

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

3-15-2001

Faculty Senate Chronicle March 15, 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. 7

March 15 and April 5, 2001

35 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of March 15, 2001	I
II. Minutes of Regular Faculty Senate Meeting of April 5, 2001	22
Appendices to Minutes of Regular Faculty Senate Meeting of April 5, 2001	
A. Executive Summary Rule 3359-20-037	29
B. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	30
C. CCTC - Technology Fund Expenditures History	34
D. <i>Faculty Research Committee</i> - 2001 Spring Grants	35

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 SPECIAL FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MARCH 15, 2001

A special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:06 p.m. in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education on Thursday, March 15, 2001.

Chair Sheffer began the meeting by stating that he had two pieces of business which needed to be dealt with directly at the start of the meeting. The first was whether the Senate had an objection to allowing non-senatorial members of the Task Force to participate in debate of this particular issue, the motion. By that he meant that any Task Force member who wished to speak and was not a Senator would not have to first obtain permission of the body to do so. Was there any objection?

Senator Ritchey asked whether this was to explain or debate. Chair Sheffer replied that if there were questions, this would allow Task Force members to be able to speak to the issues. Task Force members might have had some point they wished to bring up, so to answer Senator Ritchey's question, it was both. There was no objection, so the Senate proceeded to the next piece of business.

The second item of business was that the entire motion was brought up at the last meeting as part of new business and the Senate went directly into the amendments without allowing the original presenter of the motions, the chair of the RTP Task Force, to even introduce the motion. Chair Sheffer thought the body needed to do that, and then proceed with the amendments. With no objections coming from the body, Professor Stokes, Chair of the RTP Task Force, made some comments regarding the motion in general.

Professor Stokes stated that the RTP Task Force wanted to bring to Senate an informational presentation about the document as a whole and to remind the body that the document originated in the WOW Committee, the strategic thinking committees, that were in place a year ago. In particular, one of the recommendations of the WOW Committee was to create a policy-wide review committee. Faculty Senate then appointed members of the Senate and members of other colleges to the Task Force so that the Task Force would be balanced, so that every college would be represented, and that every faculty be represented, both tenured and non-tenured. The discussion about the document started to create a document from the bottom up.

We were presented with the opportunity to look at other documents from other universities and determined that no, we did not want to pick another university's work and adjust it to fit our particular needs; but rather, we would start from the very bottom and create something that specifically addressed The University of Akron so that we could be responsive to the needs of the faculty here at the University. The entire process was faculty-driven. It was created to be objective and fair and to allow all criteria to be determined at the departmental level. There was nothing to be inconsistent with the AAUP guidelines, and every effort was made so that all of the candidates that were in the probationary period process would be afforded the best opportunity available to be successful in that process. So the idea of the document as a whole was to create something that would give the best, fair, and objective opportunities to

everyone in the process, either probationary or standing for promotion at a later time after their tenure had been granted. The Task Force hoped that Senate would consider the document as a whole after the discussion of the amendment. It was met in that fashion to be treated as a whole and not looked at in little, bitty pieces. The Task Force had met with all of the colleges, except for the College of Polymer Science and Engineering, to discuss the document with the colleges. Many changes had been made to the document from the time it was first conceived. The Task Force had gone through 14 different copy makers that all had first received in December, which was draft no. 2. The Task Force now, with the amendments that were proposed by the Task Force and were before the body today, was up to draft no. 11. There had been hours and hours of work and a lot of changes made to this document. She then thanked the body for allowing her to present the document itself.

Senator Franks stated that since Professor Stokes had asked that the body consider the document as a whole as soon as we finished discussing the amendments, and since he represented the Library and had brought another amendment, he would like to ask the committee a question. His understanding was that the concerns the Library had of the appeals process and the appeals committee were discussed with the RTP Task Force, but the Library did not feel that their concerns were addressed in any way, and he asked for a valid reason as to why this was so.

Professor Stokes suggested that the Library present their amendment at the appropriate time, to which Senator Franks agreed.

Senator Sterns then asked for a point of clarification. Even though the request had been made to take the document as a whole, he wanted to ask the parliamentarian whether the body had an obligation to do that, or, he corrected himself, he asked that of the Chair.

Chair Sheffer then stated that the document could be broken up; it was up to the Senate as a body to do that. He then directed the body's attention to the amendments proposed by Senator Erickson.

Senator Erickson said that Senators had received materials in regard to this amendment during the past two weeks, partially from comments she had gotten, and partially also in an effort to have tried to make certain things clear. Part of it had come from herself and part of it had come from Senator Yoder. At that point in time, as Nancy Stokes had pointed out, there were two parts to this. One was some real worry about a college-wide RTP committee, and then secondly, what Senator Yoder and herself thought could be done as an alternative to meet the same goals of processes in colleges and departments in an effort to have had a high quality in all departments and units in our University. The committee had sent out a partial list of the schools that had similar committees. It seemed to her that if one looked at these other departments at other universities one wanted to find out what their experiences with those guidelines would have been; not whether they had had them, but what their experiences had been.

They had not had the time to poll everyone, but as it so happened, Steve Aby, who was the chair of AAUP, independently had sent out email to the AAUP chairs across the state asking them in a very neutral manner what their views were of RTP, pro and con, plus or minus. He had gotten eight replies from universities, and Senator Erickson wanted to share a little bit of that

experience with the Senate. Not everybody had viewed them negatively, and she had checked with Steve before sharing these ideas with the Senate.

There were at least three universities - Bowling Green, Wright State, and the University of Cincinnati, where the AAUP chairs unhesitatingly said that they had had negative experiences with these RTP guidelines. She quoted another problem from Bowling Green: "Another problem is that members from quite different disciplines are ignorant of standards that commonly apply in disciplines that are not their own. For example, philosophers seem to count pages without regard to measures of quality; historians think publication of books is more important than, say, grants. Few people recognize what represents good scholarly work outside their own discipline. Given those problems, the committee often relies on evaluation letters from outside experts which are considered more accurate if they are anonymous. This leads to many other problems with sunshine laws, etc. The bottom line, in my opinion, is that these college-wide RTP committees create many more problems than they solve." Wright State, again after discussion of similar issues said: "In my view, higher level reviews should be primarily procedural." The University of Cincinnati - "Originally, they were set up to see to it that appropriate procedures were adhered to. Over time the committees have become administrative tools often with the college-wide committee reviewing not only the procedure but the substance of the decision made at the departmental level. The committees create an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy, and these substantive interventions by college committees violate a basic AAUP principle that the department should decide on the competence of the individual being reviewed for RTP. In general college-wide committees, RTP committees have been more of a problem than an asset in guaranteeing due process."

Now those who had had a more positive view of this, Cleveland State in particular, said their contract brought in college-wide committees, and they pointed out that they were worried about their deans and their department heads. And while a college committee was not likely to be able to judge scholarship, it could indeed judge teaching, service, and procedural questions, where most of the problems arose. The University of Toledo spelled it out in even more detail: "A college-wide committee is good because we've got a union system, and there's a union rep and a management rep at each phase of evaluation." But even they said, "I do realize that this gives some members more opportunities to wield the knife." Here was what KSU thought was good: "Those who are turned down at the departmental level can appeal to the college committee and are sometimes successful." And finally, from Kent State - "Faculty with expertise should make the primary evaluation. When they're split, some other group needs to look at it, and isn't a faculty committee better than just a dean"? She thought, frankly, that that was probably the basis of our discussion.

First of all, they had gotten at least three universities here that clearly said there were major problems and precisely the kind Senate had discussed previously. Secondly, the issues that the others were most concerned about were procedural. As all knew, in the document there was a whole appeals process - an appeals committee, and they had not touched that appeals committee. The appeals committee was to deal with procedural problems, and they agreed that it should be there. The next thing they had considered about what those people had said was that this management union issue was not relevant at The University of Akron. This University had turned down a notion of having a union some years ago. We had said we wanted a shared

governance model. This discussion she had just been talking about was not shared governance. What did we do about gray areas? Well, they considered that indeed if a faculty member was turned down on the basis of gray areas that are not procedural, then she/he went to the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee. This was not included in their document because that had a whole piece of the Faculty Manual to itself. It was a whole system of evaluation that many had been involved in which had to do with going back to the original group, discussing it there, seeing what had really been said, and doing a whole overall evaluation, which they saw as a different type of procedure.

Finally, after having said that about the college-wide committee, what about our guidelines committee? Senator Erickson hoped that all would realize they were trying to say that the Task Force had looked at comparisons and had been trying to set up a single guideline across departments. But what they were saying was that their amendment made sense if one was trying to improve a university, that a department should think through for itself what its guidelines represented in terms of the great expanse in its discipline and with the goals that it had, and that those goals and guidelines that had come out of the department should be presented to a college-wide committee who could evaluate it. Somebody had said to her that maybe that was interference in departments. They could not know how a college-wide committee like this could interfere. All they could do was make a recommendation; it was only a recommendation to the dean. As it was now, the dean was the one who said yes or no to departmental guidelines. They thought that this particular kind of guidelines would be effective.

