

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

5-5-1994

## Faculty Senate Chronicle May 5, 1994

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. 10

May 5, 1994

32 Pages

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 5, 1994	1
Appendices to the Minutes of the Meeting of Faculty Senate of May 5, 1994	18
A. Remarks of the President of the University	18
B. Report of the <i>Executive Committee</i>	20
C. Report of <i>Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee</i>	21
D. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	23
E. Report of <i>Research (Faculty Projects) Committee</i>	25
F. Amendment to Senate Bylaw V K	29
H. Newly Elected Senators of Faculty Senate	30
Curriculum Changes	31

---

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



**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAY 5, 1994**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Gerlach at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 5, 1994, in the Goodyear Lecture Hall in the College of Business Administration.

Forty-eight of the fifty-five members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Cohen, Frank, Kimmell, Newman, Stafford and Wright were absent with notice. Senator Clay was absent without notice.

**SENATE ACTION**

- **APPROVED DEGREE CANDIDATES FOR SUMMER COMMENCEMENT**
- **APPROVED CURRICULUM CHANGES**
- **APPROVED TEMPORARY ENLARGEMENT OF APCC**
- **REFERRED BYLAW VII, E, 4 TO REFERENCE COMMITTEE**
- **REFERRED BYLAW II, A OF THE BPCC TO REFERENCE COMMITTEE**
- **REFERRED BYLAW III, A & B OF THE BPCC TO REFERENCE COMMITTEE**
- **REFERRED BYLAW II, A OF THE LRPC TO REFERENCE COMMITTEE**
- **DIRECTED PRESIDENT TO CONSULT WITH EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REGARDING ADDITION TO LRPC**
- **APPROVED CHANGE OF SENATE BYLAW V, K (STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE)**
- **ELECTED SENATOR HARRIS TO BE REPRESENTATIVE TO FACCOBOR**
- **DEFERRED MOTION ON ACROSS-THE-BOARD RAISES TO BPCC**
- **REFERRED DEFINITION OF MERIT RAISES TO BPCC**
- **ADOPTED STANDING RULE EXTENDING 5-MINUTE RULE TO GUESTS**



**ITEM NUMBER 1- APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - On behalf of the Executive Committee, Secretary Brink moved the adoption of the agenda. Motion carried.

**ITEM NUMBER 2 - CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 7** - Senator Fowler said on page 45 there were two points mentioned. The second point was identified as 20 rather than 2).

Senator Aupperle asked if would it be possible to meet on May 18 if the Senate did not conclude the agenda. Chairman Gerlach answered it was up to the Senate to decide. He suggested the Senator wait until the end of the meeting and when there was a motion to adjourn, another motion to adjourn to a specific time would take precedence. He declared the minutes approved as circulated, subject to the one slight editorial change.

**ITEM NUMBER 3 - CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS** - Chairman Gerlach said he had a few remarks. One, the President had reported her approval of the actions taken on April 7, which had been forwarded to the Board of Trustees. Two, the Workload Policy which was adopted April 28 was edited by the Chairman, making certain those changes of "heads" to "chairs" and so on were made, and it was delivered to the President's office. Third, questionnaires would be circulated for all faculty to state preferences for committees. Even those who had positions on committees for longer than one year should respond and indicate this fact. This would be helpful to the Executive Committee when it made reappointments and new appointments this summer. Finally, Chairman Gerlach and the Senate wished to welcome the new Senior Vice-President and Provost, Mr. Jamison, who was present at the meeting. (Applause)

**ITEM NUMBER 4 - SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - Secretary Brink said he had two announcements. First, after today there would be two sets of minutes circulated, but he cautioned Senators not to be anxious - they would receive them some time this summer. More important and more immediate, was to remind everyone that next Thursday afternoon beginning at 3:30, the Executive Committee was hosting a reception in the Faculty Senate offices for the retiring Chairman, Dr. Gerlach, and the retiring representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, Dr. June Burton.

Ms. Carmen Keener introduced herself as the new Associated Student Government President. She said she looked forward to working with everyone next year. (Applause)

**ITEM NUMBER 5 - REPORTS**

**A. Remarks of the President of the University (Appendix A)**

**B. FACCOBOR Representative - No report.**

**C. Executive Committee (Appendix B)**

**D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - No report.**



**E. University Well-Being Committee - No report.**

**F. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Associate Provost Walton said he had three items. (Appendix C)**

1. Degree candidates, summer commencement. Senator Oller moved approval of the list, subject to the completion of requirements on behalf of the committee. Motion carried without dissent. (On file in the offices of the Provost and the Faculty Senate.)
2. Curriculum changes. Associate Provost Walton said there were a series of ten changes which were listed in his report. All contingencies had been met. On behalf of the committee, Senator Oller moved approval of all changes. Motion carried.
3. Curriculum process. Associate Provost Walton referred to item 3 in his report. APCC considered a recommendation from the Curriculum Subcommittee to form an ad hoc committee for the purpose of recommending revisions in the current curriculum process. Following discussion, APCC voted to request the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to form an ad hoc committee for this purpose when it made committee assignments for 1994-95. He brought that recommendation to the Senate.

Senator Oller said he would like to amend the recommendation. Rather than create an ad hoc committee, he would recommend that some additional people be added to the APCC Committee so the Committee could divide up into three groups: one for calendar and policy; one for curriculum; and this separate subcommittee that could look into the procedure of curriculum matters. Since APCC normally had a preponderance of Senate members, five or six people who were not Senate members could be added to give additional workers. This would still leave a majority of Senators. Seconded by Senator Clinefelter. Chairman Gerlach noted this was for one year only. Motion carried.

Senator McGucken asked about the Scientific Misconduct Policy. He recalled that under President Muse there was a policy drawn up on rather short notice by the Legal Affairs office and then it was referred to APCC. He was on the subcommittee that reviewed the policy two years ago, and wondered what was holding this policy up. Senator Oller replied he had contacted Professor Stephen Brooks, who was chairing the committee for the graduate faculty. The graduate council was in the process of getting together some sort of document they would then share with the Policy & Calendar subcommittee. The last time he had heard from them about this was four months ago, and he believed it was in the Legal Affairs office.

President Elliott stated that she, too, was in search of the elusive Scientific Misconduct Policy, as this was a very important document. The University was working under the policy that was just referenced and this was adopted by the Board as an interim policy pending receipt of the Scientific Misconduct Policy. Until this was resolved, the University could not receive federal funding; perhaps the new Provost could find it.

Provost Jamison said the interim policy satisfied the minimal requirements to obtain some federal grants but was not satisfactory in its content the way it was adopted. This was one of the items Dean Griffin was working on with the University Research Council at the time he fell ill, and



he was unable to complete that project. He promised this would be placed at the top of the list and reported the APCC Committee by their first meeting in the fall.

**H. Athletics Committee - No report.**

**I. Campus Facilities Planning Committee** - Senator Guegold said the Facilities Planning Committee had met twice in the last three weeks with the BPCC Facilities subcommittee, which meetings had been valuable to both groups. There was a great deal of discussion concerning labs and general studies classrooms and the committee had been working very hard on the situation for the implementation of the new general studies program this fall. The committee sent to Vice-President Helmick its recommendations for the use of the remaining 1993-94 plant funds. A recommendation that priority be given to Arts & Sciences projects that impact on the general studies implementation beginning in the fall had also been made. Another recommendation was that the Senate offices next year move into the rooms in Crouse Hall currently reserved for Dr. Guzzetta, 212, 213 and 213C, if alternative space can be provided for his office. He thanked the committee members for their help this past year. **(Appendix D)**

President Elliott asked if it was the committee's wish that the Senate office location be permanent or temporary until Kolbe was ready again. Senator Guegold said the committee was looking for permanent space, and based on the recommendations he had received, Crouse Hall appeared to be very good permanent space for the Senate offices.

**J. University Libraries Committee - No report.**

**K. Reference Committee - No report.**

**L. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - (Appendix E)**

**M. Student Affairs Committee - No report.**

**N. Computing and Communications Technologies Committee - No report.**

**O. Shared Governance Council and Subcommittees - No report.**

**P. Long Range Planning Committee - No report.**

**Q. Budget and Planning Coordination Committee - No report.**

Chairman Gerlach observed there had been no report on the issue of salary equity. He wondered if any progress had been made. Senator Cheung said the committee had met once and was collecting information.

