

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

10-1-1998

## Faculty Senate Chronicle October 1, 1998

Heather M. Loughney

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).



1998-99, No. 2

October 1, 1998

17 Pages

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Faculty Senate Membership	1
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members	2
Faculty Senate Committees	2
Senate Members of other University Committees	7
Minutes of Regular Faculty Senate Meeting of October 1, 1998	9

---

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Dr. Gary Oller (+1910).  
FacultySenate@Uakron.Edu

## FACULTY SENATE MEMBERSHIP

(Update: 10/1/98)

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</b> (16)</p> <p>S. Baranowski, 00 James Buchanan, 99 Lindgren Chyi, 00 Elizabeth Erickson, 99 F. Griffin, 01 D. Malhotra, 01 J. Marquette, 99 TBA, 01 <i>Dr. FOOs, 01</i></p> <p>Chand Midha, 01 T. Norfolk, 00 Gary Oller, 00 W. Pelz, 99 Diana Reep, 99 S. Stevenson, 00 J. Stinner, 00 Mark Tausig, 99</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Community &amp; Technical College</b> (5)</p> <p>Fred Baldwin, 01 John Edgerton, 01 Rebecca Gibson, 99 Lawrence Gilpatric, 01 Elizabeth Kennedy, 01</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Education</b> (4)</p> <p>Susan Clark, 99 Robert Dubick, 99 Timothy Lillie, 01 Lynn Smolen, 99</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Engineering</b> (4)</p> <p>Celal Batur, 99 Jack Braun, 01 Michael Cheung, 99 Dan Sheffer, 01</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Fine and Applied Arts</b> (9)</p> <p>Laura Gelfand, 01 Virginia Gunn, 99 Barbara Heinzerling, 99 Robert Huff, 99 Scott Johnston, 99 James Lynn, 00 Marc Ozanich, 00 David Ritchey, 01 Ralph Turek, 00</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Business Administration</b> (4)</p> <p>Susan Hanlon, 01 Emeka Ofobike, 01 Jay Patankar, 99 David Redle, 99</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>University Libraries</b> (3)</p> <p>Steve Aby, 99 Judith Fitzgerald, 99 Mary Konkel, 00</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>College of Nursing</b> (4)</p> <p>Cheryl Buchanan, 99 Elaine Fisher, 01 Kris Gill, 99 Karen Reed, 99</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Polymer Science/Engineering</b> (2)</p> <p>Ali Dhinojwala, 01 A. Isayev, 99</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Wayne College</b> (2)</p> <p>Dan Deckler, 99 Forrest Smith, 99</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Contract Professionals</b> (2)</p> <p>Connie Murray, 99 Gregory Stewart, 00</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Part-Time Faculty</b> (2)</p> <p>B. Filer-Tubaugh, 00 Peggy Richards, 01</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Students</b> (3)</p> <p>Thomas Bird, 99 Brian Mormino, 99 Mary Wright, 99</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>School of Law</b> (2)</p> <p>William Rich, 00 Paul Richert, 99</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SEAC</b> (2)</p> <p>Kevin Butler, 00 Dolli Markovich, 00</p>

Note: Term expires in year listed.

Members - 64

*For Dec. Times - fat*

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON  
1998-99

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

- Dr. Devinder Malhotra, Chair
- Mrs.* ~~Dr.~~ Barbara Heinzerling, Vice-Chair
- Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary
- Dr. Steve Aby
- Dr. Timothy Norfolk
- Mr. William Rich
- Mrs. Peggy Richards

**SENATE COMMITTEES**

\* designates Senator  
**Boldface** designates Chair  
 Term expires in year listed.

**ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE**

- C. Gigliotti, 99
- W. Kilgallin, 00
- E. Mancke, 00
- G. Oller, 00\*
- S. Stevenson, 00\***
- N. Stokes, 00

- R. Turek, 00\*
- D. Frampton, 01
- C. Midha, 01\*
- E. Ofobike, 01\*
- P. Richards, 01\*

**CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

D. Deckler, 99\*  
 D. Redle, 99\*  
 D. Reep, 99\*  
 S. Baranowski, 00\*  
 C. Clemons, 00  
 R. Clinefelter, 00

M. Jalbert, 00

~~S. Rasor-Greenhalgh, 00~~

J. Welch, 00

E. Fisher, 01\*

TBA, 01\*

A. Foos

Ex officio member, Dr. Jean Blosser,  
 Assoc. Provost

Ex officio non-voting member, Martha  
 Booth, University Registrar

**ATHLETICS COMMITTEE**

T. Bird, 99\*  
 C. Buchanan, 99\*  
 J. Lynn, 99\*  
 J. Braun, 00\*  
 D. Brink, 00  
 D. Canary, 00  
 N. Clark, 00  
 R. Dubick, 00\*  
 B. Filer-Tubaugh, 00\*  
 J. Hebert, 00

T. Norfolk, 00\*

V. Rostedt, 00

L. Saliga, 00

J. Zipp 01

Ex officio members: Mr. David  
 Jamison, NCAA Faculty  
 Representative

Mr. Dennis Helsel, Athletic  
 Director, or designee

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE**

K. Gill, 99\*  
 B. Heinzerling, 99\*  
 J. Patankar, 99\*  
 L. Smolen, 99\*  
 K. Hinckley, 00  
 P. O'Connor, 00  
 M. Ozanich, 00\*  
 N. Ranson, 00  
 J. Edgerton, 01\*  
 M. Savage, 01

E. Sotnik, 01  
 TBA, 01\*

Ex officio members: Delmus  
 Williams, <sup>D</sup>Dean of University  
 Libraries, or designee  
 Mr. Paul Richert, Law Librarian

Ex officio, non-voting member,  
 Mrs. Debra Keller, Director,  
 Network Services

*Info.*

**REFERENCE COMMITTEE**

J. Larose, 99  
 D. Chlebek, 00  
 J. Harris, 00  
 W. Pelz, 00\*  
 S. Hanlon, 01\*  
 W. Rich, 01\*

~~TBA, 01\*~~

*P. Richert, 01\**

Ex officio member, Dr. Gary  
 Oller, Secretary, Faculty Senate

Ex officio, non-voting member,  
 Mike Sermersheim, Deputy  
 General Counsel

**CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE**

*P. Ritchey, 99\**

V. Gunn, 99\*  
 A. Isayev, 99\*  
 C. Murray, 99\*  
 F. Smith, 99\*  
 D. Buchthal, 00  
 L. Chyi, 00\*  
 E. Erickson, 00\*  
 R. Turek, 00\*  
 W. Yoder, 00  
 J. Drummond, 01

K. Dunning, 01  
 P. John, 01  
 J. Kline, 01  
 E. Laughner, 01  
 D. Markovich, 01\*  
 H. Sterns, 01

*D. Ritchey, 01\**

Ex officio member, Mr. Ramesh  
 Vakamudi, VP for Administrative Support  
 Services, or designee

*Ex officio, Tom Bennett, AV*

*Kathie Ruther, Mgr., Telecommunications Services*

**STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

T. Alexander, 99  
 R. Gibson, 99\*  
 B. Mormino, 99\*  
 M. Wright, 99\*  
 J. Buchanan, 00\*  
 M. Konkell, 00\*  
 D. Laconi, 00  
 P. Linberger, 00

T. Connell, 01  
 T. Jolly, 01  
 G. Stewart, 01\*

Ex officio members: Dr. Thomas Vukovich,  
 Asst. VP Enrollment Serv., or designee,  
 Mr. Doug McNutt, Director Student  
 Financial Aid

**COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE**

F. Griffin, 99\*  
 F. Kinsinger, 99  
 K. Butler, 99\*  
 J. Marquette, 00\*  
 B. Vijayaraman, 00  
 R. Caplan, 01  
 M. Cheung, 01\*

*A. Dechambeau, 01*  
 A. Dhinojwala, 01\*  
 S. Johnston, 01\*  
 W. Rich, 01\*

Ex-officio member, Debra S. Keller,  
 Director, Network Services, or designee

**RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE**

S. Aby, 99\*  
 C. Batur, 99\*  
 J. Karns, 99  
 S. Clark, 99\*  
 J. Fitzgerald, 99\*  
 E. Klosterman, 99  
 K. Reed, 99\*  
 J. Stinner, 99\*  
 M. Tausig, 99\*  
 K. Endres, 00  
 J. Hawes, 00  
 P. Henriksen, 00

G. Jones, 00  
 D. Sheffer, 00  
 F. Baldwin, 01\*  
 K. Calvo, 01  
 L. Gelfand, 01\*  
 M. Graham, 01  
 E. Kennedy, 01\*  
 P. Schmidt, 01