Where had they gotten this idea? No, they had not gone around and checked out other universities, but instead to the scholarship reassessed, the Carnegie Commission. The University was trying to be a Carnegie institution. She had gone back and looked at what the Commission had thought were the real issues involved. Not the exact committees, but the issues. The point that she saw in this particular chapter on evaluation started by calling it "trusting the process." A trustworthy process of evaluation led to intellectual growth, and the result should have strengthened the academic community. They saw that this kind of process, having looked at the whole document that Carnegie put out, was about how to do guidelines and why they thought it was relevant.

Senator Stinner then spoke. He started by stating that he was not sure whether this was speaking against it, but he wanted to split it. He made a motion to break the amendment into two sequential motions so that Senator Erickson's amendment could be addressed as two separate issues. He believed that the college-wide guidelines committee was not a direct replacement for the college-wide review committee, and therefore presented the following sequential motion so that the issues could be addressed separately.

Chair Sheffer then asked for a second of the motion; this was given by Senator Midha. This was not a debatable motion so a vote was taken. The motion passed.

Senator Stinner said that the first motion was to insert the college-wide guidelines committee introduced in Senator Erickson's amendment into the document. It was to have been noted that a vote in the affirmative would create a college-wide guidelines committee and the document would have to be altered to reflect such an addition. A vote, however, in the negative

would abolish the creation of a college-wide guidelines committee. The motion was seconded by Senator Steiner.

The Chair then clarified. The first motion that Senator Stinner had made was actually the second paragraph that Senators had been given. Senator Erickson stated that in essence in this procedure there had to be a motion that it was discussable. Chair Sheffer replied that the motion was discussable, the college-wide guidelines committee introduced by Senator Erickson's amendment into the document. Senator Erickson then asked that if voted against, was it totally eliminated, and Senate could now discuss the point of college-wide guidelines committees? Yes, replied Chair Sheffer.

Senator Yoder asked whether Senate could essentially do both, and felt that this violated the spirit of the original proposal. Chair Sheffer stated that the motion to divide had been made and seconded and this was going to stop debate. Actually, the last sentence of the motion was not correct. He asked the parliamentarian, Dr. Gerlach, to speak to this if there were no objections from the body.

Dr. Gerlach stated that the last sentence, "A vote in the negative will abolish the creation of college-wide guidelines committee," was inaccurate. If the motion before the body passed, it would add the college-wide guidelines committee and that was all. The next question was, did Senate want to keep the review committee or not? So the college-wide guidelines committee of Senator Erickson's amendment was to be inserted in addition to the rest. Once that was decided, Senators could say no and then they would have the original amendment that was proposed, which was to remove that review committee, the appeals committee of the college.

Senator Erickson stated that their original motion was to replace. Parliamentarian Gerlach replied that Senator Stinner's motion was to add their committee and not replace.

Senator Stinner then stated that he thought this had been brought up in the last discussion. His rationale was that we were looking at two different issues here. A guidelines committee was something different than a review committee; in fact, guidelines had been purposely left from this original document. So he thought that it was two different things. He thought it to be apples and oranges, and that was what he was trying to do by separating them.

Senator Erickson replied that the particular order Senator Stinner had suggested meant that certainly she would not argue that there were two whole levels in here, two levels of bureaucracy. She did not think they had both been there. So it seemed to her more sensible to have started with the RTP committee and decided whether that was wanted or not, before deciding on the other.

Senator Pope felt that the amendment totally altered the original amendment in its sense. We could have easily ended up with two committees, whereas the basic change was to replace the review committee with a guidelines committee. When these two questions were split, it altered the amendment, so it made no sense and thus could not be voted on.

Senator Graham then asked for a point of order. Had not the Senate just passed Dr.

Stinner's motion? If so, it was where the debate now stood.

Chair Sheffer stated that the Senate had passed the first part to break it into two sequential motions; Senator Graham was correct. Now Senator Stinner had put forth the second paragraph, which was actually the first motion. That was what the body was supposedly debating.

Senator Graham asked whether the body was debating whether it wanted to insert a college-wide guidelines committee into the document, and Chair Sheffer replied yes, in addition to.

Senator Erikson then asked whether the body could put in a motion to reverse the order?

Senator Graham asked whether he had the floor at the moment. It struck him that the RTP document as it was originally given to Senate had aimed at procedural questions more than anything else, and had tried its best to avoid dealing with actual substantive issues of what the actual standards for retention, probation, and tenure in the individual department would be. His sense was that the guidelines committee would potentially cross that line into actually setting standards for departments, which it seemed to him were best left to the departments themselves in their disciplines. So it struck him in that sense as not only an additional layer of bureaucracy, but also a layer of bureaucracy that would have violated the spirit of what the RTP document had attempted to do.

Senator Qammar then agreed with Senator Erickson's point that the order was a problem. It might not actually have been dictated by one's true feelings about the guidelines committee, whether it was a benefit or not as Senator Graham had just talked about, but whether or not it led back to Senator Erickson's original amendment. She did not think it to be particularly appropriate. She then wanted to move that the body table the first motion so that it could go to the second motion and then come back to the first motion.

Senator Lillie made a point of order - was there a second to this motion? Senator Binienda seconded the motion. Chair Sheffer asked for unanimous consent to withdraw this motion from the Senate floor so that the body could proceed with the second motion and then come back to the first. All in favor of unanimous consent were to signify by saying aye. With one opposed, it was not unanimous consent; it was majority.

Senator Sterns then made a point of clarification. As he understood parliamentary procedure, to table was a non-debatable motion. To table or not table was the issue, and then the body could go on to the next phase of business. The vote could be taken to remove from the table, if the body so chose. That was the way it worked, was it not?

Parliamentarian Gerlach replied that yes, when something was tabled, then all the motions appended to that were also tabled.

A vote was then taken to table the first motion to insert the college-wide guidelines committee. This was passed.

Senator Stinner said that the motion was to remove the college-wide review committee as it existed in the document. It was to be noted during the discussion of the removal of the college-wide review committee that a vote in the affirmative would delete all references, processes, and procedures from the college-wide review committee from the document. A vote in the negative would retain all references, processes, and procedures of the college-wide review committee as presented in the document. Senator Qammar seconded the motion.

Senator Pope then asked whether it would be possible for this first part to be rejected, that there would be no new committee, and then the second part to be rejected also, and there would be no guidelines committee as well?

Chair Sheffer said, yes. If this were approved, it would have removed the college-wide review committee.

Senator Qammar then spoke in favor of keeping the college-wide review committee. Certainly, the Task Force had gone back and forth for many, many weeks, and all the things that had been brought up within the comments from other universities, both negative and positive, had in fact been considered. There were a couple of things that she thought were important when the body just looked at those comments that were presented today. No one had really spoken directly to the time factor and the inefficiency of the particular process. It had not stood out as a particularly burdensome task that spoke to not having the college-wide committee. The amendment also had not spoken to another issue which she thought was at a certain level for some individuals, the trusting factor; whether or not one would have trusted people from other departments to actually have done a fair and objective job during a particular review. She could understand the difference between what the Task Force was trying to do here at The University of Akron and some of the bureaucracy that had to happen at union-type of institutions, but there were a couple of things she really wanted to impress upon people.

One, if the college-wide committee did not perform, would it in fact follow some of the other sister institutions that had degenerated down into something that was ineffective, rubber-stamped, not particularly having done its job or in fact overstep its bounds and create an element in the process which was unfair? The Task Force had in fact created a review of the process within this document, and all of the data on the way in which the college-wide committee voted in terms of splitting their vote. For instance, in Arts & Sciences, which might have had 30 cases a year - did they get a college-wide committee that in every single case for that year split 7-6, 7-6, 7-6? In that case one could have claimed that what one was seeing out of that committee was 6 people having applied their own personal department standards, and 7 people always having put their personal department standards on. In the document's review process it was able to identify whether or not that kind of voting pattern showed up. We were going to look and see how often they disagreed with the departments. How often was there a particularly strong vote one direction or another on those cases where the department themselves were split? The Task Force absolutely had a process within this document, a way of collecting the data, and we insisted that a committee of the Faculty Senate review that data every three years. The purpose was to make recommendations so that that did not put into place a college-wide committee that could degenerate down into something that was unfair and of no particular purpose to us.

