

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

11-5-1998

Faculty Senate Chronicle November 5, 1998

Heather M. Loughney
hl@uakron.edu

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.

Recommended Citation

Loughney, Heather M.. "Faculty Senate Chronicle November 5, 1998." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 5 Nov 1998. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/428>

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.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of November 5, 1998	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of November 5, 1998	16
A. Responses to Executive Committee from President Ruebel	16
B. Report of <i>University Well-Being Committee</i>	18
C. Report of <i>Academic Policies and Calendar Committee</i>	21
D. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	22
E. Report of <i>Athletics Committee</i>	25
F. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	26
G. Mission Statement of Ohio Faculty Council	28
H. Statement of Principles for Policy and Reporting Procedures for Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, Scholarly Misconduct and Ethical Conduct	29

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

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 5, 1998

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, November 5, 1998, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-eight of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators J.Buchanan, Fisher, Isayev, Murray, Ozanich, Richert, Stevenson, and Stewart were absent with notice. Senators Baldwin, Batur, Clark, Dhinojwala, Dubick, Ritchey, and Stinner were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * APPROVED THE LIST OF FALL 98 COMMENCEMENT CANDIDATES**
- * PASSED A RESOLUTION WELCOMING PROFESSOR LUIS PROENZA AS THE 15TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON**
- * PASSED A RESOLUTION OF THANKS TO PROFESSOR MARION RUEBEL AS 14TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON**
- * APPROVED TWO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chairman asked for any additions, etc. to the agenda, and Senator Peggy Richards noted that the body would be considering under item II only the minutes of October 1. The Chairman replied that "and 10/8/98" would be slashed from item II. Since there were no other changes, Senator Richards moved acceptance of the amended agenda, and this was seconded by Senator Thomas Bird. The body then voted its approval.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 1, 1998 - Secretary Gary Oller stated that he had no corrections. Since none were presented from the floor, Senator Richards moved approval of the minutes, and this was seconded by Senator Kris Gill. The Senate then approved the minutes.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - The Chairman, on behalf of the body as well as his own, wanted to welcome President Luis Proenza as the fifteenth President of The University of Akron. He also commended the Board, especially the Chair, Mr. Alex Arshinkoff, for making such an excellent choice. He was sure that everyone was looking forward to working with Prof. Proenza to accomplish the academic mission of this University.

The Chairman then wanted to inform the body that this was going to be the last meeting which he would chair, as he was going to submit his resignation as Chair of the Faculty Senate to Secretary Oller, effective November 30. At that point, the Vice-Chair, Barbara Heinzerling, would take over to finish the rest of the term. He wanted to seek her indulgence and admit that he had made a mistake. At the last meeting he had announced that there would be an election for a new Chair. At that point he had been going on a precedent because the last time this had happened, (Professor Don Gerlach had left in the middle of his term), there had been an election in which Senator Michael Cheung had been elected Chair. However, as had been correctly pointed out to him at the last Executive Committee meeting, there was no such provision in the Senate Bylaws. The Bylaws stated that where we could not use them as the guidelines, we should go to "Robert's Rules." "Robert's Rules" were very clear on this issue; namely, in the event that the Chair could not complete his term, the Vice-Chair stepped in and finished the term. Because his Parliamentarian (Prof. Gerlach) had been out of the country while this was going on, he had depended on the constitutional expertise of Senator Rich and the Executive Committee. Senator Rich confirmed that this would be an appropriate course of action with which he agreed. Therefore, starting on December 1, Senator Heinzerling would be the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Having worked with her for a year and a half, he was confident that she would do an excellent job. He would be working closely with her this month to insure an orderly and smooth transition, and he would still remain in the Senate through the end of December if she wanted him to be involved in dealing with some of the issues or ongoing initiatives. He wished her the best and would be turning over the gavel to her at the end of the meeting.

The Chairman then continued with the following remarks:

"Since this was my last meeting, I thought about my farewell speech and made a few drafts, and then threw them away, because I said I'm not going to be emotional. When I came to this body as a Senator, I was a rebel without a cause. I was just bouncing off walls because I hated everything that was happening at this University. I think what this body provided me, and especially the office of Chair provided me, was a unique perspective as to how universities function and why sometimes they don't function as quickly or as well as they should. So therefore, from a rebel without a cause I became a rebel with a cause, and my cause was shared governance. I'd be lying to you if I said I was not a cynic about shared governance before I came into this body. I didn't think anything happened except people talking, but over the last few years I have realized that yes, we can make a difference. That difference may at times be incremental, almost marginal, but we do make it and over years that incremental difference adds up and will definitely improve the environment in which both faculty productivity in all facets of their endeavors, as well as student learning, will improve. I firmly believe now that shared governance has moved past being a matter of choice. It has to become part of the campus institutional structure; it has to become part of the academic culture in the way we function and govern the University. And I tell you when I look across the body, that I see a dedicated bunch. I think any faculty at any University would be proud of this group.

I also would like to take this opportunity to thank President Ruebel over the last year and a half as Chair. He has come across to me as very accessible and very committed to shared governance. He basically was always there and available on very short notice, and whenever he made decisions, what always amazed me was that if there was a gray area, he always gave faculty the benefit of the doubt, and I thank you, sir, for that accessibility and that cooperation.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Provost Leathers and his staff. They were also very cooperative. I would like to thank the Senate liaison from the President's office - first it was Prof. Gigliotti, and now it is Prof. Walton. Both always have come across to me as faculty first and foremost and administrators second, and therefore, it was always easy to talk to them and deal with them and work with them. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Ted Mallo and the Board office for their cooperation and their willingness to work with the Senate. I would be remiss if I didn't thank my Executive Committee. This is a feisty bunch, but it's a bunch where we can argue, talk, listen, fight with each other, but yet we all come from the same perspective as to what is good for the academic mission of this University. I tell you that for these people I have a tremendous amount of respect because of their dedication and for their commitment.

I would like to talk about two other individuals - one, Marilyn Quillin. She does an excellent job, and she made the job of being Chair of the Faculty Senate very easy. Thank you, Marilyn, for that. Then last but not least, I would also like to point out Secretary Oller, because here's an individual who has a tremendous amount of institutional memory and memory about the Senate. I didn't know anything, and so whenever somebody asked me a question, I just called Gary. Gary would give me the answer and I went to this individual and gave him the answer without giving Gary the credit. And Gary knew that all along for a year and a half, and he did that for me and never complained once that I haven't given him credit. So I thought at least grudgingly today I'll give him credit for helping me out. Thank you, Gary.

The last thing I would like to say is thank you to this body for giving me the opportunity to serve as Chair of the Senate. It's a difficult job at times; it takes a lot of time and can be very frustrating. It can be aggravating, but I would be lying to you if I didn't say that I enjoyed every single moment. I found it challenging, but I found it exciting, and I finally realized that if you are on the right side and have the moral high ground on your side and have the ideal way of functioning on your side and keep making the argument, you may not make a perfect world but you will definitely make a better world. Therefore, I know you will continue the tradition of the Senate to pursue such a course of action, and I as faculty of this University, am very proud of this body and all of you and want to thank you for giving me the opportunity."

After the Chairman finished his remarks there was applause.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - First, the Chairman wanted to introduce a new Senator from Arts and Sciences - Annabelle Foos. The next item was the approval of the Fall 98 commencement candidates. There was a copy in the Senate office for members' perusal. He urged everyone to attend the commencement and see the final product going through that line, finally graduated. Senator Chand Midha moved approval of the list and Senator Richards seconded the motion. The Senate then voted its approval.