**R. General Studies Advisory Council - No report.**



**ITEM NUMBER 6 - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Bylaw Amendments** - Chairman Gerlach noted an omission at the beginning of the agenda and hoped it was not out of line to mention it now. He assumed the first item of unfinished business would be an item that appeared on the special meeting agenda which the Senate had not discussed. Hearing no objection, this issue would be addressed first.

**1. Bylaw VII, E, 4, insert the words: "Should a member of the Senate be absent without notice or excuse for three meetings, the Executive Committee may, after due consultation with the absentee, declare that Senator's seat vacant."** Proposed by Senator Richards. Seconded by Senator Clinefelter.

Senator Richards stated the reason this amendment was proposed was because as elected members of the Faculty Senate, Senators had a duty and a responsibility to their constituencies. Everybody needed to be at the meetings; every college needed to be represented; every interest group needed to be supported. The Senate was the only mechanism she could think of that would allow some kind of protection for the people who were not getting the representation they deserved.

Senator Green said he had a number of serious problems with this amendment, but he wanted to say at the outset, he sympathized with the issue Senator Richards had raised. Almost all constitutions or bylaws of legislative bodies had procedures for dealing with members who misbehaved. Unfortunately, that seemed to be necessary. However, this amendment had some serious flaws which he wanted to address briefly. First of all, it seemed to him this particular amendment was an example of overkill. While someone not attending, not participating, was certainly an annoyance, it probably was not a fatal annoyance. If the Senate allowed a procedure for declaring a seat vacant, it was effectively using the death penalty for a particular minor transgression. He compared this with using an elephant gun to kill a fly; flies were certainly annoying but there were other ways to deal with them. The presumption of the amendment was that when a Senator did not perform, the principal group being defrauded was the Senate. While there was some truth to this, it overstated the case. The principal people who were being defrauded were those who were being represented by that individual; and, therefore, they ought to have some input in whether that individual was to be disciplined. Another problem with the amendment was there was no due process. He knew all the members of the Executive Committee and he trusted them all, but bylaws and constitutions were not written for people you know and trust. Under this particular amendment there was no provision for a Senator explaining his situation. There was no provision for intermediate status, and he thought that was important. And lastly, there was no procedural safeguard. If Senators wanted to deprive their colleagues of representation, then they needed to do this very seriously and with appropriate safeguards. It may be that a recall provision should be added to allow different colleges to recall their Senators if they did not behave appropriately, or the entire Senate could vote on declaring a seat vacant. So while he sympathized with this amendment, he saw certain problems also. Accordingly, he would like to move that this amendment be sent to the Reference Committee for further study and to report its findings on this matter by the October meeting of the Senate. Seconded by Senator Marquette.

Senator Glaser said he had no objection to that motion, though he supported what Senator Richards proposed. If the Senate sent this to the Reference Committee, he would like the Reference Committee also to consider a kind of parallel motion, applying the same principle to members of



Senate committees. He had had experience with committees having to wait a long time or not being able to meet officially because a quorum was not in place and business could not be accomplished in a timely manner. He did not know whether that could be an amendment to this motion, but he would like to have both of those considered. Senator Green said he would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Clinefelter spoke against the amendment. She agreed with the provision that members of committees should also abide by attendance requirements, but to her it was a fairly easy thing to notify the Secretary of the Senate if one was going to be absent. Due process was covered with, "... after due consultation with the absentee."

Senator McElwee thought this entire matter needed to be referred to the Reference Committee because otherwise, the Senate would be taking care of individual circumstances as they arose. If, for example, Senators were unable to attend a special meeting because they did not know a meeting was going to be called, that in fact might be their third absence. There might be other issues in terms of a Senator's entire behavior over a period of time that the Senate might want to address. He thought there should be a mechanism allowing the Senate to address not only absence from meetings but the entire set of responsibilities that applied to a Senator.

Senator Oller supported Senator Clinefelter, and he noted this was not, "three strikes and you're out." There were many safeguards, and one of them was the use of the word "may." It did not say that the Executive Committee had to remove a Senator after three absences; it said it "may, after due consultation, consider" removing a Senator. It was not a requirement.

Senator Richards said if it should ever be necessary to declare a Senator's seat vacant, it simply meant the Senator would be removed from that position and that his colleagues would be required to elect a new person to replace the Senator.

Senator Perry spoke in favor of the amendment because he felt that removal of a person from an elective body was something that should be done by the entire body, not just by a committee, whether it be the Executive Committee or otherwise. He did not know of any elective body where a committee could remove a member of the whole body, so he thought this matter needed to be discussed more fully.

Senator Erickson spoke against the amendment because the proposed bylaw was not talking about, "I have a class. I can't come to the meeting." It was talking about not meeting a basic courtesy in any kind of circumstance. It seemed to her if a Senator could not notify of three absences, then this was an extreme circumstance, and she could not imagine members of this body ever doing that. If she could not come to a meeting, then she gave notice she could not attend. If a Senator did not give notice, then she thought it was a serious matter. She thought the body could separate the two items here - one, the motion as proposed by Senator Richards to deal with this particular issue, and several others, certainly the committee membership. The motion did not include this at the moment and could be discussed at a later time in Reference Committee.

Senator Marquette said he agreed with Senator Erickson's belief that this was not going to happen very often. But precisely because he agreed with her he thought there was no great need to address the issue at this moment. Rather than cluttering up the bylaws with something about absenteeism and then perhaps another change regarding committees or yet another matter, it would



behoove the body to make one change. Let the Reference Committee study the issue and come up with one change in the Senate Bylaws. If the body was addressing a problem which was not actually a problem, the body ought to make clear exactly how it was going to deal with the membership issues. Then in October it could be handled, because the Reference Committee would have produced a consistent, single change to the bylaws.

Senator Green said this discussion highlighted exactly the problem. Senator Oller pointed out under this provision the Executive Committee "may" vacate a seat. A multitude of sins could be committed through the word "may." Under what circumstances; under what explanations; all kinds of strange things evolved. He could not imagine, as Senator Erickson pointed out, that people would not have the common courtesy to report an absence, but if one observed politics long enough, one saw many strange happenings. There should be rules to deal with those kinds of problems. Referring to questions that were asked of Senator Richards, did this pertain to special meetings or only to regular meetings? These were issues that needed to be hashed out. Senator Green's motion was not to dispose of this issue permanently, but rather to study it more carefully so that the body had a complete and sophisticated response to this and other kinds of problems that might arise.

Senator Hariharan called the question. Seconded by Senator Sterling. Motion to end debate carried.

Motion to refer this matter to the Reference Committee with the charge they should look into other dimensions of the issue involving attendance carried.

**2. Bylaw II, A of the Budget & Planning Coordination Committee. Change to read: "Ex-Officio NON-VOTING: President, Senior Vice-President and Provost, Vice-President for Administrative Services."** Proposed by Senator Fowler.

Senator Fowler said in light of what was received today from General Counsel Mallo, he was puzzled as to how he should proceed and felt there was a point to be made. He believed it was redundant for the President and the Vice Presidents to be advising the President on the Budget Committee, and then the President advising the President and the Vice Presidents in the Cabinet meetings once information was sent to the President from the Budget Committee.

Chairman Gerlach added, hoping he would not be making a breach of propriety as the Chair, that he had a couple of comments. First of all, it was remarkable that legal counsel so quickly jumped on an issue when the usual practice of that office was to answer questions in a most dilatory manner. He urged Senators to be practical and reasonable about this. If the old University Council created the Senate and these other bodies and set them up with bylaws, duly approved by the Trustees, was it not possible for the Senate now as the successor of the Council to propose amendments which, of course, the Board of Trustees must then act upon? How else were these bodies to be altered as circumstances might suggest? There was no amending process provided for the Budget or Long Range Planning Committees. And it struck the Chairman that it was not inappropriate for the Senate to propose amendments to these structures. He also thought there was no issue of "ultra vires" here. This was no question of the Senate overstepping its legal powers, because ultimately such proposed amendments had to be approved by the ultimate authority at the University, the Board of Trustees.



Senator Harris said there was some discussion of what was proper or improper for the Senate to act upon. As a result of that discussion, the word "recommendation" was aptly adopted for those items that were in relation to the budget, etc., to make sure there was no acting without authorization. She questioned the reason the memo was written in the first place for a better understanding of the subject matter. On items that were going from the Senate to particular committees, the body specifically said they were expressed recommendations and suggestions which would be adopted by the Board of Trustees to prevent Senate from overstepping any bounds.