Ex officio member, ~~Dr. C.S. Chen~~,  
 VP, Research &  
 University Development, or  
 Designee

*Dr. G. Edwin Wilson  
 Assoc. Prof. for  
 Research*



SENATE MEMBERS OF OTHER COMMITTEES**FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE**

Tom Andes, 99  
 Susan Clark, 99\*  
 Michael Jalbert, 99\*  
 Lucille Terry, 99  
 M.K. Alderman, 00  
 David Durst, 00  
 Wayne Mattice, 00  
 Victoria Schirm, 00

Lloyd Anderson, 01  
 Tim Norfolk, 01\*  
 T. Srivatsan, 01  
 Nancy Stokes, 01

**UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE**

Jerry Obiekwe, 99  
 Paul Daum, 99  
 Jerry Drummond, 99  
 W.S. Jordan III, 99  
 Suzanne MacDonald, 99  
 Kevin Butler, 00\*

Laura Conley, 00  
 Marlene Huff, 00  
 Joseph Larose, 00  
 Alvin Lieberman, 00  
 Erol Sancaktar, 00  
 Elizabeth Erickson, 01\*

**PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE**

Jesse Marquette *	Arts & Sciences
<del>Rebecca Gibson</del> * <i>Lawrence Gilpatrick</i>	C & T
Robert Dubick *	Education
Dan Sheffer *	Engineering
James Lynn *	Fine & Applied Arts
Jay Patankar *	Business
Judith Fitzgerald *	Library
Kris Gill *	Nursing
Ali Dhinojwala *	Polymer Science/Engr.
Forrest Smith *	Wayne
Gregory Stewart *	Contract Professionals
Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh *	Part-time Faculty
William Rich *	Law
Brian Mormino *	Students
Dolli Markovich *	SEAC

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY MEETING  
OF OCTOBER 1, 1998**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, October 1, 1998, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-nine of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Aby, Isayev, Mormino, Ozanich, and Pelz were absent with notice. Senators Batur, Gunn, Huff, Murray, Redle, Reep, Ritchey, and Stinner were absent without notice.

**SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* **APPROVED SPACE CHANGE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE.**
- \* **CHARGED THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO CREATE A COMMITTEE AND A PROCESS TO EXAMINE THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST DRAFT BY THE SPECIAL MEETING OF OCTOBER 8, 1998.**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Senator Tim Norfolk moved that the agenda be approved, and this was seconded by Senator Peggy Richards. There were no amendments, and the body approved the agenda.

**II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1998** - Secretary Gary Oller stated that he had no corrections to the minutes. He did want to let the Senate know that if there were any corrections to the membership on committees as listed in last month's Chronicle, those could be given to Mrs. Marilyn Quillin after the meeting or in the next couple of days. The lists would be corrected and updated for inclusion in the next Chronicle.

The Chairman asked for a motion to approve the minutes, and this was made by Senator Richards and was seconded by Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh. The Senate then voted its approval.

**III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS** - The Chairman said that he had basically nothing to say today. In light of the fact that today's meeting would be short, he thought that he would leave his comments for the next meeting.

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - The Chairman wanted to welcome new Senators - Lawrence Gilpatric from C&T; Mary Wright from the students; Robert Huff, Laura Gelfand, and David Ritchey from F&AA. The body responded with a round of applause. He also noted that he had been remiss last month and had forgotten to mention reelected Senators. The following had been reelected from

A&S: Frank Griffin, Chand Midha and the Chairman himself. Jack Braun had been reelected from Engineering, and Peggy Richards had been re-elected from the part-time faculty. He welcomed them back and hoped that sanity would eventually prevail and that at some point they would stop coming. He included himself in that hope also.

The Chairman also announced that the Committee for the Status of Women would be conducting a survey to be sent to all of the full-time faculty. He had been asked by the committee to let the body know to spread the word so that as many people as possible could respond to the survey and send it back promptly.

When Senator Richards added that the survey was being sent to the entire campus community, the Chairman asked her to inform the body on this matter since she was a member of the committee and knew better about the information. She stated that the Status of Women Committee had been charged by the Provost to do an overview of the employment situation at the entire University. As a part of that report which they would be forwarding in March, they had prepared a survey that had been approved by the proper research people. Everybody in the campus community would be receiving this survey, and the committee needed to hear from as many people as possible. So please watch for it, complete it, and send it back so that there would be a good statistical report.