Finally, the Chairman asked the body to stand in a moment of silence in memory of Don Birdsell, Prof. Emeritus of Education and Associate Dean Emeritus, who had passed away last week, and the body did so.

V. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY - The Chairman recognized President Marion Ruebel, who made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to report from the Board meeting last week that we have taken the first step toward building a polymer engineering annex. The administration has authorized to advertise and interview appropriate architects and consultants to prepare construction documents for the annex. This will be next to the Olson Building.

Planning and architectural programming for Olin II is continuing, and soon architects will be consulting with affected departments to fine-tune the plans for the start of the building. We also are working very closely with Sasaki & Assoc. providing updated information for the campus development plan, and consultants will be on our campus later this month - I think four of them were here yesterday, but the entire team will be here later this month to meet with various University constituency groups.

The University also is continuing to excel on the academic front, and I especially want to recognize the School of Dance, Theatre & Arts Administration. The School has received continuing accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Dance.

I also am pleased to report that several faculty members have received special honors this past month - Prof. Dana Castle, who teaches contract and family law, has been awarded the School of Law Dean's Club professorship. This professorship was established in 1995 to honor excellence in teaching. Prof. Richard Kovach, whose specialty is tax law, has been awarded the C. Blake McDowell, Jr. professorship, a newly created professorship in the School of Law as a result of bequests from the late C. Blake McDowell, Jr. Both of these presentations were made at the Dean's Club dinner on Oct. 19. Also, on Oct. 21 Dr. Carole Garrison, professor of Criminal Justice Technology, was inducted into the Ohio Women's Hall of Fame. And Polymer Engineering professor, Avraam Isayev, recently was awarded the 1998 George Stafford Whitby Medal for distinguished teaching and research. The Whitby Medal is one of the highest honors in the world by the American Chemical Society and it is their only award recognizing both teaching as well as research. Dr. Isayev is the fourth member of our faculty to receive the medal since it was established in 1986.

Finally, I'm pleased to announce that the University police force has a new chief. Bill Lohrum has worked his way through the ranks, capably serving in a variety of positions including a year as Interim Chief, and just this past month was appointed as Chief of our Police Dept. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks and I'll entertain any questions."

There were no questions for President Ruebel.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Executive Committee had met on October 21 to discuss the question of succession of the Chair, and the results of that discussion had already been presented by the Chairman. It also had met with President Ruebel and Executive Presidential Assistant Walton this past week for the annual monthly meeting to discuss matters of mutual concern. The Committee had also received answers from the President to questions which it had raised in the past, and these would be printed in the Chronicle (**Appendix A**).

Finally, there were two resolutions to present to the body from the Committee. The first read as follows: **It is with pleasure that the Senate, on behalf of the entire campus, welcomes Prof. Luis M. Proenza as the 15th President of The University of Akron. The Senate looks forward to working closely with Professor Proenza and his cabinet to accomplish the academic mission of the University.**

The Senate voted its unanimous approval of this resolution.

The second resolution read as follows: **The Senate, on behalf of the entire campus, expresses its deep appreciation of the leadership provided by Professor Marion Ruebel as the 14th President of The University of Akron. Professor Ruebel's commitment to shared governance and his attempt to nurture the academic ethos of the University are a testimony to his academic leadership and have also gone a long way in restoring normalcy to the campus.**

The Senate voted its unanimous approval of this resolution as well.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Professor Al Lieberman, the Chair, thanked the body for the opportunity to speak. He introduced Steve Likovich from Peat Marwick, the University's consultant in the health care area, who would help in answering any questions regarding the draft of the health care proposal (Appendix B).

In reviewing the history of the Well-Being Committee's involvement with health care, he reminded the body that last year there had been an attempt to look into the health care plan at the University. Ultimately, not much had happened, but many people had become upset. This year, Provost Leathers, upon a request from the Board of Trustees, had asked the Well-Being Committee, which represented everyone - faculty and staff, to investigate ways to contain the health care costs of the University. The University presently spent more than \$11 million for health care insurance for all of its employees. With escalating costs, the Board felt that something had to be done. The Well-Being Committee had met a few times earlier this year and then opened up the discussion to the staff and faculty. It held a series of forums to receive input on this issue. Unfortunately, the attendance was not very good. Of the University's 2000 employees, less than 10% attended. In one week there were four forums here and one on Wayne's campus. The Committee took the suggestions which it had received from the attendees and began to work on a draft of a proposal. It then went back and had a second series of forums where a preliminary draft of a proposal was presented and discussed. After getting reactions to the preliminary draft at those meetings, the Committee prepared the draft with final recommendations which the body presently had before it. There was the possibility that the Committee would go before the faculty again for further comment. The Committee had been assisted in this preparation by Mr. Likovich and Desnay Lohrum, of the health care area at The University of Akron.

The Committee had found that there were many opinions as far as University health care was concerned. Some people liked HMO's, some didn't; some liked the indemnity, some didn't. This University was the only state university that still paid 100% of the indemnity-type of health care; many others had gone to the HMO and the PPO.

Professor Lieberman then began to go through the document and elaborate a bit on its elements. When he got to item 7 of the first section regarding a survey evaluation and review every

two years, Senator Dan Deckler raised the issue of holding the evaluation every two years. In order to get a true picture of how people were satisfied with their current carrier, there needed to be a yearly review, which could take many forms. A colleague had suggested a simple 10-question survey that would be sent out along with the yearly benefits package of materials. Professor Lieberman pointed out that normally the contracts were for two years, but he would take Senator Deckler's suggestion back to the Committee.

In continuing his overview, Professor Lieberman pointed out that for item 9 the Committee thought that part-time faculty should have coverage and should continue to have the choice that they presently had available. One problem was that not every carrier was willing to cover the part-time people. On the last plan the only choice available was Kaiser. He went on to note that item 10 was very controversial and had not been unanimously approved by the Committee. No one knew what this recommendation might cost, and that was the problem.

In regard to no. 9, Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh commented that many of her part-time colleagues had told her that the Kaiser plan had not worked well for them. It would be a great help if the part-time faculty could buy into the same plan that the rest of the faculty and staff had. Professor Lieberman reiterated that the problem was that not all carriers were willing to accept the part-time faculty.

President Ruebel wanted to know how the term "part-timer" was presently defined for purposes of the ability to buying coverage. How much did they have to teach? He raised this issue because in the case of the ERIP program there were people coming in and teaching one course for the University who were then entitled to the ERIP program and five years of retirement. Someone needed to pull together some numbers and see how much this would really cost.

In regard to the teaching load, Professor Lieberman thought that it was 6 semester hours. Mr. Likovich added that there was a formula that had been put together for different categories of individuals intended to get something that represented close to half of full-time employees. The Chairman suggested that the President ask Prof. Walton to check with Human Resources and see whether they could come up with some cost estimates.

Senator Susan Hanlon had a question about item 3, the graduated payments. Could Professor Lieberman talk a bit about the way this was presently done?

Professor Lieberman said that presently there were 17 levels for the deductibles. A person earning \$25,000 a year had a much lower deductible than a person earning \$50,000 a year. The Committee was suggesting that these 17 levels be lowered to 6. These levels would also kick in in relation to the Committee's recommendations regarding the indemnity plan as far as how much contribution would be required from each employee. This, too, would be based on your salary.

Senator Hanlon responded that what Professor Lieberman was saying was that higher-income people would have a higher deductible and would have to pay more for it. This seemed like a double whammy and was not fair.