Senator Green said he agreed with the argument being presented by the General Counsel. It seemed to him when the Board of Trustees created the shared governance structure, it created four separate bodies. In fact, if one looked at the bylaws, there were four separate sets of bylaws. The Board delegated to each of those bodies different responsibilities, and one of the responsibilities it delegated to the Senate was the authority to amend its own bylaws but not to amend the bylaws of the other bodies, because these bodies contained members other than Senators by law. For this reason, it seemed that legal counsel did have a point stating it was inappropriate, as these amendments were worded for the Senate to presume to amend the bylaws of other bodies on which the Senate had non-Senatorial members. If the body wanted to change these amendments to offer a recommendation that the body creating those four permanent structures make changes, this would be appropriate. But the way the amendments read now, they would be the same as the amendments to the Senate's bylaws, stating once they were passed they would be law. The Chairman's remark that the Board of Trustees ultimately approve all matters made a certain amount of sense, but the point was that the Board of Trustees had delegated to the Senate certain responsibilities. The Senate would be in a considerable amount of controversy if it tried to undermine those responsibilities delegated to it.

Senator Aupperle said the Senate's bylaws observed under Amendments VIII, part A: "Amendments to this Constitution may be placed on the agenda of a regular or special meeting of the Faculty Senate by a member of the Senate or by petition of twenty percent of the voting members of the Faculty." The bylaws stated that Senate could do this. In addition, it was noted under Duties, part A, that Senate had the responsibility to formulate suitable rules, requirements and procedures regarding admission, government, management and control of the students, courses of study, granting of degrees and certificates, and other internal affairs of the University. Under E, it talked about reviewing and transmitting to the President of the University the comments and recommendations of the Senate. Under F, reviewing and offering recommendations concerning proposals for the creation, abolition, rearrangement of colleges, departments, schools, divisions, etc., was discussed. Under G, University-wide committees which were created by the Senate shall report to the Senate. Under H, all legislation introduced in the Faculty Senate shall be designated as such and if passed shall be forwarded to the President. Also, it was observed earlier by Senator Harris these things would ultimately be decided by the Board of Trustees.

Senator Clinefelter said the Senate was recommending to the Board of Trustees that anything passing had to pass through the Senate. She did not feel the Senate was taking on any power it did not already have.

Senator Marquette said he did not understand the issue, either with the amendments in the first place or whether or not it was legal. When the body was created, the intention of the different committees was to create a place where the administration and the faculty would talk to one another to try and build a consensus on a particular issue. BPC had budgetary authority. It had both



administrators and members of the Senate on it, and they all voted. Senator Fowler noted the President appeared to be reporting to the President. All members knew in the last instance the Trustees of the University were going to make these decisions. But the President served on the Long Range Planning Committee and functioned as the Chair, as you would expect a Chair to function trying to bring some order to the discussion. The Committee had met a number of times and had quite fruitful discussions. Senator Cheung would be able to state that BPCC was functioning as a group, not only the Senators but the administrators, trying to come together rather than having "A versus B" all the time. Making these people non-voting was basically saying, "You go over there in your corner and when we feel like talking to you, we will." That was not the intention of the creation of this model of governance. It was a governance structure where people would in fact try and come together as a university and reach some kind of agreement about what needed to be done. He knew upon completion it was going to get shoved to the President's desk, and the President would then shove it to the Trustees. That was mechanistic but it was not significant in terms of the way in which the body wanted this institution to function. The faculty created a Senate and these committees so that instead of yelling at each other, as had been done in the past, there would be a place where differences could be hashed out. There was provision for roll call vote on these committees. Faculty would know how it was going; if it always came out that the administrators were going one way and the Senators were going another way on significant issues, faculty would know if they were being danced around the maypole again. However, a full year of Faculty Senate had not been completed yet. There was a need to get everybody to talk to one another, and he saw no reason why all these bylaws needed to be amended to make everyone non-voting, so they would never talk to one another again. Having spent a couple of years trying to accomplish this on a committee, he said this was a stupid idea and he was very angry about it. It was thoughtless, because all it did was create the same kind of environment where the faculty were here and the administration was over there, and the hell with each other. That was not what it was about; especially when significant issues such as budgeting and planning were being discussed. All concerned persons need to talk to one another and all need to try and convince each other rather than argue among themselves.

Chairman Gerlach observed that Senator Marquette was opposed to the amendment.

Senator Harris moved that bylaw amendments listed under Unfinished Business VI. A, nos. 1, 2 and 3 be referred to the Reference Committee for an analysis of their content. Chairman Gerlach said a motion would be in order now to refer the particular item to the Reference Committee. It did not seem the motion should apply to the others, because the Senate had not discussed them yet. Seconded by Senator Oller.

Senator Oller said there was a principle here that needed to be clarified and that was how this body would feel if changes needed to be made on the Long Range Planning Committee or the Budget Committee somewhere down the line. How did the body make its opinions or recommendations known? To whom were they sent? Can those bodies ever be changed? Did changes have to come from the bodies themselves, or could this body make recommendations for those bodies? These issues needed clarification.

Senator Aupperle stated that amendments to this constitution may be placed on the agenda, discussed and voted on. As for the process that Senator Fowler introduced, he thought there might be some concern that individuals appointed to a committee such as BPCC and held their university appointment according to the President's discretion might be in a situation of "Caesar's wife."



While she may have been pure, there was historical research to question that reality, and that was the basis for Senator Fowler's motion. This semester BPCC had been fortunate in having a Provost provide excellent service to this body and to BPCC, but BPCC did not meet in the fall, and the Senate needed to take charge of the governing process it had been dispatched with. At some point the Senate was either going to say it did not want to be 49 smiling, happy-go-lucky cheerleaders and instead, say it wanted to initiate something more than glacial change.

President Elliott said she had queried Mr. Mallo, as she routinely sent him the agenda when there were concerns from a legal point of view. This was the first time his reply seemed to be of enough consequence to send on. The issue here was not whether or not the Senate could change the Senate. In the work that Council gave her to forward to the Trustees, each body was incorporated separately. There were bylaws to change the BPCC; there were bylaws to change the LRPC; there were bylaws for the Shared Governance Council. Each could change in significant ways, and her assumption was that they would over time. Mr. Mallo was alerting the body to the fact that this body did not have the power to change other committees' bylaws; the process would be for the Senate to recommend consideration of changes to them individually. They had their own bylaws which they could follow through on and that was the issue here. A number of colleagues who disenfranchised themselves by giving up the University Council did so on the assurance that they would have a body with bylaws that would protect their rights within that body. Now, regrettably, the piece that had made the least progress this year was the Shared Governance Council and it was the most critical one to colleagues who were not part of this body. They were very concerned the Senate might start changing things without benefit. They were not committees of this body, and Senate had its own committees. These were separate committees with their own bylaws and that was the point to which he alerted us, that Senate recommend to them this consideration. They could then in turn choose to take that action or not.

Chairman Gerlach offered that the President was in error on one point. Those separate bodies in their rules had no mechanism whereby their structure could be amended; there was no provision for amendment. The only provision for amendment that could possibly exist would be from the Board of Trustees' own system. What was being proposed here was for the Senate to recommend to the Trustees to make these amendments until such time as the Trustees set up a system whereby each of these groups could handle amendments of their own. But there was nothing provided in those rules.

President Elliott suggested it must first be recommended to them that they come up with amended procedures within their own bylaws, because all these different sets of bylaws had been adopted and she thought the body had given its word. There was a way to accomplish what Senator Fowler wished to accomplish, but this was not the way it could be correctly accomplished. It may be there was even more to be accomplished, and those bodies should be alerted so they could prepare within their bylaws the capacity for amendment. She thought Mr. Mallo quite correctly sent these forward because the Senate could be challenged in the way it was proceeding, as it had chosen to disregard what it had itself sent forward.

Chairman Gerlach observed his study of early American history showed that colonial assemblies got power because they exercised it.