Senator Qammar continued that the Task Force had to decide whether we wanted this committee to try to be more faculty driven within the process or not. It was often said that people outside the key department, the primary department, would not be capable of following the criteria or of writing criteria very clearly. They would need to write letters of recommendation in such a way that spoke directly to why it was thought they had or had not met those criteria. Another element was why was it that faculty who were generally here the longest within the institution not able to evaluate other faculty outside of the departments, but an individual within the dean's office did have that ability? Senators came here every Thursday and sat in all of these subcommittees time after time because we believed in some faculty-driven processes. The Senators spent a huge amount of time doing this, and yet we claimed we could not do it with the RTP process. She rejected that.

Dr. James Lynn then spoke, stating that he was from the RTP Task Force, and to follow what Senator Qammar had just said, from the point of view of an individual who had just gone through college-wide RTP reviews, the body had heard a lot of talk about whether people in other disciplines were capable of judging a scholarship. In the College of Fine & Applied Arts this last fall semester there was a brand new interim associate dean and a brand new interim assistant dean who with no special training and with no special gifts reviewed reappointment, tenure and promotion applications. One of them was an audiologist, one of them was a pianist - no special training, no special gifts. We reviewed applications from art, music, dance, theater, arts administration, family and consumer science, communications, social work and speech pathology and audiology. With the very well written unit guidelines in one hand and the application in the other hand, it was not a terribly difficult problem to figure out whether a candidate had met those qualifications. Without the criteria as written by peers in the department, it would have been a futile task. Dr. Lynn was telling the Senate that if he could do it, then the college-wide RTP committee certainly could do it.

Senator Yoder then spoke, saying that she was pleased to hear that there were checks and balances in the system if there were college-wide review committees. She reminded Senators that the dean and the Provost were not removed from this process regardless of whether there were college-wide review committees. She also believed that people aside from department people could conscientiously make a judgment, but she questioned why. It seemed that the evidence about why these were needed was because other people had them. She had learned as an adolescent not to trust the idea that "everybody does it." Plus, as a psychologist, she might have a Freudian-type concept that might have had something to do with envy but she did not want to go there.

Senator Yoder continued that the other thing that seemed to be implied in making those kinds of references to other schools was that there was a causal connection between having college-wide review and having academic excellence, and she just did not see the causal connection. There might have been an association, but one of the things she had learned very early in her career as a researcher was that correlation did not mean causation. She thought that to be bad science and did not want to go there either. If she looked at the reasons people argued for having college-wide review committees, it seemed that they saw them as a way to check procedure. But we had an appeals and a grievance process for doing that, so the only thing that

remains is a college-wide review committee to make the kind of subjective judgments that she thought were better left to departments and to external reviewers, people in the discipline who knew the area and who could make those judgments better than people outside that area. What we had been charged to do here was find a way to have consistent standards across the University, to raise those standards, and to have fairness. She had not heard an argument yet that she thought credible, that created those three outcomes from the addition of college-wide review committees.

Senator Binienda then added that he was asked by a faculty of the College of Engineering to convey the message that he was against this committee as well, because it added an additional layer of bureaucracy and did not seem to help the RTP process.

Senator Wyszynski replied that he thought the body had not considered the process from his perspective - a nontenured faculty member's perspective. Yes, it added another layer of bureaucracy, thank God. From the nontenured faculty perspective, he did not want to exhaust his appeals, because they were limited in the RTP guidelines as they stood. And the college-wide review committee was a check; it did not usurp the power of the department, it was a check on the department to make sure the department was doing what it was supposed to be doing - making sure the cult of personality did not interfere with the clear, fair application of departmental criteria to that candidate. As a nontenured faculty member ready to go through the process, he wanted all the members of his department to know that that check was in place. So from the candidate's point of view, this was a good thing. It was more work; it was another layer of bureaucracy, but as tenured faculty members, he asked, was there another responsibility that was more important than picking your colleagues eligible for indefinite tenure?

Senator Saliga replied that she would have to burst the bubble a little bit here. College-wide committees were not necessarily going to be helpful in cases that were controversial, even straightforward. There was a case a few years ago where there was unanimous department support and support from the dean, and the Provost had turned it down. That was half the college review. If the dean and the Provost were in there making their own decisions, college-wide review committees just added another layer. The dean and the Provost could do what they wanted to with it. She was not sure it was something that was going to help faculty. She also mentioned that she thought one of the ideas behind this was to somewhat streamline the RTP. This definitely did not do that. It was making it even longer. At this point, a candidate did not get any information or final feedback until maybe five weeks were left in the academic year, if the candidate was lucky. So this was going to push into the summer before a candidate found out whether or not he/she was going to be tenured.

Senator Hajjafar stated that he thought we were fighting for something that could be done without any controversy. Deans always had the right to appoint an advisory committee, but in that case deans were more responsible because in the situation mentioned here with an assistant dean and associate dean not ready to judge, there could always be an advisory committee appointed to look into the situation - even the Provost could do that. Then the dean decided and the dean was responsible. With this college-wide review committee he thought somehow it took the responsibility off the deans' shoulders. Deans had to know their faculty, and if there was no committee like that, deans would be more careful and would try to understand their faculty better

and then a better reward system would be set in the University.

Senator Garn-Nunn, who was from Speech Language Pathology & Audiology, stated that she had polled her faculty today at a faculty meeting. What they had specifically talked about was guidelines committee versus overall review committees. But the feeling of the faculty was that it would be an advantage to faculty members in the process to have that college-wide review committee. If the guidelines for each department were stated clearly enough, they could apply those guidelines and it would then be an advantage to those people going through the tenure and review process. It would be an additional check on the possible cult of personality, not only when a faculty member that others did not like had trouble getting approved, but also in cases where a faculty member perhaps should not have gotten tenure but everyone wanted him/her to have tenure anyway. That was the point of view of her faculty, and that was her point of view also.

Senator Pope replied that there was another side to the situation. Some nontenured faculty in his department had expressed rather than eagerness to have this, a fear of it. Faculty already were semi-paralyzed for some period of time going through the reappointment procedure. He did not think there was any way to guarantee that this committee would be more responsible than one's own faculty who were closer to home and had to bear the responsibility for whether or not a faculty member got tenured. He thought we might find in fact that it not only added another layer of bureaucracy, but it actually might make the process more difficult for the person seeking tenure. There was no way to guarantee that the committee would be the check to the department to protect faculty members' rights and to protect faculty members' desire to get tenure.

Senator Lillie then added that he wanted to speak against the motion to maintain the college-wide review committee. A couple of things came to mind - some of them were in line with what these senators had said, that in cases where people had treated others unfairly, they did need to account for their treatment to the rest of their college faculty. They needed to say, in our department we had a cult of personality - what of it? That to him was a very powerful part of this document. Did it guarantee? Of course not. Nothing guaranteed fairness, unfortunately, in this life. But it did, if it was set up properly and if it was applied conscientiously, lend itself to the possibility of creating a truly more collegial environment. Finally, he was really amazed to hear from some people who he had a tremendous amount of respect for, arguing that they did not want to have faculty being in charge of this sort of thing. He thought it was time for the faculty, if they really, truly want shared leadership, shared governance, to take the bit and say okay, this was part of what we had to do. We had said we wanted it, and now we were paying the price. We were going to be grownups, finally.

Senator Midha also wanted to speak against the motion. He thought one of the advantages of having the college-wide committees was to make sure that personality issues were not a major role in the RTP process. The relationship with the chair of the department was not playing a major role in the RTP process. There had been personality issues on this campus and he was aware of some of them. We had had to live with the consequences of those since there was no college-wide committee. If we wanted to raise the bar and we wanted uniformity of the campus, personality issues and relationship with the chair had to be removed.

Senator Erickson then stated that she appreciated the comments of her colleagues on both sides, and it was something all had to think about. But she came back to the issue we had started two weeks ago, which was her response to this particular committee. That was why she had wracked her brain to think through with her colleagues what could be done instead. Because indeed high standards were wanted; there was no question about that. And indeed we wanted to prevent cults of personality and we wanted fairness at all levels. It just seemed to her that the extra benefits of doing it this way were not worth the extra process. Yes indeed, we had to make sure that departments had met their procedures. Yes indeed, we had to have clear guidelines. The Carnegie Commission said that again and again - have good guidelines. If there were good guidelines, then they were followed or they were not followed. If they were not followed, we already had appeals committees in the system to make sure that those issues are dealt with. We had made those appeals committees according to the document; we had changed that appeals committee which used to be a fairly vague notion of what it was supposed to do, to be one which looked precisely at those procedural issues. Indeed that was very reasonable. So what were we doing now? We were putting in another layer to look at. If the procedures had not been met, that should be clear. If it was not clear and it was this gray area, then it seemed to her and to her supporters that the issues were met by outside review. Now she understood that there had been problems with outside review, but the idea of it made sense. People had said that it was a case of taking responsibility. True, it was a matter of taking responsibility, but the two levels at which people had real responsibility in their decisions were at the department level, because an RTP decision concerned the faculty who we were going to live with for the rest of one's academic life.