Professor Lieberman then discussed the three types of plans which the Committee would be recommending from which University employees could choose - traditional indemnity plan, the PPO, and the HMO.

In regard to the indemnity plan, the following questions and discussion took place:

Senator Foos wondered whether the University would still be using the choice dollar system. Professor Lieberman responded that it was his understanding that there was no intent to do away with the choice dollar arrangement in terms of providing people with credit allocations to purchase benefits.

Senator Deckler asked whether the Committee had given any thought to keeping the 80 and 70% reimbursement levels and reducing the choice dollars. The reason that one did not see many people choosing those percentages was that most were provided with enough choice dollars to select the 90% option. If you gave enough choice dollars to select the 70%, but people had to pay extra for the 80 or 90%, you might find a lot of people dropping down to the 70%. Those people who then wanted to pay extra for the higher percentages could contribute a monthly amount, and that would be their choice.

Mr Likovich answered that it was true that there was little financial incentive for people to take the lower options. However, the PPO plan as it was set up, was in many ways offering similar opportunities to the 70% plan for people who did not want to pay for a plan at all and wanted a lower level of coverage without having the burden of managed care.

Senator Shelly Baranowski expressed her concern that the cost of the indemnity plan might become so prohibitive for some that it really was not a choice.

Senator Forrest Smith emphasized that it was important for the contribution levels to be communicated to University employees as early as possible and not when we got our packets. By then there would be a short time during the semester, and it would be nice to know as soon as Human Resources knew to give employees a chance to think and figure things out.

In regard to the PPO, the following questions and discussion took place:

Senator Jack Braun wondered how many of the major hospitals in the area would be included in the plans. If people were seriously ill, they would want to go to an authority in the area. Professor Lieberman replied that our ultimate PPO would be one that covered Akron City, Akron General, Cleveland Clinic, and University Hospital. The Committee was not sure whether there was one that existed which had all of those, but he had been told that one might be able to work something out.

Senator Braun also asked whether the list of hospitals and doctors involved in the system would be announced well in advance of people having to make decisions. Professor Lieberman replied that it would, but there was always the danger of how long your doctor would stay in the PPO.

Finally, Senator Braun was baffled because on the first page of the document there was the statement that this new health plan as instituted would have no negative change in the salary. Yet the

deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses were going to cost people more and that certainly would affect one's salary.

Professor Lieberman responded that the point here was that the University would not say that because the health care was going to cost it so much that it was going to have to give you a cut in pay. You might have to end up contributing more toward health care, but at least at the start there would not be any pay cut.

Senator Midha wanted to stress that there was no accreditation body for PPO's. On paper it sounded good, but we needed to make sure we were really choosing a first-rate system. Professor Lieberman replied that this was one of the first things the Committee would do. That was why the Provost had asked the Committee to start so early and be able to avoid a hasty decision.

Senator Deckler was concerned about item 4 under PPO. It said that special consideration would be given to people who lived outside of Summit County so that the PPO option "might" be made available to them. It did not say that it "would" be. He thought that the draft should be amended to say that it "must" be made available. These people were just as much employees of the University as those living in Summit County. They were supposed to have the same choices. It went on to say that "if possible" this would include contracting a second PPO to serve the unserved county. Again this should be a "must."

Professor Lieberman said that the proposal stated that these people would have a choice, but one had to be practical. There were University employees who lived in Columbus. Were we supposed to cover Franklin County too? People would still have a choice if the PPO was not favorable to them; they could always pick the indemnity plan.

The Chairman once more reiterated that this was a preliminary statement. These concerns could still be taken back to the Committee and discussed.

Senator Smith wanted to add to Senator Deckler's point. Although he taught at the Wayne branch, he lived in extreme southern Summit County. Last year when the PPO plan had been presented rather abruptly, he had looked at the ones offered and only one of the three had any of his doctors in it. Regardless of where you resided, your doctors might not be in the plan. Also, after two years if the PPO changed, there might be great disruption. Also, one might not know that one's doctor who was originally in the plan had left it. Whether we lived in Summit, Stark or Wayne County, the whole issue of the PPO was something that we ought to tread very lightly on. The widest area network that we could get though would be the best.

Senator Baranowski, an employee who lived in Columbus, realized that it had been her choice to work here. However, that choice had been between practicing her profession or not practicing her profession or remaining married or not remaining married. She was realistic enough to know the bind that the University was in. This was why she had made the point earlier about making sure that the indemnity plan, which she probably would end up choosing, would be a real choice and not so overpriced and out of reach that it became a no-choice.

Senator Deckler reiterated that if PPO's were not offered to employees in all of the pertinent counties, then the indemnity plan was not really a choice, it was mandatory.

Senator Brian Mormino commented that in the Student Senate what the body had been doing for the past hour would be called committee work. He thanked Professor Lieberman and Mr. Likovich for coming in and providing the two weeks of forums. It seemed that the people here had not gone to those.

Professor Lieberman answered that this was one of the things the Committee had been very disappointed about - less than 10% of those covered by the University health plan had attended those forums. At one of them there were 10 people and five were committee members.

The Chairman wanted to commend Senator Mormino for his comments. This was why we had students in the body to tell us what we should and should not do.

Senator Robert Huff had attended one of those forums last spring which led him to a question. Earlier, Professor Lieberman had said that 2/3 of the employees now used the indemnity plan. Did that include both faculty and staff? At the forum he had attended with 20 or 30 people, almost all of the faculty were in the indemnity plan. The staff from the Physical Plant who were at this meeting were in HMO's for financial reasons. Everyone in the HMO's seemed universally unhappy. Professor Lieberman replied that the 2/3 figure included both faculty and staff.

The Chairman noted that this was not the time for a wide-ranging debate on this. The idea was to present the body with this report so that it could get comments back to the Committee. Then the Committee would come back again next month with a final version for the body's approval. Were there questions which the body wanted the Committee to consider?

Senator William Rich asked whether there was an email address to which comments should be directed. The Chairman replied that if you sent your comments to the Faculty Senate email address, he would make sure the Committee would get them.

In response to Senator Deckler's question about how long this draft had been available, Professor Lieberman answered that about 90% of it had been presented in the second round of forums. Senator Elizabeth Erickson added that the original draft, slightly different from this one, had been on the web the entire month of October. It had also been presented at the Wayne College meetings.

In regard to the HMO, Senator Mary Konkel wondered whether the Committee could survey the people using the two current HMO's to find out their satisfaction. Unlike most of the faculty, she had been with HMO's all her life and swore by them. She had been helped much by them, but she was concerned that the one she was currently using might not be one of the choices; therefore, she wanted to comment on it. Prof. Lieberman told her to voice her opinion to the Committee.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Richards, speaking for the Committee and following the recommendation of the Chairman that the Chairs be brief in their reports, stated that there were no action items and she would turn in a report for publication in the Chronicle (Appendix C).

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Jean Blosser reported that she had submitted a written report (Appendix D), but she wanted to draw members' attention to a discussion which the Committee was having about how to review web-based courses. At this time, if it was an

existing course and the department was interested in converting it to a web-based course, it had to go through the traditional curriculum review process. The Committee was looking for a way of shortening the review process for those courses, and she was interested in any input or recommendations on how that might be achieved. There was a written report of the hundreds of proposals that were in the system now, and she hoped that members would take a look at what was involved regarding their colleges.