Senator Marquette noted this was something created a year ago and now the Senate wanted to manipulate it slightly. It did not appear to be of great significance. In fact, much thought went



into the composition of those committees. The reason there was a provision that the President could not change the composition of the committee except by "x" amount was to be sure there would always be a majority of Senators. The issue here was whether or not the body was going to behave reasonably about this set of rules. The process of how and whether or not they should be amended could be reviewed by the Reference Committee. He thought the Senate was a power grab in the first place because there was no University Council dominated by administrators anymore. None of these committees were dominated by administrators, because there were enough Senators on them. The President could add two people and there still would be more Senators than anyone else, and that was the intent. If it was discovered that somebody was playing games, then he could see responding. But he saw no reason to change something that was reasonably well thought out and had not been given even a year to work. The real purpose here was to create University governance so that all groups worked together instead of wandering around thumbing their noses at each other. This was not a good idea.

Senator Clinefelter said on this list there was an additional provision. It was adding a person to the Long Range Planning Committee. Now if the committee itself and President Elliott wanted to add this extra person to the committee, were they not able to do this either? Senator Marquette replied that it could be done. It was in the bylaws of the LRPC to do that. If the President tried to do any more, then she would have to come to the Senate so there would always be more Senators than anyone else.

Motion to refer the proposed amendment to the Reference Committee carried.

**3. Bylaw III, A & B of the BPCC - Change to read: A Senator will be chosen to chair the Budget and Planning Coordination Committee. The Senior Vice-President and Provost will serve as vice-chair (beginning with the 1994-95 academic year).** Proposed by Senator Aupperle.

Senator Clinefelter moved this item be referred to the Reference Committee. Seconded by Senator Sterling.

Motion carried.

**4. Bylaw II, A of the LRPC - Change to read: Ex Officio NON-VOTING: President, Sr. Vice-President and Provost, Vice-President for Administrative Support Services, and Vice-President for Student Support Services.** Proposed by Senators Richards and Clinefelter.

Senator Marquette moved to divide the proposal and refer the first part to the Reference Committee. Seconded by Senator Green.

Motion carried.

Senator Marquette moved that the Senate direct the President of the University to follow the bylaws of the Long Range Planning Committee and consult with the Executive Committee of the Senate about placing the Vice President for Student Support Services on the Long Range Planning Committee, because this was the proper way to handle this. Seconded by Senator Green.

Motion carried.



**5. Senate Bylaw V, K (Student Affairs Committee)** - Senator Weber said the Student Affairs Committee had spent a great deal of time trying to consider how to broaden its charge in order to address the newest issues which were a concern to students. To a certain extent, the past committee of University Council was very narrow in its focus and addressed only issues of financial aid and extracurricular affairs, excluding athletics. It seemed inappropriate, given the reorganization of the University Student Affairs Division and the widespread concerns that students on this campus have had. Some kind of channel was needed which would permit that division and student concerns to be brought forward to the Senate for consideration. The idea was that by broadening the charge of the committee to provide advice and counsel to the Vice President of Student Affairs and allowing the committee to recommend policy concerns to this body, it would serve the students better and allow Senate to have an impact on those issues related to student life. Some of the traditional aspects of the committee's charge in terms of scholarships and financial aid had been retained because that seemed to be a part of the federal regulations for different kinds of scholarships and grants. The committee also kept a component that allowed this body to act on the official registration of student organizations because that was part of the process that student organizations go through when they wanted to register on this campus. In addition to these bylaw amendments, there were two omitted that were circulated last week. They referred to the change in name from Vice President for Student Support Services to Vice President for Student Affairs; that was under Bylaw V, section C. The committee also asked the Senate to add as a member of the Student Affairs Committee the Director of Student Financial Aid. This seemed to be, again, an important piece of the puzzle in terms of making sure the University was in compliance with federal regulations.

Senator Aupperle asked if Senator Weber would accept as a friendly amendment a change of one word in no. 1, "... provides advice and "recommendations," as opposed to advice and "counsel." Senator Weber said she would not. She thought "counsel" was a sufficient word and it paralleled what was said in terms of the Athletics Committee's charge and the way the Athletics Committee dealt with the Director of Athletics.

Senator Aupperle mentioned that as a committee member, he was not the only one who was concerned by the tone of item no. 1, the problem being that this committee would be co-opted administratively. He understood the emphasis Dr. Marquette had made about the need for a collegial atmosphere and his point was a good one. But if the committee's charge was basically to provide advice and counsel, then he thought this was no longer a Senate committee. This would become an administrative committee. In order to encourage people who were part of that committee to be active participants and feel as though they were going to have some meaningful say, "recommendations" served the situation much better. He moved to amend and insert the word "recommendations" instead of "counsel." Seconded by Senator Gunn.

Senator Ranson questioned the substantial difference between the two. It seemed a big argument on a little cause. Chairman Gerlach added it was not clear to him, but the word "recommends" did fit in items 2, 3 and 4; "Reviews and recommends to the Senate; reviews and recommends; recommends to the Senate." There was a kind of consistency.

Senator Aupperle said at no time was the word "recommends" directed at the University executive in charge of Student Affairs. The committee could recommend to the Senate but could only advise and counsel the executive.



Senator Cheung observed whether it was recommendations or counsel, he did not see how a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate could cause the Vice President of Student Affairs to take any particular action. He did not see a change in substance here.

Senator Marquette said he was not sure about the word, but the point was made earlier regarding how the Senate's effectiveness was going to depend on the amount the body chose to do. He thought what Senator Weber was recommending was an appropriate power grab. What was really going to matter here was how the body behaved as a group. He could vote for the "recommendations," but keep in mind what was going to happen here depended on what the body chose to do - not the words, "counsel" or "recommendations". If the body needed to get in the face of the Student Affairs Vice President, then it should do so.

Senator Glaser said he would like to hear from other members of the committee as, apparently, this was a matter of some debate in the committee.

Senator Weber thought the concern was that the committee not be perceived as a tool of the administration, and this would not be her intent even with the "provides advice and counsel" approach. She thought Senator Aupperle was concerned with a possible misperception, but she thought it was consistent with the rest of the bylaws language. It set up an appropriate tone for dialogue with the Vice President of Student Affairs, because the committee could then recommend policy to the Senate and the body could have the appropriate amount of power that the Faculty Senate should, in fact, have in this particular set of circumstances.

Motion carried, 21 to 18.

Senator Glaser asked whether "recommends to the Senate" should be added in item 3. What was this intent? All the others had counsel or recommendations to something or to somebody. Item 3 just said, reviews and recommends. Senator Oller noted it said, "to University students" at the end of the sentence.

Chairman Gerlach said it appeared to him that reviewing and recommending policy could be done in all kinds of directions, to the Senate and to anybody else who needed policy recommendations. Senator Weber stated that in some respects the committee would be recommending policy to the Director of Student Financial Aid, so it needed to go in both directions, which was why it was omitted.

President Elliott asked if the Senate would be willing to say, "recommends to the appropriate bodies." She thought there were times when financial aid awards required a committee review before they were accepted, and she preferred to use a Senate committee rather than create a committee for this purpose.

Senator Edwards moved to insert the words, "to appropriate bodies" following the word "policy" in item 3. Senator Weber accepted that as a friendly amendment.

Motion carried without dissent. (Appendix F)



**ITEM NUMBER 7 - NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Election of Representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents** - Senator Richards nominated Senator Harris for this position. Chairman Gerlach observed there should be an alternate, but it would not be necessary at this time to select

one. Senator Marquette moved that the nominations be closed and the Secretary cast a unanimous ballot. Seconded by Senator Green. Motion carried without dissent.

**B. Motion by Senator Aupperle: "That the Senate recommend that faculty and staff raises for 1994-95 be made across the board"**, - Senator Aupperle thought it was a good idea with the sparse amount of money available that the 3.35% pool of dollars be allocated percentage-wise, across-the-board to faculty and staff on this campus. The rationale was the following: When limited funds of this nature were made available, research seemed to suggest that 3.35% would not facilitate the kind of threshold, motivational impact that would make a difference for most people if the University tried to convert this to a merit package. There would probably be a counter-motion to leave this to the judgment of individual colleges, and in those colleges there may or may not be a decision to go with merit. Of course, leaving it up to the colleges would be part of the decentralization process that President Elliott had discussed. While Senator Aupperle was generally in favor of such decentralization, he said it needed to have parallel structures such as the downsizing of the respective colleges that took place the past year. Present research argued that limited funds made available for salary increases were best maintained on an across-the-board percentage basis that facilitated collegiality. The kind of dollars that would really make a meaningful, motivational impact were not available at this time, unless one happened to be in a department where performance criteria were fuzzy and political processes ran rampant. In such a situation it was possible someone could walk away with a 10-12% raise and many faculty and staff would walk away with 1/2%. Should this scenario come to pass, the motivational impact and the morale impact would be very negative. He thought it was best at this point to work across-the-board. He had taken a poll of the management department in the College of Business Administration during its last meeting, and his colleagues supported the notion of across-the-board. He has done research in the area of compensation, mainly executive compensation, and also consulted with two other colleagues who were researchers in the compensation area. The consensus was there was no research to suggest an appropriate merit situation with the amount of available dollars.