As a last announcement, the Chairman noted that the Senate still had not heard from the College of Business Administration and Wayne in regard to the names of their representatives to the Planning and Budgeting Committee. Senator Jay Patankar stated that he was the representative from Business, and Senator Forrest Smith said that he would continue from Wayne.

**V. REPORTS** - The Chairman stated that President had informed him that for unavoidable reasons he could not attend. Also, Provost Leathers had lost a sister a few days ago, and as a result of that death in the family he could not be here either. The first report would therefore be from the Executive Committee. However, he wanted to let the body know that no matter where it was at 3:45, the meeting would be adjourned. There would be a special meeting of the Senate next Thursday in this same room, and the main item on the agenda would be the report of the Campus Facilities Planning Committee plus whatever could not be finished today.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met last month several times to deal with a variety of issues, including certifying elections, making additional appointments to committees, and setting the agenda for today's meeting. It had also received a draft of a conflict of interest policy from Interim Associate Vice Provost Edwin Wilson for reaction and comment. After some discussion in committee and also with Associate Provost Wilson and Provost Leathers, it had been agreed that this draft would be put onto the Web and made available to all faculty for their reactions. Those comments were supposed to be sent to either Vice Provost Wilson or the Faculty Senate office by today, October 1, but he thought that given what had been happening on campus with everyone focusing on the presidential search, if you had not yet gotten it in there would still be at least a few more days to write up your reactions and send them by the middle of next week. These comments would be going to the Provost, and a final draft of the document would be presented to the Senate at its meeting in November for discussion and approval. He had been told that a member of the body might want to make a motion regarding this item later on when we got to new business.

Regarding the item which was listed under new business in today's agenda - the creation of a procedure for evaluation of upper-level administrators and Faculty Senate - the Committee in going through records discovered that even though this item had been passed by the body in November of 1995, it had never been sent to the President for reaction, comment and/or approval. For that reason, before anything else was done with it, the Committee decided that it might be a good idea to send it to President Ruebel. That was done on Tuesday at the committee's monthly meeting with the President.

Finally, in regard to the charge that had been given to the Committee last month about a 3% cap on the part-time faculty merit raise pool, the Committee had begun its investigation but had nothing to report at this time.

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE - Senator Norfolk said that the Committee did not have its report completed yet but would have one next month.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Sheryl Stevenson reported that the Committee had met on September 14 and had two items of business. The first was to find a Chair, and it had been determined that she would be the Chair, mainly because she had been determined not to be the Chair, but it had gone against her. The other item of business was a distance learning policy to show how courses got approved before going on the Web. The Committee had invited members of the Distance Learning Steering Committee and the Curriculum Committee, the Chairs of those committees, and Steve Myers to the meeting on October 12. Steve Myers' interim policy now in effect appeared in the April 23/May 7 May Chronicle.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Jean Blosser did not have a written report today because of problems the past few days with the server, but there would be a report at the next meeting. Starting next week, the Committee hoped that it would be announcing on email digest the proposals that would be available for University-wide review. There would also be a link to that curriculum proposal system so that the faculty could review them, and that was what they were working on now.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - Senator Norfolk reported that the Athletics Committee had met on September 15 and the members had all introduced themselves to Mr. Helsel, the new Athletic Director. He (Senator Norfolk) had been elected again as Chair because nobody else wanted the job. Mr. Helsel wished to cooperate with the academic side of the University, and so the Committee would be meeting with all the coaches periodically on a monthly basis. There would be lunch time discussions with them. Also, several members wanted to know what the charge of the Committee was, and he had given them the bylaws.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair, reported that the Committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting and would be meeting again on Friday. The major items for discussion were space utilization issues and a major initiative to fund new capital projects on campus. At this meeting, she wished to present on behalf of the Committee some non-controversial recommended actions on space changes. There were no problems with these. The first was the use of the basement area of Polsky's 64, currently used as storage for the Police Academy training in self-defense. They needed extra space and nobody minded that they used it; it was not a very useful area for anyone else. The second was the use of Crouse 315 and 316, currently assigned to Education. Geology would acquire this space so that graduate students from Geology

could move from Crouse 319, which was going to be converted into a geology lab with fume hoods and lab benches. Education would then be allocated office space in Carroll 55.