The Chairman added that any comments or recommendations could either be emailed directly to Associate Provost Blosser or the Faculty Senate office which would make sure that the Provost's Office received them.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - See Appendix E.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson, the Chair, presented a written report (**Appendix F**) and noted that the Committee had been meeting quite frequently for the past month on specific kinds of items. The first had been to provide an advisory role to make comments on the potential plans for the Gardner Student Center, and it had passed these comments back to Ted Curtis and to Ramesh Vakamudi. The meetings of the 23rd and 30th dealt with the second, which had been a review of the campus finance plan, and the Committee had two action recommendations for the Senate from the meeting. The first read as follows: **That the following buildings (not listed in a particular order) and other facility changes have the highest priority in any campus building plan: The Bulger Hall renovation and Brown/Ellis acquisition, the Arts and Sciences building (Olin II), the Polymer research building, Science and Technology Library, Research Support Facility Building (dealing with hazardous materials), and street closings.**

In a response to Senator Mormino's question about the Student Center or Recreation Center, Senator Erickson referred him to the rest of the written report. In the report the Committee noted a need for a parallel improvement in buildings related to student services and it had already discussed the Student Center. It would review the feasibility studies for the Rec Center at a later date. The Committee had not yet finished the whole list of items, but the ones listed in the recommendation were the highest priority ones.

In reply to Senator Rich, who wondered whether the street closings might imply some changes in buildings, Senator Erickson said that this just referred to the actual costs of closing streets.

Since there were no further questions, the body voted its approval of the first recommendation.

Senator Erickson then presented the second recommendation. This had grown out of the Committee's discussion regarding the Computer Center and what sort of center it should be. The Committee thought that the Computing and Communications Technologies Committee should look at the issue. The recommendation read: **That the CCTC should look at the alternative philosophies of computer center usage to help determine the nature of any new computer center building.**

The Chairman called for a vote on this recommendation and it passed unanimously.

Senator Erickson completed her report by mentioning that the Committee had met on the hazardous materials issue, and it would be bringing that to the December meeting of the Senate as requested.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Jesse Marquette reported that the Committee had met once and would be meeting weekly from now on. Material had been sent out to the departments and colleges for the planning process which he hoped would go a little bit smoother than last year.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - Senator Baranowski reported that the first news item was that the Board of Regents had asked for a 7% increase in funding for the next biennium from the state legislature. This meant that there had been extra added emphasis recently on the faculty sample survey (FSS) now in trial stages. There had been vigorous discussion about how to be included on the FSS as well as debates about what constituted faculty productivity. The goal was to somehow wean the state legislature away from thinking of faculty productivity only in terms of the number of hours that we physically stood in the classroom. The Chancellor of the Board of Regents seemed to be very receptive to OFC's suggestions and to its ability to lay out what it was that we actually did with our time.

The second major development had occurred in the last month, and that was the Chancellor's announcement of the new organizational scheme that had been devised for the OBR. He had one kind of administration that dealt with the day-to-day responsibilities, but he had also instituted another kind of organization consisting of a series of committees that would be more proactive in developing educational policies for the state. He had openly asked for faculty representation on these committees, which would mean actually meeting with the regents themselves who met on Thursday afternoons before the general Board of Regents meetings on Fridays. The Chancellor had asked that faculty actually sit at the table and contribute to the discussion. The OFC was working to take the Chancellor up on this offer and provide representation. The next meeting was the 13th of November and she would keep us posted. (See **Appendix G** for Mission Statement of the Ohio Faculty Council.)

Senator Cheung commented that almost all of the state universities had invested heavily in equipment that could be used for video conferencing. Might Senator Baranowski encourage the Chancellor to organize the committees around a video conference format so that faculty from anywhere in the state could participate without having to find their way to Columbus and back on Thursdays?

Senator Baranowski thought that this was a good suggestion because Thursday afternoons might not agree with a lot of people's schedules. The way this had been established now was that each member of the Executive Committee send someone as an official liaison, but the video conferencing was a good idea.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST COMMITTEE - Prof. Frank Falk, the Chair, had essentially three things to communicate to the Senate. The first was a document which Senators had received called "Statement of Principles" (**Appendix H**). He encouraged members to read this because these few pages would set the criteria for the development of the full-blown policy on the conflict of interest/conflict of commitment/scholarly misconduct and ethics. He believed that this would be the

preface or facing document, the public document, that would actually be available for everyone to understand, while the policy would sit in the background and be there for formal definitions and those kinds of things. The actual policy itself was somewhere in excess of 30 pages and contained many legal definitions.

There were three major concepts in this document which the body should keep in mind. The first was that a document of this kind should be an evolving document. With the complex nature of this kind of material, one could not come up with a document and say it was all done. From the Introduction to the document he then read, "It is recognized that these principles and any associated policy or reporting procedures represent an evolving set of documents. As of this date these principles do not represent a codified or rigidly defined set of rules." This was an important part of the process that the Committee was trying to set up here. The process was continuously evolving.

The second thing to keep in mind was a recognition that in our society the intellectual community had always been a contributing part of the overall community. We did not just exist as employees of a university, but rather, we had a broader sense of obligation. To recognize that in the first paragraph of the Principles section it read, "The University of Akron recognizes that external activities can advance its ability to provide high quality research and educational experiences for students. External activities congruent with the professional expertise of the Faculty or Staff Member and consistent with the mission of the corresponding department enhance the individual's professional development and enrich the learning community as a whole. In addition, activities such as licensing of technology, consulting or business start-ups are critical to meeting society's needs." So the recognition was right there from the beginning that this was part of what we were.

Finally, he wanted to point out that what a conflict of interest document was really all about was not disallowing. What it was about was disclosure, which was the most important thing to keep in mind about this document. Disclosure protected the faculty from any form of sanction. On page 2, third paragraph of the document it read, "Conflicts of interest and commitment need to be resolved fairly and expeditiously through disclosure and management at the lowest level of supervision consistent with the level of activity. Disclosure, discussion, and oversight will most often be sufficient to handle what would otherwise be an unacceptable conflict of interest or commitment. The process begins with disclosure. Disclosure is the fundamental principle of resolution. Disclosure is used to bring resolution not to impose sanctions. Resolutions of conflicts will be resolved in the least invasive way. Disclosure and participation in a resolution process protects the employee from sanctions. Failure to disclose conflicts of commitment or interest leaves the employee open to sanctions and possible legal action."

Prof. Falk went on to say that these were the principles which the Committee would have in mind as it was rewriting a draft document that had recently circulated. It was hoped to have the rewritten document in the Senate's hands by November 23 so that members would be able to read it before a formal presentation was made by the Committee at the December 3rd meeting. The Provost's Office had asked that we respond even more quickly, as they wanted to get the document to the Board at the December meeting. The Provost had asked him to have in his hands a draft of the document by the first of December. He did not see that as a big conflict, although he would not be sure that the draft would be passed by the Senate. The principles would guide the committee members who really wanted input from the Senators. The Committee was meeting every Monday morning, and the members should be congratulated because they were working very hard and doing a good job.

Senator Cheung was concerned about the apparent time line. If the Provost hoped to take this to the Board, it would essentially be presented to this body on December 3rd as very nearly a fait accompli, since materials for a Board meeting would have to be submitted even earlier than the Dec. 1 date he requested it from Professor Falk. Was he going with the Committee's draft and the Senate would essentially debate an issue that had already been decided?

Professor Falk responded that that could not be. Because he needed it for the December Board meeting, the Provost had originally insisted on 10 days turnaround time and he (Prof. Falk) had insisted that he would resign if forced to that time table. He had asked the Provost to send the principles to the COD and have them respond. He had also sent them to Senator Jerry Stinner as Chair of the University Chairs Committee and to Ed Wilson and the University Research Council for their response. With all of these constituencies involved, he failed to see how they would in fact take this to the Board in December, but that was their problem. He felt comfortable that we could have a draft document which we would present or disapprove. If the Provost wanted to do whatever he wanted to do with that draft, that was his business.

