

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

2-4-1999

Faculty Senate Chronicle February 4, 1999

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 February 4, 1999." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 4 Feb 1999. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/432>

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.



Corrected

1998-99, No. 6

February 4, 1999

20 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|--------------------|
| Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 4, 1999 | 1 |
| Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 4, 1999 | 12 |
| A. Comments on Conflict of Interest draft | 12 |
| B. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i> | 14 |
| C. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i> | 18 |

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 OF FEBRUARY 4, 1999

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Barbara Heinzerling at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, February 4, 1999, 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 Fisher, Gelfand, Oller, and Turek were absent with notice. Senators Batur, Bird, Braun, Deckler, Johnston, Ofobike, Ozanich, Reed, Smolen, Stinner, and Wright were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * POSTPONED ACTION ON A MOTION FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO AMEND THE SENATE BYLAWS REGARDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS UNTIL THE MARCH MEETING**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chair stated that it was a pleasure to have Dr. Luis Proenza here for his very first time at the Senate. The body looked forward to hearing from him and to welcoming him to campus and the Faculty Senate. She went on to ask for approval of the agenda. This was moved and seconded, and the body voted its approval.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 1998 - Since Secretary Gary Oller was sick and unable to attend the meeting, Senator Peggy Richards had agreed to handle his duties. She presented three corrections which Secretary Oller had noted. The first was on page 2, the first paragraph of the Chair's remarks - "When I cam to this body..." "cam" needed an "e" on the end. The next was on page 3, the last quoted paragraph, third line, "i" should be changed to "I." Finally, on page 6 in the third paragraph of President Ruebel's quoted remarks, "the ability to buying coverage," "buying" should be changed to "buy." These were all the corrections which she had.

Don R. Gerlach, the Parliamentarian, asked for permission to speak, and the Senate gave its consent. He noted that on page 2 there was a reference to him having left his position as Chair of the Senate in the middle of his term. He would like to change that to read "had taken early retirement," because "left" sounded as though he might have gone off in a huff.

The other thing that he wanted to briefly comment on was the business about "Robert's Rules" when he had not been here to be of any help to the Chairman or the Executive Committee. When the Senate's rules were set up by the old faculty body, the University Council, he had pleaded passionately that Robert's Rules not be specified as the revised rules because they were in a big, fat book with all kinds of complications which he did not think the Senate needed to get bogged down in. So in its wisdom, University Council had decided that Robert's Rules - the original, simplified book, not the revised book - would be used. When he had gotten back from his trip abroad and looked up the issue that had been before the Senate in Robert's original, he had found out that it was not

altogether clear. It did not mandate that the Vice Chairman should succeed the Chairman but had only said something like, "in the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman shall preside." There was no provision in the Senate's bylaws about this succession, which he thought left the Senate open to the power to decide whatever it wished - either to have the Vice Chairman succeed or to elect a new Chairman, which was what had happened after he took early retirement. The constitutional expertise of Senator Rich and the Executive Committee had been a bit misleading or misplaced, and that is how he would have advised them had he been on the scene. He was bringing this up just to remind the body that, so far as he could tell, it was following Robert's Rules original, simplified version. It was a good thing because it left the body with more flexibility to do as it pleased. It could be like the British Parliament and do whatever it pleased, except to declare that a man was a woman. He thanked the body for allowing him to speak.

Senator William Rich thought that it was not clear whether the remarks of the Parliamentarian were intended as corrections to the minutes. He wanted it clarified that the minutes could not be corrected in the fashion that the Parliamentarian might have been suggesting. These were simply comments that could be put in the new minutes for this meeting. While his correction about the Parliamentarian's leaving because of early retirement was a true statement about what had happened, it would not be an accurate record of what had been said in the last meeting, which was what the minutes are supposed to be - an accurate record of what was said. What the Parliamentarian could do was what he had done. The comments which he had made would appear in the minutes of the next meeting, but the minutes could not be changed to say something that the speaker being quoted had not said.

The Chair asked for a motion to approve the minutes with the corrections that Senator Oller had noted. This was moved by Senator Dolli Markovich and seconded by Senator Kris Gill. The body then voted its approval.

III. CHAIR'S REMARKS - The Chair wanted to welcome everyone back. It was the start, hopefully, of a very good semester for all of us, and she knew that we were all anxious to work with Dr. Proenza. We would probably have a lot on our plate with Carnegie II and also the discussion about the Teaching Academy and what would be involved with that.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - There were none.

V. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY - The Chair introduced Dr. Luis Proenza, who made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Madame Chairperson, and good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's a pleasure to be with you. It is now my third week in this city and in this position, and as my colleague Dick Gigliotti can tell you, my first official act was to close the University thanks to some rather inclement weather. But we did begin to change that in the days ahead, and it was indeed my pleasure to be in

this very room a few days later for the dedication of the Shirla Robinson McClain Gallery which is downstairs and which I trust all of you have had a chance to visit.

I look forward to getting to know the processes of the Senate and indeed to work with you to develop the process of shared leadership that I spoke about during my opening comments to the forum several months ago. But let me take a few minutes today to say a few things. First of all, I thank all of you for your exceptionally warm welcome to the campus and indeed to the community. My wife and I could not have expected a warmer welcome than you have offered, and for that we are extremely grateful. Indeed, the entire community has been very welcoming. I think certainly you are more aware than I of the great love and enthusiasm that exists in this community for The University of Akron, and I have had nothing but pledges of exceptional support for the University. Now we have to obviously translate those wonderful remarks into action, and we shall endeavor to do so. To that end, I've had a bit of a busy schedule.

We've been to see several members of the legislature - the Governor himself, and welcomed him here when he spoke at the Akron Roundtable about ten days ago. I've been invited to make several public addresses to the Akron Press Club, to Rotary, and to the Medina Economic Development Corporation. These remarks have been reported in the press. Suffice it to say that they've tried to highlight for our colleagues in the community the fact that education is today the very infrastructure with which we can build a future of the state of Ohio and the community in which we live. I welcome your comments and certainly will elaborate on that as I learn more about the institution and can speak more intelligently. Indeed, I invite you all to tell me what it is that you feel we have the greatest strengths in and the greatest accomplishments in, so that I can begin to speak with some degree of authority about the institution and to think with some degree of background of information rather than the absence or vacuum of information.

I'm delighted to tell you that the simultaneous goals of achieving a Carnegie Research II status, while also aspiring to be designating a Carnegie Teaching Academy, are very welcome news to me, and I will be communicating with the campus community in the next few days, particularly about the Carnegie Teaching Academy. The two goals simultaneously provide a sense of balance, which I think will help address some of the concerns that many of you yourselves have had as to what this will mean as we go for Research II to the teaching mission of the University. Of course, the answer is nothing - in fact, we hope to strengthen it. We want to be a balanced institution.

The Governor himself has spoken eloquently about education as a priority for Ohio, particularly for the young people of Ohio. If there is one thing we can do better than anything for our sponsoring society, it is to advocate the early accomplishment of students in the first four years. If we do not do that, I assure you that while we should continue to try and strive to provide educational access, if we don't do the former, educate the kids in the early years, we will continue to frustrate ourselves later on with remedial education and indeed what many have been calling for lately - remedial efforts.

The Governor in his remarks here also highlighted the importance of higher education and recognizing his comments, the importance of higher education and what we do in research universities for the economic well-being of our communities. So I think we find ourselves in a propitious environment; hopefully, those words will be recognized in further action as he begins to develop his budgets, etc.

I also met with the Interuniversity Council and with the Chancellor of the Board of Regents. The Interuniversity Council consists, as you know, of the 13 public universities. There are a number of issues on their plate, and the most important one for you to hear about at the moment, as you are no doubt aware, are of the press concerns that have been circulated about international students at our campus. The Chancellor has called for a study of how indeed the subvention monies are used throughout the state, and meanwhile, we have begun to provide him not only with the data that he has requested, but with other information that should be very important.

For example, for our own local economy international students have a tremendous economic impact far in excess, at least four times more, of that which is used to pay for their studies. So the economic impact that they bring is far in excess of what the state pays. But indeed the whole purpose of our educating international students goes well beyond their economic significance to the fact that this country is a nation of immigrants. I would not be here but for that, and looking around the room, I daresay that if you trace your backgrounds far enough, none of you would be here but for that fact.

