don R. Gerlach

In her October 1993 message to "Members of the University Community," President Elliott refers to a letter (copy of which she included) that I signed along with the chairman of the UAFPA Steering Committee. She says "we [presumably the University community] must feel concerned about whether Dr. Gerlach has indicated in this way" (that is, by the letter) that the Senate "has decided to align itself with the union organizers." This imputation is outrageous; it is an impertinent attack upon my honor. Therefore, I wish you all to know that:

1. I signed simply because I believe that the Senate, like UAFPA and all of the faculty, have an interest in the budget information which was requested;
2. I believe that by joining with the Chairman of UAFPA to request this information I did -- and do-- reflect the interests of the Senate and of the entire faculty in that information. Requesting information on behalf of the Faculty Senate is a legitimate exercise of executive power; it does not require "full faculty consultation;"
3. I would never presume to indicate that the Senate had made a decision in what the President terms "this way." I regret that the President seems to have introduced a sort of red herring argument. The issue is NOT whether the Senate approved what she calls "this alliance." Of course it did not because none exists. And were I capable of such Machiavellian maneuvers, why would I address this incredible implication to the one person on our campus who surely knows that there was no vote to create an alliance?
4. Which leads me to pose 3 final questions: why has President Elliott introduced a question, the answer to which she already knows? And why does she broadcast this fictional issue to the community at large? The real issue of my letter was information. The red herring issue is whether the Senate was consulted about an "alliance." What is the President's real agenda?



**APPENDIX B****Remarks of the President of the University**

The days (and temperatures) since our last meeting have moved briskly. I hope that many of the things that have occurred have already been communicated to you, since at the request of our Presiding Officer, my remarks this afternoon will be brief. However, later in the session there will be a distribution of information from Acting Provost Dave Jamison regarding the on-going discussions about "productivity." And on the topic of provosts, I can report that we do now finally have all the elected members for that search committee and are now trying to determine a meeting date so its work can get underway.

I have been asked to speak about our health benefits and I know each of us was pleased to learn that the Board of Trustees has approved the renewal of our health benefits program through the 1994 calendar year. This means that we will once again receive enough "choice" dollars from the university to purchase 1994 basic coverages for ourselves and our families.

The University of Akron will remain one of only a handful of campuses in this country that have been able to continue to provide health benefits to the university family without premium payments. It is an important campus benefit, the cost of which is approximately \$8 million annually.

Earlier this week, I announced a realignment of responsibilities campuswide designed to strengthen and enhance our diversity efforts. Although I outlined the changes for you in my October memo, I thought I would reiterate the four goals of these realignments which are:

- 1) to continue the university's ongoing commitment to diversity issues and concerns through the office of minority affairs.
- 2) To secure more of the many dollars that are available from foundations and other external sources for our diversity programs and scholarships, which comports with our need to financially underpin all of our programs through external sources.
- 3) To broaden faculty and student involvement in diversity issues through its alliance with the Office of the Provost.
- 4) To further our continuing objective of realigning positions rather than creating new ones to meet our goals and changing needs.

Effective this past Monday, Mrs. Janet Purnell assumed a new title and expanded responsibilities as Executive Director of Minority Development in the division of Institutional Advancement. Associate General Counsel Isiah Daniels was named as Acting Director of Minority Affairs.

In preparation for a national search to fill this position, we will consult with experienced national leaders to identify outstanding programs and practices in enhancing diversity around the nation.

To provide a more comprehensive approach to our enrollment enhancement strategies, pre-college programs will now report to the division of Student Support Services.



And finally, to enhance the involvement of our academic enterprise in the broad range of diversity issues and concerns, the Diversity Council has been moved to the Provost's office.

I believe these strategies will better position our university to deal with the far-reaching impact of diversity now and into the new century.

Planning: Chairperson Nick Sylvester of the Twenty-First Century Task Force has asked me to thank all of you who responded to the second iterations of values and goal statements at the hearings held across campus last week. If you did not take the opportunity to attend one of the hearings, your written comments will also be appreciated, but the Task Force hopes you will send them along quickly.