The Chairman said that as Senators we had to be a little more sensitive to the time line than Prof. Falk who was a non-Senator. It might be possible for the Senate to meet before December 1, if the Committee finished its work by November 23. This would come up against the Thanksgiving holiday, but perhaps something could be worked out with the Provost's Office.

In response to a question regarding an email address for the Committee, Professor Falk asked that responses be sent back to the Faculty Senate office.

Senator Dan Sheffer asked about which laws had to be followed in crafting this document. In terms of the Ohio Revised Code, did they apply to everyone in general, or individuals with federally funded grants, or the institutions that had federally funded grants?

Prof. Falk first noted that the statutory authority which he used were primarily the NSF Guidelines in order to set the criteria. The federal guidelines were in place for any university. Now if we got rid of all research and all the graduate programs, you might think that we were safe. However, as long as you wanted students to get federal loans, you still had to comply with the federal guidelines. So that was not an option. When he had come here ten years ago, he had been shocked to find out that we did not have a conflict of interest policy. He had been operating under one for years. It was a tremendously protective mechanism for the faculty, and it was really important when you got into technology. So you had to meet the federal guidelines. The Ohio Code which also had to be met was more difficult to deal with. He was glad that Paul Richert, the Law School librarian, was on the Committee. The serious problem here was that it was essentially being used on a case-by-case basis, case law based. For example, the Ohio Code said that if you were a faculty member, it did not apply. However, it defined you as being in an administrative position if you oversaw a graduate student or if you had any grant funds, and then it immediately applied. So the interpretation became very case-based and the Committee did not have a good handle on it.

The Chairman again raised the possibility of a special earlier meeting to deal with this issue. Prof. Falk urged the body to simply point out to the Provost that he had received a draft of a committee report and it had no authority under the point of view. Then we were being cooperative and sharing information.

Senator Marquette agreed with Prof. Falk that December 3 was the date the Senate would decide this. The Provost just needed to adapt to that because we had to live with this policy permanently, and it made no sense to rush this document in for a particular meeting. Prof. Falk added that we would not be living with something in a permanent kind of sense. It had to be an evolving document. The Chairman said that the concerns of the body would be conveyed to the Provost.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - There was none.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Baranowski proposed that the Senate recommend to the Board of Trustees a change in the University's tenure rule. She wanted the Board to consider awarding automatic tenure to new faculty who were hired into the University if they had been tenured at their previous institutions. At present, this was not allowed.

The Chairman asked her to make a formal motion, and after it was seconded, a discussion could begin.

Senator Baranowski moved that the Faculty Senate propose to the Board of Trustees that a change be made to the University rules on tenure to allow for the hiring with automatic tenure new faculty to the University if they have been tenured at their previous institution. For clarification purposes, the Chairman asked whether this would be in rare and compelling circumstances or under any circumstances. Senator Baranowski replied that it would be under every circumstance. The motion then died for lack of a second.

Senator David Redle pointed out that there were some potential changes to University rules floating through the Council of Deans, and he believed that some changes had been proposed to facilitate some of the issues which Senator Baranowski might be referring to.

Dean Roger Creel asked for permission to address the body, and it was given. He noted that at the last COD meeting, the deans had recommended a change in the language to the Provost on this issue. At present it goes something like, "In rare and compelling cases, tenure can be granted on an appointment of professors or distinguished professors provided it has a positive vote of the appropriate faculty body." The deans have proposed adding "associate professors" to this along with the phrase "if they are tenured at another university." That had been passed by the deans and given to the Provost. There had been some question as to what the Provost should do with that, and the deans decided that it was up to him to decide.

In response to Senator Cheung's question as to whether the language remained that made it clear that for an offer of tenure to be made the department tenure committee would still have to vote, Dean Creel said that this was absolutely the case.

Prof. Walton asked for permission to address the body which was given. He reminded the body that the motion which Senator Baranowski had made had been addressed to the Board and it should have been addressed to the President. The Chairman agreed, but the motion had died for lack of a second. Senator Tim Norfolk added for that reason the body should not even be discussing it.

The Chairman responded that it was not. Professor Walton had asked to address the body, and he had done so with unanimous consent.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - There were no comments.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn, which was made by Senator Cheung and seconded by Senator Midha. The body voted its approval and the meeting ended at 4:45 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin



Office of the President
Akron, OH 44325-4702
(330) 972-7074 Office
(330) 972-8652 Fax

APPENDIX A

Office of the President

October 16, 1998

To: Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary
Faculty Senate

FROM: Marion A. Ruebel *MP*
President

Subject: Responses to Questions Raised during the Executive
Committee Meeting on September 29, 1998

1) Pay Schedules of Part-time and Emeriti Faculty

I have discussed the pay schedules for part-time and emeriti faculty with Interim Provost Leathers. Our conclusion is that since these pay schedules were just approved during the Spring, 1998, for the current academic year, the schedules will be evaluated again during the Spring of 1999, based on the 1998-99 history to see if additional adjustments should be made.

2) Cap and Limitations on Part-time Faculty

Interim Provost Leathers indicated that there was not a 3 percent cap on part-time salary increases. The raise pool given for all faculty was 5 percent. While merit raises were developed within specific units, it was necessary to allow for fringe benefits for part-time faculty as adjustments were made.

Dr. Leathers confirmed an 8 semester credit-per-year teaching restriction for retired part-time faculty. We believe this is a sound policy, particularly in view of the fact that many part-time faculty have retired under ERIP.

3) Administrative Evaluation Proposal

The administrative evaluation proposal, which was initially developed in November, 1995, was referred officially to me during a meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Tuesday, September 29, 1998.

Dr. Gary Oller
October 16, 1998
Page -2-

My review of the proposal raises questions as to the appropriateness and timeliness of such an evaluation at this point, since the proposal was apparently conceived prior to my current tenure as president during a period when the institution was experiencing significant difficulties. My fundamental question is what would be the purpose of the evaluations, and what would be done with the results of the evaluations after they have been completed?

Beyond that, I have several operational questions:

- 1) Would the evaluations be formative or summative in character?
- 2) Against what specific standards would administrative performance be judged, and who would determine those standards?
- 3) Would there be a component of self-evaluation, and would the administrator being evaluated have a chance to respond in writing to the results?

I would urge the Faculty Senate or a committee thereof to examine these questions carefully, and resolve them before moving forward with an administrative evaluation process.

cc: Interim Provost Leathers

Attachments

APPENDIX B**UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS ON GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE**

The University Well-Being Committee (UWBC), drawing upon the findings of the Group Health Initiative Meetings held in the Spring of 1998, using the resources of KPMG Peat Marwick and Benefits Administration at The University of Akron, and relying on feedback from faculty and staff of the University, submits the set of recommendations noted below to the Faculty Senate.