I might just add that this is not something new in America - just last year we fought this very same issue in Congress during the time that the H1 visa quotas were being discussed. The cap existed at 65,000; business and industry and higher education wanted it raised to 95,000. Congress, much like this legislature, was concerned about these students, these people taking American jobs, etc., and we know that at the present time there simply aren't enough Americans to take many of the jobs that are being made available by the high-tech economy and other opportunities. So these are among the kinds of things that are being presented to the Chancellor. He himself is an immigrant and certainly a person of background in industry who knows of the importance of international students, and you have all of the other arguments about global economy so I will not dwell on that.

Last week I began a process with the senior leadership, which will ultimately begin to include not only the Senate but indeed the full campus community, and that is the process toward planning and strategy and moving to the concept of shared leadership. It is just the beginning, and we'll try to build some common ground in a small group and then begin to reach out by soliciting your input as to how we can best do that. The process will need to be data-driven rather than opinion-driven. It will call for as open a communication as we are willing to undertake within the reasonable time frames that we need to move forward; we can't debate everything for the next 35 years. But we need that common framework to enable us to move forward.

Many of you here today know I've been getting around to each of the colleges and schools. I plan to complete the process, including most of our administrative and staff units, by the second week in March. After that time, hopefully I'll have a little bit more perspective of this institution than I have at the moment, but again, I invite you to tell me about the institution, about what you think we need to be proud of, about what you think we need to fix. As you're aware, I'm on email and will endeavor to reply to you, but otherwise I do assure you that I read all of my email and hope to register at least most of it. So you'll hear more about our planning process in the weeks to come.

I know one thing that is very much on the mind of this Senate is the conflict of commitment, conflict of interest, intellectual property policy. Your Executive Committee met with me even before I assumed this position. I have their document, and I have the document that was prepared by Dr. Wilson's office. I asked the Trustees to please table their discussion on that because there were several issues that I thought needed to be elaborated on, not the least of which is obviously your

feeling that you've had adequate input without again dragging this out beyond a reasonable point. Let me just say a couple of things - the motion indeed was tabled, and I've invited a person who has considerable expertise in this area to visit us and work with us to take the documents and additional input and first of all, to separate the two policies; they don't belong together. Secondly, insure that what is required by federal and state law is indeed in our policies. Thirdly, that what is stated is stated in the positive and not in the negative. You will have occasion to again have some input in it, and I'll be working with General Counsel to determine whether it's appropriate to separate policy from procedure, because at least in my experience those are two separate statements of the matter.

Lastly, let me just briefly report to you on Board actions at the last meeting. You'll be getting a more detailed, written report as usual from my office. First of all, I was very pleased to begin a new tradition with the Trustees of sharing with them each time they meet, an opportunity for them to see at least one example of faculty excellence and scholarship. For no other reason than I just visited the Law School and happened to be extremely pleased to see a very timely book by one of our chaired professors published by the Congressional Quarterly, I, with Dick Aynes' help, presented the Trustees with a copy of Paul Kinkelman's book.

I invited the deans and would invite you to please let me know of timely examples of faculty scholarships that should be shared, that should be celebrated, and I will endeavor to try to be equable in terms of moving around schools, colleges, and departments in highlighting these things. Just yesterday in the Library I was presented with a number of examples, and today in Engineering and the day before in the Community & Technical College, and a week ago in Continuing Education found other examples, so again, I invite your input as well as those of your deans and department heads.

Trustees approved the establishment of a Research Center for Health and Social Policy under the leadership of Dr. Richard Stephens, Director of the Center. They approved and honored a doctorate for Dr. John Hope Franklin, who will be visiting us in the next few weeks. This is a joint invitation between the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Law, an exceptionally worthy individual, presently a chaired professor at Duke University.

The Board approved a revised budget for the Arts & Sciences building, and you may be aware that this building has gone through several conceptualizations, and as the master plan continues to evolve, it also brought several additional suggestions. The reason for the increase in the budget was first and foremost that the original budget was presented three years ago. First, there have been some changes in prices since then in construction costs, and secondly, the Trustees have wanted each of our major buildings to try to make a statement in and of itself to make them both attractive, welcoming, and exciting places in which to work. They had received an earlier proposal which they rejected because it was too much money, and I notice that that was not reported about, but this most recent conceptual plan was approved and now we have to move to the design stage.

They also received several reports and accepted my recommendation to make some short-term changes in the units that report to me. I'm not planning to make any major administrative changes at the present time; I simply need some time to have an opportunity to get to know the University without the day-to-day pressure of as many reports as are presently noted in the organizational chart.

