

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

2-1-2001

Faculty Senate Chronicle February 1, 2001

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.



2000-2001, No. 5

February 1, 2001

39 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 1, 2001	1
Appendices to Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting of February 1, 2001	
A. Report of <i>University Well-Being Committee</i>	19
B. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	30
C. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	39

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Dr. Elizabeth Kennedy (x6932)
facultysenate@uakron.edu

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 1, 2001

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, February 1, 2001, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Clark, Edgerton, Filer-Tubaugh, Hanlon, Kim, Lavelli, Lyons, Mothes, Saliga, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Binienda, Braun, Ebie, Fisher, Graham, Hebert, Kendra, Lee, Louscher, Pope, Purdy, Qammar, and Stinner were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTION

*** APPROVED COURSE AND PROGRAM PROPOSALS FROM CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chair called for a motion to amend the agenda, so that President Proenza's remarks became the second item of business. This was so moved by Senator Lillie and was seconded by Senator Sterns. The body voted its approval of the amended agenda. President Proenza began his remarks.

II. REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

"Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for indulging me, as I have to be at two places at once, and the only way I can do that is to be late for the second one. I want to take a few minutes - first, to welcome Vice President George Newkome, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate School. George, could you rise for a moment and be recognized... (applause) I also have the privilege of telling you that yesterday the Board of Trustees approved my recommendation to designate Dr. Newkome as the James and Vanita Oelschlager Professor of Science & Technology. In connection with Dr. Newkome hitting the ground running, because he's not only a distinguished scientist but has 14 years of experience as a vice president of research, he has begun to work on the issues, and as you know, we have a conflict of interest policy that is in an interim status and I've asked him to continue that process. So in the same spirit that we worked closely together last year to effect an interim policy, I would like to ask Senator Lillie and Senator Kennedy and two other individuals you might so designate to work with Dr. Newkome in affecting that in a collegial and shared leadership fashion.

Ladies and gentlemen, I wanted to just make a few comments with regard to the Governor's budget proposal to the legislature which was released just on Monday. That budget proposal and the state address that the Governor made a week ago Wednesday is a

significant positive statement for higher education. But as some of you may have heard me say today, it is simply not enough. Ohio is behind and has got to find a way to catch up, sooner rather than later. That said, you need to understand just a couple of things. First, K-12 education and higher education and medicaid, of course, are the only pieces of the state budget that are in the plus category. So we might have been in the cut category; we are not. The Governor is proposing a modest increase in the state share of instruction, some modest increases in the performance challenges, and he is putting some money toward creating a beginning step in the science and technology and for economic development initiatives such as the Ohio Plan.

Now where we are is that this budget is now being presented to the legislature. The legislature has to work through it, much as the federal Congress does when the President presents his budget to the Congress, and we will not know therefore for some time what the actual appropriation to higher education is. Technically, it is fairly close to the Governor's recommendations, so we don't expect any major departures. In the meantime, however, I have asked Vice President Nettling and Provost Hickey to work with the Planning and Budgeting Committee to effect the kind of budget scenarios that we will need to consider in order to do appropriate planning so that we are ready to propose an actual budget to our Trustees that can be approved and then implemented.

I have asked that we meet our continuing obligations, and as you know, some of those have increased in cost, such as energy costs. Gas has been an issue we've had to deal with. Equally, I have asked that we attend to those expenditures that we may need to effect to ensure that we continue to meet the needs of our students, and particularly that we can be more effective at recruiting new students.

Thirdly, but hardly last, it's very important for us to consider appropriate measures to ensure that we give our faculty and staff an appropriate salary pool to work with in allocating their base compensation increases. We will be developing those budget scenarios over the next few weeks. Clearly, the Governor has said that would be roughly a 2% increase in the base budget for this next fiscal year beginning in July, and I believe it's 3.7 for the following year."

Vice President Nettling pointed out that the increase was, in fact, still 2% for the following year. The President continued.

"So we have to develop scenarios; we have to work with the legislature, and hope that they will increase that number to 3, 4 or 5%. The university presidents are sending a very strong message to the legislature next week indicating that our first priority is indeed that instructional base on which our basic operations are needed. I have no further remarks today, but if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them."

No questions were forthcoming.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7 - Chair Sheffer then asked for consideration of the minutes of the meeting on December 7. No changes were put forth by any member of the body. The Secretary did have some corrections. Secretary Kennedy stated that on pg. 16 of the Chronicle, Dr. Prough was quoted as saying that he had spoken to Kathy Stafford. However, Kathy Stafford no longer worked for the University. The Secretary had received clarification from Dr. Prough that he should have said Kathy Watson, not Stafford. The second correction concerned Appendix D on pg. 23. The date on the minutes submitted by the Athletics Committee was incorrect - the date of the minutes on pg. 23 should have read November 16, 2000.

Without any other corrections, a motion was made by Senator Midha to approve the minutes. This was seconded by Senator McCollum. The Senate voted its approval of the minutes as amended.

IV. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS - The Chair welcomed all back to the semester and pointed out that Professor Mike Cheung was going to serve as the parliamentarian today.

V. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chair asked the Senate to remember Dr. Lung-ho Lin, Associate Professor Emeritus of Economics, who passed away on January 14 at University Hospitals after a long battle with cancer. Dr. Lin received his Bachelor's degree at the National Chenchei University in Taiwan, and his M.A. and Ph.D. at the University of Notre Dame. He taught at The University of Akron from 1978 until his retirement in December 1999. For many years he served as Graduate Advisor for the Department of Economics. Dr. Lin had great enthusiasm for his field of macroeconomics, which he passed on to his students. There were generations of alumni who remembered him with affection and respect. The department had set up a scholarship fund in his name. He was a friend and colleague to many Chinese faculty members on campus and a well-loved member of the local Chinese community.

Senators then stood for a moment of silence.

VI. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Senator Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met three times during the month of January, twice with only committee members present and once with President Proenza and his assistant, Becky Herrnstein. At the meetings, enrollment statistics were discussed. Executive Committee members were curious about the enrollment numbers but needed clarification. This led into a discussion about the Governor's budget which the President had just addressed in his remarks. A second item dealt with the parking survey. As all knew, a survey had been distributed

electronically via email and at the December Faculty Senate meeting. Senators had been asked to distribute this survey to their constituents. However, the Executive Committee was concerned about the limited response to the survey and discussed the need to repeat the survey. Senator Sterns would be reporting on this during his committee report.

The committee also talked about student-athlete graduation and retention numbers. In an earlier edition of the Chronicle of Higher Education, The University of Akron had not rated very highly in terms of athlete retention and graduation numbers. The Athletics Committee had since collected some of this data and reviewed this data, and had more favorable findings to report. Senator Baldwin (Chair of that committee) would report on that later.

Finally, the President had given the Committee a brief update on the status of the campus plan and the Landscape for Learning, as well as some news about the revitalization plan on campus. At this point everything was moving forward.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - The Chair then introduced Provost Hickey.

"Thank you. First, let me tell you that at the Board of Trustees meeting this week the new campus academic calendar was approved, which allows for three 15-week semesters. This would end the summer term and make the capability of dividing into three 5-week terms or a 10-week or 15-week or any other permutation that would make sense in terms of the students. Now this doesn't officially take effect until summer 2002. However, one of the advantages of this 15-term now is that faculty who support themselves off research grants in the summer can now request support for 15 weeks as opposed to 13 weeks. That capability is going to begin this summer, so faculty will be able to request support for a full 15 weeks starting this summer.

Those of you who read the newspaper this morning probably saw an article about the Medina Higher Education Center, and for many of you this is probably the first time you've heard about this. Let me tell you how this came about. I started meeting with officials in Medina back in the summer, and initial discussions were around our post-secondary programs delivered through distance education in the Medina high schools. Those programs aren't doing quite as well as we would hope; in fact, during the fall semester there were only 20 high school students enrolled in those programs. I made the point to the people in Medina that we had tremendous facilities in the distance education rooms and asked that they consider opening those rooms up to adult students during the evening hours and on weekends so that we could start offering distance education courses to individuals in Medina County. Those discussions not only were viewed positively, but they wanted to talk about other possibilities as well. So I started meeting with some of the economic development people in Medina County, and it became very clear that Medina is in search of a higher education presence in Medina County.

