

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

10-7-1993

Faculty Senate Chronicle October 7, 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, uapress@uakron.edu.



1993-94, No. 2

October 7, 1993

26 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7, 1993	1
Appendix to the Minutes of the Meeting of Faculty Senate of October 7, 1993	10
A. Remarks of the President	10
B. Report of the Representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents	13
C. Committee Membership Lists	17
D. Reports of Committees	20
E. Academic Calendar	24
Curriculum Changes	25

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

ITEM NUMBER 4 - SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - Chairman Gerlach said that he had an announcement that was too late to be effective but that Senators might want to keep it in mind for another year. The American Association of University Professors sponsors conferences such as one being held October 15-17 in Washington called "Faculty Senates and the Fiscal Crisis." It might have been nice if some representative of our Faculty Senate had gone to that because the conference was to deal with the strategies of survival; workshops on financial exigency; senate influence; exploiting financial data, institutional, state and national levels; and so on.

He said that the College of Business Administration had asked the Senate to surrender this room next semester. They located one which he thought was suitable and if it met Senate's approval, the body could oblige their request. The other room was Buckingham Center 201. It had comfortable seating; straight tables, with non-attached chairs in the front and angled ones on the side. Hearing no objections to the movement from this room, he would indicate agreement to let the College return this room next semester to classes.

ITEM NUMBER 5 - REPORTS

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

Chairman Gerlach referred Senate to the governance structure bylaws. He said that he had been informed by the Provost that the opening paragraph, the Preamble, was stricken, as was section I on page 6, that begins "Legislation sent to the Board . ." The following sections needed to be relettered. President Elliott commented that the Board understood Senate's point, that a timely response to things was desired. But anything that was to become official because the Board did not take action would not be official anyway.

Isadore Newman asked if it would be appropriate to put a motion on the floor about the colleges being assessed proportional to the number of representatives within that college. President Gerlach replied that any motion for the disposition of the President's budgetary statement would now be in order. Senate could accept it, or defer it to next month.

President Elliott said that the Provost used to have some discretionary funds that would have been distributed among colleges or used during the year. All that money was distributed back to the colleges so that the monies for sending out the Chronicle was no longer in the Provost's budget. All of the monies went to the colleges. How did Senate want it to be brought back?

Chairman Gerlach noted that the Executive Committee had met with the President, Dr. Helmick, and others, and submitted without figures the items of office equipment the Committee thought were needed. The Committee had been assured that the three rooms, which were formerly offices of the Dean of Buchtel College in Kolbe Hall, under the arch, room 52, had been set aside for the Senate, to be painted, the rugs cleaned and the furniture moved in and a secretary duly hired.

Barbara Clements stated that she thought it unnecessary to sink \$53,000 a year into an office of the Senate. It sent the wrong message in time of austerity. It did not seem necessary that the President of the Senate have a separate office of his or her own. She did not think a conference room was warranted; the Executive Committee could meet in an office or a conference room in a department. And the proposal seemed to be creating spaces which would then suck up resources that were not available. \$28,000 for a secretary seemed to be reasonable, but note that in addition to the projected budget of the secretary's salary, there was more than \$20,000 in annual operating expenses. She did not think that this was a reasonable expenditure for the University and she thought the Dean of Arts & Sciences, when he looked at the \$17,000 that he was supposed to cough up from this year's budget to support this, would have a conniption fit. She simply did not think that this was a reasonable expenditure of money.

Chairman Gerlach commented that President Elliott had referred to two figures. One was about \$10,000 for start-up costs and the other was the annual operating budget. He trusted that the annual operating budget was what Senator Clements was referring to, more than anything else. She replied that she was not sure the two could be separated. Once something gets started it takes on a life of its own. She thought that the Senate

could be run without all the bureaucratic infrastructure. So the \$10,000 to paint the room and come up with a credenza... and she did not even know what a credenza was. She had been here 24 years and had never seen a credenza. She did not know why the Chairman's office would need a credenza. The Chairman had a nice office in Olin Hall. A secretary: yes, this she could understand. But the conference room and a separate office for the chair she could not understand.

President Elliott offered that an office for the Chairman of the Senate became possible because there were office spaces available. Chairman Gerlach said those spaces were available so the Committee asked to have them. The three rooms allow Senate to have a separate area to work in. But it was clear from Roger Ryan's observations that after about a year when Kolbe Hall gets some major uplifting done that the Senate office would have to move. As to a credenza, he did not know whether that was an extension of the secretary's desk for typewriter and computer space, or what. President Elliott said it was a cabinet.

Chairman Gerlach stated that he had understood that for the conference room a table was available from the old offices of Dr. Helmick on Broadway and that would not involve any extra money at all. The chairs would be new, however. Dr. Helmick's secretary, who was doing the yeoman's work on this, thought that Senate ought to have some decent furniture and not some castoffs. But the Chair observed that much of what Senator Clements said had merit.

Virginia Gunn asked if the colleges had been putting out money of this sort for University Council. President Elliott said that the printing was done out of the Provost's discretionary funds. Senator Gunn said that she understood the need for it, but on the other hand it was a sizeable amount out of current budgets.