I'm probably forgetting two or three other things, but let me just end with what I most need from you for the foreseeable future and indeed for the tenure of my role as your President, and that is

your help and assistance. There is nothing, absolutely nothing, ladies and gentlemen, that I can do by myself for this institution without your participation. I promise my energies and assistance in working with you, and ask you to educate me by telling me about this institution, the things you love the most, the things you feel we must change in order to do our business well. Thank you very much."

The body applauded at the end of his remarks, and President Proenza offered to take questions. There were none.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Senator Richards, reporting for Secretary Oller, stated that the Committee had met a number of times in December and January to deal with a variety of items. In regard to the Conflict of Interest, Commitment, Etc. Policy which the Senate had passed on December 3, the Committee had been informed that a different version of this policy had actually gone to the Board, and Dr. Proenza had covered very well the results of what had happened as a result of the Committee's request to him that this matter be looked into. Additionally, the Committee had asked Dr. Frank Falk, in his capacity as Chair of the committee that had written the original report, to respond to the significant differences that he saw between the version that had gone to the Board and the one that the Senate had passed. He did that for the body (see **Appendix A**), and Dr. Proenza also had that information available with which to work.

The second item that the Committee had brought up with the President was the master academic plan currently being worked on by PBC, and the Committee had asked that this be shared more widely with the University - with the Faculty Senators as well as the rest of the faculty - and President Proenza had been agreeable to that as well.

The Committee had met in January to set the agenda for today's meeting and to discuss other matters. A question had been raised by a member of the Committee, Senator Stephen Aby, regarding a memo dated December 3 from the Provost's office which appeared to be changing the length of time that an untenured faculty member who was not going to be retained had to remain in the position. This had led to a meeting between Chair Heinzerling, Senator Aby and Provost Leathers, who had reassured them that there was some confusion here which he would clear up, but there had been no intention of changing the rules as they appeared in the University Bylaws regarding this matter - 3359-20-034(A)(1). At that same meeting it had been brought to Provost Leathers' attention that the subcommittee of PBC on general equity and salary compression as recommended by the Senate on April 1, 1997, and reported in the May 1 Chronicle of 1997 had not yet been formed. Provost Leathers agreed that he would bring this to the attention of the PBC and the subcommittee would be formed.

The Committee had also received requests from Senator Elizabeth Erickson and a University faculty member to allow non-Senators to chair Senate committees. Senator Erickson's rationale for this read as follows: "For shared effective governance we need Chairs prepared to be knowledgeable and proactive. The person on the committee with these characteristics may not be a Senator. Too often it seems that a specific Senator is chosen as Chair because no one else would serve when a non-Senator has background and expertise." As far as non-Senators being part of Senate meetings, Senator Erickson had reminded the Committee that the chairs of University Committees - Rights and Responsibilities and University Well-Being - if not Senators, were non-voting members ex officio for

reporting purposes. The same situation had pertained back in University Council days for all committee chairs who had not been members of the Council. The Committee had discussed this, and on the basis of the previously stated rationales agreed to offer the following Senate Bylaw change. The original rule reads: "In all cases the chairperson of the Senate subcommittees will be a member of the Senate unless otherwise noted." The new rule IIID would read: **The Senate committees shall yearly elect their own chairs, who, if not already members of the Faculty Senate, shall become ex officio non-voting members.** Senator Richards reminded the body that, although it could discuss this today, because it was a bylaw change it required a month holdover until it could be voted on and had to be passed by a 60% majority of the votes cast. Since this was coming as a part of the report of the Committee, she moved that this motion be placed under new business for purposes of discussion later in the meeting. The body then voted its approval.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Sheryl Stevenson, the Chair, announced that the Committee had not yet met this semester but was working in subcommittees on two items of policy. The first item related to recommendations which the Committee planned to make to update the Faculty Manual with regard to the curricular review procedures. The second item was that at the request of the Provost's office, the committee was developing a policy for the last day to add a course.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Jean Blosser, the Chair, passed out a written report (see **Appendix B**). She stated that there had been 200 curriculum proposals that had been submitted for review so far this year, and the majority had been reviewed. There would be another set that she would bring to the March meeting. What the body had before it today was a list of those proposals that had been reviewed through the entire system. Objections had been resolved, and these had been approved by the Provost. Thus, she now brought them to the Faculty Senate. There was an improvement coming - the format would now have a place for titles, so in the future there would always be a title attached to the number, and that should help.