They also made it clear early on that they were going to obtain such a presence, and they would like very much for it to be The University of Akron that served them, but if it wasn't us, it would be somebody else. Those discussions prompted me to start thinking about ways in which we could better serve them. As a result, they put together a task force to look at the possibility of establishing a higher education center in Medina County located somewhere with easy access to expressways and in fairly close proximity to the city of Medina. As you may know, Medina County and the city of Medina are two of the fastest growing areas in the state of Ohio. Also, if you note the types of houses being built over there, there are obviously some individuals in Medina with considerable discretionary income, and I thought it might be very nice to be able to serve those populations. So this past Monday night I met with a Medina County Economic Development Task Force. At that meeting they voted unanimously and enthusiastically to join with The University of Akron in developing a higher education center in Medina.

The President and I then attended a dinner in the southern part of Medina County on Tuesday night, where this amounts to a group of individuals who will likely be strong supporters of this in terms of what they say and what they give, and that was received very warmly by that group as well. Then we announced it to our Board of Trustees yesterday, and it was picked up by the news media at that point in time. The center is still in the early stages of conceptualization, but the initial idea is a facility somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000 sq. ft. in the \$20 million range. Fund raising efforts have already begun in the Medina area. This would be a combination of public and private support that would go into this facility. No location has been selected, although they are narrowing the field, and I encouraged them to look for sites that would be easy access to expressways and easy access for many of our faculty who might be teaching there on site. We envision a combination of distance education classes being taught there as well as live instruction being provided by faculty from both the University, including the Community & Technical College and Wayne College. We don't envision any permanent faculty there at all; this would simply be a situation where we would try to define their education needs and then provide for them. I'll be happy to address any questions you might have, but it's still in the very early stages. The newspaper said break ground within a couple of years. I think that's most optimistic - it could even be three years from now before we break ground, because as you might guess, the first thing we have to find are the dollars necessary to do this. I'll be happy to come back to that if you have questions.

Summer instructional allocation I'm working through right now. I'm determined to incentivize this process, and I'm working with Vice President Nettling and his colleagues and am very optimistic that starting this summer we will actually be able to incentivize the summer instruction at the college level such that the colleges get to retain a portion of the tuition revenue that they bring in over and above a defined amount. I will be bringing this to the deans' attention next week.

One final comment - the President has asked me to begin the process of putting together a group of individuals to work on developing an academic strategic plan to fit with

the Landscape for Learning and the Charting the Course documents that have been put forth already. At this point I'm trying to figure out how to do this without requiring enormous amounts of effort on a lot of people's parts, and I hope to delve through some of these issues in the next few weeks. Having been through at least three academic strategic plans in my life, they're very important exercises, but if not planned and executed appropriately, it can end up requiring an enormous amount of time and ending up as documents that don't get referred to very often. I don't want to waste either your time or my time, so sometime this spring we'll be rolling out some ideas about how we might go about this as soon as I get those ideas. So I would encourage you to send me thoughts that you might have. If it sounds like I'm dragging my feet, I am, but the President has now asked me 27 times about this and I think he must be serious so we'll obviously have to move forward in that regard. I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have."

The Senate had no questions for the Provost.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - (Appendix A) Senator Erickson began her report by stating that the University Well-Being Committee had met twice since the last meeting of the Senate on Dec. 8 and January 26. At the December meeting, the committee reviewed issues relating to health insurance. On February 15, 2001, a subcommittee was going to meet with representatives of Medical Mutual about the problems that both Human Resources and many members of the University community had had regarding health service claim problems (e.g., time to process claims, and so forth) with Medical Mutual. The committee had to meet with them about that issue. The process of contracting for health insurance for the year January 2002 would begin this month. As in the past, representatives of the Well-Being Committee would be represented in the entire contract process. Senator Erickson stated that the committee also was in the process of looking at pregnancy/sick leave and child care issues. Both of those were in process as stated in the report.

At the January meeting the main issue discussed was the report of the subcommittee on domestic partner benefits. This issue had been referred to the committee last spring after the resolution that was passed by the Senate. Senators might have remembered that Senator Huff had brought the request from the Ohio Faculty Council, which, after some discussion, the Senate passed. The Well-Being Committee was directed as a University committee to look at that issue. In the spring a subcommittee was appointed to look at domestic partner issues. That committee was reconstituted with changing personnel in the fall. It had a report of which Senators had been given a copy. The report included sample policies and forms for other universities, the University of Alaska, University of Michigan, and Wayne State. There were 15 pages of material on those forms. Senators who were reading this material might want to examine those on the Faculty Senate web page. Senator Erickson asked that Senators review this report and the appendices and be prepared to discuss the committee's recommendations at the March Senate meeting. She wanted to make sure all had time to look at this material. The committee examined first what other universities were doing.

The committee also examined the benefits to the University and the cost to the University for domestic partners benefits. The committee also provided a distinct definition of what a domestic partner was. This was in part based on what other universities with such policies did. Senators were referred to Appendix B and again to the web page. Senator Erickson concluded by stating that the report had recommendations which would be brought to the Senate for passage at the next meeting. At this point, the committee wanted all to read and think about this issue.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Mrs. Nancy Stokes began her report by stating that the subcommittee of the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee, the RTP Task Force, had been visiting with the different colleges across campus. The RTP Task Force had visited Education, the Library, Fine & Applied Arts, chairs and directors of schools and colleges, and with the Council of Deans. They had yet to honor Arts & Sciences and Community & Technical College but had covered a large portion of the colleges across the campus.

One glaring question that had come out was the question of implementation, about which the Task Force had not thought. However, the Task Force had now thought about it and had been able to respond to some of the colleges concerning implementation of the new RTP draft. That was, if and when the Board approved the policy, that would be the official date the policy became official. However, because the policy would require the review and possible revision of individual academic unit guidelines, it could not be implemented until that review and/or revision was completed. Thus, the Task Force would be asking the colleges and academic units and departments to do that review and those revisions within the time the policy was approved by the Board of Trustees until Dec. 15 of this year. Further, that those revisions and reviews would be given to the Provost by Dec. 15 of 2001. All guidelines needed to be approved by the Provost; that was what had always been done. At that point the Provost would either approve the guidelines as submitted or return them to the departments with suggestions. It gave three months for those approvals to take place, so that by March 15 of 2002 the entire process could be in place. That was the implementation that had been devised.

There was one issue that dealt with criteria. That was the issue of tenure and promotion occurring at the same time. In addressing that issue, the Task Force realized that it could not change criteria for probationary faculty; that was not an option. So for probationary faculty in colleges that allowed for separate tenure and promotion and had substantially different criteria for tenure and promotion, those probationary faculty would be allowed to remain under the criteria under which they had been hired. Of course, probationary faculty could choose the new criteria if they wished, but they would not be required to stand for tenure and promotion at the same time. If a given college had tenure and promotion separated but the criteria for tenure and promotion were substantially the same, then probationary faculty would be required to stand for tenure and promotion at the same time. The Task Force had discovered in many of the colleges that the criteria for tenure and promotion as associate professor were exactly the same. So the argument became, how could

a faculty member be tenured and not promoted if the criteria was exactly the same? So that was why probationary faculty were required to stand for promotion at the same time as tenure.

That raised the question of what was substantially the same versus substantially different. The recommendation of the Task Force was that if there were any doubt within an academic unit about sameness or difference, the chairman of the tenure committee should address that issue to the Provost for a ruling. The Provost would decide whether it was substantially the same or substantially different.

Those were the implementation pieces that had not been available until now. Mrs. Stokes then asked for questions.

Senator Sterns had a question regarding the implementation of college-level committees. He stated that he thought that could certainly serve faculty well, and that this had come up in discussions as to what the nature of the coordinating role in those committees was. A strong model in many schools contained pre-tenure reviews; others operated as more of an appeals function. Senator Sterns said that nowhere did the RTP Task Force document really address this since there had been no precedent.