Senator Marquette said there were a couple of problems with this motion. First, a lot of the money was used to support promotions and other kinds of things, so if this recommendation was adopted, promotion increases would disappear. Secondly, he did not know about the morale of people getting 12%, but he knew his morale was deeply offended when he looked at colleagues who did not work and got a raise merely because they hung around, and that was what an across-the-board raise did. He sympathized with the problem that some places had and he knew this had been a bone of contention at the University for a long time. It was one of the matters prior administrations had not handled properly. The idea of merit had never been properly defined and had been abused in many instances. But an across-the-board raise was not the way to handle that problem. This was a matter that needed to be discussed over the long run, because it was going to have a major impact on how faculty dealt with themselves and their colleagues and downsizing and how faculty respond to the outside world. He could not see how faculty could face the legislature and say: "Well, we're all equally meritorious. We're going to abandon any responsibility for making judgments or differentiation between our colleagues and even the drunk who doesn't work that we can't get rid of because he's tenured is going to get 3.35%." It was not right, but the merit



issue needed to be remedied because Senator Aupperle was right. There were some departments where someone could walk away with a big raise just because of political play and that was not correct. Prior administrations had not dealt with this successfully. That, however, was a different question than saying everybody ought to get exactly the same amount of money no matter what they did. He would like to move that the question of the definition of merit be referred to the Long Range Planning Committee, and the question of across-the-board raises be deferred since they were already in process at this point, rather than take up the issue at this time. Seconded by Senator Green.

Senator McGucken opposed referring anything from this body to the Long Range Planning Committee. Early this year this body got notice from the Provost's office there would be two committees set up to look into the whole question of inequity, and this body thought it was inappropriate that additional committees be formed. Initially, he and others had suggested that the whole issue of salary inequity be referred to the Faculty Well Being Committee, and as he recalled, it was Senator Marquette who said it would be much better to refer the matter to the Budget & Planning Coordination Committee, which this body did. At the time, he recalled no one was too clear about the body's purpose. This body referred it with the charge that there ought to be a report back to the Senate by April of this year. He was disappointed to hear from Senator Cheung that the committee was unclear about what its charge was, particularly because the Provost who initiated the whole thing in the first place was on that committee. Dr. Marquette said the Senate ought to get into people's faces, but what have the Senators been doing on that committee in regard to the matter of salary inequity? For that reason, the Senate ought to take care of its own affairs; and, therefore, he did not want to refer this to the Long Range Planning Committee.

Senator Fowler said this was his understanding of how the "four separate groups" followed: issues went to Long Range Planning and then to BPC and then came back.

Senator Green asked if Senator Marquette would accept a friendly amendment to his motion directing this matter rather than to the Long Range Planning Committee, to the Budget & Planning Coordination Committee because it was already dealing with these matters, as Senator McGucken pointed out. Senator Marquette accepted.

Senator Aupperle thought it was a good idea to try to create a University-wide process of assessing merit. Faculty were probably going to have to address the issue of assessing teaching, research, service and so forth, particularly in light of what was passed at the last meeting. But that did not mean an across-the-board pay raise for staff and faculty could not take place on this campus. In fact, it would seem to make sense until there was a merit structure in place that people had confidence in. At this point in time without a unified merit system in place, it did not make sense to defer this to each individual college. In fact, a couple of weeks ago one person on campus, a Senator here, came to him and said she could not make an announcement to Senate, but she knew being a junior member in her department she was going to get "zero" increase. She conveyed some very frightening concerns on her part. If in fact this body did not choose to provide across-the-board, all the Senators in this room needed to be prepared to speak to the faculty of this campus and indicate to them that they were part of the reason people did not get 3.35% this year.

Senator Cheung called the question. Seconded by Senator Green.

Motion to end debate carried.



Chairman Gerlach said he would exercise his right as a single member of the Senate and call for a roll call vote. The motion was to refer Senator Aupperle's motion on recommending that the faculty and staff raises for the coming year be made across-the-board to the Budget & Planning Coordination Committee and to defer the issue until the BPCC came up with some other scheme to deal with questions of merit.

Aupperle - no	Harris -
Brink - yes	Huff - yes
Buie - yes	Jalbert - no
Cheung - yes	John - no
Clay -	Kimmell - excused
Clements - yes	Laconi - yes
Clinefelter - no	Liang - yes
Cohen - excused	Marquette - yes
Dilts - no	McElwee - yes
Drummond - yes	McGucken - no
Dye - yes	Midha - yes
Edwards - no	Moss - yes
Endres - yes	Newman - excused
Erickson - yes	Oller - no
Fleming - no	Patton - no
Focht - no	Peeples - yes
Fowler - no	Perry - yes
Frank - excused	Ranson - no
Frederick - no	Richards - no
Gerlach - no	Sibberson - yes
Gigliotti - yes	Stafford - excused
Glaser - yes	Sterling - no
Green - yes	Stull - yes
Griffin - no	Stuyvesant - no
Guegold - no	Webb -
Gunn - no	Weber - no
Halasa -	Wright - excused
Hariharan - yes	

Motion to refer to committee passed: 23 yes, 22 no.

Senator Aupperle said given the possibility Senators were going to be viewed as very greedy, could there be a recount, with a difference of only one? Chairman Gerlach replied that as long as the Secretary was not in any doubt about how people answered, he did not know what more could be done in this instance.

**C. Motion that the Senate adopt a standing rule** - Senator Aupperle moved that, "When permission to speak has been granted, all guest speakers and external constituents be limited to five minutes for their remarks." Seconded by Senator Newman. Senator Aupperle said this motion was fairly straightforward. Senator Green called the question. Motion carried without dissent.

Senator Green moved that the Senate thank Chairman Gerlach for his work here in the Senate's maiden year and to congratulate him on his retirement. (Applause)

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

**ITEM NUMBER 9 - ADJOURNMENT** - Senator Marquette moved to adjourn. Seconded by Senator Green. Motion carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By  
David R. Brink, Secretary

*Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quinn*



## APPENDIX A

### **Remarks of the President of the University**

It is a pleasure to be with you today as we close the inaugural year of the Faculty Senate. You all are to be commended for the serious, dedicated, and inclusive way in which the new governance structure has been implemented.

Although we are still finding the need for some explanation of our work from time to time, the governance models appear to be working well and serious issues are being addressed.

Many Senate highlights of this year come to mind:

- Approval of the Faculty Governance Documents by the Board of Trustees;
- A new, more collegial approach to departmental administration (which was approved with only editorial adjustments by the Board of Trustees on April 27);
- An updated sexual harassment policy for the campus;
- A new Faculty Workload Policy in keeping with statewide guidelines.

I believe we have succeeded through our shared governance structure in creating more academic focus on our campus and in better involving our colleagues in meeting the challenges of the new times.

Personally and on behalf of the Board, I would like to extend congratulations and best wishes to those many Senators for whom significant personnel actions were approved last week. Many of you were among those who received promotions in rank, were granted tenure, or earned emeritus status upon your retirement.

I would also like to take this opportunity to formally recognize our new Senior Vice President and Provost David L. Jamison, who has been an active member of this faculty for more than 20 years. The feedback from the Search Committee and the many responses to the candidates from across the campus made it very clear the high level of trust and confidence his colleagues feel for him. I am sure that Mr. Jamison will provide firm and effective leadership for our academic enterprise.

While you have important business to consider, I hope that your meeting will conclude by 5 P.M. so you can attend the Board of Trustees recognition reception at the Martin Center. At 6 o'clock, the formal program will begin with recognition of the four outstanding teacher and researcher award winners selected by the Alumni Association. The outstanding teachers for 1994 are Professor Harry Chu of Physics and Chemistry and Professor Gerald Young of Mathematical Sciences. The outstanding researchers are Professor Antonia Forster of English and Professor Peter Rinaldi of Chemistry.