At the request of the Chairman, Senator Erickson presented these actionable items one by one. The first was: **The use of Polsky's Room LL 64, currently used for storage by the Physical Plant, by Public Service Technology for Police Academy training in self-defense.**

Since there was no discussion, the body unanimously approved the motion.

The second actionable item was: **The use of Crouse 315 and 316, currently assigned to Education, by Geology so that graduate students from Geology can move from Crouse 319. Crouse 319 is to be converted into a geology lab with fume hoods and lab benches. Education will be allocated office space in Carroll 55, already vacated by Electronic Systems.**

Again since there was no discussion, the body unanimously voted its approval.

Senator Erickson said that the second major item of business was the plan to borrow approximately \$150 million for capital improvements, and that was to be brought to the October meeting of the Board of Trustees. The Committee was currently discussing this proposal and would bring the report and recommendations to next Thursday's Faculty Senate meeting. This was a list of projects almost forgotten for capital improvements, and the Committee was considering it at the moment. At this point, all of this was just for the information of the body.

**VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - There was none.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS** - The Chairman noted that the item listed under new business had already been discussed by Secretary Oller in the Executive Committee report. When Secretary Oller said that he had nothing further to add to the earlier statement, the Chairman said that the floor was open for new business.

Senator Jack Braun wanted to address the issue of the conflict of interest and commitment draft. That draft submitted to the campus by email by the Vice President for Research, Dr. Wilson, on or about September 23 was a far-reaching document with serious professional, legal and financial implications for the members of the faculty of this University. The time by which Dr. Wilson had requested feedback was October 1, which was today. This document had been a long time in the making. It was rather impossible to have a campus-wide debate and collect organized information for such a comprehensive document in such a short time. Therefore, the discussion/debate period should be lengthened by at least one month and not a couple of days. It would also be a hasty action to adopt such a document before a new president was appointed. Therefore, he proposed the following: The Senate should assemble in a special meeting in order to start discussing this document. The authors of this document should be kindly asked to take part in that meeting in order to answer questions and/or clarify matters. A special committee should be elected by the Senate to deal with this document and to collect information from Senators, who in turn would collect information from their constituencies. Every college should be asked to provide their position in writing in regard to the document. This special committee should then report to the Senate and then it should vote on this

document. We could then assure that we had a campus-wide debate of such a motion. He introduced this as a motion and it was seconded by Senator Dan Sheffer.

Before opening this issue to the body for discussion, the Chairman wanted to give the genesis of this document and to what extent the Executive Committee had been involved with it. The Committee had been contacted by the Provost's office and had been asked to react to it since it was scheduled shortly to go before the Board of Trustees for consideration. At that point, the Committee had said that in order for it to provide that reaction it would need to seek input from the faculty at large. It requested the Provost's office to put the document on the Web and make hard copies available to faculty at large. Once receiving the faculty input, the Committee would pass that on before the Provost's office finalized the document. What had been put on the Web was a draft document. Once the document had been finalized by the Provost's office, it would come before this body for further discussion. That was the extent of the Executive Committee's involvement with this up to this point. He asked whether any other member of the Committee wanted to add anything. When no one did, he opened the floor for discussion of Senator Braun's motion.

Senator Chand Midha, having heard what Senator Braun and the Chairman had just said, wondered how many people had read the policy at this point. He had just received a copy, so he had not yet read it. If the Executive Committee had been charged to give comments which the faculty might have about the document, why did we need to appoint another subcommittee for that same purpose? It was a signal that you did not trust the Executive Committee and needed to appoint another committee.

When the Chairman replied that it was the prerogative of the body to overrule the Executive Committee, Senator Midha asked whether the Committee had received any comments yet. The Chairman responded that involvement in the presidential search had left little time to review any comments received and to formulate a response. Senator Midha felt that perhaps the deadline could be extended to October 15, and we could go from there.

The Chairman responded that this body could come up with whatever recommendation it liked to be presented to the administration.

Senator Mark Tausig noted that the University Research Council had met today to review this document. From the suggestions that had been made in that committee, the material was not going to be brought to the Trustees for at least another month, so he suspected that we already had that extra time for comments. He added that Ed Wilson had told him that to date he had received only three comments on the draft.

The Chairman added that as Chair of the Dept. of Economics also, he was a member of the University-wide Chairs Committee, and that Committee had endorsed the document with some suggested modifications and already sent their report to the Provost.