There were no questions for Associate Provost Blosser, and no issues were raised regarding any of the proposals.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson, the Chair, reported that the Committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting - December 14 and January 28. On December 14 it had met with Sasaki & Associates to review the draft version of the campus development guide plan, and members of the Committee had been impressed with the overall concept of the plan and were excited by the long-term improvement to the campus that it represented. On January 28 the Committee had its initial meeting of the semester, and the University architect had reported further on the campus development plan and the direction of the Board. There was a lot of material in the campus development plan that she urged members to read when it became available for everyone to see. Among the issues that he had raised at the meeting had been the concept of marking the edge of campus development with trees and shrubs. The Board had agreed to a slight change for the site for the new Arts & Sciences building to fit with that concept, and there were placement issues of buildings outstanding. The Committee was considering the issues that it planned to investigate this semester. The next meeting would be on Thursday, February 18, at 3:15 p.m., Auburn Sciences 105, and anyone was welcome to attend.

Senator Erickson also wished to present a report by Senator Lindgren Chyi, the representative of CFPC on the Academic Renovation Project Review Committee, which had been set up by Dr. Richard Gigliotti last semester. She had reported at the last meeting that this committee had just completed its first set of evaluations, and Senator Chyi had a report.

Senator Chyi reported that in October of 1998 a pool of money had been released by Provost Leathers to be used for renovation projects in academic areas. The dollars for these projects had been budgeted by PBC and supplemented by carryover funds. Eligible projects had been those falling outside of the normal maintenance and painting funds. They had been those which, while necessary, could not be funded by a department or the physical plant. There had been four members of this committee - Dr. Gigliotti, Director of Administrative Services; Mrs. Laurie Madden, Director of Physical Facilities; Mr. Phil Bartlett, Director of Space Utilization; and himself, representing CFPC.

As recommended by Provost Leathers, the projects had been evaluated following similar procedures used with faculty research projects. Evaluation criteria had included such factors as the extent to which the project supported UA's goals and strategies as listed in the Master Academic Plan as well as the condition and visibility of the project. Eighty proposals had been received, and 21 had been given a priority score high enough to result in an award. In November departments had been notified of their score on each project request, and cost estimating was begun by PFOC for selected projects. As of today, the estimating was done and work would soon begin on funded projects. If any dollars remained after estimating was finished, those dollars would be awarded to the next highest score on the priority list.

The Committee was quite pleased with the process, as were all the participants, including those who had not gotten an award. Unfunded projects with high scores were encouraged to try next year. Three of the projects had been put together by Dr. Gigliotti, including new drapes being put into classrooms where absent or needed. The next project would be new or refurbished seating in all classroom buildings. The third was that all exterior windows on academic buildings would be washed this spring. The Computer Center labs and testing lab would receive carpeting and drapes. For A&S and the Physics Department, Ayer 105 and 111 would be renovated for safe human occupancy. The former WZIP studios would be remodeled for our band called "Ohio's Pride." For C&T, SHN 56/57 would be divided into three separate labs for instruction of GPS (surveying with global positioning system). For Polymer Science and Engineering, one of their lab's voltage would be increased to 240. A Chemical Engineering facility in Whitby 71 and 118 would be renovated for undergraduate students and graduate students to use as a computer lab. These were just a few of the 23 projects which would all be listed in the Chronicle (see Appendix C).

The Chair asked whether there were any questions for either Senator Erickson or Senator Chyi. Senator H. Michael Cheung asked Senator Erickson when and in what format the campus development plan would be made public.

Senator Erickson replied that this had not been made clear because it had to be accepted by the Board. The Committee had only gotten the draft in December, and it had to go to the Board. She did not know when the Board would make that public.

President Proenza added that the Board had heard a brief review from the Sasaki team. They had several questions and had asked that he be more fully briefed and have a chance to provide input

and review it with staff before a final draft would be prepared. He did not know how long that would take. They were anxious to move ahead, and there was hope that it would be some time yet this spring.