The Task Force will be meeting tomorrow to discuss how to incorporate all of the input that has been received to date.

The values and goal statements, along with results of internal and external scans, will provide the context in which planning by departments, divisions, and colleges will occur.

Using our bottom-up, iterative process, it will be in the colleges and departments where the overall detail and directions are truly given shape and meaning and life.

Along with these background documents, the Task Force will be developing a vision statement that reflects its sense of what the campus hopes to become in the 21st century.

If I had to state this as succinctly as possible, I would suggest that what we are really trying to do is become a premier 21st century urban university. The Task Force's six goals are really strategic directions based on current needs that, once accomplished, will position our campus for success in the new and radically different times.

Our major challenge—individually and collectively—is to try to understand, to prepare for, and to deliver education and knowledge in a time when learning will be continuous and not bound by space or place. In many ways, what we are trying to do today is become delivery system and technologically literate in the same way that we became computer literate two decades ago.

There is real urgency in our learning our way. Rapid technological delivery is here whether we want it to be or not. The prospect of Nintendo and IBM marketing college classes on video, we are told, is likely to be a regrettable reality, but one we should expect very soon.

In this week's Chronicle of Higher Education, there is an article about grass-roots efforts to guarantee public access to the proposed national "data highway." The Ohio state university presidents have already addressed our concerns about this with the Ohio Congressional Delegation.

The Clinton Administration has called for the creation of a national information infrastructure linking every home, school, college, and business in the nation. This network now may be achieved since several major companies in the communications and entertainment industries have pledged to work together on the concept.

The Chronicle article describes how an "eclectic" group of 71 nonprofit organizations—including some universities and libraries—have formed the telecommunications policy roundtable to ensure that a national network developed by market forces continues to have the possibility of also serving the public interest. Through the ASCU we will stay involved in this debate and, hopefully, its direction.



Financial stability: finally, I want you to know that later this month we will be announcing a plan--developed in consultation with IBAC and the Cabinet--for completing reduction of our operating debt by the end of this fiscal year. This is a proactive move on our part that will enable us to target new dollars toward emerging opportunities or needs, instead of past commitments.

So, in deference to Professor Gerlach who has reminded me of the important business you must consider today, I will now conclude my report. Once more, I would like to tell you how grateful I am for the part each of you plays in our considerable progress.



## **APPENDIX C**

### **Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee met on October 12 and 28. The Committee recommended changes to the Bylaws, considered the eligibility of several Senatorial seats, appointed non-senators to standing committees, and set the agenda for the November 4 meeting.

Respectfully submitted by David Brink, Secretary

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Report of the University Well-Being Committee**

The meeting centered around information gathered from invited members of the Part-Time Faculty Task Force. We discussed the report submitted to the Provost and what our role will be in recommending amendments not already adopted by the Provost's Office.

Next meeting will be November 19, 2-4 p.m. in Chestnut A, GSC.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Bucey, Chair



**APPENDIX E****Report of the Academic Policies, Curriculum,  
and Calendar Committee**

The Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee met on Tuesday, October 26, 1993 at 3 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of the Gardner Student Center. The following actions were taken:

1. APCC members were assigned to either the Curriculum Subcommittee (chaired by Joseph Walton) or the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee (chaired by Gary Oller).
2. The following items were referred to the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee.
  - A. Scientific Misconduct Policy
  - B. Reading Day Proposal from the Associated Student Government
  - C. The charge to recommend a permanent 1994-95 and preliminary 1995-96 academic calendar to APCC for approval by the Faculty Senate.
3. APCC members who are senators were assigned APCC terms concurrent with their appointments to the Faculty Senate, while non-senators were assigned one- or two-year terms. The result is the following:

1993-94 One-Year Term	1993-95 Two-Year Term	1993-96 Three-Year Term
Dan Buie Barbara Clements Ruth Clinefelter Patricia Edwards Kathleen Endres Elton Glaser William Lewis Gary Oller John Serafini Amy Spooner	Lawrence Focht Michael Jalbert Dennis Kimmell Chand Midha Joyce Mirman Peggy Richards	Marlene Huff Robert McElwee Philip Stuyvesant

The next APCC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 23, 1993 at 3 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room in the Gardner Student Center.