The UWBC views with concern the request to evaluate our healthcare plan and the recommendation of options that may not be as beneficial to the individual employee as the plan now in place. It has been documented that salaries at The University of Akron are low when compared to other state-supported schools and comments made at the Group Health Initiative Meetings indicated that some people came to the University because of the health benefits. For those employees who choose to stay with a Traditional Indemnity plan, the required monthly contribution results in, effectively, a decrease in salary. The UWBC therefore considers that highest priority be given to the following points:

1. The new health plan, when instituted, will have no overall net negative change in the salary and benefit pool, and any overall initial savings will be put toward improving the salary/benefit package available to employees, possibly including improvement of the dental, vision, and long-term disability benefits;
2. Employees will have a healthcare choice, without regard to the geographic area in which they live;
3. Contributions to cover a Traditional Indemnity plan, as well as deductibles and out-of-pocket maxima in the Indemnity and PPO plans will be graduated according to compensation level such that those least able to pay will be the least affected;
4. There will be no changes in other aspects of the present plan (such as Flexible Spending Accounts) and the life insurance options will remain the same;
5. With the recognition that the University must be able to contain healthcare costs, we also recognize the need that any cap the University places on healthcare costs be flexible, being dependent upon a reasonable medical-care cost trend factor;
6. Given the importance of health benefits to faculty and staff, three members of the UWBC should be included in the group that will design and review bids for the plan;
7. A survey evaluation and review of healthcare must be conducted and reviewed by the UWBC after two years;
8. An independent audit of payments made by the University to healthcare providers should be conducted for PPO and Indemnity plans, such an audit must not result in any net cost to the University.
9. For part-time faculty now able to purchase health coverage through the University, the possibility of purchasing coverage through the Indemnity plan and the PPO as well as the HMO will be investigated; those individuals will have at least one option for health care coverage,

10. The resolution of January 1, 1992, that excludes from health coverage the spouses and dependents of retirees having 10 years or more service to the University should be revoked; at present, only those employees hired before 1992 have the option of having dependents covered by the health plan after their retirement; the possibility of including the PPO and HMO as carriers along with the Indemnity plan must also be considered.

With the above points in mind, the UWBC recommends that in January, 2000, the University move to a system that includes three basic plans from which the full-time faculty and staff may choose: a Traditional Indemnity Plan, a Preferred Provider Organization, and multiple Health Maintenance Organizations. The outline of recommendations for each plan is as follows:

A. Traditional Indemnity Plan

1. The Traditional Indemnity Plan as it now exists will be continued with the 90% reimbursement level only;
2. Recognizing cost savings available from the PPO and HMO choices, the Traditional Indemnity Plan will be contributory;
3. Such a contribution as noted in 2 should be implemented in phases: the first phase will require the employee to pay 50% of the difference of the cost between being part of the Indemnity Plan and part of the PPO (2000-2002), the second phase will require 75% of the difference to be paid (2002-2004); at the start of the year 2004, the employee will be paying the full difference between the two plans;
4. Following the initial phase-in, the contribution increases for those covered by the Indemnity Plan should be limited by a reasonable medical-care cost trend factor;
5. The contribution for those wanting to remain in the Traditional Indemnity Plan should be imposed for all groups taking part in that plan (employee only, employee plus children, employee plus spouse, employee plus spouse and children);
6. The contribution required for the Indemnity Plan will be known by employees prior to making their group health choices in the Fall of 1999;
7. Contribution levels, levels of deductible and out-of-pocket maximum amounts will be graduated by compensation levels and six (6) gradations of salary will be used;
8. The Indemnity option will retain a prescription drug plan with a copayment format;
9. The Indemnity plan contributions will be pre-tax.

B. Preferred Provider Organization (PPO)

1. No contributions will be required for the PPO;
2. Levels of deductible and out-of-pocket maximum amounts will be graduated by compensation levels and six (6) gradations of salary will be used;
3. The PPO selected will match the hospital charge utilization and the professional charge utilization of the existing indemnity plan as closely as possible;
4. When selecting PPO providers, special consideration will be given to employees in Medina, Wayne, Stark, Portage, and Cuyahoga counties, in addition to Summit County, so that a PPO option may be made available to them; if possible, this will include contracting a second PPO to cover the unserved counties;
5. The PPO option will include a prescription drug plan with a copayment format;

6. After meeting appropriate deductibles, in-network reimbursement will be at a 90% level up to the out-of-pocket maximum while out-of-network reimbursement will be at a 70% level up to that appropriate out-of-pocket maximum;
7. The PPO option should include items, such as a copayment system for physician office visits, that make the plan usable to those needing only routine medical care or preventive care;
8. The PPO must be an organization of recognized high quality.

C. Health Maintenance Organization(s) (HMO)

1. No contributions will be required for the HMO;
2. When selecting HMO providers, special consideration will be given to employees in Medina, Wayne, Stark, Portage, and Cuyahoga counties, in addition to Summit County, so that an HMO option may be made available to them;
3. The HMO option(s) will include a prescription drug plan with a copayment format;
4. Any HMO chosen must be a high-quality, accredited organization.

APPENDIX C

Report of Academic Policies and Calendar Committee

APCC met on October 12 and October 26. The primary business for both meetings was policy issues with regard to the curriculum review process for Web-based courses and Distance Learning courses. Representatives from the Distance Learning Steering Committee, the Curriculum Review Committee, and the School of Business attended our meeting on October 12, so that the APCC could learn more about courses that have already been approved and offered in either format, as Web-based or distance Learning courses. Questions were raised about how such changes in course delivery should be handled in terms of the established curriculum review process. Discussion also focused on clarifying the relationship between the regular review process and the interim policy for Web-enhanced, Web-based, and Distance Learning courses, brought forward by Steve Myers last spring.

When APCC met a second time, on October 26, we continued our discussion concerning curriculum review procedures for such courses. We hope that we will soon bring a recommendation concerning this policy to the Senate for approval.



APPENDIX D

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost
Akron, OH 44325-4703
216-972-7593 216-972-8699 Fax

**REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE
CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 5, 1998**

The Curriculum Review Committee has met twice since September, 1998. The Committee's activities to date include:

- **Discussing the current web-based curriculum review process to identify changes that can be implemented to improve campus awareness, accessibility, and user-friendliness**
- **Forming subcommittees**
 - **Liaison to the Distance Learning Subcommittee**
 - **Liaison to the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee**
 - **Development of a format for listing curriculum proposals that are available for university-wide review regularly on the E-mail Digest**
- **Determining steps that can be taken to increase efficiency of the proposal system. The committee is considering the possibility of shortening the time period for university-wide review for course changes such as name and number changes.**
- **Reviewing proposals that have been submitted to date.**
- **Discussing how to review proposals for web-based courses. The committee concurs with the current policy: Proposals for existing courses that are being developed as web-based courses must be submitted to the CRC for review. They should be submitted as "course changes".**

DEADLINE FOR 1999 PROPOSALS

The deadline for submission of proposals is November 20, 1998 (the 12th Friday of the Fall Semester). Only proposals with the status "Approved for University-wide Review on November 20, 1998 can be guaranteed review in time for Fall 1999 implementation.