Frank Griffin defended this budget. A lot of the annual operating budget was going on presently. It was simply being spread among the colleges. For example, the \$12,000 for the Chronicle must be being spent already. He thought a telephone was absolutely necessary, and he certainly would want released time if he were the President of the Senate because this was going to take quite a lot of work. The only questionable item which was more than 50% of this \$53,000 was whether you have to pay \$28,000 a year including fringe benefits for a secretary. He did not know the cost currently of a secretary. So he thought these expenses were not out of line.

JoAnn Harris said that in regard to the start-up costs, what Senate had to consider was that if it was going to be creditable, it needed separate facilities. She thought that these figures could probably be altered or amended according to what was available. Senate should understand that it will not go any higher than \$10,-260. But there are a lot of things that will be taken care of even by the gracious donations of the departments, colleges, or divisions that are represented here; for example, paper or file folders, etc. In terms of the start-up costs, she thought Senate should go on if the space was available. Further, there was a comment made that Dr. Gerlach had a nice office. Dr. Gerlach was not going to be President forever. Therefore, if she were to be President next year, there was no way in this world that she would invite anybody from the public to her office, particularly representing a body that was supposed to have some credibility. In terms of the annual operating budget, she personally was hard pressed to cast any kind of vote before going back to her department and finding out how each of the proposed plans would affect her department's budget.

Jesse Marquette said that when the Senate proposal was designed, it was believed that there needed to be a facility of this nature so that the Senate could function independently of the administration; to establish a center to this organization that was ongoing rather than the monthly meetings. In the annual operating budget, one of the figures, \$11,520 is essentially "funny money." This covers released time and does not have to come out of anyone's budget for real. President Elliott commented that it did; one had to pay a part-time faculty member. Senator Marquette continued, stating that \$40,000 of the annual budget was for the secretary and for the cost of the Chronicle and supplies. He thought that this money had to be available in some form to have the Senate function. The fact that it came out of the Provost's office earlier means fundamentally, under the budget decentralization that Senate will just have to deal with these issues. He thought that Senate needed to support this budget in some form as an ongoing sentiment, to show that this Senate does, in fact, exist as an independent organization.

Jesse Marquette offered a friendly amendment to this that any committee of the Senate to which non-senators were appointed always contain a majority of senators on the committee. Seconded. Chairman Gerlach clarified that these were voting members on standing committees of the Senate. Amendment passed. Amended motion passed.

B. Elections - Given the lateness of the hour, Chairman Gerlach asked Senate what it wanted to do about elections; to continue, to call a special meeting, or to lay it over until the next regular meeting.

Jesse Marquette moved that the elections be laid over to the next meeting. Seconded.

Deborah Weber stated Senate needed to move ahead. Senate would look like buffoons if this important business was delayed month after month. Senator Marquette agreed that important business should not be delayed. But, he said, both IBAC and the 21st Century Task Force were effectively functioning now as these committees. These committees would simply segue into IBAC and the Task Force of the 21st Century during the course of the year. He did not think Senate would hurt itself by laying this over until the next meeting. John Green added that there was not a full complement of senators. There were two more Senators to be elected from one college. It seemed appropriate to wait until there is a full complement. Motion passed.

Chairman Gerlach said he had to ask one more thing. In one place the bylaws suggested that the committees "shall choose their own chairmen." In another place they seemed to indicate that they should be choosing a senator. There was consensus that committee chairs should be senate members.

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 at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
David R. Brink, Secretary

Transcript prepared by Dana Zaratsian

APPENDIX A**REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

It has been just a few weeks since our last meeting and these have been very busy for the campus. Since almost all of us have been involved in or informed of the variety of events, I need not catalogue all of them today. I will observe, however, that the quality of our efforts and the stimulation they provide are bringing more people to our campus and a heightened awareness of our university.

Academic programs garnering support

It is gratifying that alumni and friends are recognizing the quality of our academic and research programs through their donations. More than \$5.6 Million of the total \$9.9 million in private fund-raising last year went directly to the colleges for academic and scholarship support. We also have begun this new academic year with significant gifts. In September, the Trustees approved new academic institutes in law and in business administration, each of which was created through a \$500,000 endowed gift. At the same board meeting, a \$1-million in donated services to our master's program in nursing anesthesia was reported. And we have just learned that the Bliss Institute is receiving a \$500,000 gift from the estate of the late Ellen Bliss. These generous gifts illustrate the promise that an academically centered capital campaign offers for our community of learners.

Effects of Polsky move

In the next few months, the campus will have its largest moving days ever with relocation of people and programs to the renovated Polsky building. This massive movement of campus activity will have wide-ranging effects. I am told that if one were to make a grid of the population of the campus, the center now is at Auburn Science Center. With the moves to Polsky's, it will shift to the Law School. As funds are available, units will be moving or growing into the vacated spaces in Schrank North and South, the Buckingham Center, and Gallucci Hall. These moves also should free up some parking spaces on this end of the campus. A student concern that now is being explored is the amount of time that may be needed between some classes. With the expansion of the campus, 10 minutes may not always be enough to get from one class to another. Registrar Gerri Chitty is working with the Council of Deans to identify a number of options which might be implemented where necessary.