Mrs. Stokes replied that she thought the document said that the college review committee was a substitute review. It was a qualitative review. Senator Sterns then stated that that might be true, except that The University of Akron had no history of the function of those committees. So it was very difficult to interpret what was meant. One could only look at how college-level committees had functioned at other universities. He thought that needed to be clarified. For instance, in many models, in order for the coordinating college-level committee to be effective, there might have been a pre-review again in 2 years, 4 years - that was not clear. In other words, when it came to the college-level committee, it would not be the first time that the college had ever seen the faculty member. In other colleges and universities the model was to look at issues to ensure that there was even treatment across all departments. Senator Sterns interjected that he hoped it was not being construed that he did not support such a thing. He was just stating that he did not know what the coordinating college-level committee would look like and how it would be implemented at this University. He would like to know more about what was in mind.

Mrs. Stokes replied that the intent of the Task Force for the college-wide review committee was to be a second substantial and qualitative review of the candidate. The Task Force had discussed on several occasions whether there should be a preliminary review by a college-wide committee. They had gone back and forth about whether to include it or not. Finally, it was not included for the simple reason that the Task Force thought it put too much pressure on a faculty member to convene that committee and do the internal reviews, at the third year, for example. That was the Task Force's basic decision. It was made because it was too much to ask to do two reviews of the tenure-promotion people and of third year

people. It was discussed as something that could be added should there be a ground swell of support for that issue.

On the second point of how it was to be implemented, the college-wide review committee looked at criteria as they applied to the candidate, the criteria of the department from which the candidate came. If a faculty member was in the College of Arts & Sciences and was a candidate from Economics, then the people on the college-wide review committee would look at the criteria established by the department of Economics and judge the candidate substantially and qualitatively on those criteria.

Senator Erickson then wondered if that was how it was to be done, then college-wide review committees were essentially checking to see that departments did what they were supposed to do. College-wide review committees would not know how to judge criteria given them and would have to take whatever information departments provided regarding quality. The college-wide committee would not be able to make a judgment on the quality of the work. If guidelines were designed with that in mind, then the college-wide committee would be checking to see whether departments had met what each was supposed to do.

Mrs. Stokes replied that college-wide review committees were to be making separate recommendations on the candidate. Senator Erickson responded that the Task Force was saying that the college-wide review committees would be using the same criteria, in essence giving a second judgment on whether the Economics department did an adequate job. This, she thought, was what Senator Sterns had been asking about.

Mrs. Stokes replied that it was a separate issue. To which Senator Erickson replied that it would be doing one evaluation within department's guidelines.

Senator Midha then joined in by stating that part of what Senator Erickson was saying was correct. The college-wide review committee would in fact be looking at evaluations of the department, but they would also be asking for an external evaluation. Senator Erickson then asked whether there would be a second external evaluation. Senator Midha replied that the college-wide committee would be looking at internal and external evaluation.

Senator Erickson stated that this seemed to result in a lot of doubling up here. Senator Midha replied that he did not think there was doubling up. Senator Erickson stated that what was being said was that one group was not enough to make that judgment; that there had to be two or three. Everyone understood that the dean did this, but what was now being said was that in the college there needed to be two to check on what a department was doing.

Mrs. Stokes then stated that part of the purpose of the college-wide review committee was a leveling effort. There were colleges where some departments were less productive than others, and it would be nice if the whole college were more level.

Senator Erickson replied that that was why she was asking. If the one department's guidelines were to be used and then there were another department within the College of Arts & Sciences with different guidelines, then that might be another issue. But the college-wide review committee would be judging it by the department's guidelines. That was why she had some confusion here. If the Task Force's job was to try and change and level out the guidelines across the college, then that was a different matter.

Senator Lillie stated that there was one other thing he wanted to say about this particular topic. Sometimes personalities tended to become involved in these kinds of activities. Within small departments in particular there might be a situation in which there were some very serious personal problems. So part of the reason for the college-wide review committee was to basically hold accountable each department by saying each committee would look at each candidate's dossier and would use the department's criteria. Then if the college-wide review committee came to a different conclusion than did the department, maybe it was time all sat down and talked. So part of the reason was to make sure that if there was a problem, it didn't get out of the college.

Senator Erickson then stated that clearly, one of the problems was that the questions were probably being asked in Arts & Sciences. This was where college appeals committees existed.

Mrs. Stokes replied that the new college appeals committee would only deal with procedural error.

Provost Hickey then interjected by asking Senators to remember that the departmental criteria and procedures would undergo a rewriting process that would begin when the document had received all necessary approvals. Those criteria would come to the office of the Provost for approval. So there was an opportunity in the process in terms of looking at the various criteria forwarded by a unit. With regard to the third-year review, the Provost stated that he would welcome a third-year review if Senators wanted to put it back in. He thought it was a very good idea, particularly for the faculty member. He thought it gave the faculty member a very realistic assessment of how he/she was progressing. So he would welcome a third-year review. He hadn't fought for it at this point in time, but with a little encouragement he would.

Senator Sterns then stated that he thought it was this kind of clarification that was very worthy of discussion. He said that he thought it was very important if the University was going to institute this new approach, that it be done in a way that was facilitative and useful. Senator Sterns thought that the departments had always had a great deal of input here, and so the question was, what would be the balance under this new approach? He thought that this was a good discussion. It was not the place today for Senators to address it, but he did think he wanted to give enough comment. Faculty had spent quite a bit of time in his own department and he felt further discussion was warranted.

be initially eligible for financial aid and first year athletics participation at a university. If you recall reading about prop. 16 or prop. 48, you should know that what we've got now is an index, which indexes a student's high school grade point average and other predictors including ACT or SAT, which gives the University a better indicator of which students realistically have a chance to participate and succeed academically. The faculty athletics representative monitors that index. At our University no student participates, no student stays on the squad, unless I have signed that they are academically eligible, whether as initial recruits or as continuing students.

A second area in which we've been involved, and I think this is enormous progress, is continuing eligibility. If you follow this, you already know that for some years at some institutions, (and I'm proud to say I don't believe Akron was ever in this category), some student-athletes were basically majoring in eligibility. They took whatever courses they could to stay eligible for athletics. Some years ago in a measure endorsed by the faculty reps association, the NCAA adopted what we call the 25-50-75 Rule. It states that at the start of the third year of enrollment, the student-athlete must have completed 25% of a recognized degree program to be eligible to participate in athletics; 50% by the start of the fourth year on the campus; and 75% at the start of the fifth year. That's a substantial improvement, I think. It helps assure the students are majoring in something and are making adequate degree progress. We add to that a Satisfactory Progress Rule, whereby 24 credits must be completed during the academic year; 3/4 of those in the fall and spring semester, so that students can't slough off during the year and load up on course work in the summer, as was the abuse and habit at some places in the past. Further, to keep continuing eligibility, students must maintain a minimum grade point average.

I've also been, on your behalf, monitoring student-athlete welfare. I monitor practice times and opportunities to make sure we are in compliance with NCAA rules. I drop into practices; I review logs to make sure that coaches are logging the times of practice for our student-athletes. We're taking a serious look, as faculty reps in the conference, (and we've worked with your Athletics Committee in the past on this), a scheduling policy that will minimize class absences. Missed classes have a serious impact and are a particular problem for our region of the country, particularly with spring sports like softball and baseball. While it is a problem for the coaches, it's also a problem for us in the classroom when people are missing a week or two of classes. So we're monitoring that and attempting to deal with it.

I want to tell you about two other things that are done on your behalf as faculty members. One is if a student-athlete wants to transfer from The University of Akron and the coach does not want to permit him to do that or to talk to other institutions, we have a faculty appeals committee that reviews the request from the perspective of student-athletes and of the institution. I convene that committee, and may be calling on some of you to help with that.