Trustees also will honor 49 other faculty, administrators and staff selected for recognition on the basis of their achievements this year. Tomorrow, we will recognize our retirees at the Founders' Day luncheon.

Next week, we will graduate some 2,500 new members of the class of 1994. I hope that many of you will be participating in this very special occasion (the bookstore is still taking cap and gown orders). Our Honorary Faculty Marshals will be Instructor Kriemhilde Livingston of Modern Languages and Professor John MacDonald of Music. A new addition to commencement festivities is the GradFest Party on Buchtel Commons from 11 A.M. to 2 P.M.

On your agenda today, you will approve some 725 prospective degree candidates for the summer commencement ceremony on August 20. While we knew there was some student interest in a summer ceremony, we never imagined that the response would be so great! I expect that we will be asking the Senate to make summer commencement a permanent fixture on the academic calendar.

The final item upon which I would like to comment is Senator Aupperle's motion in support of an across-the-board distribution of faculty and staff salary increases. While we will welcome any advice from the Senate on this issue, you should know that salary increase work sheets have already been distributed across the campus and I know that a great deal of consultation has already begun. We have asked the Deans and Vice Presidents to prepare individual recommendations for salary increases, assuming at least a 3.35% increase in their total salary budget for faculty, contract professionals and unclassified staff. In the spirit of budget decentralization, I believe that each unit should be able to design its own formula. Individual recommendations will be approved at the June 22 meeting of the Board of Trustees and communicated by letter to each member of the faculty and staff.

After this very active and challenging year, I continue to feel honored and privileged to serve as your President. I have valued your candor and your commitment to reinvigorating and reshaping this University to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st Century. If our paths do not cross in the last few days of the semester, let me say now that I hope you have a restorative and productive summer. I look forward to the fall when we begin anew together with the energy and creativity that can enrich and broaden our horizons.

Thank you.



**APPENDIX B**

**Report of the Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee met on April 14. The Committee set a time for its next meeting (May 19 at 10:00 a.m.); and set agendas for the April 28 special meeting and for today's meeting.

Respectfully submitted by David R. Brink

---

The following is a summary of the Senate budget to May 31, 1994

Year to date - Actual activities expenses:

Faculty and Staff Salaries	\$7,740.40
Supplies and Services	9,344.29
Communications	488.79
Movable Equipment	<u>5,577.36</u>
TOTAL:	\$23,150.84
BUDGET BALANCE AVAILABLE:	<u>\$7,186.80</u>

May 5, 1994

Page 21



Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost  
Akron, OH 44325-4703  
216-972-7593 216-972-6293 Fax

APPENDIX C

**April 27, 1994**

**TO:** Members of the Faculty Senate  
**FROM:** Joseph M. Walton <sup>jm</sup> Chair of APCC  
(Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee)  
**RE:** APCC Report to the Faculty Senate for the Meeting of May 5, 1994

**I. Curriculum Changes**

- BA-94-10 - Approved
- ED-94-07 - Approved
- ED-94-08 - Approved
- ED-94-10 - Approved
- ED-94-11 - Approved
- ED-94-12 - Approved contingent upon change of course number from 5300:633 to 5300:530.
- FAA-94-14 - Approved
- FAA-94-35 - Approved
- WC-94-13 - Approved
- WC-94-14 - Approved

**II. Policy and Calendar Items**

- A. There has been no action on the Scientific Misconduct Policy at this point because the chair of the subcommittee has not received a report from those principally involved with the revision of the policy.
- B. After due consideration of the Repeat for Change of Grade Policy, the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee had no recommendations for changes in the current policy.
- C. The RTP Guidelines in the Faculty Manual (Sections 3359-20-034 and 3359-20-037) have been considered by the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee, and suggested revisions were presented to APCC. After extensive discussion, action on the proposal was postponed until the Fall of 1994. Dr. Oller will re-draft the proposed revisions and send them to the chair during the summer for circulation to APCC and review by the University's General Counsel.
- D. The subcommittee provided Dr. Oller with additional feedback on the Proposed Workload Policy, which will be considered at a Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 28, 1994.



**APCC Report to the Faculty Senate for the  
Meeting of May 5, 1994  
April 27, 1994  
Page 2**

E. Under the item of old business, Peggy Richards reminded the subcommittee of the need to have answers to questions raised about the Part-Time Faculty Proposal. Review is needed by The Budget and Planning Coordination Committee (BPCC) and by the Office of the General Counsel.

F. A recommendation from Interim Provost David Jamison to alter the President's day schedule by celebrating President's Day on Monday, and following a Monday schedule on the following Tuesday in order to avoid the excessive loss of Monday classes, was considered. After discussion, APCC voted to refer the matter to the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee of APCC for consideration in the Fall of 1994.

**III. Additional Item**

APCC considered a recommendation from the Curriculum Subcommittee to form an ad hoc committee for the purpose of recommending revisions in the current curriculum process. Following discussion, APCC voted to request the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to form an ad hoc committee for this purpose when it makes committee assignments for 1994-95.

c: Peggy Gordon Elliott, President  
David L. Jamison, Interim Senior Vice President and Provost

ald\apcc\fs9405.05



**APPENDIX D**

**Report of Campus Facilities Planning Committee**

A meeting was held April 21, 1994, at 3:30 PM at GSC Chestnut B.

Members in attendance: Guegold, Moore, Drummond, Brink, Noble, Kline, Clay, Dunning, Wright, Bartlett, Trouard, Buchthal, Gunn, Coons, Sterns.

Members of the BPCC Plant/Facilities sub-committee were introduced. It was decided that the BPCC sub-committee would be invited to future meetings in an effort to coordinate and expand the information flow across campus in regard to facilities planning.

The minutes of the March 17, 1994, meeting were approved.

A great deal of discussion once again was held concerning the need to find new offices for the Faculty Senate in 1994-95.

Several space requests were granted.

Dave Buchthal raised some concerns about the funding of the new General Studies lab requirements and the associated one-time and continuing costs. The committee decided that it must take on the responsibility of making recommendations for the G.S. labs and would continue to collect more information for discussion at its next meeting.

Due to the length of the discussion on the above items, it was decided that the group would need to meet again before the next regularly scheduled full Senate meeting and set April 28 at 12:30 PM for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted by William K. Guegold, Chair



### **Campus Facilities Planning Committee**

A meeting was held April 28, 1994, at 12:30 PM at GSC Chestnut B.

Members in attendance: Guegold, Drummond, Buchthal, Kline, Gillon (ASG - for Clay), Fowler, Dye, Dunning, Keller, Wright, Ryan, Coons.

Once again we welcomed members of the BPCC facilities sub-committee who joined us today.

Phil Bartlett presented to us a very precise description of the "Space Allocation Routing Procedure." This was requested so that we might better carry out our duties under the Senate Charter.

The committee considered the information from the last meeting in which it examined identified possibilities for the Senate Offices for next year. It recommended that Phil Bartlett and Roger Ryan pursue additional information, in particular for the use of Crouse 212, part of 213 and 213C. It was noted that a determination would need to be made in regard to Dr. Guzzetta's wishes and if alternate space could be found for him should he desire to return to campus. Space would also need to be found for Dr. Carr (Center for Economic Education) who currently uses these areas.

The committee considered a list of plant funds requests dated March, 1994. They made comments and recommendations on these in the form of brief written comments associated with a ranking system (1-4) with a 1" being "definitely fund," through a "4" which would indicate we do not recommend funding at this time.

The committee also passed a resolution stating that priority should be given to projects that have a definite impact on the ability to implement the new General Studies programs in the fall of 1994. There was also a unanimous expression of appreciation for being allowed the opportunity to make these recommendations.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted by William K. Guegold, Chair



APPENDIX E

April 27, 1994

To: Faculty Senate

From: Daniel Sheffer, Co-Chair Research (Faculty Projects) Committee

Subject: Research (Faculty Projects) Committee, Minutes of April 19, 1994

*Daniel Sheffer*  
*bt*

The following information is to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for their next meeting of May 5, 1994.