Scheduling issues

As we strive to become an even more adaptable, viable institution, we must be willing to engage in such self examination and we must be committed to doing our very best to prepare ourselves and our students for a new tomorrow. I believe these words of Marcel Proust are particularly meaningful to us as we face the challenges of these new times. Proust said that, "the real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new landscapes but in having new eyes." In the past year we have made crucial changes and begun to solve tough problems — more than many campuses would have the courage to tackle in one year. I thank all of you for that.

In my visits to the colleges, in faculty receptions at my home and indeed everywhere I go, colleagues are most concerned whether our campus will have enough funds to support their work and to provide them with fair and equitable compensation. My response continues to be that if we are to have additional income for salaries, positions, research, and other campus priorities, we must do those things that will strengthen the enrollment and progress of good students. Some of you may have heard me say this before, but I find it so important that I cannot help but repeat it: 95 percent of our operating revenues are directly generated by enrollment. Increasing credit production (by recruiting better students and by keeping the ones we have) is the only real way we have to substantially increase our operating income stream.

It is encouraging that the number of new freshmen this fall was more than we expected, and we are getting good publicity for the new conditional/unconditional admissions policy that will go into effect next fall. But at the same time, we are losing continuing students who were in good academic standing. This tells me that we are not providing what our students need when they want it.

One of the reasons for this may be a compression in class scheduling. A reliable litmus test of this compression is the usage of parking lots. On Monday and Wednesday mornings, all of our parking lots are absolutely filled, even though we have sold fewer parking permits this semester than usual. The rest of the week, there are plenty of spaces open all day. We need to be concerned about course scheduling for much more than the turnover of parking spaces. Nationally, there is growing concern that it is taking students longer to graduate because they cannot get the courses they need in timely offerings. Most students today are working and must fit classes around the source of income which enables them to attend school. If we cannot or will not give our students the courses they need, when they can attend them, they will go somewhere else. Classic examples of this have been the last two semesters when a great many classes were canceled for low enrollment, with the assumption that those students would just sign up for other sections. They did not and our data suggest that it was because most of them could not.

As we prepare for the 21st century, we need to move in new directions that are not always bound by traditional definitions of semesters, curricula, and class schedules. We must rethink how we conduct our activities in light of the needs, life experiences, and schedules of our students now and tomorrow. As a university, we need to work harder to achieve a better balance of times in class schedules so we are not so gridlocked on some days and under utilized on others. And we need to accept the fact that weekend, evening, and off-campus classes are not "additional" scheduling. They are in reality a necessary way to attract the good students we need and want.

Though they may not be fully understood, a number of changes have been made this past year to empower the colleges to be more flexible and more entrepreneurial in the development and delivery of courses and programs in response to student needs. Recognizing that the best decisions often come from the front lines, we are moving control out of Buchtel Hall into the colleges under the mantra of decentralization. While we do not have more dollars to give through decentralization, we are giving units more control over their budgets, their decision making, and the opportunities to chart their own destiny. However, with these new powers come accountability. I will be meeting with IBAC in a couple of weeks to discuss how adjustments should be made in resources so that income follows enrollment. We must ensure that those who are creative and motivated do not have to subsidize the failures of those who are not willing to be so.

I believe with some effort and experimentation we will find ways to better serve the needs of our students. I welcome your ideas and advice how we can make progress in these areas. Time really is of the essence; we must act soon in order to affect scheduling for the spring semester and for the 1994-95 year.

One interesting note about our student population that I would like to share with you is that they are now the "typical" student in higher education across the country. Over half of our undergraduates are new majority students in that they are 25 or over, or younger than 25 but attending part time or not entering directly from high school. This is true statewide as well.

National issues for higher education

In recent weeks, much of the nation's agenda has focused on issues which could have far-reaching impact on our campus. Among the issues being debated in congress are student financial aid and President Clinton's health care reform proposals.

Last week, ten of the Ohio University presidents met in Washington with Ohio's congressional delegation. Despite all of the activity on capital hill with health care reform, nearly all of the state's representatives and senators attended. It was a good opportunity to talk about the importance of financial aid to our students and other issues.

Health care reform is far too uncertain at this point to speculate in dollars and cents how President Clinton's proposals would impact our university. However, there are many consistencies in concept between our plan and the Clinton proposals. We already offer three options (indemnity, PPO and HMO) for our faculty and staff to choose from, and we offer all of the preventives President Clinton has proposed and more.

FACULTY SENATE MATTERS

Elections: Under new business, you will be electing Senators to serve on the Shared Governance Council, Long-Range Planning Committee, and the Budget and Planning Coordination Committee. These important assignments will involve colleagues in key issues for the campus: consultation, planning, and resource allocation. I look forward to working with these groups.

Senate Office: I also would like to give you a progress report on the work to identify the Senate's needs for space, staff, and operating support. I have a handout, which lists the projected startup costs as well as continuing operating expenses for the Senate. This list was developed in consultation with Chairman Gerlach and the Executive Committee.

As you will see, they project about \$10,000 in startup costs and \$43,000 in annual operating expenses. The \$10,000 can come from the campus facilities balance. Since there is no longer a central "pot" controlled by the President or the Provost, the Senate's continuing expenses must be assessed to the colleges. My handout shows two options for this assessment: either assessing all colleges a flat fee of \$5,000, or setting differential rates based on the number of senators per college. I welcome your ideas or advice how to proceed on this matter. If it is agreed that this budget is reasonable, the University will loan the Senate enough funds to hire a secretary and set up the office until the college assessments are determined and collected.