The other thing we have is a Professional Sports Counseling Panel for those athletes who are at the elite level contemplating professional participation. Professor Prough and also

Professor Sahl, from the Law School, and I serve on this panel. We've had six members of the football team this fall to counsel them about how to stay eligible and how to prepare themselves for professional careers and what options are available to them. Last year two of our men basketball players went through those services and are playing professional sports in Europe at this time.

There are two other things I'll be working on in the spring semester in which I'll probably be needing your help. One is that you may remember when the Knight Commission met the first time, they called for a new model of intercollegiate athletics that includes peer certification of the athletics program on a 10-year cycle, much like academic accreditation. We were Certified Without Condition the first time around. Dean Frank Kelley chaired our committee on the campus, and it's been five years since that happened. We are now due to do a 5-year interim report, since our second certification visit will be five years hence. I'll be writing that Interim Report this spring to indicate the progress we made since our last report. We are also required to monitor our compliance activities to make sure we're in compliance with NCAA rules. I will be doing a compliance audit this spring to make sure we're consistent with NCAA rules.

Finally, I can tell you that as a faculty member, I'm very pleased with the attitude and approach that I hear from the Athletic Department, from our AD, Mike Thomas, (who is here today), and from the coaching staff. I think they're addressing academics in a serious way, and we're going to continue to make good progress with that. My email is david34@uakron.edu if you want to ask me any questions. I'd be glad to hear questions now if you like, but feel free to email me with any questions you have about NCAA matters or student-athlete welfare."

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report by addressing the parking survey. However, he stated that the committee had not gotten an overwhelming response. He asked that all Senators please fill out the survey. The number who had responded to the original survey was embarrassingly low. He then stated he would make a brief report (**Appendix C**).

The University had gained parking spaces to make life easier. There was both a decline as well as an increase model here, because parking spaces were taken away as well as spaces given. A new 4-loop shuttle bus service had been instituted. Members of the Facilities Planning Committee actually had planned and ridden and helped design the routes. That made the CFPC even more deserving of Senators' feedback. Another concern regarded buses that were supposed to allow transfer from one route to another and whether they would stick around long enough so one could get off one bus and get on another. That had been documented and the committee was refining the process. Feedback though was welcome. The one thing about the new approach was that it reached all the parking areas and really attempted to accomplish what a shuttle bus service should do. Senator Sterns welcomed this

professional growth experience that Senators had provided him in his quest to understand transportation and parking.

Senator Lillie then asked a question regarding how to respond to the survey. He asked whether Senators were to rate each of the questions using the 1-5 scale. Senator Sterns replied, yes. Senator Lillie then asked whether Senate was not going to take and rate the top 5 out of 7. Senator Sterns replied that that was correct. Senator Ritchey then asked whether Senator Sterns wanted all of the faculty members in the individual units to fill out the surveys. Senator Sterns replied that the survey was really asking that Senate members serve as representatives.

Senator Zap then asked what the survey item was which dealt with, "provide extraordinary service." Senator Sterns replied that he thought the interpretation of that would be to have more buses pick up and drop off right at one's car, providing more hours of frequent service, that kind of thing.

Senator Zap then said that if one was arriving at 7:30 a.m., one was most likely getting a very good parking space, so that would be her one concern with that one. Also, was this just for full-time employees? (No.) So this was encouraging them? Senator Erickson replied that this was so they could get in closer. Senator Sterns added that, for instance, if one went to the parking area around the library and in the lots adjoining the dormitories, one would find that those cars did not leave. So a real question existed about what should be designated for dorm students, whether there should be a parking area that was slightly farther out. So even if someone showed up here early in the morning, he/she would notice no cars were moved. What caused movement was using EJ Thomas for performing arts events where attempts were made to get people to vacate those lots. Senator Sterns stated that he thought there was a real problem regarding the dormitory and parking issue.

Further, he stated that one of the reasons a bus service starting now at 7:30 was available was that there was no incentive for someone who came here early to park out in many of the lots available and walk in. Now there is good coverage of the lots behind the Chapel, behind Spicer, so that people could really have access to the full range of parking on a fairly regular basis. He thought that the opportunity was there to make it better. He stated that everyone should think about what he/she thought was a fair approach to some of this.

Senator Sakezles then had a question regarding how long the parking crunch would last given the cost of some of the solutions being put forward. For instance, if the University was going to put \$20-50,000 into low frequency, it would be relevant to know. Was the University going to have a parking problem for the next two years, the next 5, 10 years?

Senator Sterns replied that if the University's projected enrollment increases were achieved, parking would be a continuing issue. Things should get better as new parking opened up, but it would still be a challenge. Senator Sakezles asked for a year range for this.

Senator Sterns replied that financing was a concern. He stated that each parking space now was costing somewhere between \$10-11,000 per space. So it was something that was fairly expensive. The committee thought that the pressure would be off a bit as soon as the east deck was completed. He also raised the issue of going back to faculty-designated areas. He thought that the Facilities Planning Committee had always said it saw the opportunity to return to faculty-designated parking as appropriate.

Senator Sakezles stated that this really didn't answer her question as far as the number went. She stated that all could assume the situation was going to last for quite a while. Vice President Nettling then stated that the Landscape for Learning was going to spread out probably over the next 4 years, even if only phase 1 was currently the topic of discussion.

Provost Hickey then remarked that he had thought the timing of the current deck renovations and closing for construction was a somewhat shorter time frame. Vice President Nettling replied that it was. Senator Sterns stated that the Auburn Science deck had just been closed. Polsky was fully functioning now as well as the Exchange deck. In reality, most of the decks now were back in operation.

Provost Hickey stated that his sense was that the parking decks were front loaded in the construction plan such that the number of spaces available would be back on line within the next 18-24 months. Vice President Nettling replied that only the east parking deck was part of the Landscape for Learning right now. The north deck and the west deck were yet to be funded. Provost Hickey then inquired about the renovations of existing decks. Vice President Nettling stated that as far as existing decks, those should be pretty well done once the east deck was completed. Provost Hickey asked whether that would be within the next 18-24 months.

Senator Sterns stated that he thought the point being raised was excellent. The sooner funding was obtained for the other two decks, the better off the University would be.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Reed reported that the committee had met three times since the last meeting of Faculty Senate and had been working on two fronts. First, the committee had been trying to come up with (for the long run) a budget model that was more reflective of productivity of units and tried to have a better relationship between revenue generated and expenses of units. And also, to fulfill the committee's responsibility to this body, which was to bring to Senate, before the end of this spring and before the Board met, budget recommendations for next year. So during the last few meetings the committee had really been concentrating on working on that academic incentive model, the first draft of which was prepared by Dr. Hickey. Senator Reed stated that she knew that some of the units were looking at that and some of the colleges had actually brought feedback back to the table. She encouraged those who had not had the opportunity yet to review it in their units to spend some time in a faculty meeting and take a more detailed look at some of the issues being discussed.

Those issues were very complex, and she cited a few of those to illustrate the kind of conversations the committee was reviewing. In light of the somewhat tight budget situation, how could the committee come up with a model that both provided a return of more dollars back to units that were now operating with a very high return on investment, while at the same time still provide some reward incentives to units which demonstrated improved progress. So that was one of the challenges that the committee was dealing with. Both components were necessary for any model the committee devised.

Senator Reed went on to say that the committee also talked about things such as how to deal with special circumstances in units; for example, the Law School, which had a library that charged an expense to the units which was not common to other units within the University.

Further, she wanted to thank our business colleagues - Dean Hallam who presented to the committee and who gave to the Council of Deans a model that had a work sheet to play with in which changes could be entered. For instance, if masters enrollment were to increase by 1,000 student credit hrs., how would that impact revenue generated? If costs were cut, how would that affect ratios? The deans had been asked by the Provost as well as the committee to play with that model and see what some of the different scenarios might be.

Senator Reed mentioned that Vice President Hank Netting had given the committee a preview of the Governor's budget which was actually very close on target. If anybody was interested, he/she could get into the Governor's complete budget recommendations from the state of Ohio web page. She suggested the address to access was: www.state.oh.us/obm. That was the office of budget and management which did have a link to the Governor's recommendations.