Senator Greg Stewart asked Senator Chyi whether only projects in academic units had been considered for the funds. Senator Chyi answered that proposals had been requested from all academic or academic services departments. Senator Stewart went on to note that given Senator Chyi's answer, he knew of at least one area that had never received a response from the Committee. He was not sure how this should be addressed. Senator Chyi added that there had been a deadline and not every unit had responded in time. Some had responded after the deadline, and the Committee had not accepted those proposals.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Jesse Marquette reported that the Committee had been meeting.

REPRESENTATIVE TO THE OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - Senator Shelley Baranowski reminded members of a faculty survey being circulated by OBR. It was being sent to certain people, and if you had received one, please take the time to fill it out and return it quickly. The data would be processed and supposedly used to give the state legislature and the Governor a better impression of what faculty did. This was extremely important.

The second item was one that President Proenza had already talked about. There had been a great deal of discussion with the Chancellor about the "Toledo Blade" article about subvention for foreign graduate students, and President Proenza had already said that he was soliciting information from the various universities to compose a hopefully sane response to this recent outburst of negativism. The third item had to do with the Governor's initiative to have all students at the fourth grade level pass the fourth grade proficiency test by the year 2002. The Governor was seeking 20,000 volunteers, preferably students from the state's universities, to serve as tutors to students in grades 1-4. The Chancellor was very excited about this and found this a golden political opportunity for the University to support this initiative. He hinted that those institutions that did support this in various ways would be rewarded. He also was suggesting that faculty get involved and draw upon their various specializations to actually tutor younger students themselves. This was something that the members of the OFC wanted to talk more about. Teaching a fourth grader to read was not something that we were normally trained to do, although the Council was quite sympathetic to the political opportunity that this would provide.

Senator Baranowski concluded her report with a comment about the new organization of the OBR that she had reported on a few months back. The Chancellor had devised five separate committees on various projects. His thinking was that each member of the OBR's Executive Committee would sit on these committees, and they would be starting to meet this week. The OFC had been encouraged by his inviting faculty participation on these committees. This could become another avenue by which faculty voices could be heard.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - There was none.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - The Chair said that it was now time to take up the motion from the Executive Committee regarding committee chairs. She asked Senator Richards to read the motion again, which she did. Since there was no discussion, the motion became unfinished business that would be taken up at the next meeting following the one-month wait requirement.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh said that she had intended to ask this of the Provost, but perhaps Associate Provost Blosser might want to respond. The part-time faculty had held a meeting of its loosely-knit organization on January 23. They had tried to discuss such issues as the 3-tier program, merit pay raises and other topics that would be of concern to the part-time faculty. In regard to the 3-tier system the part-time faculty wanted some reassurance that the tiers would be supported as recommended by the Senate in two areas: 1) the criteria established for each position - auxiliary, continuing and renewable; 2) the number of hours allotted to each position. The part-time faculty had asked that these questions be raised on the Senate floor for a response.

Associate Provost Blosser, given permission to speak, began by noting that the plan that had been put in place had become unwieldy to administer at best. This was because there were three categories of appointment, and within those categories there were three levels to which you could be appointed, and on top of that, there were limits on the hours that a person could teach (this last might have been a misunderstanding). As departments needed faculty to teach different numbers of courses and hours, etc., they were switching categories. Therefore, persons who had started out as auxiliary could become, for no better reason than the number of hours they were teaching, renewable. It had been her understanding that the intent of the policy had been to try to have the hierarchical system in terms of what you were contributing to the University, length of service, etc. Since this was becoming unmanageable, the Provost's office had asked if it could for this semester step back and take a look at the administration of this procedure. Perhaps by working with part-time faculty on campus, we could come back with a better implementation. She had met with part-time faculty representatives and would be holding focus groups next month. She had asked colleges to give her names of part-time faculty who might attend, and she would be announcing this more publicly in order to make sure that a part-time faculty member could attend different focus groups. She thought there were a couple of things that we wanted to do here. One was to identify other kinds of amenities such as looking at the phone situation, and the ability to get materials from the unit in terms of goals. There was a lot more here than just money involved; we needed to look at the whole picture again, and she had taken on that task. Any contributions would be helpful.

Senator Filer-Tubaugh thanked Associate Provost Blosser for her response, and she wanted to recommend that anyone who had a lot of part-time faculty in their departments should work with Associate Provost Blosser and the group that she was developing so that we could resolve some of these problems and not have so many inconsistencies across campus.

Senator Gill wondered whether Associate Provost Blosser would talk about a new program, the Masters of Public Health Program.