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL HARDCOPIES AVAILABLE IN BIERCE

A hardcopy of the 1999 curriculum proposals will be placed on reserve in Bierce Library after the status has been changed by the college contact to "Approved for University-Wide Review". Comments can be submitted to the Office of the Provost and CRC by e-mail via the web system. At Bierce, ask to see "UA Curriculum Proposals". The proposals will be available in the Reserve Room for faculty review. They will be designated "For Room Use Only". We are just getting this organized so it may take a few weeks before it is accessible.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL STATUS FOR CURRICULUM PROPOSALS
SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW TO DATE****Number of Proposals Under Development by College**

Arts and Sciences	(72)
Business	(23)
Education	(12)
Engineering	(25)
Fine and Applied	(14)
Provost Office	(1)

Number of Proposals Available for Collegiate Review

Arts and Sciences	(30)
Business	(5)
C & T	(16)
Fine and Applied	(11)
Nursing	(2)
Polymer Sci/Eng	(1)

1998 Proposals Still Listed as Not Yet Finalized (Notify Provost Office if status has changed).

FAA-98-34
UC-98-01
AS-98-47
AS-98-70

Proposals Approved for University-wide Review (Includes only proposals for program changes or new programs/courses; does not include course changes)

PROPOSAL NUMBER	PROPOSAL TYPE	PROPOSAL TITLE
CT - 99 - 02	Program Change	Manufacturing Eng Tech (Credit by-pass)
CT - 99 - 03	Program Change	AAS Surveying & Construction Eng Tech: Surveying Option
CT - 99 - 04	Program Change	BS Surveying & Mapping
CT - 99 - 05	New Program	Certificate Program in Surveying Technology
CT - 99 - 06	Program Change	BS in Construction Engineering Technology
CT - 99 - 10	Program Change	Community Services Tech: General Option
CT - 99 - 12	Program Change	Fire Protection Technology
CT - 99 - 14	Program Change	Educational Tech, Child Development
CT - 99 - 15	Program Change	Mechanical Engineering Technology
CT - 99 - 18	Program Change	Medical Assisting Technology
CT - 99 - 21	Program Change	Associate of Arts
CT - 99 - 23	Program Change	Com. Services Tech: Social Service Emphasis
WC - 99 - 02	Program Change	Business Mgmt. Tech.-Data Management Option: Software Emphasis
WC - 99 - 03	Program Change	Business Mgmt. Technology-Data Mgmt. Option: Networking Emphasis
WC - 99 - 04	Program Change	Network Management Specialist Certificate
WC - 99 - 05	Program Change	Information Processing Specialist Certificate
WC - 99 - 06	Program Change	Computer Service and Network Technology

Check the Web to view all course proposals including those that are for course changes only.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jean Blosser
Associate Provost

APPENDIX E

Report of Athletics Committee

The Athletics Committee has been conducting regular meetings, at the request of Dennis H Helsel, the new Athletic Director.

Below is a brief synopsis of the discussions to date:

Tuesday, September 15

1. Re-elected Tim Norfolk as Chair.
2. Was introduced to Dennis Helsel, and discussed his philosophy and plans for the Athletic Dept.

Tuesday, October 13, 1998

1. Discussed the Men's Basketball program with Head Coach, Dan Hipsher.

Tuesday, November 10, 1998

1. Discussed the Women's Softball program with Head Coach, Deanna Parks.
2. Briefly discussed the incident involving the University soccer players.
3. Listened to a presentation by Dennis Helsel on fund-raising plans, plans for the athletic facilities, and long-term plans, with specific emphasis on gender equity and the next NCAA report (2003-2004).

Respectfully submitted by
Tim Norfolk, Chair

**REPORT OF CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 5TH, 1998**

CFPC has met four times since the last Senate meeting: on October 19th, 23rd, 26th and 30th.

On Monday, October 19th, CFPC reviewed the Program of the proposed new and /or renovated Gardner Student Center. On the basis of that discussion the Committee in its advisory role made the following suggestions to the University Architect and Planning Officer, for consideration in the initial planning of the building:-

1. Dining facilities for students
Members of the Committee were concerned that the dining area in the food court was only 8,400 sq. ft. plus the café area of approximately 1,700 sq. ft. They pointed out that the present area was over 20,000 sq ft. The Program still incorporated a Resident Hall dining area: now that it seemed that this would not be included, space for eating needs might not be adequate, especially during lunch hour periods.
2. Dining facilities for faculty and Staff
Many Committee members expressed their real concern about the lack of any faculty dining area. They pointed out that many faculty are part-time and may not have real office space. A dining area was necessary for their eating and meetings as well as providing a place for faculty to congregate on campus.
3. Computer area and study area needs
Given that the Survey of Student Needs stressed the need for adequate computing facilities and study areas, the plan in the Program to provide only 30 computer stations seemed inadequate. Would it be possible to increase the stations - it seemed that 60-90 stations could be provided in the space available? Members also noted their experience of lack of study space on campus.
4. Bookstore needs
It was noted that the bookstore space had been increased to 18,000 sq ft. The Committee understood that the increase was to incorporate a shift of bookstore facilities from Polsky's. However it was noted that the bookstore had greater square footage than the dining area. Some members pointed out that on some other campuses the dining area/bookstore ratio was 2:1. Perhaps there could be a consideration of reallocation of some of the bookstore space.?
5. Incorporation of the Student Advising into the Student Center
Given the need to meet dining and meeting room needs in the Program without increasing the size of the facility, the Committee questioned the need to move Advising into the Center (with the use of about 7,000 sq ft of space). Had the possibility of siting the new Student Services Building nearby been considered, which could include advising.
6. Billiard and bowling area.
The Committee concurred with the suggestion of the Director of the Student Center that these facilities might be better incorporated into the proposed Recreation Center.

It should be noted that the building is in preliminary design phase. No decision has been made on when or where this building will be built (or renovated).

The meetings of October 23rd and 30th reviewed priorities in the Campus Finance Plan. To this point the Committee makes the following recommendation for Senate endorsement:-

That the following buildings (not listed in a particular order) have the highest priority in any campus building plan:-

**Bulger Hall Renovation & Brown/Ellis Dorm acquisition
Arts & Sciences Building (Olin II)
Polymer research building
Science and Technology Library
Research Support Facility Building
Street Closings**

This first list of buildings etc. is estimated to cost approximately \$30 million. Some of the list are in process or about to commence. The others are those which seem to us of highest priority to the academic mission of the university. The Committee is considering further parking options and a possible modification of the Auburn Science Parking Deck. They note also the need for a parallel improvement in buildings related to student services. We have discussed the Student Center and are considering further other priorities. We understand that feasibility studies are to start concerning a Student Recreation Center and we shall review these at a later date.

In the process of discussing needs for buildings in the future, the issue of the computer center was raised. It seemed that there needed to be a discussion of the role of the computer center versus other computing sites. The Committee makes the following recommendation for Senate endorsement:-

That CCTC should look at the alternative philosophies of computer center usage to help determine the nature of any new computer center building

The CFPC meeting of October 26th discussed the issue of hazardous materials. As requested by the Senate, we shall bring the results of that discussion to the December Senate meeting.

We note that Sasaki and Associates will be on campus on November 19th and 20th. They will meet with the Campus Development Guide Planning Committee on November 20th. A member of CFPC has been asked to be apart of this Committee..

The next meeting of CFPC is on Friday, November 13th, at 3:15 p.m in ASC 105 if anyone would like to attend.

Elizabeth Erickson



CFPC Chair

APPENDIX G

MISSION STATEMENT OF THE OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL:

The Ohio Faculty Council (OFC) represents the faculty at all of the four-year public colleges and universities in the State of Ohio. It is recognized by the Chancellor and the Ohio Board of Regents.

I. The Ohio Faculty Council is composed of two faculty representatives from each of the four-year public institutions of higher education in the State of Ohio. One representative shall be the Chair of the Faculty Senate or the comparable elected faculty leader. The other shall be a person whom the Faculty Senate or comparable body elects to be a representative to the OFC. Whenever feasible, each representative shall serve a two-year term. Terms shall be staggered within each institution's two-member delegation in order to maintain continuity.

II. The Ohio Faculty Council addresses concerns common to faculty members of the four-year public colleges and universities and issues crucial to the citizens of Ohio that are related to higher education.

III. The Ohio Faculty Council maintains a permanent liaison with the Ohio Faculty Senate of Community and Technical Colleges.