Senator Reed continued by stating that some of the new initiatives were coming up at the state level. One concerned how to improve math and science instruction and other topics which might have broad university consequences.

The committee also looked at the first-day figures and were really encouraged by those, as they did show some growth compared to the same time last year. As Dr. Roney had mentioned, there really had been a lot of effort put forth this year to try to get students to register early and to make arrangements for payment so that they were counted as paid enrollments.

Senator Reed stated that she had asked for an ad hoc subcommittee to look at the proposals that were submitted by the colleges for the House Bill 640 on instructional equipment funds. Some people had responded to her or had a little group of PBC looking at those requests and helping the Provost's office give feedback to them by the middle of this month. The committee appreciated that opportunity.

Finally, Senator Reed stated that the next committee meeting was Tuesday, at which time the committee would be working on the calendar to make sure all was accomplished in a timely way for the budget recommendations that would eventually come to the Senate.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - None.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Redle reported that The University of Akron soccer team was one of 13 teams recognized on a national basis for its grade point average - it was above the 3.1 figure. He felt this was a nice bright spot in the face of some of the other discouraging news.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chair called for a motion to adjourn. This was so moved and seconded. The meeting ended at 4:15 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin

APPENDIX A**DOMESTIC PARTNER BENEFITS****Campus Well Being Committee Report to Faculty Senate
January 2001**

Over the past decade, a growing number of public and private employers, including a significant number of colleges and universities, have begun to offer unmarried employees with domestic partners some or all of the benefits they give to married employees. (Appendices A&B) The members of the Committee investigated issues surrounding the extension of "spousal" benefits to unmarried faculty and staff who are in long-term, caring relationships with adult partners. A summary of questions frequently asked and their answers is found in Appendix C. On the basis of our review, we have developed the benefits and costs to the University of Akron of extending such benefits and are making recommendations to the Faculty Senate

Definition of Domestic Partner

Definitions of domestic partnerships typically state that a domestic partnership is a committed relationship between two adults, regardless of gender, that has the following characteristics: the partners live together, have been in their relationship for at least six months, are 18 years of age or older, are not related by blood closer than would bar marriage in the State of Ohio, are mentally competent to consent to a contract, are each other's sole domestic partner, and are responsible for one another's common welfare.

At a number of institutions offering benefits, employees fill out an Affidavit of Domestic Partnership to register their partnerships and an Affidavit of Termination of Domestic Partner Status if the partnership is terminated. (See Appendix B)

Potential Gains for The University of Akron

- With the extension of domestic partner benefits, the university would be helping all employees provide their families with the same security and protection against crises as it enables married employees to give their families. It is an issue of fairness.
- The extension of domestic partner benefits would be consistent with The University of Akron's stated policy of not discriminating on the basis of sexual preference when hiring. Where equal benefits are not available this policy is not truly met.
- By adopting a domestic partner benefits policy, the university would be modeling the respect for diversity it hopes to instill in its students.
- Such a policy would also assist the university in recruiting and retaining capable faculty and staff, especially as major universities in our area (e.g. Case Western Reserve, Eastern Michigan, University of Michigan and Michigan State) have these benefits.

Page 2

Domestic Partner Benefits

Costs

Domestic partner benefits for all full-time employees are as follows:

- No cost or low cost:
 - Bereavement leave upon a partner's or partner's dependent's death
 - Sick Leave to care for a partner or partner's dependent
- Some cost:
 - The estimates from experienced institutions (see appendices) are that approximately 2% or less would be added to health costs. The number of potential employees eligible are not great and the number of registrants even smaller.

Recommendations

We recommend that The University of Akron

- Establish a definition of domestic partnership and a registration procedure to file a domestic partnership affidavit modeled after those used at similar universities.
- Include domestic partnerships in the university's policies that address the employment of members of the same family, including health coverage.
- Incorporate domestic partner benefits in the documents given to prospective employees during recruitment.
- Incorporate domestic partners in the university's definition of "immediate family" in sick leave policy.
- Continue to assure that all present and future benefits affecting domestic partners, not identified in this report, be brought to equitable status.

APPENDICES FOR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON DOMESTIC PARTNER BENEFITS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

Appendix A. What other universities are doing about domestic partner health benefits

Appendix B. Sample policies and forms from other universities: University of Alaska, University of Michigan, and Wayne State University (see

Appendix C. Frequently asked questions

APPENDIX A

WHAT OTHER UNIVERSITIES ARE DOING ABOUT
DOMESTIC PARTNER HEALTH BENEFITS

The WorkNet Project of the Human Rights Campaign (<http://www.hrc.org/>) collects and disseminates information about workplace discrimination and domestic partner benefits in the United States. Their employer database identifies (as of Jan. 19, 2001) 128 universities and colleges in the U.S. that offer some type of domestic partner health benefits to their employees.

Institution	Who's Covered	Year Instituted
American University	Same Only	1992
Amherst College		
Antioch College		1995
Augsburg College	Same & Opposite	1999
Baldwin-Wallace College	Same & Opposite	1998
Bates College	Same & Opposite	
Beaver College	Same & Opposite	1998
Beloit College	Same Only	1998
Bentley College	Same Only	1999
Bloomfield College	Same Only	2000
Bowdoin College	Same & Opposite	1996
Brandeis University	Same Only	
Brooklyn Law School		1995
Brown University	Same & Opposite	1994
Bucknell University	Same & Opposite	1996
Calif. Acad. Of Sciences		
Calif. Inst. Of Tech.		1995
Calif. State Univ. System	Same Only	2000
Carleton College		
Carnegie Mellon Univ.	Same & Opposite	2000
Case Western Reserve	Same & Opposite	2000
Central Michigan Univ.		
Claremont Colleges		
Clark University	Same Only	1993
Coe College		1999
Colby College	Same Only	1993
College of Wooster	Same Only	1999
Colorado College	Same & Opposite	1995
Columbia University	Same Only	1994
Comm. College of Phil.		
Connecticut State Univ.	Same Only	2000
Cornell University		
Culinary Inst. Of Am.	Same & Opposite	
CUNY City Univ. of NY		
Dartmouth College	Same Only	1994
DeAnza Comm. College		
Denison University		1995

DePauw University	Same Only	1997
Dickinson College	Same Only	1995
Duke University		1995
Eastern Michigan Univ.	Same Only	1999
Emerson College	Same Only	1994
Emory University		1995
Foothill College		
Franklin & Marshall College	Same Only	1992
Golden Gate Univ.	Same & Opposite	1992
Grinnell College	Same & Opposite	1994
Guilford College	Same & Opposite	
Hamilton College		1995
Harvard University	Same Only	1994
Hofstra University	Same Only	1995
Illinois Wesleyan Univ.	Same & Opposite	1999
Iowa State University	Same Only	
Ithaca College		
Johns Hopkins Univ.	Same Only	1998
Julliard School of Music		
Kalamazoo College	Same & Opposite	1999
Kenyon College		1998
Knox College	Same & Opposite	1998
Lawrence University		1997
Lesley College	Same Only	1994
Macalaster College		
Maricopa Co. Comm. Coll.	Same & Opposite	1998
Mass. Inst. of Tech.	Same Only	1993
Maryland Coll. of Art & Design	Same & Opposite	1993
Mass. Inst. of Tech.	Same Only	1993
Michigan State Univ.		1998
Middlebury College		
Mills College		
Mission College	Same Only	1996
Muhlenberg College	Same Only	2001
New York Law School		1995
New York University		
Northern Michigan Univ.	Same Only	1995
Northwestern Univ.		
Oakland University		
Oberlin College	Same Only	1992
Occidental College		1995
Portland Comm. College	Same & Opposite	1995
Princeton University	Same Only	1994
Rice University	Same & Opposite	2000
Rochester Ins. of Tech.	Same Only	1998
Rockefeller University		
Rollins College	Same & Opposite	2001
Rush University		1998
San Francisco Comm. Coll.	Same & Opposite	1991
Simmons College		
Skidmore College	Same Only	
Smith College	Same Only	
Southern Oregon Univ.	Same & Opposite	1998