Also, the second one was the dean. If the dean passed on someone and somebody was turned down, it would go to the appeals committee. If in fact the dean was going to put through again and again people who should not have been accepted for tenure, then in fact the dean should be responsible. The dean's job was to do that; the responsibility was his and his performance was judged by how well he worked with his college as well as the effectiveness and quality of his college. But the RTP committee in a short period of time had to go through large numbers of people in disciplines for which they did not have any particular expertise, and as seen, the extra costs involved in that was not worth that extra benefit when we already had the benefits in other ways. Let us think about the qualities in the University and the qualities in the college. That was why we did not have a motion that said to remove the college-wide guidelines. We wanted to replace it where we thought how we wrote our guidelines in the department mattered. That was why we considered that that was a replacement even though it was not exactly the same.

Senator Stinner then said that he had been chair of the Biology Dept. for about 8-1/2 years, so he guessed that made him a quasi-chair. In addition, he was on the WOW group for assessment so he sympathized with the RTP Task Force, because he knew that they had had wrenching discussions. Members of the WOW group did talk about college-wide RTP committees. He thought that eventually the group had come to the conclusion that we were for the idea. He had talked with faculty in his department, and they were for it, especially untenured assistant professors. We not too long ago went through external review, and that had been a terrific thing, and he thought this college-wide RTP committee could also be a very good thing.

He had never found peer review to be negative, so he welcomed it. He also liked very much the idea that the faculty had even more say now in the RTP process. He did think it helped to balance out, to counter, a dean's decision. He was much more comfortable with the thought that a group of faculty were looking at these RTP documents and making a decision. So he was speaking against his own amendment.

Senator Sakezles then spoke against the motion. There was a difference between an appeals committee and this college-wide review committee. It said on page 17 of the RTP document that the appeals committee's job was limited to determining whether each step in the reappointment process was followed correctly. It specifically said they should not evaluate the merits of the candidate's application in order to determine whether the candidate had met all approved reappointment criteria. That was what the appeals committee did. What the college-wide review committee was supposed to do was determine whether the candidate had satisfactorily met all approved tenure and promotion criteria established by the University and academic unit. So they did have different jobs; it was not a duplication of the same thing. She would then agree with Senator Wyszynski from the perspective of nontenured faculty, having had some personal knowledge of a candidate who was hated by one person, possibly for sexist reasons, and in that particular case even though the candidate clearly had met all the department criteria, this person voted against her anyway with a made-up rationale which was luckily checked by the other people on the committee. But if one vote had gone the other way, things could have been very different. She thought that sort of situation could have been stopped with this type of measure. At first she had been against it because it did add more bureaucracy and she hated that; nevertheless, it could be a safety valve.

Senator Graham then added that coming from the History Dept., his colleagues were in favor of the college-wide review committee, not in favor of the motion. He stated that this fall he had had the unusual experience of being asked to serve on a tenure committee from another department that did not have enough faculty to constitute the committee themselves. He stated quite clearly that he felt the candidate deserved tenure, and that the decision in this case had been the correct one. But he felt that the process was rather rushed. When the committee was formed he had the sense of being an outsider, and it was like a train that could not be stopped at that point. He saw the process as open to abuse if the candidate had in fact not been so qualified. Having had that experience and then having seen the guidelines as proposed, including the college-wide committee, he had thought that that sort of institutional check would lessen problems like that because the department would have to realize that standard procedures had to be followed. Here, we had to have our ducks in order at the right time. And as had been stated before, our colleagues from other departments, which he thought in some ways were more effective than administrators who were viewed as the "dark side," would be looking at what we did. In this particular case, the person had been very qualified. He had been sitting on the fence before, but he emerged from that experience convinced that a college-wide faculty review committee would be very helpful.

Dr. Malhotra then spoke, indicating he wanted to talk more as an economist rather than a proponent of the committee, and he wanted to address the gentlelady from economics. Senator Erikson had fallen into the very typical professional hazard of economist, that of having an irrational obsession with dispassionate rational analysis. There were times when the cost benefit

calculus broke down. If he had had to use cost benefit calculus while raising his daughter, she would have been out in the yard at age 3. Ultimately, there were a lot of instances where we looked at the totality of the aspect and did not engage in marginal analysis.

Dr. Malhotra continued. Another argument which was made was how it would actually improve the functioning of the RTP process. Here again, this was falling into the same hazard of which he had accused his friend, Senator Erickson. He would appeal for rationality, and that was in terms of strategic behavior. The very existence of this committee would force departments to act in a manner where they would be very, very careful because they knew their peers outside the department were also watching them. Thirdly, he did not view this as another layer of bureaucracy, because the last time he had read the document it had said it was a committee of the college faculty. He did not know when college faculty became college bureaucrats. In other words, there were three layers of peer evaluation this committee was advocating. One was at the level of the department, another was at the level of the profession in the form of external reviews, and another layer was of faculty who were in the college but outside the department. He did not necessarily view this as another layer of bureaucracy. What he viewed this as was another input to the administration, and he did not view this committee as overseeing, supervising, or monitoring what the departmental committee did. There were departmental missions, there were college missions, and then there were university missions, and they all had to be linked and complimentary to each other. At each level we were looking at a different aspect of the same file. The qualitative evaluation would be very different. There were two important things we did as a faculty - we were protectors of curriculum, and we engaged in academic self-governance where we decided matters relating to personnel through peer evaluation. Now if one looked at the curriculum side of our activities, there were already college-wide and university-wide review committees. Dr. Malhotra thought they functioned fairly well, so he failed to understand why we were so hesitant to allow the same kind of openness and the same kind of discussion and debate at the college level in the form of a college-wide review committee.

Senator Gelfand then spoke against this motion, in part, because she would have rather had her colleagues in the School of Art decide her guidelines for RTP rather than a college-wide committee which decided the guidelines. And that was what it had come down to for her.

Senator Louscher then added that he would shock a number of members of the RTP Committee, but he wanted to stand in support of having this review committee. He knew he had given the Task Force a rough time. Having rethought all the issues, he believed that this was also an instrument by which the faculty member who was up for tenure or promotion could be assured, that the department chair whose recommendation was separate from the RTP Committee in the department had done everything possible to have given this person a very fair reading. The chair's opinion would now be read not just by the dean or Provost, but by colleagues from other departments. He thought this was a way of making sure the chairs did their job to the best of their ability.

Senator Pope then wanted to respond. Just because a person was a professor did not keep them from being a bureaucrat. They could be both at once; it was not exclusive. And one of the things that really surprised him was the underlying assumption he had been hearing that

the departments did not take these decisions seriously. This was not his experience. It had not been his experience that people were cavalier about tenure decisions, and it had not been his experience that the people closest to you, even if they did not like you, were going to wish you dead. He thought that they were taken very seriously in his department. He knew every single decision was gone over very closely, even though there was a lot of talk of, "they did not like me because I was in this field," or, "they did not like me because I was not as funny." That was simply not true when it came down to a tenure decision, and he had just wanted to say that the assumption that the department level did not take this seriously and let ride those foolish prejudices, was wrong during the 24 years he had been here.

Senator Hajjafar then responded to the fact that this committee would watch over the chairs. He thought this had been considered in the Faculty Manual, that if a chair wanted to disagree with the committee, they had to come and explain it to the department. In his department, if the chair wanted to disagree with the committee, he had to come and make himself clear as to why. He thought that this was a better idea - again, the department understood the chair better than a committee from another department.

Senator Lillie then said he really appreciated Senator Pope's discussion of the RTP process in his department and in his college. That was what the Task Force had wanted to extend to the rest of the University. We had spent a lot of our time early on in this process listening to horror stories, listening to decisions that were made on what can only be called thin excuses, thin reasoning. This was not to somehow make it more difficult for a department that was doing its job well. This was intended to ensure that those departments that had not been doing it, learned how to do it the way Senator Pope's department had been doing it for 24 years. That was also one of the purposes behind this college-wide review committee.

Senator Sterns then commented. He had been trying to very carefully listen to all the arguments, but something that Senator Qammar said had disturbed him. That was how this committee would be evaluated. He found that how the decisions that were made by these committees would be looked at to be the scariest part of this whole process. He did not know whether how they voted or how they deliberated was relevant to this discussion right now, but that we were concerned and that he knew people were trying to alleviate concern that they would operate correctly. But what Senator Qammar had described to him was not something that sounded right in terms of looking at how you voted, and if you voted wrong over the last three years we were going to seriously question your motivation or approach. He hoped that if we indeed did move in this direction, that there was going to be very serious concern about how would evaluate them and how their performance was going to be used, and what happened in three years if we could not take action until then?