Senator Braun wanted to answer some of the issues already raised. First, the reason that he had suggested the mechanism he had was because the draft was a 30-page document. With hundreds of faculty sending in comments by email, etc., it would be a totally discombobulated way of handling this. That was why there had to be focus points that gathered information to be related in a very orderly manner. Insofar as Dr. Wilson's receiving only 3 comments, he could tell the body that in

the College of Engineering there were at least 20 people today that would offer comments. Insofar as the University-wide Chairs Committee was concerned, he had queried two department chairs in the College of Engineering and neither of them had the knowledge that such a document was actually afoot, much less had voted on the document.

The Chairman replied that as a member of the Committee, he had been giving the body an accurate representation of what had occurred as a matter of information.

Senator Braun concluded by emphasizing that if this document were treated lightly and not given an organized response, it would harm the University and the faculty, which was actually a major part of the University.

Senator Jesse Marquette was not sure that he supported the entirety of Senator Braun's motion. He had had the misfortune of reading this document, and it was clear that we needed to look at this very carefully. The research 2 initiative had been adopted, and this document was not positive; it was negative when you read it. "You are bad people, and we are going to catch you." Secondly, it violated laws of governance procedures at this University that we already had in place in terms of the question of academic misconduct and things like that. There were already committees which were supposed to do that. We did need to give clear and organized consideration to this, or else when we met next to consider the document we would wind up picking it apart again until there was a very clear analysis done. In addition to the problems with the tone and the violation of processes already in place, a third difficulty was that instead of saying we want you to go out and get money and do research, and we are going to tell you how to stay legal, which would be a proactive approach that should be adopted by a policy of this nature, what we had here was you can't do this and you can't do that. This bureaucratese was fitting for the University 15 years ago, but if we were going to try to reach research 2, this document was not saying the sorts of things it ought to.

Senator Sheffer wanted to speak in favor of the motion and the creation of a separate subcommittee to look at this rather than the Executive Committee, because the Executive Committee had so many other issues to look at at the same time. We needed to concentrate on our response to this conflict of interest proposal.

Senator William Rich, as a member of the Executive Committee, thought that it probably would be a good idea to have a committee focus on this issue rather than the Executive Committee. There were some very serious and legitimate concerns about the particulars of this policy that would need to be addressed and would surely need to be changed. Some things had already been mentioned. Another in general terms was the breadth with which this was written. It was simply not drafted carefully enough, and therefore it was too broad in important respects. He wondered though whether this was something about which we needed to specifically elect a committee rather than to follow the usual mechanism for forming a committee, which was that the Executive Committee appointed the members. If we were to have an election, it would be a good idea for the motion to be amended to specify a little more about the intended makeup, at least the number of committee members to be elected and the process to be followed. He urged instead that the committee be appointed in the usual fashion by the Executive Committee. He did not know whether that proposal was acceptable to the mover and the seconder, but he offered it as a friendly amendment.



Senator Braun said that if the body was in agreement with Senator Rich's amendment, he had no reason to doubt that the Executive Committee would elect a representative group. The only thing that he would like to make sure here was that it would be a representative group from the Senate that represented every college, and there would be genuine input.

Since there was some confusion about the wording and point of Senator Braun's motion, he reread the four points which were as follows: 1) **The Senate should assemble in a special meeting in order to start discussing this document. The authors of this document should be kindly asked to take part in that meeting in order to answer questions and/or clarify matters.** 2) **A special committee should be elected by the Senate to deal with this document, collecting information from Senators who in turn collect information from their constituencies.** 3) **Every college should be asked to provide their position in writing with regard to this document and it would be part of the working documents of that committee.** 4) **The special commission should then report to the Senate, and the full vote of the Senate should follow.**

The Chairman suggested that if the concern was just how to form the committee and what that formation should be, perhaps the body could vote on this motion and then later on if the motion carried, we could deal with the formation of the committee.

Senator Rich pointed out that the motion as reread still specified election. Now that it had been reread and he had been reminded of some of the language, it seemed to him that the ideas were good and we should do most of what had been suggested. However, the particular way it had been worded, while very detailed in some respects, was probably more constraining than it needed to be. His suggestion would be that the motion not be carried and instead that the Executive Committee appoint a committee along the lines that had just been suggested with representation of all the colleges. The spirit of the motion would still be adhered to. Therefore, he was speaking against the motion and would present what he had just suggested as another motion if one were necessary. It was within the power of the Executive Committee to do what had been proposed in spirit and largely in detail. It was his sense that the Executive Committee would be happy to do this.