Southwestern Univ. School of Law		1995
Springfield College		1995
Stanford University	Same Only	1993
SUNY-State Univ. of NY	Same & Opposite	1995
Susquehanna University	Same Only	1995
Swarthmore College		
Sweetser Children's Services	Same & Opposite	1999
Syracuse University		1995
Thos. Jefferson Univ. & Hospital		1995
Trinity College	Same Only	1997
Tufts University	Same Only	
Tulane University	Same Only	2000
Union Theological Seminary		
University of Alaska		
Univ. of Calif. System		1998
University of Chicago	Same & Opposite	1993
University of Calif. System		1998
University of Chicago	Same & Opposite	1993
Univ. of Colorado at Boulder		
University of Denver	Same & Opposite	1995
University of Iowa	Same & Opposite	1992
University of Main System	Same Only	1996
University of Miami	Same Only	2000
University of Michigan		1994
University of Minnesota		1993
University of New Mexico		1994
University of Pennsylvania		1994
University of Rochester	Same Only	1992
Univ. of Southern Calif.		
University of Vermont		
University of Washington	Same Only	2001
Univ. System of New Hampshire	Same Only	2000
Vanderbilt University	Same Only	2000
Wake Forest University	Same Only	2000
Washington University	Same & Opposite	1994
Wayne State University		
Wellesley College		1994
Wesleyan University	Same & Opposite	1994
Wheaton College	Same Only	1995
Williams College		
Yale University	Same Only	1994

APPENDIX B**Sample policies and forms from other universities**

On the next pages are policies and forms for domestic partner benefits used by three state institutions: the University of Alaska, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State University. They reflect some of the wide variety of options available to the University of Akron, should we decide to include domestic partners in our benefits plans. The University of Michigan and Wayne State University offer extensive supporting information about issues such as the tax implications of including domestic partners in benefit plans. The University of Michigan's answers to "Frequently Asked Questions" are included as an example of such supporting documentation.

Appendix C

Frequently asked questions

Extending benefits to domestic partners is a significant change to an organization's way of conducting business. There are many concerns that need to be addressed when considering such a change. Following are responses to some of the questions and concerns that commonly arise. These responses come primarily from the WorkNet Project of the Human Rights Campaign (<http://www.hrc.org/>).

Why should we be thinking about extending benefits to families of unmarried employees?

Old benefits models that rely on marriage to determine who is eligible for coverage ignore dramatic changes in the American family in recent years. In 1970, the percentage of households fitting the "traditional" definition of the family a husband and wife living with their children -- was 40 percent, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. By 1998, only 25 percent of the nation's 102 million households fit that definition. Meanwhile, the number of Americans living in unmarried partner households is large and growing more rapidly than the number living in married households. From 1994 to 1998, the number of married couple households in the United States increased by just 2 percent, while the number of unmarried partner households increased 11 percent. In 1998, there were 5.9 million unmarried partner households in the United States. Of these, approximately 28 percent, or 1.7 million households, contained unmarried partners of the same sex. Domestic partner benefits offer an easy method for employers to adapt to the changing needs of their employees by simply expanding the eligibility for existing benefits programs. If one purpose of a benefits program is to provide a safety net for employees and their families, thereby enabling employees to focus better on work, a plan that does not include domestic partner benefits ignores a growing portion of the workforce.

How would it be beneficial?

A domestic partner benefits program will improve employees' productivity by alleviating personal stress that may keep them from focusing fully on work. At least one workplace advocate has employed a simple formula to measure the dollar amount of increased productivity created by a fair and inclusive work environment for GLBT workers. The formula conservatively assumes the number of GLBT employees in any workplace to be 5 percent and the amount of productivity associated with a safe and equitable workplace to be 10 percent. Using these figures, you can illustrate how much money a company might lose by not providing a safe and equitable workplace. (For example: A company with a workforce of 1,000 employees would have 50 GLBT employees [$1,000 \times 0.05 = 50$]. If the average salary is \$40,000, the average loss in productivity per GLBT worker per year is \$4,000 [$\$40,000 \times 0.10 = \$4,000$]. Thus, the total annual loss to the company in productivity would be \$200,000 [$50 \times \$4,000 = \$200,000$].)

Also, domestic partner benefits can have a positive impact on hiring and retention. With national unemployment running near 4 percent through the 1990s -- its lowest level in decades competitive benefits packages have become key in attracting the best employees.

Not only do DP benefits provide an inexpensive enhancement to the overall compensation package, they are one of the hallmarks of a progressive company that values diversity. Indeed, domestic partner benefits were ranked as the No. 1 most effective recruiting incentive for executives and the No. 3 most effective recruiting incentive for managers and line workers. Plus, domestic partner benefits can improve a company's employee retention rate. Any CEO can tell you, turn over is bad for business. Some studies have put the cost of recruiting a new employee as high as \$75,000. Costs include advertising, interviewing, training, testing, relocation expenses, lost productivity and recruitment incentives.

Will insurance carriers be willing to include domestic partners? Will they add a surcharge?

When domestic partner benefits were first offered, the few insurance carriers that wrote such policies usually added a charge to cover any unexpected cost increase. Today, many insurance companies will cover domestic partners and most of those have stopped adding a surcharge. In cases where this still happens, the surcharge is often reduced or eliminated after the cost of the additional coverage is shown to be minimal.

How much is this going to cost us?

Nearly two decades of employer experience in offering domestic partner health benefits have proven that the overall cost is quite low. Numerous empirical studies, as well as the testimonials of human resource professionals who have implemented domestic partner benefits programs, have shown this to be the case. In February 1999, Sally Fox, Seattle's benefits and safety director, told The Associated Press, "After nine years of doing this, I'm here to tell you it's one of the best things we did. Our health costs increased in proportion to the people we were covering, but their costs were the same as everyone else's." Because enrollment in domestic partnership programs is generally low, Seattle's overall health insurance costs increased between 2 percent and 3 percent. This experience is repeated time and again at major corporations and governments across the United States. Eastern Michigan University reports that they experienced no financial burden with the institution of domestic partner benefits.

That still doesn't say how much it's going to cost!

To estimate the overall health insurance cost increase for extending benefits to domestic partners, two questions must be answered. How many employees will enroll a domestic partner for coverage? And, what will be the cost of treating a domestic partner? Several studies have shown that enrollment rates tend to be in the 1 percent to 2 percent range. Employers that offer benefits to opposite-sex couples as well will experience enrollment rates at the higher end of this range. A 1995 survey of employers by the International Society of Certified Employee Benefits Specialists found that 75 percent of companies with domestic partner policies reported an enrollment rate of 2 percent or less. The following table shows the enrollment experience of several companies that offer domestic partner benefits.

EMPLOYER	ELIGIBILITY	PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES ENROLLED
ABC Inc.	Same-sex partners	< 1.0
Adolph Coors	All employees	< 1.0
Apple Computer	Same-sex partners	0.7
Levi Strauss	All employees	0.8
Lotus Development	Same-sex partners	0.5
Silicon Graphics	Same-sex partners	0.4

(Source: Domestic Partner Benefits: "A Trend Toward Fairness," National Lesbian and Gay Journalists Association, Washington, D.C., 1997.)

The second component of overall cost is expenses incurred for coverage of the domestic partner. Numerous studies have shown that the cost of covering a domestic partner is equivalent to that of covering a spouse. In fact, the September 1997 issue of Risk Management reported that many companies found that covering a domestic partner is typically less expensive than covering a spouse. Andrew Sherman of the Segal Co., a benefits consulting company, told Corporate Cash flow in August 1994 that gay couples may cost less because they tend to be younger and usually don't have children. The U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey found that 65 percent of same-sex unmarried partners were under age 35, as were 60 percent of opposite-sex unmarried partners. Early anxiety that a disproportionate number of HIV- and AIDS-related claims would inflate domestic partner costs have proved unfounded. "A lot of people with HIV stick with their insurer," says Cynthia Goldstein, contract compliance officer for the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, who works closely with companies considering implementing DP benefits. "And the actual claims experience of someone with HIV is not any higher than other major health problems."