Respectfully submitted by Joseph Walton, Chair



**APPENDIX F****Report of the University Libraries Committee**

The committee met at noon on 29 October 1993 in Bierce 161. Present were committee members: Drs. Gerlach, Sterling, Canda, Erickson, Williams, and Cheung, and Mrs. Patton. Absent with notice were Dr. Fleming and Mrs. O'Connor. Also present was Mr. Paul Richert, Law Library. The first order of business was the election of a chair. Dr. H. Michael Cheung was elected chair. The next order of business was the selection of 1, 2, and 3 year terms by lot. The results were:

1993-94 One-Year Term	1993-95 Two-Year Term	1993-96 Three-Year Term
Frank Canda Don Gerlach Phyllis O'Connor	Rachel Schneider H. Michael Cheung Elizabeth Erickson	Wallace Sterling Virginia Fleming June Patton

The committee instructed the chairman to convey its gratitude to last year's chair, Dr. Charles Monroe, for the fine job he did in guiding the committee.

In response to a memorandum from Dean Williams, the committee submitted the name of Dr. Wallace Sterling to Dean Williams as a potential representative from The University of Akron to the OhioLink User Advisory Committee.

The committee requested that the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate appoint Mr. Paul Richert from the Law Library and either Mr. Rick Wiggins or Mrs. Debbie Keller of Network Services as ex officio, non-voting members of the committee.

Dean Williams outlined the status of OhioLink, long-term storage, and Library budget planning to the committee. The implementation of online book requests via OhioLink is scheduled to become available beginning 1/1/94. OhioLink orientation sessions are continuing through December 4; all faculty are encouraged to attend. Information on the orientations is available in any of the libraries. The Polsky and Rootstown storage facilities will be "coming online" shortly (11/19 and 11/12 respectively). Last years' estimate of a 10 percent inflation rate for journals seems to have been a good one and no "emergency" measures are anticipated.

Dr. Cheung distributed copies of last year's recommendations by the University Council ULLR committee. That committee had suggested that the Faculty Senate University Libraries committee review their final report and recommendations. The report will be discussed at the next University Library committee meeting. The next two meetings of the committee were scheduled for: 19 November 1993 (12 noon, Bierce 161) and 14 January 1994 (location and specific time TBA). Dean Williams indicated that he would try to have updated data similar to that reported in last year's final report available for the next meeting to facilitate discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 1 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by H. Michael Cheung



**APPENDIX G****Report of the Student Affairs Committee**

The first meeting of the Student Affairs Committee was held on October 28, 1993 at 4 p.m. in Carroll Hall 208A. The following members were in attendance: Ken Aupperle, Curtis Clemons, Don Laconi, Lynne Pachnowski, Diane Vukovich, Deborah Weber, and Marcia Weidnecht. Two additional members have yet to be appointed.

Committee members introduced themselves and shared a moment of silence in remembrance of our colleague and fellow committee member, Ralph Alexander.

The first item of business was the selection of the committee chair (who must be a Senator). Don Laconi will serve as Chair of the Student Affairs Committee for 1993-94. Committee members then drew numbers to determine which will serve 1-, 2-, and 3-year terms. The makeup of the committee is as follows:

1993-94 One-Year Term	1993-95 Two-Year Term	1993-96 Three-Year Term
Curtis Clemons Don Laconi TBA (Grad/Law Student)	Lynne Pachnowski Deborah Weber TBA (Faculty Senator)	<b>Ken Aupperle</b> Diane Vukovich Marcia Weidnecht

(Bold names indicate Faculty Senate member)

Don Laconi, Committee Chair, will contact Don Gerlach, Faculty Senate President, to discuss the charge of the committee. They will also try to clarify the relationship of this committee to the Student Affairs Liaison Committee to the Shared Governance Council. Don Laconi will also meet with Marion Ruebel, Interim Vice President for Student Support Services and ex officio member of this committee, to share ideas concerning what might be the most productive projects for the committee to pursue.

The next meeting of the Student Affairs Committee is scheduled for Thursday, November 18, 1993 at 2 p.m. in Schrank Hall North, 160.