Since the full dollar amount would certainly support at least one more faculty member, I think we need to be certain that we believe the tradeoff of teaching for this level of administration is appropriate. You may then wish to delay the decision today to consult with your colleagues.

Governance document: as I reported to you in my September letter, the Trustees made two revisions which they felt were necessary to ensure the faculty governance document is completely legal.

Let me explain why the Trustees felt these changes were necessary. Ohio law is very clear that the Board of Trustees is the governance body for the institution, and their statutory responsibilities cannot be delegated to the President or any other body. Our Trustees were concerned that the preamble language as originally proposed did not recognize their mandated responsibilities.

In addition, Ohio law also requires that public business must be conducted in public meetings; hence, matters requiring the Board's approval must be acted upon in public by the Board. These matters cannot become official simply by the passage of a specified number of days.

However, the trustees asked me to make it clear to you – that while they felt these points had to be addressed – they support the intent behind each of these provisions: 1) that faculty must play a central role in the life and direction of our university; and 2) that there should be timely response by the administration and the board to your recommendations.

What I, at least, was told we could not accomplish, we have accomplished and I do thank you for it. Now I and our colleagues look toward to our discussion of senate funding. I have a handout to distribute.

Akron Representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee
to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents

Report to the Faculty Senate
October 7, 1993

The FAC Committee met on Tuesday, October 5th in Columbus, on the 36th Floor of the State Office Tower on Broad Street. The two speakers for the day were Matt Phillipic and Chancellor Elaine Hairston.

Dates of scheduled FAC meeting for the rest of this school-year were announced: December 7th, January 19th, March 2nd and May 18th. That this is fewer than previous years was noted.

Approval of the minutes of the June 30th meeting was amazingly exciting! People who asked not to be identified expressed irate feelings over the fact that both the Chancellor and Howard Gauthier had both misled the committee when they had stated what the minutes accurately reported on page 2—that the 10% increase in faculty undergraduate teaching workload figure had been deleted from the permanent legislation. What actually happened and has caused confusion all over the state is that while the 10% figure was deleted from the draft language of the permanent legislation, it was added to a temporary (2 year) bill that was passed. So by means of this latter bill, the 10% figure was mandated. But the minutes were correct as circulated in that they were accurate about what these public servants had told us even though it was false information.

Matt Phillipic handed out a chart of Appropriated Levels of State Support for Higher Education for the fiscal years 1988 to '95, which he explained at length. The chart shows annual appropriations before and after cuts, inflation, FTEs, and unadjusted as well as adjusted data. If you consider inflation, in 1993 we are receiving about 22.36 % fewer dollars per FTE than in 1988. If you forget inflation, we are only receiving 3.68% less. He noted that now 1 1/2 % has to be cut from this in the aggregate. Enrollment growth seems to have ended so estimates for growth in 1994 and 1995, which had been deliberately inflated to encourage the growth of 2-year technical colleges, are apt to be more incorrect than intended. Growth seems to have ended on both 2 and 4-year campuses. Increases in appropriations of 6% are projected for the next two years. He said that if growth doesn't occur, the amount per FTE could improve, however, with our enrollment-driven formula, money could just lapse! Tax collection has been good so far this year, but some of this money is a one-time gain, so don't get overjoyed. The State and National economies don't seem any stronger.

When asked about the conversion of technical colleges to community colleges, Phillipic said that institutions in North west and Northwest Central will convert, as well as Jefferson Tech in Eastern Ohio and Cincinnati Tech. These conversions presumably will increase enrollment since Washington State and Columbus State doubled in size. They thus gained students who went on in their junior and senior years to attend private colleges. [Later on, he said that OBR will not help any institution that loses students because of these conversions.] He also expressed OBR's philosophy that State institutions ought to compete with private institutions if they see a need to serve more people.

He said that the tracking system for transfer students, is probably 2 years away. Fiscal '96 is the target for the student tracking system to be in place. The new OBR system for fiscal information should be operating in fiscal '97 or '98.

Regarding legislation on shifting debt service on bonds to the benefitting institutions, Phillipic clarified that no language was passed; instead, they mandated a study commissios be

created by July 1, 1994, but nobody has been appointed yet.

Phillipic also commented about the relationship between skepticism about the value of research and emphasis on funding and expanding 2-year colleges. OBR still is interested in both because of the importance of research, because it brings in money to the system and creates jobs for Ohio. However, within the OBR, he said, there's concern that graduate schools neglect undergraduate education. A "Cultural War" is on, he said, *Profscam* has a definite political/ideological bent to it.

Latter someone asked a physical plant question about State \$\$\$ for solving the "Freon Problem" in air conditioning systems. He said multiple avenues to correcting this problem are already available, and he expected no special appropriations for this, which he thought the best way to do it--to keep legislators in the dark about where money is going!

Phillipic described how we now calculate formula 3 ways to provide buffers for dropping enrollment:

- 1) current enrollment multiplied by applicable rates
- 2) average enrollment for the 3 previous years
- 3) average enrollment for the 5 previous years

Then the campus gets the highest of the 3 amounts. If your enrollment plummets in 1994, you won't feel it for 5 years. This allows a campus to scale back or correct its recruitment process. No longer is 1980 used as a base model.