Senator Erickson concurred with Senator Rich, and she saw a real need for this committee. However, she wondered whether a meeting before the committee had even been appointed and presented a report to the Senate would be a useful employment of time. It would be more appropriate for the members of the committee to meet with the authors of the document and to compare their thoughts. Then we could have our discussion after the committee brought its report to the Senate.

Senator Tim Lillie thought that it might be good to have some of these folks come before the body to explain why elements of this particular policy were needed so that in turn as Senate members, we could go back and explain it to other faculty members. After that we could act as a feedback mechanism to the smaller group. The whole essence of the motion as he saw it was to make sure that we had an informed discussion among all the people who might be involved. He strongly supported that.

Senator Dolli Markovich thought that staff and contract professionals should also be represented on this committee, so she made a friendly amendment which read as follows: **I**

**recommend that we'd like to amend that we have one person represent the staff and the contract professionals. This was accepted.**

Senator Norfolk wanted to argue against the motion even though he did not like the policy. There was a committee called Academic Policies. This should be their job; it was a fairly representative committee. They could call in anybody who wanted to discuss this issue. That was what they were in place to do. Why were we trying to create separate subcommittees again to do this?

Senator Braun replied that this was not academic policy. This was basically administrative policy that was being thrust upon the body of the faculty and staff. Moreover, since the staff was involved, Academic Policies had nothing to do with it. This concerned every single person who worked in this University, so he thought that there should be a special group. Whether they should be elected by the Senate or nominated by the Executive Committee, he bowed to the wisdom of that Committee.

Senator Rich agreed and added that this was much more general than academic policies. It did need a committee that was focused on this particular document. He would prefer that a little more flexibility be retained so that the Executive Committee could not only appoint members but design a process very much along the lines that had just been suggested in the motion. Since he was very much in sympathy with the motion, he found himself in the uncomfortable position of arguing against it but only to preserve a little bit of flexibility and to address some of the details in it.

Senator Lyn Chyi said that we needed the special committee because, for example, this conflict of interest document would affect members of the Dept. of Psychology and the consulting that they did professionally.

Senator John Edgerton asked whether Senator Braun would accept as a friendly amendment that the Executive Committee be empowered to make adjustments to the details or flesh out the details of his proposal as they saw fit. That would take care of a number of concerns that had been raised here. Then we could be more positive about the proposal but allow for intelligent adjustments, if necessary.

Senator Braun said that basically that would be okay, but he needed to know what the modifications would be.

Senator Frank Griffin remarked that in light of the time he did not think that the Senate could elect a committee today. He was very much in support of what was proposed here, but given the urgency he would like to see it turned over to the Executive Committee so that it could get started on this.

After some additional brief discussion on how to proceed, Senator Braun withdrew his motion and left it to the Executive Committee to implement as it saw fit, but he urged the Committee to actually cleave to the spirit of what he had proposed.

Senator Norfolk now moved that the Executive Committee in the next week should flesh out the details of this and come back to the Senate next Thursday and present a structure of a committee

October 1, 1998

Page 17

and how to deal with the issue. This was seconded by Senator Chyi.

Senator Braun wanted to add that what he had proposed should be the starting point for this, and this was acceptable to the mover and seconder.

Senator Mary Konkel asked that the body be encouraged to take a look at the document.

The Senate then voted on the motion and it carried unanimously.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT** - Senator Richards moved that the Senate adjourn until next Thursday, Oct. 8. This was seconded and the body voted its approval. The meeting ended at 3:50 p.m.

*Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillen*

**ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION**

We are once again updating the Chronicle mailing list. Please indicate whether you want to receive a copy of this monthly publication, **if you are not already on the mailing list**, or whether you want your name dropped from the list. Also, indicate whether there is a change in your Zip +4 for our records.

**\*NOTE:** The Chronicle is always available on-line through the Faculty Senate Web page at:  
<http://www.uakron.edu/facultysenate>

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/+4: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ I am currently **not** on your mailing list; please add my name.

\_\_\_ Please drop my name from your mailing list.

**Please return this form to Marilyn Quillin, CH 326 (+4910).**