The meeting began at 9:05 a.m. in the Chestnut B Room of Gardner Student Center. Members present: Miss Virginia Berringer, Dr. Dolores Bower, Dr. Gary Frank, Dr. Lazarus Macior, Dr. Dan Sheffer (co-chair), Dr. Nancy Somerick, Dr. Claire Tessier, Dr. Gerald Young. Members absent with notice: Ms. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. Jeff Dilts, Dr. Dale Borowiak, Dr. Alan Gent, Dr. Nick Ranson, Dr. William McGucken, Ms. Christina DePaul (Sabbatical), Dr. Isadore Newman (Sabbatical), Mrs. Charmaine Streharsky, and Dr. G. Edwin Wilson. Absent without notice: Dr. J. Clayton Fant, Dr. Peter Henriksen, Dr. Thein Kyu, Dr. Brian Leonard, and Dr. Robert Liang.

This meeting was called to order to wrap up this year, discuss the 1994-95 Guidelines and discuss any recommendations for next year.

Dr. Sheffer explained that in the case of the science and engineering proposals, which were voted to be funded, those faculty did accept the dual award of OBR-Research Challenge and a Faculty Research Grant for Spring 1994.

Dr. Sheffer stated his concern that this Committee be permitted to carry over the remaining funds of \$25,404.96 to the 1994-95 fiscal year. The total for the FRG Spring 1994 awards was \$10,690; and the total for OBR-Research Challenge was \$25,369. Dr. Frank asked if there were any funds carried over from 1992-93. Dr. Sheffer stated \$11,691 was the carry over to 1993-94. (At that time, the assurance of carryover came from the Provost.) A total of \$76,000 was approved for the 1993-94 budget plus the carry over of \$11,691, plus a carryover surplus in supplies of \$1,400 gave this Committee a beginning balance of \$89,091.21. Dr. Sheffer would hope that the entire balance of \$25,404.96 will be carried over to 1994-95.

Dr. Sheffer opened the floor to the Committee asking if they had any comments or suggestions or concerns.

Dr. Frank asked if there had been any questions with respect to how this Committee reviewed the proposals and Dr. Sheffer stated that he hadn't received any comments this year. Dr. Sheffer replied that most people who have commented about the use of a primary reviewer were generally positive.

Dr. Frank explained there was a provision that appeared to allow the author(s) of a proposal to petition before the Committee; he would like the language to be clarified. Dr. Somerick pointed out the passage to be under #4b "Evaluation by Research (Faculty Projects) Committee". The sentence reads: "At the option of the Committee, a personal appearance of the faculty member can be requested." She explained this reads as placing the responsibility in the Committee's hands to request a faculty member to appear. Dr. Frank believes this is placing a higher burden on the Committee and feels this is unnecessary. Dr. Macior remarked this could be a problem if we didn't have representation from the department. Dr. Sheffer explained that this is one of the reasons the Committee started the primary reviewer process so that person (even if not from the same department) could have sufficient time to either solicit a secondary reviewer from the department or a reviewer from outside the UA. Dr. Bower commented that the option of having the investigator come before the Committee had been discussed in the past and would logistically be very difficult. Dr. Sheffer questioned the Committee if more than three weeks was needed to review the proposals. No one objected to the three week review. Dr. Frank made the motion to strike



Faculty Senate  
April 27, 1994  
Minutes of 4/19/94

the sentence regarding personal appearances by the investigators. Dr. Sheffer clarified that if a primary reviewer felt it would be best for the investigator to come before the Committee, then that would be something the primary reviewer would bring to the Chair to put on the agenda. **ACTION:** Strike sentence 4b of the Guidelines: "At the option of the Committee, a personal appearance of the faculty member can be requested".

Dr. Sheffer pointed out paragraph two of the cover letter of the guidelines which refers to eligibility. The provision enables new faculty to seek repeat funding. Senior faculty can apply once every five years with the exception of extraordinary circumstances. Dr. Sheffer explained that Dr. Fant had concerns over the wording at the December 13, 1993 meeting. It was decided that this paragraph would be clarified at the April (this) business meeting. **ACTION:** The year in the sentence will change from 1988 to 1989 and the sentence stands as it reads: Except in extraordinary cases, those who have received funding from this committee since September 1989 will not be considered for funding this year."

**ACTION:** The following represent the deadlines for the 1994-95 receipt of faculty research proposals and the time deadline changes from 5 pm to 4 pm: Fall 1994 deadline is October 21, 1994 (4 p.m.). Spring 1995 deadline is February 24, 1995 (4 p.m.). Summer Fellowship 1995 deadline is November 18, 1994 (4 p.m.).

Dr. Young pointed out that when new people come to this Committee they are not aware of their responsibilities as a primary reviewer. Dr. Sheffer noted that the responsibilities are usually explained at the "get acquainted meeting" in early September. Due to the restructuring of the Faculty Senate this year, the Committee membership changed and expanded after the first meeting.

Dr. Sheffer thanked the Committee for all their hard work and their service. Dr. Sheffer explained he would be writing a letter to the chair of the Senate reminding them that a third of the Committee will be leaving and they need, this summer, to determine the new members.

Meeting adjourned 9:25 am.

**THE FIRST MEETING OF THE 1994-95 SEMESTER WILL BE MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1994, 9-NOON, MCCOLLESTER ROOM OF BUCHTEL HALL.**

/ca

FRG\FacSenate-FRG-4-19-94Min



NOT PRINTED IN 1993Spring 1993 Faculty Research Grants  
Awarded 3/15/93  
Effective 3/15/93 through 1/31/94

## OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS AND FACULTY RESEARCH GRANT AWARDS

<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME AND DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1248	Dr. Thomas Baker Marketing	"The Relationship Between the Environ- ment, Strategy and Performance in High Technology Firms"	\$ 1,381 (FRG)
1249	Dr. Constance Bouchard History	"Completion of the Cartulary of St.-Marcel"	1,250 (FRG)
1250	Dr. George Chase Chemical Engineering	"A Study of Wall Effects on Deformation-Relaxation of Packed Beds"	2,950 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1251	Dr. Thomas Dukes English	"After Eden: The Novels of Rumer Godden"	1,300 (FRG)
1252	Dr. Antonia Forster English	"Index to Book Reviews 1775-1800"	3,000 (FRG)
1253	Dr. Vassilios Galiatsatos Polymer Science	"Determination of the Structure of Trimethyl Terminated Poly(dimethyl- siloxane) in the Melt"	2,993 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1254	Dr. Kristine Gill Nursing	"Parent Participation in Hospitalized Children's Care: Nurses' Attitude- Practice Connection"	1,593 (FRG)
1255	Dr. William Guegold School of Music	"Music and Composers of the Modern Olympiad"	2,719 (FRG)
1256	Dr. Chang Dae Han Polymer Engineering	"Phase Equilibria in Ternary Mixtures of a Block Copolymer and Two Immiscible Homopolymers"	3,000 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1257	Dr. Frank Harris Polymer Science	"Controlled-Release Anticoagulants For Vascular Grafts"	3,000 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1258	Dr. Philip Howard History	"Culture, Nationalism, and Liberation: The Afro-Cuban Mutual Aid Societies in the 19th Century"	3,220 (FRG)
1259	Dr. Joseph Kennedy Polymer Science	"Diffusion of Insulin and Glucose Through Amphiphilic Networks"	4,900 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1260	Drs. Il-woon Kim/ Jayprakash Patankar	"A Practical Approach to Estimating the Company's Warranty Cost"	2,190 (FRG)



Spring 1993 Faculty Research Grants  
 Awarded 3/15/93  
 Page 2

1261	Dr. Dorothy Moses Biology	"Radioimmunoassay of Urine Melatonin Levels in Alzheimer's Disease Patients"	2,500 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1262	Dr. Dale Mugler Mathematical Sciences	"A Neural Network Model for the Body's Accelerometer"	2,960 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1263	Dr. Judith Palagallo Mathematical Sciences	"An Analysis of Attitudes Contributing Toward the Continuance of Mathematics Study"	415 (OER) 500 (FRG)
1264	Dr. William Timmons Biomedical Engineering	"A Model of Gastric Acid Secretion for Design of an Automated Drug Infusion System"	2,660 (OER) 500 (FRG)
TOTAL		(8 FRG AWARDS) (9 QUALIFYING OER AWARDS)	\$ 21,153 (FRG) <u>25,378 (OER)</u>
		Total amount awarded for Spring 1993	\$ 46,531



**APPENDIX F**

**Amendment to Senate Bylaw V K**

Amendment to Senate Bylaw V K to read as follows:

1. Provides advice and recommendations to the Vice President of Student Affairs concerning operations of the Division of Student Affairs.
2. Reviews and recommends policy concerning student affairs to the Faculty Senate.
3. Reviews and recommends policy regarding the granting of scholarships, awards, grants, and loans to University students to appropriate bodies.
4. Recommends to the Senate the extensions of official registration of student organizations.