Phillipic responded negatively to a query about whether OBR has any interest in creating a single health plan for higher education.

Then we asked him for his story on the 10% workload increase. He said it applies only to 4-year institutions and it calls for a statewide average only, not individual campuses. The Workload Committee will revisit Management for the Future language stating that "instructional function ought to be a function of the degree program." Therefore, undergraduate programs should have heavier teaching loads than M.A. programs than Ph.D. departments. He said OBR liked that concept, it just needs to be flushed out. If 2-year colleges had to do this, their loads would be too high--they could only give objective tests. In the university setting, few faculty already teach a high enough load. Some campuses as a whole do not differentiate between non-doctoral programs and doctoral ones in assigning workload. Two things need to be done: 1) articulate more clearly Management for the Future Taskforce policy connecting load to program level and 2) reviewing doctoral programs, lowering them to M.A. or B.A. level and increasing faculty workload. Again, *Profscam* assumes it's doctoral faculty who are neglecting undergraduates, not undergraduate teachers.

After lunch, Chancellor Elaine Hairston came in for 40 minutes instead of her usual hour and a half. She said that no roller coasters are in fiscal sight. OBR is in a time of transition, with vacant slots open for the appointment of new Regents. Normally, they get 3 new ones annually.

The Two-Year College Performance Standards Committee has reported. Now OBR will call for more specific links to performance in the subsidy--something nobody else in the US has been able to achieve. They created a list of 9 standards of performance as a substitute for the creation of a single community college system recommended by the MFTFTF but rejected by the legislature last year.

Hairston told us that the first meeting of the Advisory Committee on Workload would meet [today]. She distributed a partial list of its membership as she assured us that it is full of faculty

representation. [I immediately saw that the Provost is our faculty representation and rumbles went across the room as people realised that their so-called faculty representation was administrators!] Members of the Ohio General Assembly will be added to it; also, private individuals and an assistant to the Governor. It is chaired by Dr. Jim Bruning, a retiring faculty member at Ohio U. who is teaching 3 classes this term. When asked, she said that he had been the Provost there for many years along with their great president of 18 years. Besides recommending workload policy (due January 1st), this committee is charged with telling her (in the spring) what incentives we need to offer to encourage a better balance of teaching and research. Do we need to change "Faculty Culture" or what? What role might OBR play in changing this balance? After enumerating all the pressures for research, she went on to say: "The 'toughest nut' in higher education today is thinking out a better transition for freshman, or we are going to get killed."

A member asked her, why not hire people to teach and people to do research? Hairston said she agrees that universities should. I added: "But we do that already--we call them 'Part Time Faculty.'" [There was a big pause with the silence interrupted by the slow grinding of brains.]

Then Hairston said that parents are unhappy with the growing use of T.A.s. That as a T.A. she had a wonderful course to teach her how to teach but she thinks today few institutions do this. The bashing the T.A.s discussion continued, and as I was ready to burst, I got a word in that I know what she thinks about neglect of T.A. is unusual, but that I personally fail to understand why she has been unwilling to discuss a subject on our minds now for several years--namely how OBR can facilitate plugging part-timers into the academic culture much better than they are in many departments at some campuses, that much could be done to integrate them more fully into the system, fulltime faculty might likewise benefit from an exchange of wisdom, thereby improving the overall quality of everybody's undergraduate offerings. I asked her point blank if she would discuss part time issues with the FAC Committee. She responded: "Yes. Nobody ever presented the need with such clarity before. Why not? But present this as a subset of everything we need to do to improve undergraduate education. That's the best way to do it."

A few people chimed in about special programs they've tried-- to improve undergraduate education. Toledo has FIGS--Freshman Interest Groups--the best professors get \$1,000 from the Dean to meet with interested students for stimulation. KSU has a book freshman are supposed to read before arriving for orientation so they can discuss it with professors, but participation has been "spotty." A technical college Rep said that psychologically, freshman have greater needs than the professors who teach class, that advisers need to be around and available, then she praised their "Skills for Success" course. Simply mandating a 10% increase in workload will not solve the problem. The Chancellor agreed to this, and said that's why she's giving the Workload Committee a second charge--by spring they will realize this too and develop an agenda for achieving the needed change. After writing their Functional Mission Statements, institutions will then be able to see what programs are duplicated and need to be cut to improve overall quality. "Duplication and Functional Missions blend." There's a blueprint in the MFTFTF document for enhancing quality. She suggested that Randy Smith talk to the group about what the Workload Committee is doing as it progresses.

After the Chancellor left for another meeting, we discussed what we need to do for next time. After long debate, we decided that each of us should obtain the answers to 4 questions from our faculties:

- 1) How is good teaching measured at our institution? i.e. How is quality of teaching measured?
- 2) What incentives are already in place to encourage good teaching? [Do we 40/40/20 merit salary splits or what?]

- 3) What additional incentives could be instituted? What creative ideas do we have?
- 4) What is the correct balance of teaching and research?

We will exchange these ideas at the beginning of the December 7th meeting before we pass them on to the chancellor. That was the plan as the meeting ended around 3 o'clock.

June K. Burton.