Associate Provost Blosser said that this was a consortium program - five universities had gone together to form a Masters of Public Health degree. They were Cleveland State, The University of Akron, Kent State, Youngstown and NEOUCOM. We would be housing this in the College of Nursing. She thanked Senator Gill for reminding her.

Senator Cheung wanted to urge the powers that be, especially President Proenza, to consider making the campus development plan available for campus-wide review and comment prior to it becoming a fait accompli and an act of the Board. He would not say that it was difficult to criticize actions of the Board; we had done so in the past, but it was more effective to make one's comments while it was still a malleable draft.

President Proenza said that he would see what he could do about making drafts available.

The Chair apologized to Senator David Ritchey from F&AA for not introducing him earlier as a new Senator, and she welcomed him to the body.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - There was a motion to adjourn, which was seconded. The body voted its approval, and the meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin

APPENDIX A**COMMENTS ON THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST, ETC. DRAFT DATED 12/8/98**

The Faculty Senate reaction to the initial draft policy forwarded to the Faculty Senate on October 16, 1998, focused on six fundamental issues.

The first issue was about the organization and demeaning language in that document. The second was a concern with definitions that were too broad and the need for additional definitions. Third was a concern with a centralized versus decentralized reporting and certification procedures. Related to this third concern was a fourth issue revolving around the nature of a review committee for cases where disputed resolutions would be ameliorated. The question here related to the need for the committee to have members familiar with the professional standards. The fifth issue was a concern about which employees would have to submit annual reports. The sixth critical concern centered around what information the University needed to know.

Applying these concerns to the 12/8/98 draft, the following points of contrast with the Senate draft 12/4/98 can be made.

First, the 12/8/98 document accepted much of the reorganization and language substitution present in the Senate document.

Second, the definitions between the two documents are now consistent with the very important exception of "family member." There are multiple legal definitions in Ohio Code, and the definition selected in the 12/8/98 draft is too broad. The Ohio Ethics Code defines an immediate family members as "spouse and dependent children" only.

The reporting and certification procedures have been partially reconciled between the two documents. Of prime importance, however, the word "approval" needs to be removed and the word "certify" inserted. Points A(9)c and A(10) recentralizes the reporting procedure, which is an inconsistency.

The makeup of the compliance committee, Section D & E1 in the 12/8/98 draft is totally inconsistent with the Faculty Senate draft. The Senate draft uses the same structure as the scholarly misconduct procedures, which involve an inquiry committee. The notable exceptions to the inquiry committee and compliance committee in the 12/8/98 document is the lack of timely reporting deadlines. Important to both of these committees in the 12/8/98 document is who will decide the members. The 12/8/98 draft allows the Senior Research Officer to appoint these persons. The question that arises is can the Senior Research officer both bring forward a complaint and select the committee members who will hear the issue in an impartial manner?

Section A(11) exempts only hourly wage students from completing the annual review form in the 12/8/98 draft. The Faculty Senate draft also exempts part-time faculty and staff

employed less than one-half time. Many of these individuals will have outside employment with incomes above the \$10,000.00 limit that requires prior certification. For example, it is not unusual for a part-time instructor to work at more than one university in order to obtain a living wage. Many of these employment opportunities occur with little time for the instructor to accept, thus making prior approval impossible.

The critical issue of what the University needs to know is reflected in A(10) items (a) through (g). Careful restrictions need to be in place to insure that the employees' private life is not trampled. One example will suffice. Item (e) requires an employee to report their ownership of an equity stock in any company when that ownership exceeds \$10,000.00 when aggregated across the employee, the employee's grandparents; parents; spouse; children, whether dependent or not; grandchildren; brothers and sisters; or any person related by blood or marriage residing in the same household. Does the University really expect an employee to discover and disclose the equity holdings of their non-dependent children and grandchildren?

The Faculty Senate draft carefully considered these major and many minor issues in crafting their document. The Senate document addresses the above issues and finds an appropriate resolution. The 12/8/98 draft is flawed with respect to these major concerns, and there are many smaller inconsistencies between the two documents.

APPENDIX B



Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost
Akron, OH 44325-4703
(330) 972-7593 Office
(330) 972-8699 Fax

Date: February 4, 1999
To: Faculty Senate
From: Dr. Jean Blosser, Interim Associate Provost
Re: Curriculum Proposals

The proposals on the attached list have matured without objection and have been approved by the Provost. Unless Faculty Senate acts otherwise at its meeting February 4, 1999 these proposals will become record.