Respectfully submitted by Diane Vukovich, Chair



## **APPENDIX H**

### **Report of the General Studies Advisory Council**

Priorities for Fall 1993 are to:

1. Review new, revised, and existing courses using guidelines for general studies courses developed in Fall 1992.

Many courses have been renumbered to reflect college and departmental administration. Courses requiring approval through the Faculty Senate have been forwarded via Associate Provost Walton. General Studies Advisory Council forwards its recommendation for inclusion in the general studies program. An updated list of courses recommended for inclusion by General Studies Advisory Council will be forwarded later this semester.

2. Develop communication materials and procedures about the Revised General Studies Program for several audiences; students, faculty, and advisors.
3. Select student outcomes for inclusion in university-wide assessment activities.

Working groups have been established to address these priorities. The Council has met three times this semester and has two more meetings scheduled, with a third meeting time identified if needed.

Respectfully submitted by Jo Ann Collier, Chair



## APPENDIX I

## Proposal for Funding the 1993-94 Faculty Senate Budget

The following proposal is offered to fund the 1993-94 Faculty Senate budget approved at the October meeting.

1. The Faculty Senate gratefully accepts the offer from President Elliott to fund the renovation of the Faculty Senate offices from university plant funds (in the amount of \$10,260).
2. The Faculty Senate gratefully accepts the offer from Provost Jamison to continue to publish The Chronicle for the remainder of the academic year (in the amount of \$8,000).
3. The Faculty Senate will assess each academic unit represented by senators (each of the colleges plus the University Library) for the remaining \$45,520 on the basis of the proportion of the total operating budget available to all such units in the 1993-94 academic year. The assessments will be as follows:

UNIT	% OPERATING BUDGET	ASSESSMENT
Arts & Sciences	27.34%	\$12,445
Business Administration	9.20%	4,188
Community & Technical	7.69%	3,500
Education	7.89%	3,592
Engineering	8.43%	3,837
Fine & Applied Arts	11.62%	5,289
Law	4.81%	2,190
Nursing	4.32%	1,967
Polymer Science & Engineering	4.30%	1,957
University Libraries	6.47%	2,945
Wayne College	7.93%	3,610
TOTAL:	100%	\$45,520

4. The Faculty Senate directs the Chair to meet with the Deans of the relevant academic units to determine the timing and method for the payment of these assessments, providing that all funds are paid prior to the end of the 1993-94 academic year.



**Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (cont.)**

In order to regularize the finances of the Faculty Senate, the following amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws is offered:

1. The Faculty Senate shall have suitable office space, budget for appropriate expenditures, and at least one full-time secretary for support of its activities.
2. Beginning with the 1994-95 academic year, the Faculty Senate shall be allocated a regular University general fund account through the normal budgeting process. For budgetary purposes, the Faculty Senate shall be treated as an independent administrative unit.
3. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall be responsible for the administration of the Faculty Senate account. The Chair shall make regular reports concerning the account to the Senate and to the relevant University budgetary authorities according to regular budgetary procedures.
4. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall prepare a budget request for each academic year and present it to the Senate for approval in a timely fashion, consistent with the regular University budgetary process.
5. Once approved by the Senate, the Chair of the Senate will submit the budget request through the regular University budgetary process, where it will be considered along with budget requests from other administrative units of the University.



**APPENDIX J**

**Resolution from the Faculty in the College of Engineering**

Whereas the Faculty Senate of The University of Akron, is a university entity and has no connection with UAFPA, and signing a UAFPA letter by the title of "Chair, Faculty Senate," is incompatible with and represents a misuse of that position;

Be it resolved that the faculty of the College of Engineering requests that Dr. Don Gerlach be censured for inappropriately associating Faculty Senate with the 27 October 1993 letter of the UAFPA to President Elliott.

Be it further resolved that the faculty of the College of Engineering request that the Faculty Senate investigate and correct this matter of conflict of interest.

Passed by the College of Engineering faculty at its regular faculty meeting on 4 November 1993.



MR DAVID JAMISON  
ASSISTANT PROVOST  
4703