APPENDIX C**ACADEMIC POLICIES, CURRICULUM, AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE**

Mr. Dan Buie *
 Dr. Barbara Clements *
 Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter *
 Dr. Patricia Edwards *
 Dr. Kathleen Endres *
 Dr. Lawrence Focht *
 Dr. Elton Glaser *
 Mr. Michael Jalbert *
 Dr. Marlene Huff *
 Dr. Dennis Kimmell *
 Mr. William Lewis
 Dr. Robert McElwee *
 Dr. Chand Midha *

Mrs. Joyce Mirman
 Dr. Gary Oller *
 Mrs. Peggy Richards *
 Dr. John Serafini
 Ms. Amy Spooner, (Student Rep) *
 Dr. Phillip Stuyvesant *

Dr. Joseph Walton, Ex officio,
 designee of the Senior Vice President
 and Provost

ATHLETICS

Mr. David Brink *
 Dr. George DiSabato
 Dr. Paul John *
 Dr. Donald Stull *
 Mr. Richard Cohen *
 Dr. Thomas Baker

Dr. Isabelle Stombaugh
 Dr. Adele Webb *
 Dr. Steven Chuang

Mr. David Jamison, Ex Officio member,
 NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative

Mr. Richard Aynes, Ex Officio member,
 Athletic Director, or designee

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE

Dr. Wallace Sterling *
 Dr. Michael Cheung *
 Dr. Virginia Fleming *
 Dr. Elizabeth Erickson
 Dr. Frank Canda
 Mrs. June Patton *

Dr. Rachel Schneider
 Dr. Don Gerlach *
 Mrs. Phyllis O'Connor

Ex officio member, Dean of University
 Libraries, Delmus Williams, or designee

APPENDIX C (cont.)

REFERENCE COMMITTEE	
Dr. Dianne Wright * Mrs. Jean Galan Ms. Jo Ann Harris * Dr. John Green *	Dr. Barbara Moss * Mr. LaVerne Yousey Mr. Daniel Mack

CAMPUS FACILITIES COMMITTEE	
Dr. Harvey Sterns Dr. Jerry Drummond * Dr. Kenneth Dunning Mr. Lyle Dye * Mr. Paul Fowler * Dr. David Buchthal Dr. Virginia Gunn * Dr. Georgia Peeples * Mr. Derek Clay *	Mrs. Debra Keller Dr. Dale Coons Mr. John Kline Dr. William Guegold * <i>Ex officio member, Roger Ryan, designee of the Vice President for Administrative Support Services</i>

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE	
TBA (Grad/Law Student rep) * Dr. Ralph Alexander * Dr. Ken Aupperle * Mrs. Deborah Weber * Dr. Diane Vukovich Ms. Marcia Weidnecht Ms. Lynne Pachnowski	Dr. Curtis Clemons Mr. Don Laconi * <i>Ex officio member, Dr. Marion Ruebel, Vice President for Student Support Services, or designee</i>

APPENDIX C (cont.)**COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE**

Ms. Onadell Bly
 Dr. John Frederick *
 Dr. Frank Griffin *
 Dr. S. Hariharan *
 Dr. Jesse Marquette *
 Dr. David Perry *
 Mr. Ray Sibberson *
 Mrs. Rebecca McCollum

Mr. Richard Wiggins
 Dr. Robert Dial
 Dr. Scott Forbes
 Mr. William Rich
 Dr. Kathy Stafford *

Dr. Frank Thomas, ex officio
 member, Associate Vice President
 of Information Services, or designee

RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE

Dr. Jeffrey Dilts *
 Dr. Gary Frank *
 Dr. Robert Liang *
 Dr. Nick Ranson *
 Dr. Isadore Newman *
 Dr. William McGucken *
 Ms. Christina DePaul
 Mrs. Eleanor Klosterman
 Dr. Dale Borowiak
 Dr. Thein Kyu
 Dr. Claire Tessier
 Dr. Brian Leonard
 Dr. Dan Sheffer
 Miss Virginia Berringer

Dr. Dolores Bower
 Dr. Peter Henriksen
 Dr. Jerry Young
 Dr. Alan Gent
 Dr. Nancy Somerick
 Dr. Lazarus Macior

Dr. Charmaine Streharsky, Ex officio,
 non-voting member

Ex officio member, Associate Vice
 President of Research & Graduate Studies,
 Dr. G. Edwin Wilson, or designee

APPENDIX D**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**Executive Committee

The Committee met with President Elliott, Provost David Jamison, Dr. Faith Helmick, and Mr. Roger Ryan to discuss secretarial support for the Faculty Senate. The discussion covered the skills needed by such a person, whether the position be full or part time, and the equipment required. Further, office space for a Secretary to the Faculty Senate and for the Chair of the Faculty Senate were considered. The Committee also made preliminary committee appointments and set the agenda for the October 7 meeting.

Respectfully submitted by David Brink, Secretary

University Well-Being Committee *Chair*

At the first meeting held on Friday, September 24, Barb Bucey was elected Chair for the 1993-94 year. A discussion of the Sexual Harassment Policy took place. It was decided that the committee would deal with issues as deemed necessary by the Faculty Senate. The committee also discussed the results of the Task Force on Part-Time Faculty and decided to invite members from the Task Force to the next meeting for clarification purposes. There was concern regarding benefits and the resumption of the Benefits Committee. The Chair was given the task of contacting Faith Helmick to find out time frame, etc. The last topic looked at was the smoking policy and the possibility of this becoming a major issue for the committee to work on in the next year.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Bucey.