Senator Hebert then stated that he did not know whether he was speaking actually for or against the motion. He wanted to make a comment as a faculty member though. He had quite a few new faculty now in his department, and he was sure virtually half of the colleges were getting that way. As a faculty member, he was not going to volunteer to do this, and he did not want to get involved in the decisions of other departments. He had enough respect for his colleagues in other departments that they were going to do their job, and that that dean and department chair were going to do their job, and he was not going to get involved in it. He did

not think he, as an outsider, could have the objectivity or sensitivity to the issue that somebody in the department had. He could take a look and see they had been doing a lot of research but was he going to know whether they were a good teacher, were they doing lots of good service, were they a collegial partner? He did not think he was going to know. So he stood as a faculty member and as he sat here and listened to what they wanted that committee to do, he knew that as a tenured faculty member in his department, he was not volunteering. He also thought that that would be typical of most of the faculty in his college, because their process was working fine. Regardless of what had been said, we were trying to add an additional layer of bureaucracy for what he saw was some unknown reason.

Dr. Mancke of the Task Force then spoke. She thought that there were a number of issues raised here that needed to be addressed. There was already a system in place through the appeals committee. The appeals committee forced a candidate for tenure and promotion into an adversarial relationship. A college-wide committee would hopefully preclude many of the cases where there would have been the need to force someone into an adversarial position. In designing this we had hoped that an appeals committee would essentially become a committee that would very seldom be activated because the college-wide committee had done its function well. So in that sense the appeals committee was there in the odd circumstance when that may not have happened. Now relative to that, the argument was placed forward that the college-wide committee would then be dealing with all of these other cases that it did not necessarily need to be dealing with that the appeals committee could handle. That was looking at short-term benefits over long-term benefits. She did think that there were issues to be considered in putting a nontenured faculty member who might have gotten tenure through an appeals process. The long-term situation of many of those people who had been through that appeals process was that they had basically been destroyed for their position in the University. That suggested to her that part of what we were dealing with here in this situation was creating good civic community. Good civic community was not created through the short-term benefits of cost analysis and time analysis, but the long-term benefits of the civic community were created through what appeared to be wasteful procedures by looking at situations that you did not need to look at. Anyone who had been in a department where there had been a contentious case knew that enormous amounts of faculty time was sucked up and that a college-wide committee would have actually appeared to be efficient in those cases. The long-term interests, the civic interests of the University, needed to be kept in mind.

Dr. Mancke also thought that this body knew that time and again we had had new administrators, and it was best to put in place a system of faculty governance, of faculty oversight, when we had administrators who were sympathetic and who would not put us in a situation where we might have desperately wanted college-wide committees. But we had administrators who were not sympathetic to it, because control over tenure was an enormous power that could be manipulated by administrators who wanted to build power blocks. So it seemed to her that a college-wide committee might have appeared in the short run to be an extra layer of bureaucracy. It might have in the short run appeared to use up time, but in the long run she actually thought it would help the health of the University.

Senator Qammar then added that she would like the people here within the Senate to envision the process in each of the stages, because the people who did not want the college-wide

committee felt that the chair and the dean in fact would do their job and that the strongest voice was down at the department level. She completely agreed that the strongest voice should be faculty down at the department level. The point was, how did you make that a reality? How did you actually make the faculty voice at the department level the strongest voice? As long as that was a fair voice, you could ensure that that voice spoke true, was consistent and they could stand behind their particular decision based on the credentials or lack of credentials of the candidate. That absolutely should have been the strongest voice. So envision the process. The department faculty had a hidden vote; it was a secret ballot. There it was - the ballot came out, whether it was a simple majority or maybe just below a simple majority. That recommendation letter went forward, and it was up to the department committee to decide what types of things they were going to put within that recommendation as justification and then they were done. They were out of the process, because they were so far down at the initial stages of it. Then the department chair got to decide. How long had they been department chair? Had they come from the outside? How well did they know all the ramifications of the faculty? They had been here a long time and listened to chairs here. The chairs that had been here a long time spoke in favor of this college-wide committee. Then that recommendation and the justification for the chairs went up to a dean. Now her college might have been particularly unusual, but she had had six of them in 12 years at the dean's level. The people who were going to be tenured this year had had three different deans during their probationary period. What was that dean who had not been within our system going to do? They had the blind vote by the department faculty. Then it went on to the Provost's level. Again, Provost Hickey might well have taken offense with this, but provosts did not stay very long. And what was the Provost to do? He had all of these deans who were working for him. Was the Provost supposed to go all the way back to the department's plus or minus recommendation level and bring that one up to the top as the most significant? In reality it did not appear to work that way. She asked the body a question - after it left the department, could the department faculty predict with great certainty what the chair, the dean, and the Provost would do with that file? If you could predict really well, then vote for this. If you could not predict very well, vote against this and stick in a college-wide committee.

Senator Hebert said that he thought there had been very good arguments on both sides of this issue. One he had failed to make previously was that all of the arguments that had been made for the college-wide committee could have also applied to a university-wide committee, and yet he did not know why we were not talking about that.

Senator Clark then spoke, citing the wonderful ideas and excellent discussion. Two points had come to her mind that she wanted to share. One was the importance of due process, and the second was importance of community. Since Dr. Proenza had come on board, we had learned some new ways of thinking about the University as a whole, as a campus community, as a place where pockets of excellence exist, as a place where there were particular superlatives that we needed to start to reconfigure the notion of colleges. In part was a reconceptualization of departments. We were in an environment where the state had really reduced our funding. We were in an environment where we did not have the technical, monetary, or human resources to have engaged in kinds of initiatives and work that we wanted to do. In that kind of an environment, she thought the college-wide review committee would have afforded us an opportunity to build those bridges between isolated departments that worked in such narrowness to their own disciplines or their own fields that we needed to extend our knowledge of one

another. This college-wide review committee would give us that opportunity to get to know one another, because whatever happened on paper was what really happened. If something was not on paper and documented, it did not happen. If someone in your department knew you and knew you well and knew that you were working hard, if it was not produced in documented form, then it had not really happened for purposes of tenure and promotion anyway. So the college-wide review committee would be looking at that paperwork, getting an understanding of who you were, and allowing for that interrelationship to grow throughout colleges. She knew that the Colleges of Education and Arts & Sciences now were starting to blur some of their resources, were starting to work together on grant projects and so forth. We saw this happening around the University. This was one vehicle that could allow for that collectivity to occur.

Secondly, she continued, is the due process issue. We all knew using the "Kirsch" case as our jumping off point, that non-tenured employees were probationary employees. They were not granted the comfortability and the security that tenure provided and knowing that we had an obligation as a college community to support those individuals that we brought in. We spent a lot of time and resources in pulling in the best candidates that we could for our open positions, and once they arrived here we had an obligation to help them to perform, to produce, and to become the best that they could be for us, for our departments, and for the University as a whole. The more due process protections we had would ensure that these people were given the supports and the resources that they needed in order to produce and so that we could become a world-class facility serving Akron and for Akron and the Akron area, and we needed to go ahead and make sure that this college-wide review committee was in place.

Senator Pope called the question and was seconded.

Chair Sheffer stated that a two-thirds majority was needed to call the question. A two-thirds majority so approved.

Senator Louscher then asked for clarification as to how each vote did what.

Chair Sheffer provided the clarification by stating that this motion the body was going to vote on now would be one to remove the college-wide committee. If a Senator voted for this motion, he/she was voting to remove all mention, references, processes and procedures of the college-wide review committee from the document. If a Senator voted against this motion, he/she was voting to keep all references, procedures, and so forth for the college-wide committee. Was everyone clear on that? A vote for the motion was to get rid of it; a vote against it was to keep it. A written ballot was taken.

Forty-two Senators voted; 17 voted for the amendment, which would've removed the committee, and 25 voted against. The motioned failed.

Senator Pope then called the question for the second half of the motion. However, the motion was tabled.

Senator Hajjafar then asked Senator Erikson whether she wished to withdraw her motion to insert college-wide guidelines committee. Chair Sheffer stated that that was what was on the

table.

Senator Qammar made a motion to remove it from the table and bring it forward as a motion. The Senate approved that motion and was ready for discussion.

Senator Graham stated that out of respect to Senator Erickson and Senator Yoder, who proposed this, he wanted to ask them whether they still wanted it to be considered or whether at this point they would consider it redundant.

Senator Erickson replied that they had clearly put this in as a replacement, not an addition, but she liked the discussion on this. In some sense, she thought that once there were college-wide RTP committees like this there would have to be damn good guidelines, and the guidelines committee was about guidelines. Because she had had it as a replacement and not as an addition, she would have at least liked it to be considered by each college. In some colleges it seemed that the first reaction was another level. However, what was not clear was whether or not it should have been done as a requirement in this document or whether it was done as a decision of a college itself. She was not quite sure. She thought that that was something people could have considered here and commented on. Colleges should have thought about that themselves because clearly the guidelines were the way to get academic excellence.