An Excel spreadsheet and further responses to questions are available at (<http://www.iglss.org/pubs/highlights/highlights.html>).

What about fraud? Won't people cheat to get added benefits?

Many employers require the employee to sign a legally binding statement attesting to the existence of the partnership. That affidavit can be used to exact repayment from any employee who fraudulently receives domestic partner benefits. There is no reason to assume that domestic partners are any more likely to falsify a partnership than married couples. Married couples are not usually required to provide any proof of marriage, unlike domestic partner who may be required to show shared bills, a rental agreement or a joint checking account. Further, individuals in same-sex partnerships may be reluctant to identify themselves to their employers as gay. In the absence of a comprehensive federal law protecting employees from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, such a disclosure may bring discrimination. This means that it is unlikely that an employee would claim a relationship falsely. Lastly, in the almost two decades since domestic partner benefits were first offered, there have been no cases of domestic partner fraud reported.

Considering where we live, might there be some backlash to implementing domestic partner benefits?

The vast majority of companies that implement DP benefits do so entirely outside of public view. For those that do garner outside attention, experience has shown that it is far more likely that media coverage will be positive. Companies such as IBM, Wells Fargo, Eastman Kodak, BankAmerica, Xerox and Coors Brewing Co. have all received positive publicity from their domestic partner benefits plan. Some fear of public backlash no doubt derives from the well-publicized boycott of the Walt Disney Co. by the Southern Baptist Convention. In 1996, the Southern Baptist Convention, with 15.7 million members, voted to boycott Disney because of its gay-friendly policies. The results? Disney posted record earnings that year. Heterosexual consumers very rarely make purchasing decisions based on a company's gay employment policies, and if they do, such reaction will probably be short-lived. Also, there is probably just as much potential for gaining consumers who agree with a decision to implement DP benefits.

Companies can manage public backlash by anticipating an attack and being prepared with responses. First and foremost, the employment policies of a corporation are not designed to change personal values; they are designed to foster an atmosphere of fairness and professional respect at work. Domestic partner benefits are equal pay for equal work, a tool for attracting and keeping the best employees and a means of improving employee productivity.

APPENDIX B**Proposals Approved By Provost
To Faculty Senate February 2001****Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-01-01	Political Science	Additional Tracks in BS for Political Science/Criminal Justice
AS-01-03	Philosophy	Philosophy of Religion
AS-01-04	History	Islamic 'Fundamentalism' and Revolution
AS-01-05	History	The Crusades through Arab Eyes
AS-01-06	History	United States Military History
AS-01-07	Psychology	Change prerequisite for 3750:410/510
AS-01-08	Psychology	Change prerequisites for 3750:495
AS-01-09	Deans Office	Job Search Strategies
AS-01-12	Canadian Studies	Addition to Certificate in Canadian Studies Electives List
AS-01-13	Political Science	American Foreign Policy Course Change
AS-01-15	Sociology	Department of Sociology - Undergraduate Program
AS-01-16	Sociology	Graduate Bulletin Revision
AS-01-17	Sociology	Graduate Sociology-Program Changes in MA Degrees
AS-01-18	Chemistry	Chemistry for Everyone
AS-01-19	Philosophy	Advanced Topics in Ethics
AS-01-20	Mathematics	Program Change - Master of Science- Applied Mathematics
AS-01-22	Sociology	Graduate Sociology-Program Changes in PhD Degrees
AS-01-23	Mathematics	Course Description Change - Mathematics for Elementary School Teachers
AS-01-24	Mathematics	Mathematics Course Additions
AS-01-25	Mathematics	Mathematics Course changes
AS-01-26	Mathematics	Program Change in Mathematics and Computer Science - Prerequisites
AS-01-27	Geology	Environmental Magnetism
AS-01-28	Mathematics	Mathematics Course Additions

AS-01-29	Mathematics	Mathematics Program Change - Master of Science in Mathematics
AS-01-30	Mathematics	Computer Science Course Change
AS-01-31	Mathematics	Program change for BS in Computer Science
AS-01-34	Bachelor of Science / Doctor of Medicine degree	Medical Seminar & Practicum II
AS-01-36	Modern Languages	The Don Juan Myth in Spanish Culture
AS-01-37	Modern Languages	Cultural Politics in the River Plate
AS-01-38	English	3300:354 Fiction of the South
AS-01-39	English	3300:361 The New Testament and Apocrypha as Literature
AS-01-40	English	3300:399 The Gothic Imagination
AS-01-41	English	3300:407/507 Middle English Literature
AS-01-42	English	3300:424/524 Early English Fiction
AS-01-43	English	3300:453/553 American Women Poets
AS-01-45	English	3300:569 Eros and Love in Early Western Literature
AS-01-46	English	Drop Second Language Requirement in the English MA Program
AS-01-50	English	Additional Requirement for the MA in Literature
AS-01-57	Geography	Changes for B.S. in Geography/Cartography
AS-01-59	Classical Studies, Anthropology and Archaeology	A Course change for Cultures of the World
AS-01-60	Classical Studies, Anthropology and Archaeology	Program change for Interdisciplinary Anthropology Program
AS-01-61	Institute for Life-Span Development and Gerontology	Undergraduate Certificate in Gerontology
AS-01-62	Geography	BA Geography - Geography Track

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
BA-01-01	Management	6500:663 Description Change

BA-01-02	Management	MSM - HR Concentration Change
BA-01-03	Management	MSM Deletion of Deactivated Program Tracks
BA-01-04	Management	MBA MOT Concentration Change
BA-01-05	Management	MOT Certificate Change
BA-01-06	Accounting	6200:670 Prereq Change
BA-01-07	Accounting	6200:658 Prereq Change
BA-01-08	Accounting	MSA Program Change (AIS Option)
BA-01-10	Management	6500:622 Prereq Change
BA-01-11	Marketing	E-Business Certificate Change
BA-01-12	Marketing	6800:685 Prerequisite Change
BA-01-13	Marketing	6800:690 Prerequisite Change
BA-01-14	Marketing	6600:635 Prerequisite Change
BA-01-15	Marketing	6600:670 Prerequisite Change
BA-01-17	Finance	6400:390 Career Planning Prerequisite Change
BA-01-25	Management	6500:222 QBA II course change
BA-01-26	Management	6500:443 Adv. H.R. Mgmt - course change
BA-01-28	Management	6500:425 Decision Support and Expert Systems
BA-01-30	Management	6500:471 Management Project
BA-01-31	Management	6500:325 Analysis and Design of Info. Systems
BA-01-32	Accounting	6200:250 Microcomputer Applications for Business
BA-01-33	Accounting	6200:320 Accounting Cycles and Financial Statements
BA-01-34	Accounting	6200:301 Cost Accounting
BA-01-35	Accounting	6200:321 Intermediate Accounting I
BA-01-36	Accounting	6200:322 Intermediate Accounting II
BA-01-37	Accounting	6200:440 Auditing
BA-01-38	Accounting	6200:454 Information Systems
BA-01-39	Accounting	Accounting Information Systems Option
BA-01-41	Marketing	Advertising Program Change

Community and Technical College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT-01-01	Engineering and Science Technology	Electronic Engineering Technology
CT-01-03	Public Service Technology	Fire Protection Technology

CT-01-04	Public Service Technology	Emergency Management
CT-01-06	Engineering and Science Technology	General Technology
CT-01-07	BS Surveying & Mapping Technology	Surveying & Construction Engineering Technology AAS
CT-01-08	BS Surveying & Mapping Technology	BS Surveying & Mapping Technology
CT-01-09	Engineering and Science Technology	BS Construction Engineering Technology
CT-01-13	Engineering and Science Technology	AAS Drafting & Computer Drafting Technology
CT-01-14	Associate Studies	Commercial Art
CT-01-18	Public Service Technology	Criminal Justice Technology (General Option)
CT-01-21	Public Service Technology	Criminal Justice Technology (General Option)
CT-01-23	Associate Studies	Course Description Change-Death & Dying 2040:244
CT-01-24	Public Service Technology	Community Services Technology (General Option)
CT-01-20	Associate Studies	Revision-Associate in Arts Degree
CT-01-28	Public Service Technology	The Whole Child
CT-01-30	Allied Health	Radiologic Technology
CT-01-32	Business Technology	Marketing and Sales Technology, Advertising Option
CT-01-33	Business Technology	Marketing and Sales Technology, Fashion Option
CT-01-34	Business Technology	Marketing and Sales Technology, Retailing Option
CT-01-35	Business Technology	Marketing and Sales Technology, Sales Option