APPENDIX HNewly Elected Senators of Faculty Senate

<u>College</u>	<u>Senators</u>
ARTS & SCIENCES	3 yet to be elected by Buchtel College - At Large Natural Sciences Div.: <b>Timothy Norfolk</b> At Large : <b>David Buchthal</b> Social Sciences Div. : <b>John Green</b> Humanities Div. : <b>Gary Oller</b>
BUSINESS ADMIN.	Elected: <b>George Prough</b>
C & T	Elected: <b>Carol Gigliotti</b>
CONTRACT PROF.	2 to be elected by Contract Professionals
EDUCATION	Elected: <b>Carole Newman</b>
ENGINEERING	Elected: <b>Daniel B. Sheffer</b>
FINE & APPLIED ARTS	Elected: <b>Kathleen Davis</b> <b>Kenneth Siloac</b> <b>David Witt</b>
LAW	Elected: <b>William D. Rich</b>
PART-TIME FACULTY	Elected: <b>Paul Fowler</b>
STUDENTS	<b>Carmen Keener</b> and 1 to be named by Assoc. Student Govt. President 1 to be elected by Law & Graduate students
UNIV. LIBRARIES	Elected: <b>Ruth Clinefelter</b>



## CURRICULUM CHANGES

The following curriculum changes, in accordance with the Curricula process adopted by University Council on December 12, 1974, have had final approval by either the Senior Vice President and Provost or by Faculty Senate. All changes are effective Fall, 1994 (unless otherwise noted).

## COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

AS-94-47

Mathematical  
Sciences

(Summer, 1994)

**Course Addition:** 3490:808 Preliminary Research (1-15 credits), prerequisite: Permission for students seeking Ph.D in Engineering Applied Math.

**New Bulletin Description:** Prerequisite: permission. (May be repeated) Completion of qualifying examination and approval of Student Advisory Committee. Preliminary investigation of Ph.D dissertation topic.

**Additional Resources:** Current research articles on the techniques and applications of engineering applied mathematics appear in a variety of journals. The library has an adequate number of these holdings to initiate research.

## COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BA-94-10

Business  
Administration

**Admissions Standards Change:** (College of Business): from: 3.5 high school grade point average or upper 25% of high school graduating class; 25 ACT-1050 SAT; core curriculum to: 3.0 high school grade point average or upper 25% of high school graduating class; 23 ACT-960 SAT; core curriculum.

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

ED-94-07

Counseling &  
Special Education

**Program Change Summary:** (Master's Programs): 1) In all CACREP accredited master's programs in Counseling, delete the current requirements under the Behavioral Foundations and Humanistic Foundations areas and add the following two new courses: 5600:648 Individual and Family Development Across the Lifespan; 5600:646 Multicultural Counseling

2) Delete: 5600:671 Counseling Clinic in Testing (1 cr. hr.), and combine with 5600:645 Group Testing, and change to 4 cr. hr. with a new title, "Tests and Appraisal in Counseling."

3) Delete 5600:665 Seminar in Counseling Practice (3 cr. hr.), and 5600:663 Seminar in School Counseling (3 cr. hr.), and change the minimum hours required for 5600:685 Internship in Counseling to six credits.

(Doctoral Programs): 1) In the Collaborative Program in Counseling Psychology, add two semesters (8 credits) of Advanced Counseling Practicum 5600:702 and delete 5600:675 Counseling Practicum (5 cr. hr.).

2) In the Ph.D in Guidance and Counseling Program, add one semester (4 credits) required in Advanced Counseling Practicum, 5600:702, and delete four hours of elective credits in major.

ED-94-08

Physical Education

**New Program:** Athletic Training for Sports Medicine (NON-NATA)

**Course Additions:** Every course in this proposal currently exists within the University in various departments.

**Program Revision:** School Nurse Certification (See full proposal for further details)

**Program Revision:** Athletic Training for Sports Medicine (Master's Option) (See full proposal for further details)

**Program Revision:** Adapted Physical Education (Master's Option) (See full proposal for further details)

**Program Revision:** Adapted Physical Education (Master's Option) (See full proposal for further details)

**Program Revision:** Outdoor Education (Master's Option) (See full proposal for further details)

**Program Revision:** Exercise Physiology/Adult Fitness (Master's Option) (See full proposal for further details)

**Program Revision:** Physical Education Master's Option

**Course Addition Summary:** (Existing Courses): 5100:600 Philosophies of Education (3); 5100:604 Topical Seminar in the Cultural Foundations (3); 5100:620 Behavioral Bases of Education (3); 5100:624 Seminar in Human Development and Education (3); 5550:536 Foundations and Elements of Adapted Physical Education (3); 5550:555 Motor Development of Special Populations (3); 5550:603 Curriculum Planning in Health and Physical Education (2); 5550:609 Motivational Aspects of Physical Activity (3); 5550:695 Field Experience: Master's (2-4); 5550:698 Master's Problem (2-4); 5550:699 Master's Thesis (4-6)

(New Courses): 5550:606 Statistics: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods (3)

**Course Deletion Summary:** (From Program): 5550:606 Measurement and Evaluation in Physical Education (3)

**Course Changes:** (See Full Proposal For Details): 5550:601 Administration of Physical Education, Athletics, and Intramurals (3); 5550:605 Physiology of Muscular Activity and Exercise (3)



ED-94-10

Educ. Foundations  
and Leadership

**Changes In Masters Admissions Testing:** We propose dropping the use of the Watson-Glaser, The Guilford-Zimmerman, and the Bernreuter, and implementing the use of the Millers Analogy Test beginning Fall semester, 1994. All students will be required to achieve a raw score of 35. Experience indicates this cut score has been effective.

ED-94-11

Educ. Foundations  
And Leadership

**Changes In ED.D. Admissions Testing:** We propose dropping the use of the Watson-Glaser, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and the Bernreuter Personality Inventory and implementing the use of the Graduate Record Examination beginning Fall semester, 1994. We would require that the test be taken within the last 5 years. It has been the experience of comparable colleges that the range of scores has been Verbal: 400-614, Quantitative: 400-695, and Analytical: 400-640.

ED-94-12

Secondary Ed.

**Program Revision:** Certification Option in Master's Degree in Secondary Education

(Contingent upon change of course number from: 5300:633 Instructional and Management Practices to: 5300:530)

### COLLEGE OF FINE AND APPLIED ARTS

FAA-94-14

Home Economics &  
Family Ecology

**Course Change:** 7400:602 Family in Lifespan Perspective from 2 to 3 credit hours.

**Bulletin Description Change:** Study of individual and family development across life span. Emphasis on adjustment patterns and interpersonal competence.

**Course Change:** (title)

**Course Number:** 7400:496/596 from: Parenting Skills to: Parent Education, prerequisite change: from: 7400:265 or permission of instructor to: 7400:265, comparable course, or permission

**New Bulletin Description:** Prerequisite: 265 or permission. Practical application that reviews and analyzes various parenting techniques with major emphasis on the evaluation of parent education programs.

**Course Addition Summary:** (Existing Courses):

7400:601 (3) Families in Transition

7400:602 (3) Family in Life-Span Perspective

7400:610 (3) Child Development Theories

FAA-94-35

Music

**Course Addition Summary:** (New Courses): Senior Recital 7500:457 sections 001 (percussion), 002 (guitar), 003 (voice), 004 (keyboard), 005 (strings), 006 (brass), 007 (woodwinds), 008 (composition), 009 (jazz studies)

### WAYNE COLLEGE

WC-94-13

Wayne College

**Course Change:** from: 3100:101 Nature Study Animals (3) to: 3100:101 Introduction to Zoology (4)

**New Bulletin Description:** An evolutionary survey of the animals. Investigation of local fauna is stressed. Laboratory. Not available for credit toward a degree in biology.

WC-94-14

Wayne College

**Course Change:** from: 3100:100 Nature Study Plants (3) to: 3100:100 Introduction to Botany (4)

**New Bulletin Description:** An introductory survey to the Plant Kingdom. Investigation of local flora and landscape species is stressed. Laboratory. Not available for credit towards a degree in biology.