Chair Sheffer then stated that the body had a motion on the floor which it needed to discuss at the moment.

Senator Sterns wanted to speak to the issue of guidelines, because he was at the same WOW as Dr. Stinner, and he thought that one of the major issues that emerged from that meeting was the fact that there were a lot of inconsistencies and incompleteness in the various guidelines we saw in the retention, tenure and promotion process. This actually came more from the experience in his 30 years here. He had had a chance on numerous occasions to serve on other departments' full professor committees or other retention committees over his years. One of the concerns that he had had was that he had been fortunate on a number of occasions to support our guidelines which he thought were flawed. There had been no remedy because they only were at the level of the department at that time and there was no discussion or way to correct or modify or provide another viewpoint. So he thought this was a very important additional piece of the discussion.

Senator Lillie then spoke, stating that this had been processed quite thoroughly in the committee itself. So maybe if there was anybody else here from the committee who could help, he/she could jump in, too. Essentially, Senator Erickson was right. If this motion were to fail, there was no reason why a college could not have put in a college-wide guidelines committee. Colleges could do that if they wished. But he thought that that decision might better have been made at the level of the college than at the level of the University. Secondly, Senator Sterns mentioned the guidelines for which there was no particular remedy. In this document the guidelines were to be approved not only by 60 percent of the faculty of each academic unit, but also approved by the dean and the Provost. He was pointing out that there was review process here and there was also a process by which these criteria could be reviewed at the motion of a relatively small number of the faculty. So his point here was that the ability to set criteria did not

need to have a university-mandated criteria committee. The college could do it any way it wished to.

Chair Sheffer asked whether Senator Lillie was speaking against the motion, to which he replied that he was.

Senator Saliga then stated that she wanted to speak in favor of the motion. She thought it needed to be mandated due to some of the discussions we had had. We were too busy; we did not have enough time; we were not going to do it. She thought that having a college-wide guidelines committee where we all knew what was going on would be very beneficial to these college-wide review committees so that it was clear or it seemed to be clear to some other subsets. Maybe Arts & Sciences was one that was a little more of a diverse college than some of the others as far as that was concerned. For instance, the English Dept. had an idea of what the Math Dept.'s guidelines were before they had to review and apply them. However, she thought it would have been beneficial for all the colleges to have had them.

Senator Louscher then stated that he originally had liked the whole notion of a guidelines committee. However, he thought what he had heard in this document was inappropriate. He thought that it would have been most useful if the whole process was assigned to the deans of the various colleges to have worked in an informal way to create in their own colleges an instrument that would have created stronger guidelines and up the bar. He thought that was a very useful process, but he did not think it was one that should have been legislated here. He thought it was one that should have been worked out between the deans and the units in the colleges, so he reluctantly opposed this amendment.

Dr. Mancke spoke, stating she was opposed to the principle of colleges reviewing their guidelines. The RTP Task Force, however, had had a couple of issues. One, that they had really stayed away from creating criteria. They had really thought that needed to be done in the academic units. And as a member of that Task Force she thought that that was still where it belongs. She did not have the amendment in front of her, but it was her recollection that this committee would have activated once every five years. That would have created horrific problems of grandfathering. If the criteria got changed, then grandfathering kicked in and you would have people on different sets. She did think that it was probably incumbent upon the departments and the academic units and it was incumbent upon the deans to perhaps call guideline committees. This was something which should perhaps have gone to the Council of Deans to have it recommended that before the new criteria were created next fall, they went through some kind of college review. But to have had a system which kicked in once every five years and could have created the problem of grandfathering once every five years, she really thought the Senate needed to think about carefully; whether it was best to put that in as a permanent part of the RTP document or whether it was best that the Senate send a very strong recommendation to the Provost that that became a part of the implementation process of the RTP document. As a guidelines committee, she thought it should have been voted down because of the problem of five-year activation.

Senator Sterns then asked whether Dr. Mancke could point to the exact part of the document that talked about the 5-year review, because he did not have that recollection. He still

wished to reinforce the point that he had made earlier in regard to guideline review being critical, and he found it very interesting that we would have imposed the college-level committee if we had reservations about consistency of guidelines. It seemed to him it was just as appropriate for this body to do that as it was to recommend college-wide review committees. He realized the fact that logic or rationality should reign was not a criteria. He moved that he would like to make a friendly amendment that the 5-year review be removed from the document.

Chair Sheffer stated that the body was not to this point yet, but would guide Senator Sterns at that time.

Senator Erickson stated that she was just trying to work out this 5-year issue, having had a problem with this altogether. We had put this in in the sense that we had wanted departments to look at their guidelines continuously. You could not change guidelines every year, but it was definitely a situation where you needed to change guidelines every so often and you needed to review, whether or not you needed to change them. It did not mean that you would change them necessarily every five years, but she certainly had had it pointed out to her that in some cases departments had had guidelines that had been exactly the same for "x" years. Anytime guidelines would change you had the problem potentially of grandfathering. The way it happened in her department where they had not changed theirs in a long time was that the dean would send a letter to a person being hired stating a level of standard about their guidelines that was to be met by faculty. So you always had to deal with that kind of problem. If in fact you were saying that everybody would have had to look at it at one particular time, there was nothing in what we said that suggested you had to do them all in one year. You could stagger it and then just review it every five years.

Senator Wyszynski stated that he saw somewhat of a contradiction in the discussion today. But the way this was written as it stood, it said that this committee would evaluate the criteria consistent with the standards of the discipline. One of the arguments that several Senators had made was that they had not felt competent to have evaluated a candidate in light of the standards of the discipline, but now they were going to evaluate the criteria. It said that your criteria should reflect the goals of the college or University. She thought everyone agreed with that; however, consistent with the standards of the discipline, she found that very problematic.

Professor Stokes then commented. The first was that the criteria would have to be reviewed should the RTP document pass; every single unit would have to review their criteria and have it reapproved by the dean and by the Provost. Secondly, the document did not preclude creating a college-wide guidelines committee within the colleges. Thirdly, should we finally ever get to considering the document itself and wished to make an amendment to it, we could insert where we discussed criteria in academic units as stated: "Subsequent reviews of the criteria may be initiated by no fewer than one-third of the faculty members of the academic unit faculty, the college dean, or the senior vice president and provost." We could have at that point inserted an amendment to say, "Such review must be conducted every 'x' number of years." So the possibility existed to add that when we finally got around to the document.

Senator Qammar spoke against the motion for college-wide guidelines committee, and she wanted to follow up on what Professor Stokes had said. She thought there was some merit in

making sure there was a continuous process for the guidelines. She thought we were all familiar that the guidelines did change; the criteria did change. But they changed in this sort of informal way or in a way that was actually not faculty-controlled or faculty-driven, which was not in the spirit of what this body should have recommended. But she thought actually that she would rather vote against the motion which was to insert the amended document describing the exact formulation of the guidelines, and instead perhaps have this body at a future date recommend that the RTP Task Force, if this body so chose, revisit the issue of a guidelines committee in a particular different form where it might have best fit into the document as a whole.

Chair Sheffer added that essentially we had to come up with the wording. To which Senator Qammar replied that she would vote against it. Her problem was we would not necessarily insert Senator Erickson's amendment and her description of the guidelines committee, but instead, we vote against it at a future date and if this committee felt that a guidelines committee was a good idea, we could ask the Task Force.

Senator Graham then called for the question and was seconded by Senator Midha. Senate approved and a vote was then taken. The motion failed; the college-wide guidelines committee insertion introduced by Senator Erickson was defeated.

Senator Midha made a motion to adjourn and was seconded by Senator Steiner. Chair Sheffer stated that Senate would continue the RTP document at the next Faculty Senate meeting under old business. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 5, 2001

**** NOTE: Due to a mechanical failure, the meeting was not tape recorded. Therefore, a verbatim account of the meeting's proceedings is not possible. Reports and summations are provided in as much detail as is practicable.**

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:06 p.m. in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education on Thursday, April 5, 2001.

Forty of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Fisher, Hanlon, Kim, Lavelli, Lyons, Ofobike, Ritchey, Spiker, and Wyszynski were absent with notice. Senators Binienda, Braun, Gibson, Hajjafar, Hebert, Holz, Louscher, Mothes, Pope, Purdy, Redle, Turning, and Weaver were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * APPROVED THE SPRING 2001 SPRING COMMENCEMENT CANDIDATES.**
- * PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE BYLAW CHANGE TO INCLUDE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON RETIREES.**
- * PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE BYLAW CHANGE REGARDING FACULTY SENATE MEETING ATTENDANCE BY SENATORS WHO BECOME UNABLE TO ATTEND MEETINGS REGULARLY DUE TO CONFLICTING PROFESSIONAL DUTIES, IMPERATIVE PERSONAL AFFAIRS, OR ILLNESS.**
- * APPROVED CRC CURRICULUM PROPOSALS.**
- * APPROVED FACULTY SENATE BYLAW CHANGE REGARDING FACULTY SENATE MEETING ATTENDANCE BY SENATORS ON PROFESSIONAL, MEDICAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE.**
- * AMENDED RTP DOCUMENT REGARDING LETTERS OF REAPPOINTMENT.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Senator Qammar moved to approve the agenda, which was seconded by Senator Filer-Tubaugh.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 1 - Senator Qammar moved to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Senator Saliga.

III. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS - Due to the full agenda of today's meeting, the Chair had no remarks.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - Chair Sheffer reported the deaths of two former colleagues from the University. First, Mr. Hobart W. Adams died March 12. Mr. Hobart received his BA degree from Kent State University, and his MBA and DBA from Indiana University. He retired as Professor of Accounting from The University of Akron.

The second death was that of Carolyn Elaine Hann, who passed away March 12. Ms. Hann graduated as valedictorian from Ellet High School in 1961. She attended The University of Akron, where she earned a BA in Education and a master's degree in English. Her passion was teaching literature to middle school and senior high students. She also taught 10 years at The University of Akron, including several years as a teacher in the Upward Bound Program.

Chair Sheffer then asked for a motion to approve the Spring 2001 Commencement candidates. Senator Midha made the motion; Senator Zap seconded it. The body then voted its approval of the commencement candidates.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - The Executive Committee met three times in February, twice with only committee members and once with the President and Provost.

Issues the Executive Committee addressed:

1.) Request for Senate seats by Association of The University of Akron Retirees - The Association had requested that it be granted two seats on the Senate. Chair Sheffer stated that members of the Association were highly involved in the University. Senator Sterns echoed his comments stating there were over 300 dues-paying members who were very active and involved in the University community. Senator Erickson added that retirees had been voting members as part of the University Council prior to the Faculty Senate. Provost Hickey stated that he thought the Senate should consider this request very carefully as it could potentially

open the door to other non-constituencies. Senator Yoder then made a motion to amend the request so that it read: "THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON RETIREES SHALL ELECT TWO SENATORS FROM ITS DUES-PAYING RETIRED FACULTY MEMBERS."

This was seconded by Senator Saliga.

2.) A Senator on leave for one semester – There is no rule in the Faculty Senate Bylaws regarding replacement of a Senator who is on leave for one semester only and the question centered on representation. The Executive Committee felt that those represented by the Senator should be able to decide whether the Senator on leave should be replaced (through a new election) or should be allowed to retain his/her seat. Full representation of all faculty is the goal.

Therefore, the Executive Committee is proposing to amend the Senate Bylaws under (H)(5)(f) to add to the sentence: "Senators who are on professional, medical, or administrative leave for one semester or less will retain their seats IF APPROVED BY THEIR CONSTITUENTS. IF NOT APPROVED, THE SEAT SHALL BE CONSIDERED VACANT." At which point, an election of a new Faculty Senate representative is held. Therefore, the motion is to amend the FS bylaws as proposed.

Senator Qammar then made a friendly amendment to the motion, stating it should read: "IF APPROVED BY A SIMPLE MAJORITY OF THOSE VOTING IN THEIR CONSTITUENCY. IF NOT APPROVED, THE SEAT SHALL BE CONSIDERED VACANT."

This was seconded by Senator Yoder.

3.) Faculty Senate Meeting Attendance – Attendance to Senate meetings of late has been poor. In the next two months, Faculty Senate will be dealing with some very important issues. The Executive Committee urges all Senators to make attending the Senate meetings their highest priority.

4.) Additional Curriculum Proposals that were inadvertently left off the list for approval by Senate at last meeting; these were passed and sent to the Board by Executive Committee.

5.) Conflict of Interest Committee – Per President Proenza's request, the Executive Committee was directed to choose individuals from Senate to sit on the Conflict of Interest Committee and begin work on this document with Dr. Newkome. The four individuals who will be representing Faculty Senate include three from the original Conflict of Interest Committee, Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Lillie, and Mr. Brant Lee, and a new member, Dr. Kim Calvo. The four of us will be meeting with Dr. Newkome on March 9, 2001.

6.) Associated Student Government Proposal - Elliott Anderson presented ASG's request that ASG be allowed to conduct independent student evaluations of faculty. Data from those evaluations would be made available to students via a Blue Book - publication of the evaluation results. While the Executive Committee supported the idea of student evaluations and of making that information available to students, the committee had several questions, concerns, and comments regarding the proposal. Therefore, the Executive Committee forwarded this proposal to the Student Affairs Committee to examine in greater detail. We should be hearing from this committee about the proposal in the near future.

Issues the Executive Committee, President, and Provost discussed:

1.) Revision of RTP Guidelines - The Executive Committee, President, and Provost discussed the status of the revision of the RTP guidelines. The President then related that he had obtained information from two other institutions (Georgia & Purdue) which had been through a similar RTP revision process. As he saw it, faculty needed to understand that the issues included: a) Diversity of the RTP process and criteria - the need for commonality of process across groups (appropriate to disciplines) to ensure fair treatment; b) Creating uniformly high standards institutionally - importance of ensuring high quality throughout the University; moving as a whole to uniformly high standards. The question of college-wide review committees was discussed as well the issue of external review.

2.) Budget - The Executive Committee asked the President to address rumors surrounding the merit pool/salary increases; discussed the timeline for the budget, and what PBC is doing in regard to that process.

3.) Salary Sheet - Asked the President to provide faculty with a sheet of salary information - comparisons of salaries at various ranks in the University; faculty had been receiving these but not within the last two years; President said that that would be provided to faculty.

4.) Enrollment Strategy Plan - Executive Committee has extended an invitation to Vice President Roney to attend a Faculty Senate meeting in the near future to present information on the Enrollment Strategy Plan, to update the Senate on what's being done and what the future holds.

5.) Planning & Budgeting Committee involvement in the Strategic Planning Process - discussed the need to include PBC in this planning process; PBC will be directly involved.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Provost Hickey reported on the status of the University's budget. The state's Office of Budget and Management had informed the Ohio Board of Regents that it would be cutting the higher education budget by 1% this year. If only our instructional support allocation is included in the calculation, we will lose approximately \$1 million from our current budget. If other line items are included in the calculation, we will lose even more. In order for the University to avoid reducing operating budgets, the Provost stated that all unallocated salary savings for the months of April, May and June '01 would be

sequestered at least through FY00-01. The Provost stated that it may prove necessary to continue this approach into FY01-02, should the reductions in our instructional support continue into next year. Given the uncertain status of the state's next biennial budget (which, at the moment, does not look promising for higher education), it is premature to tell you with any certainty whether it will be necessary to sequester some or all of the FY01-02 salary savings.

The Provost also stated that he was working with Hank Nettling to create a 3% merit salary increase pool for faculty through a proposed 6% tuition increase. Concerns were raised regarding faculty searches in progress. Senators were told that cuts would not be made for faculty searches nearing their completion.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Professor Stokes mentioned that the committee was working on definitions for part-time faculty and for term faculty. No written report was available at this time. See (Appendix A) for Executive Summary for Rule 3359-20-037, Guidelines for initial appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion of regular faculty.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Professor Stokes presented curriculum proposals which had been approved by the Provost. The Senate now needed to vote on those proposals. Senator Lillie stated that he had one correction to proposal number ED-01-26. The department listed should have been Counseling and Education. The Senate then voted its approval of the proposals (Appendix B).

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns presented three space reallocation resolutions as follows:

1. **The Faculty Senate supports the proposed expansion for the Institute of Health & Social Policy and the Center for Gerontological Health Nursing and Advocacy on the 5th floor of Polsky.**
2. **The Faculty Senate supports the temporary assignment of the University Police Department Detective Division to the Trecaso Building until permanent space is aligned in the Goodwill Building.** Phil Bartlett presented the request for the use of the Trecaso Building as the temporary location for the University Police Department Detective Division from North Hall until permanent quarters can be arranged in the Goodwill Building. When Registration moves to the new Student Affairs Building, estimated in November 2003, then the police will move into the Goodwill Building.
3. **The Faculty Senate supports the modification of Zook Hall 201 as part of the expansion of the Office of the Dean of the College of Education. The Committee recommends that this construction be accelerated so that the classroom will be available for Fall semester.** Phil Bartlett presented this request in order to accommodate remodeling

and improvements on the 2nd floor of Zook for expansion of the office for the Dean of the College of Education.

Each of these proposals were approved by the body.