Athletics Committee

The Athletics Committee met with President Elliott in mid-September. She discussed with the committee the events of this past summer in the Athletic Department. President Elliott informed the committee that the report written by outside consultant, Ed Penson, which compares the budget of The University of Akron Athletic Department to departments at comparable universities is expected near the end of September. She has asked for input from the Athletics Committee on this report once it arrives.

Dean Frank Kelley reported on the search committee for the Athletic Director. Two other Athletics Committee members besides Dean Kelley are on the search committee for the new Athletic Director.

APPENDIX D (cont.)**Athletics Committee (cont.)**

Three reports developed by subcommittees of the Athletics Committee have been forwarded to both the acting Athletic Director and President Elliott. These reports are entitled "Gender Equity," "Graduate Rates and Academic Performance of Student Athletes," and "A Plan for Restructuring the Athletics Committee."

Committee members were informed that the Faculty Senate Athletics Committee is currently being created. Members of Faculty Senate will be given membership on the committee if they so desire. Any unfilled positions on the committee will be filled with individuals who are not members of the Faculty Senate.

Respectfully submitted by Isabelle Stombaugh, Chair

University Libraries Committee

The University Libraries Committee met on September 24, 1993 at noon in the Bierce Library conference room. The meeting was chaired by Professor Charles Monroe. The committee approved a motion recommending that the new University Libraries Committee, soon to be constituted by the Faculty Senate, review last spring's recommendations made to University Council

Dean Delmus Williams reported on recent developments at the Library including:

- Implementation of ZipLink and OhioLink
- Anticipated institution of a courier service for interlibrary loans (November 1, 1993)
- Training plans for ZipLink and OhioLink (October through December, 1993)
- Effects of ERIP on the Libraries (2 employees affected)
- Budget projection from last year seems to be okay making it unlikely that any further significant cuts will be needed in the acquisitions budget this year
- Polsky and Rootstown storage facilities due "online" soon for storage of low use materials

The committee wishes to acknowledge the time and leadership given by Dr. Charles Monroe as Chair of the University Libraries committee.

The committee adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Michael Cheung (on behalf of Professor Monroe)

Campus Facilities Planning Committee

Present: Janne Dunham-Taylor Michael Donnelly (for Debra Keller)
Ken Dunning Roger Ryan
Bob Holland Ellen Moore
Phil Bartlett Isaac Hunt
Nick Sylvester

The Committee met on September 27, 1993, at 1:00 p.m. The Committee had conducted business during the summer. In August, a mail ballot of the Committee was carried out. Eric Kreider, Head of University Media Productions, was funded for a project which required installation of a telephone bank. He requested the use of the Kolbe Hall #107 area for the next year—or whenever the rehabilitation of this area is to begin. The space was not occupied and was available for temporary use. The Committee voted to support the use of this space by University Media Productions on a temporary basis. The Committee reviewed the request for the transfer of Olson Room #110 from the Provost's Office to the Polymer Engineering Department. It was pointed out by Mr. Bartlett that this room can be used for storage only. According to the University Environmental and Occupational Safety and Health Office, occupancy is not permitted unless a ventilation system is provided.

The Committee received a request for Crouse Hall #214, a general purpose classroom at present, to be made into a lab for the Department of Geology. It was decided that the Committee needed to check with the Registrar's Office regarding the ramifications of removing this classroom from the schedule. The Committee will take this issue up at its next meeting. The Committee received a request for the use of Kolbe #52 for use by the Faculty Senate on a temporary basis. The Committee approved the request.

The Committee was alerted by Mr. Bartlett that it would be getting a request from Dr. Dye for space to be allocated for the Graduate Student Association Office.

The Committee then discussed a number of follow-up issues:

- The University Nursery School will not be able to move to the "Girl Scout" building until next February.
- Money has been allocated for departmental moves to the Polsky building, therefore, moves would not be charged to current departmental budgets.
- The Committee requested that we get information and rates for the use of the Convention Center and Inventors Hall of Fame.
- The Committee asked Mr. Ryan about the planning process and what President Elliott had decided regarding an outside planning consulting firm. It was suggested that the Committee ask for a briefing from President Elliott and/or Vice President Helmick.
- The Committee then turned to the issue of class scheduling and the issues of the time it will take for students to go from classes at one end of the campus to another. There was discussion regarding what had happened to the planned shuttle bus. This also raises issues about the shortage of parking at Polsky's and the need to further consider this issue. The Committee requested more information about the discussion with Metro regarding student bus pass and the shuttle bus. A question was raised about a UMPTA demonstration grant.
- The Committee, realizing that a change of membership and structure will take place, voted to affirm that Harvey Sterns continue as Chairperson. The Committee requested clarification regarding whether a non-senator could be a co-chair, if not a chair of a committee.

The Committee also reviewed the State Funded Capital Request Summary Priority List of Major Projects (attached).