IV. The Ohio Faculty Council presents a faculty perspective on major issues affecting higher education to the Chancellor, the Ohio Board of Regents, officials of the State of Ohio, the administrations of four-year public institutions of higher education, and the general public. These activities incorporate, but are not limited to, the functions of the former Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents (FACBOR).

V. The Ohio Faculty Council espouses strong and consistent faculty influence at the state level on issues and policies related to higher education.

VI. The Ohio Faculty Council advocates shared governance at all levels so that faculty participate in formulating academic policies appropriate to each college or university.

APPENDIX H

1

Draft: 11/2/98

Statement of Principles for the Policy and Reporting Procedures for the Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, Scholarly Misconduct and Ethical Conduct**Introduction**

It is recognized that these principles and any associated policy or reporting procedures represent an evolving set of documents. As of this date these principles do not represent a codified or rigidly defined set of rules. The complexity of the subject matter is such that the current policies and procedures will need a periodic formal review by the senior research officer of the university with the advice of the faculty senate and other bodies which have interest (Purdue, 1995). For clarification of definitions and guidelines see Policy 3359-11-13 Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, Scholarly Misconduct and Ethical Policies and Procedure (Revised).

Principles

The University of Akron recognizes that external activities can advance its ability to provide high quality research and educational experiences for students. External activities congruent with the professional expertise of the Faculty or Staff Member and consistent with the mission of the corresponding department enhance the individual's professional development and enrich the learning community as a whole. In addition, activities such as licensing of technology, consulting or business start-ups are critical to meeting society's needs (Purdue, 1995).

At the same time, all members of the University must be committed to conducting themselves in accordance with the highest standards of integrity and ethics. This includes identification of the potential for conflicts of interest and the assurance that they do not improperly affect the conduct of University activities. These principles are not intended to eliminate all conflicts of interest but to set forth the guidelines and procedures for proper disclosure and management of these situations (Purdue, 1995).

The professional expertise of faculty and professional and scientific staff is expected to be devoted principally to the performance of their teaching, research, and service obligations to the University. Historic custom and practice, however, within this and other universities has shown that it is beneficial to the University, the employee, and the external community for employees to devote some of their professional expertise to outside activities (Wilson, 1998).

When employees engage in outside activities unavoidable conflicts of interest may arise. When these conflicts emerge they need to be disclosed and managed to assure that the employee's integrity and objectivity in the performance of University responsibilities are not compromised and that their conflict of commitment does not unduly interfere with the time they devote to their University obligations.

Conflicts of interest and commitment need to be resolved fairly and expeditiously through disclosure and management at the lowest level of supervision consistent with the level of activity. Disclosure, discussion, and oversight will most often be sufficient to handle what would otherwise be an unacceptable conflict of interest or commitment. The process begins with disclosure. Disclosure is the fundamental principle of resolution. Disclosure is used to bring resolution not impose sanctions. Resolution of conflicts will be resolved in the least invasive way. Disclosure and participation in a resolution process protects the employee from sanctions. Failure to disclose conflicts of commitment or interest leaves the employee open to sanctions and possible legal action (Wilson, 1998, Purdue, 1995).

Procedures

Any specific activities noted within this document are not intended to be inclusive and serve only to illustrate the nature of situations which can give rise to conflicts of commitment and interest. These situations call for interpretation and review with the immediate supervisor within the context of the faculty and staff member's professional area, and the extent, nature, and consequences of involvement in specific outside activities (Purdue, 1995).

Some activities are routinely allowable without approval but with timely notice to the immediate supervisor because they are (a) accepted practices and (b) generally minimal in their personal financial impact and impact on the University. Examples of such activities: public service in community service agencies, royalties for published scholarly works or institutional royalty sharing, honoria, or prizes and awards for professional recognition, routine activities for professional organizations and associations.

All forms of activities, not routinely allowable, which involve a time commitment of one day or less during the five-day forty-hour work week or activities for which a full-time employee receives remuneration of less than \$10,000.00 must be reported to the immediate supervisor (e.g. department chair or supervisor) in written form with simple statements of what is being done, for whom, and at what level of compensation. Approval is required prior to engaging in any such activity. If there is no significant conflict of interest or commitment and the activities are common, the immediate supervisor may approve and file the report with signed approval in the department or equivalent level personnel file. Examples of such activities include: those in which the employee receives less than \$10,000.00 during the university employment contract, extensive activities for professional organizations and associations, time commitments of one-day or less on average during the work week.

All other forms of activity which involve a time commitment in excess of one day on average during the five-day forty-hour work week or activities for which a full-time employee receives remuneration valued at \$10,000.00 or above must be reported to the immediate supervisor (e.g. department chair or supervisor) in written form with simple statements of what is being done, for whom, and at what level of compensation. Approval is required prior to engaging in any such activity. If the immediate supervisor approves, he or she will, with signed approval, forward the request to their immediate supervisor (e.g. college dean or division director). If the intermediate supervisor approves, he or she will, with signed approval, forward the request to the appropriate central administration officer (e.g. Senior Research Officer or Executive Director for Human Resources). If the central administration officer approves, the request will be approved

and kept on file at that location. Should a request be denied at any level and the employee disagrees, an ad hoc compliance committee will be convened with five appropriate members selected by the central administration officer. This committee may suggest appropriate oversight or management procedures to ensure no conflict of interest or commitment or may recommend other forms of amelioration.

	Routinely Allowable	<1 day/wk. <\$10,000/yr.	>1 day/wk. >\$10,000/yr.
Report	X	X	X
seek approval from immediate supervisor		X	X
seek higher approval			X

References

Purdue University, Executive Memorandum No. C-39, October, 25, 1995.

Wilson, E. Draft Statement on Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, Scholarly Misconduct and Ethical Conduct Policies and Procedures, October 12, 1998.

Yearly Report

Each year on April 30 every employee will answer a questionnaire which discloses any activities which could represent a significant conflict of interest or commitment. Such a questionnaire will not substitute for the immediate request for approval of activities that might constitute a conflict of interest or commitment.

Yearly Conflict of Interest and Commitment Report

Employee Name: _____

Employee Title: _____

Employee's Department: _____

Instructions: Every employee of the University of Akron must disclose activities which might be considered a conflict of interest or commitment to their employment. If you respond yes to any of these questions you may be required to provide additional information. If the employee responds no to all of the questions this report will remain on file in the employee's department personnel file. If the employee answers yes to any of the questions the immediate supervisor should secure simple statements that describe the activity and forward the report to the intermediate supervisor

1. Did you engage in any activities which involve a time commitment during the five day forty hour work week or activities for which you received payment or recompense that did not receive required prior approval? Yes _____ No _____

2. Do you directly supervise a spouse or immediate family member within the University? Yes _____ No _____

3. During the last year did you engage in any outside consulting activities for pay beyond \$10,000 from a single source? Yes _____ No _____

4. Do you engage in any outside activities which cause you to be away from the University more than a quarterly average of one day per five day work week for which you have not received prior approval? Yes _____ No _____

5. Do either you or a member of your immediate family own more than 10% of a business enterprise which provides goods or services to the University? Yes _____ No _____

6. Do you serve as an adviser, consultant, or in any other capacity with a public or private agency that grants money or decides policy for grants that could adversely affect the University's eligibility for funds from that agency? Yes _____ No _____

7. Do you own, hold a line management position, or participate in the day-to-day operations of a commercial enterprise that is closely related to your academic or other University work? Yes _____ No _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION

Due to a computer error with Chronicle labels, we are correcting/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).