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE - Senator Dechambeau reported on the committee members' experiences with the laptop pilot program and felt that laptops should be deployed to faculty at least one semester prior to distribution to students. This would enable faculty to become familiar with technology and better able to incorporate it into their teaching. The entire laptop project must be a university-wide effort, and as many people as possible need to be involved. She also stated that CCTC had a new website. Senators were encouraged to send to her items they wished posted there. See (Appendix C) for VPCIO Technology Fund Expenditures History.)

Senator Erickson asked whether the committee had been collecting data regarding the laptop program and on related student expenses. Senator DeChambeau stated that the committee had not been charged to do so but did think it a good idea. She had no definitive answers at this point in time.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - Senator Huff stated that the Ohio Faculty Council had met on March 9. The topic was the "State Supported College and University Performance Report: Student outcomes and Experiences" compiled at the request of Governor Taft. He provided a written report and stated that Senators wishing additional information about his report would find it in the Faculty Senate office or on the Ohio Board of Regents website. This document contains a great deal of information and allows us to compare and contrast our situation with that of other institutions in Ohio. He also mentioned that results of the part-time faculty survey were available in the Senate office.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - Revised list of 2001 spring grants (Appendix D).

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Faculty Senate Bylaw change proposed last month was amended by Senator Erickson to read: "Senators who are on professional medical, or administrative leave for one semester or less will retain their seats IF APPROVED BY A SIMPLE MAJORITY OF THOSE VOTING IN THE CONSTITUENCY. IF NOT APPROVED, THE SEAT SHALL BE CONSIDERED VACANT."

The amended Bylaw change was approved by the body.

Senator Qammar then moved to substitute draft 11 for draft 10 of the RTP Guidelines document approved by Senate at the last meeting. Senator Erickson then proposed an amendment regarding letters of reappointment which stated: "THE LETTER, IF POSITIVE, SHOULD ALSO INCLUDE A CLEAR STATEMENT OF HOW TO ENHANCE HIS/HER PERFORMANCE TOWARD MEETING THE GOAL OF TENURE AND PROMOTION."

Senator Sakezles stated that insertion of the amendment into the RTP document was needed in other places as well as what had been proposed. Professor Stokes stated that this would be done. Further, Professor Stokes offered the friendly amendment to change the word "should" to "shall" in Senator Erikson's proposed amendment. The Senate then approved this amendment.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - There was none.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT - The Chair called for a motion to adjourn. Senator Midha so moved, which was seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

APPENDIX A

Executive Summary 3359-20-037

The rule will replace 3359-20-037 Guidelines for initial appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion of the regular faculty.

President Proenza and Provost Hickey charged a task force of the Faculty Senate Academic Policies and Calendar Committee to review and revise this rule with the goal of creating uniformly high standards-of-excellence in teaching and research by establishing greater consistency in the criteria and procedures under girding our retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process.

Detailed criteria and procedures shall be adopted by each academic unit and shall be suitable for its special needs but consistent with the new rule. These revised criteria shall be reviewed and approved by the dean of the college and the senior vice president and provost.

The major changes instituted in the new rule are:

- a university-wide probationary period of six years for tenure track regular faculty regular faculty hired after Friday of week seven of the fall semester may apply for tenure in either the tenth or twelfth semester of service
- university-wide minimum criteria for RTP
- expanded definition of "professional conduct"
- a university-wide timeline for the RTP process
- university-wide procedures for the RTP process
- expanded definition of "termination for cause"
- a listing of materials to be included in the candidate's file
- a candidate may apply for early tenure only once, and if denied will not be issued a terminal contract
- a candidate must apply for promotion to associate professor at the time of application for tenure
- a college-wide review committee, which provides a separate recommendation, has been added to the process for tenure and promotion applications
- external reviews (external to the university) are required for tenure and promotion
- the College Appeals Committee and the university Faculty Rights and Responsibilities committee are the only points of appeal before direct appeal to the President

**Proposals Approved By Provost
To Faculty Senate April 2001**

Butchel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-01-10	CSAA	Anthropology course number changes to reflect new department
AS-01-21	ILSD&G	increase of credit hours to conform to national standards
AS-01-32	Math	change in degree requirements for MS Computer Science
AS-01-51	PAUS	program changes to MA in Urban Studies
AS-01-52	PAUS	program changes to Master of Public Administration
AS-01-53	PAUS	reorganization of undergraduate curriculum
AS-01-64	CSAA	Archeology course number changes to reflect new department

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title

Community and Technical College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT-01-15	Associate Studies	delete Commercial Photography courses
CT-01-17	Business Technology	change bulletin description: Applied Accounting
CD-01-22	Business Technology	Add elective: Office Administration, Office Software Specialist Certificate
CT-01-31	Public	Revision of program requirements: Community Services Technology
CT-01-36	Business Technology	Update certificate program: Marketing and Sales Technology
CT-01-37	Business Technology	Update certificate program: Marketing and Sales Technology, Advertising Option

CT-01-38	Business Technology	Update minor: Marketing and Sales Technology
CT-01-41	Business Technology	Course deletions and credit hour changes: Hospitality Management, Culinary Option
CT-01-42	Business Technology	Course addition: Principles of Sales and Business Software Application; course deletions
CT-01-43	Business Technology	Course additions: Principles of Advertising; course deletions
CT-01-44	Business Technology	Program change: Hospitality Management, Hotel Marketing and Catering Option
CT-01-45	Business Technology	Delete 3 hours from requirements: Office Administration, International Secretarial
CT-01-46	Business Technology	Course addition: Women in Management; course deletions
CT-01-47	Business Technology	Course additions and deletions: Office Administration, Medical Front Office Certificate
CT-01-48	Business Technology	Course additions and deletions: Office Administration, Medical Transcriptionist Certificate

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-01-26	Counseling	Change in admission requirements for doctoral programs
ED-01-28	Sports Science and Wellness Education	Athletic Training for Sports Medicine
ED-01-29	Sport Science and Wellness Education	Sport Science and Wellness Education
ED-01-30C	Sport Science and Wellness Education	Update School Nurse Licensure Program-Option 1
ED-01-33	Sport Science and Wellness Education	New course: Injury Management for Teachers and Coaches
ED-01-34	Sport Science and Wellness Education	New courses: Musculoskeletal Anatomy I and II

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

EN-01-02	Chemical Engineering	New Course: Surface Science in Chemical Engineering
EN-01-03	Electrical Engineering	Adds elective course: Wireless Communications
EN-01-04	Electrical Engineering	Change in Natural Science requirements
EN-01-05	Biomedical Engineering	New Course: Biomedical Nanotechnology
EN-01-06	Undergraduate Engineering	Special Topics course for incoming female freshman engineers
EN-01-08	Mechanical Engineering	prerequisite change

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title
LIB-01-01	Library	New course in Information Tools for Academic Success

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
-	-	-

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
WC-01-05	Wayne	course deletion

**Proposals Approved By Provost
To Faculty Senate April 2001 (New Programs)**

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-01-36	Phys	New Certificate: Sport Management Concentration

APPENDIX C

VPCIO Technology Fund Expenditures History			
	Spring FY 2000	FY 2001	Projected FY 2002
Microsoft License	183,000	183,000	183,000
Specialized software i.e. Web CT	12,500		
Dial In Modem Lines	17,000	49,000	
Classroom Projectors-replacements		181,000	
Cisco Backbone and Wireless		40,000	539,000
Computer Lab Upkeep		100,000	300,000
Laptop Initiative <i>(2001 less \$100,000 contribution by Law School for their pilot)</i>		200,000	300,000
C&T Engineering Science & Technology Lab upgrd		75,000	
Dorm replacement switches		13,000	
Tech Classrooms Remodeling		283,000	
	212,500	1,124,000	1,322,000

Submitted on behalf of CCTC,
Aimée deChambeau

APPENDIX D**2001 SPRING GRANTS****Awarded 3/13/2001**

**Internal Grants Awarded by
The University of Akron's Faculty Research Committee**

ACCT#	FRG#	NAME	TITLE OF PROJECT	AMOUNT
2-07488	1525	Dr. Elaine Fisher Dr. Richard Steiner Nursing and Statistics	"Gut Dysoxia: Changes in Regional Measures of Gut Oxgenation During Ischemic-Reperfusion."	\$3,495.00
2-07489	1526	Dr. Lisa Park Geology	"Ostracodes as Paleoenvironmental Proxy Indicators: Characterizing the Variability of Non-Marine Ostracode Faunas on San Salvador Island, Bahamas."	3,500.00
2-07490	1527	Dr. Pizhong Qiao Civil Engineering	"Exploratory Research on Meshfree Simulation of Shape Memory Alloys."	3,500.00
2-07491	1528	Dr. Rex Ramsier Physics	"Adhesively Bonded Aluminum: A Surface Science Approach."	3,500.00

TOTAL FUNDED: \$13,995.00