Respectfully submitted by Harvey L. Sterns

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
STATE-FUNDED CAPITAL REQUEST SUMMARY
PRIORITY LIST OF MAJOR PROJECTS

1995/96 PRIORITY LIST

1.	Student Services Building	\$ 12,000,000
2.	Kolbe Hall, Phase II	3,500,000
3.	Leigh Hall Rehab.	5,100,000
4.	ASC Sci/Tech Library Addition	3,300,000
5.	Simmons Hall Rehab.	4,500,000
6.	Ballet Center Addition/Rehab	1,500,000

Subtotal 1st Biennium Request \$29,900,000

1997/98 PRIORITY LIST

1.	ASC, Phase III	\$ 9,700,000
2.	Schrank (N) Rehab	1,500,000
3.	Polsky Building, 3rd/5th Floors	3,000,000
4.	Admissions Building Rehab	500,000
5.	Ayer Hall Rehab	1,200,000
6.	H.T. Water Ball Joints	800,000
7.	Zook/Crouse Link & HVAC	4,500,000
8.	Goodwill Purchase/Rehab	3,000,000
9.	Carroll Rehab & HVAC	3,300,000
10.	Computer Center Addition	2,300,000

Subtotal 2nd Biennium Request \$29,800,000

1999/2000 PRIORITY LIST

1.	Parking Deck/C.R./Office Building	\$ 17,000,000
2.	Land Acquisition	3,000,000
3.	Converter Plant Reconfiguration	2,500,000
4.	Haz. Mat. Building	8,600,000
5.	Exchange St. Pedestrian Bridge	1,700,000
6.	Emergency Power Telephone Svc	600,000

Subtotal 3rd Biennium Request \$33,400,000

5/23/93

Revised 6/2/93; 6/10/93

APPENDIX E**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON****Academic Calendar****1993-94****FALL SEMESTER**

Day & Evening Classes Begin	Mon., August 30
* Labor Day (Day & Evening)	Mon., September 6
Veterans Day	Thurs., November 11
(Classes Held, Staff Holiday)	
** Thanksgiving Break	Thurs.-Sat., November 25-27
Classes Resume	Mon., November 29
Final Instructional Day	Sat., December 11
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., December 13-18
Commencement	Sat., December 18
Spring Intersession	Mon.-Fri., January 3-14

SPRING SEMESTER

* Martin Luther King Day	Mon., January 17
Day & Evening Classes Begin	Tues., January 18
* Presidents' Day	Tues., February 22
Spring Break	Mon.-Sat., March 21-26
*** May Day	Fri., May 6
Final Instructional Day	Sat., May 7
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., May 9-14
Commencement	Sat., May 14
Summer Intersession	Mon.-Fri., May 16-June 10
Commencement/Law School	Sat., May 21

SUMMER SESSION I

First 5 and 8 Week Sessions Begin	Mon., June 13
* Independence Day	Mon., July 4
First 5-Week Session Ends	Fri., July 15

SUMMER SESSION II

Second 5-Week Session Begins	Mon., July 18
8-Week Session Ends	Fri., August 5
Second 5-Week Session Ends	Fri., August 19

FALL SEMESTER

Day & Evening Classes Begin	Mon., August 29
-----------------------------	-----------------

** Classes canceled**** Classes canceled from Wednesday at 5 p.m. through Monday at 7 a.m.***** Classes canceled from noon to 5 p.m.*

1. COURSE NUMBER: 2920:142**Course Number:** N/A**Credit Hours** N / A**From:** _____ **To:** _____**From:** _____ **To:** _____**Course Title:****Prerequisite(s):****From:** Design Materials**From:** _____**To:** Introduction to Material Technology **To:** _____**2. New Bulletin Description (25 words or less):**

No Change.

3. Programs Impacted by this Change (Indicate current undergraduate/graduate General Bulletin page and title of program:

Associate of Applied Science in Mechanical Technology; page 58, 162 (92/93 Bulletin)

4. Effective Date: Fall Term 1994 Year**5. Rationale**

"Design Materials" does not properly reflect the nature of the course. It is felt that the proposed title better describes the course content and its sequential relationship to Production Machinery and Processes.

6. Statement of additional resources required.

None

kolton
CURRICULUM
rev11.1

1. Course Information:**Course Number:** 2880:151**Course Title:** Industrial Safety and Environmental Protection**Credit Hours:** 2.0**Prerequisite(s):** None.**2. Effective Date:** Fall Term 1994 Year**3. New Bulletin Description (25 words or less):**

A contemporary overview of the science and management of occupational health and safety programs, policies, and procedures in an industrial and business type environment.

4. Rationale:

In the highly technical work environment of research, product development, and manufacturing, the demands for productivity and quality levels which compete on global terms must prepare its workforce to accommodate these changes as well as understand the inherent hazards which may be a by-product of their evolution. The ecology of the workplace, the laws governing its conduct and the methods used to protect the human element are essential if management systems wish to participate.

5. Statement of additional resources. (If more space is needed, please attach separate sheet.)

None.

6. Programs Impacted by this Addition (Indicate current undergraduate/graduate General Bulletin page and title of program):

Associate of Applied Science in Polymer Technology (Proposed)

7. Radiation materials used in the course Yes X No.

Note: Attach Course Syllabus/Outline (which includes identification of required text and bibliography).

Kolton
CURRICULUM
rev11.1