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-01-03	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Hypermedia
ED-01-04	Educational Technology	M.A. Educational Foundations Bulletin Change
ED-01-06	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Web-based Learning Systems
ED-01-07	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Visual Literacy
ED-01-08	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Emerging Technologies for Instruction

ED-01-09	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Instructional Design
ED-01-10	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Philosophies of Educational Technology
ED-01-13	Curriculum and Instruction	Course Changes in Technical Education
ED-01-14	Curriculum and Instruction	Course Changes Technical Education
ED-01-15	Counseling and Special Education	Addiction Counseling Certificate Program
ED-01-16	Curriculum and Instruction	Course Changes Technical Education
ED-01-17	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Movement of Core Courses into EF&L
ED-01-18	Curriculum and Instruction	Movement of Core Courses into C&I Studies
ED-01-19	Counseling and Special Education	Introduction to Play Therapy
ED-01-20	Counseling	Counseling Youth At Risk
ED-01-24	Counseling	Program Change: Marriage & Family Counseling/Therapy
ED-01-25	Counseling	Course Change: Issues in Sexuality for Counselors
ED-01-30	Sports Science and Wellness Education	School Nurse Program (Option 1)
ED-01-32	Sports Science and Wellness Education	Exercise & the Older Adult
ED-01-37	Curriculum and Instruction	Reading Option: Master's Elementary Education
ED-01-38	Curriculum and Instruction	5500:485 Name Change
ED-01-39	Curriculum and Instruction	5500:541 Name Change
ED-01-40	Curriculum and Instruction	Undergraduate Prerequisite Changes

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-01-13	Communicative Disorders	Anatomy and Physiology of Speech and Hearing
FAA-01-16	Dance	Dance: BA, BFA
FAA-01-17	Dance	Physical Analysis for Dance I

FAA-01-18	Dance	Musical Theatre Degree BFA in Dance
FAA-01-19	Dance	Theatre Arts Minor
FAA-01-20	Dance	Bachelor of Arts in Theatre Arts: Musical Theatre
FAA-01-22	Art	Addition of 7100:103 to the Bachelor of Fine Arts
FAA-01-23	Art	7100:103 Addition to the Bachelor of Arts Degree
FAA-01-24	Art	7100:250 New Course Title: Foundations Review
FAA-01-25	Art	Addition of elective courses to minor in Art History
FAA-01-26	Art	New Course Number 7100:145 Three Dimensional Design
FAA-01-27	Art	7100:103 Addition to BA w/Certification in K-12 Art Ed
FAA-01-28	Art	Bachelor of Arts in Art Studio Changes
FAA-01-29	Art	Requirement Revision for Computer Imaging Minor
FAA-01-30	Art	7100:285 Digital Imaging Bulletin Description Revision
FAA-01-31	Music	Vocal Pedagogy Class
FAA-01-33	Music	Junior High/Middle School Choral Methods
FAA-01-35	Music	Technologies of Music Education
FAA-01-37	Music	Elementary Instrumental Music
FAA-01-38	Music	Secondary Instrumental Music
FAA-01-39	Music	Trumpet and French Horn Methods
FAA-01-40	Music	Clarinet/Saxophone Methods
FAA-01-41	Music	Teaching General Music
FAA-01-42	Music	Low Brass Methods
FAA-01-43	Music	Flute and Double Reed Methods
FAA-01-44	Music	Percussion Methods
FAA-01-46	Music	Conducting
FAA-01-48	Music	Advanced Conducting: Instrumental
FAA-01-49	Music	Student Teaching
FAA-01-52	Family and Consumer Science	Bachelor of Science in Dietetics - Coordinated Program Option
FAA-01-54	Family and Consumer Science	Program Change - Bachelor of Arts in Food Science

FAA-01-55	Family and Consumer Science	Program Change - Didactic Program in Dietetics
-----------	-----------------------------	--

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
NU-01-01	Nursing	Direct Admission Change Proposal
NU-01-03	Nursing	Addition of Special Topics and Independent Study Courses to MPH Program
NU-01-04	Nursing	Addition of two practicum courses to the existing School Nurse Licensure Program
NU-01-07	Nursing	N/A

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
WC-01-03	Wayne	Business Management Technology – Data Management Option: Software Emphasis
WC-01-04	Wayne	Computer Service and Network Technology

**Proposals Approved By Provost
To Faculty Senate February 2001
(New programs)**

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-01-02	Philosophy	Bioethics Minor
AS-01-58	Deans Office	Certificate in International Development

Community and Technical College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT-01-10	Engineering and Science Technology	Certificate Program in Geographic and Land Information Systems
CT-01-11	Engineering and Science Technology	Certificate Program in Construction Management
CT-01-12	Engineering and Science Technology	Certificate Program in Residential Building Technology

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-01-05	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Certificate in New Media Technologies
ED-01-11	Curriculum and Instruction	Certificate in Postsecondary Teaching
ED-01-12	Curriculum and Instruction	Certificate in Postsecondary Teaching
ED-01-35	Physical Education	Certificate for Exercise/Sport Science & Pedagogy

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-01-34	Music	Certificate in Piano Pedagogy
FAA-01-51	Home Economics and Family Ecology	Certificate in Parent and Family Education

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
NU-01-02	Nursing	Advanced Role Preparation in Nursing Education Certificate Program

**Proposals Approved By Provost
to Faculty Senate Executive Committee February 2001**

Community & Technical

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT-00-48	Business Technology	Prerequisite changes
CT-00-49	Business Technology	course changes

Community & Technical: New Programs or Certificates

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT-00-41	Business Technology	New Program option: Computer Maintenance and Network Technology
CT-00-42	Business Technology	New Minor: Computer Maintenance and Network Technology
CT-00-43	Business Technology	New Certificate: Microsoft Networking
CT-00-44	Business Technology	New Certificate: Programming
CT-00-45	Business Technology	New Certificate: Database Development
CT-00-46	Business Technology	New Certificate: Cisco Networking Technology
CT-00-47	Business Technology	New Certificate: Webmaster

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

No January meeting was held.

The Campus Facilities Planning Committee is requesting that all members of the Faculty Senate fill out the "Parking Problem-Solving Retreat Summary of Concerns and Recommendations" survey that requests priority assignments and return to Harvey Sterns +4307.

At the request of the Committee Chair, Jim Stafford, Director of Parking Services, provided the following update for the Faculty Senate.

*Currently, we have a net gain this Spring Semester of +506 spaces vs. Fall Semester. This includes assumption that Auburn Science Deck is completely closed (which it is now until further notice) and the permanent loss of parking behind Bierce Library for the new Arts & Sciences building. The main reason for the increase in parking is the complete opening of the Exchange St. Deck and the Polsky Deck – a total gain of approximately 630 spaces. There are a total of 3775 spaces in these two decks, which is approximately 37% of our total parking spaces.

*We have a new 4-route Loop Shuttle Bus service this semester that replaces the former one-big-loop route used in the Fall semester. These shuttle routes focus on parking lots for stops to bring students and employees to and from the center of campus (the "hub" is the College St. cul-de-sac) with the ability to change buses depending on your origin and destination. The main issue: the cycle frequency is 10-12 minutes vs. the 5-minute frequency with the former route. There is one bus on each route between 7:30AM-6:00 PM Monday thru Friday and two buses operating in the loops 6:00 PM-10:30 PM Monday-Thursday.

PLEASE go to the Parking Services website frequently for current status information about parking at www.uakron.edu/parking.

Respectfully submitted,

Harvey L. Sterns, Chair