202 curriculum proposals have been submitted for review so far this academic year. Reviewing them is a monumental task made more effective thanks to the dedication of faculty and staff.

Special thanks to . . .

All Faculty and Staff working on curriculum revisions

Bibliographers

College Contacts

Curriculum Review Committee

Distance Learning Steering Committee

General Bulletin Team

Graduate School

Information Services

Institutional Research

Provost's Office

Registrar's Office

Att.

ald\curr99\fs990204

| Proposal No: | Proposal Type | Proposal Title |
|--|----------------|--|
| A & S | | |
| AS-99-04 | Program Change | Change in Electives |
| AS-99-106 | Program Change | Change in reqds in BS (Statistics) |
| AS-99-107 | Program Change | New division Major |
| AS-99-36 | New Program | New Certificate Program in graduate Level |
| AS-99-46 | Program Change | Course changed, Course added, change in reqd & elective credits |
| AS-99-49 | New Program | New Minor |
| AS-99-50 | Program Change | Increase in credit hours, Increase in 1 credit for completion |
| AS-99-51 | Program Change | Introduction of an alternate course |
| AS-99-55 | Program Change | Bypass credit to a course (Spanish) |
| AS-99-56 | Program Change | Bypass credit to a course (German) |
| AS-99-57 | Program Change | Bypass credit to a course (Modern Language) |
| AS-99-64 | Program Change | Comprehensive Examination added to degree requirements |
| AS-99-65 | Program Change | Provide a Logical structure to BS (Geography) |
| AS-99-66 | Program Change | Provide a Logical structure to BS (Geography/Cartography) |
| AS-99-68 | Program Change | Course deleted |
| AS-99-69 | Program Change | Bypass credit to 3 course (French) |
| AS-99-74 | Program Change | Changes made to reqd , elective courses |
| AS-99-75 | Program Change | |
| AS-99-79 | Program Change | Delete Bachelor of Arts - Mathematics degree |
| AS-99-80 | Program Change | Delete Bachelor of Arts – Applied Mathematics |
| Business | | |
| BA-99-07 | Program Change | Course added in electives |
| BA-99-08 | Program Change | Number of credits increased to complete a major |
| BA-99-12 | New Program | Create a minor in Financial Planning |
| BA-99-13 | New Program | Create a Certificate Program in Financial Planning |
| BA-99-14 | New Program | Minimum required hours for courses in finance and business law |
| Community & Technical College | | |
| CT-99-02 | Program Change | Provide 27 hours of by-pass credit to graduates |
| CT-99-03 | Program Change | Deletion and Addition of courses |
| CT-99-04 | Program Change | Deletion of courses, addition of new courses, and course change |
| CT-99-06 | Program Change | Change in degree title, Change program degree requirements. |
| CT-99-10 | Program Change | The changes in the Community Services Technology |
| CT-99-12 | Program Change | Course substitution, new elective course |
| CT-99-14 | Program Change | Delete a course (no longer offered), replace a new one |
| CT-99-18 | Program Change | Courses deleted, additional courses to complete program |
| CT-99-21 | Program Change | Revision of Associate Arts Degree to conform University requirements |
| CT-99-23 | Program Change | The changes in the Community Services Technology |
| CT-99-24 | Program Change | Deletion of Legal Secretarial inactive program |
| CT-99-26 | Program Change | Deletion of Office Services (Inactive) program |
| CT-99-27 | Program Change | Deletion of Administrative Assistant certificate |
| CT-99-28 | Program Change | Deletion of Office Information Management certificate (inactive) |
| CT-99-29 | Program Change | Delete Word Processing certificate |
| CT-99-30 | New Program | New certificate program in Medical Front Office |
| CT-99-31 | New Program | Add certificate, reflects current business occupational needs |
| CT-99-32 | New Program | Add certificate, reflects current business occupational needs |

| | | |
|------------------------------|----------------|---|
| CT-99-33 | New Program | Add certificate, reflects current business occupational needs |
| CT-99-35 | Program Change | Changes to Business Management Technology-Accounting optn. |
| CT-99-36 | Program Change | Changes to Business Management Technology - General Option |
| CT-99-37 | Program Change | Changes to Bus Mangnt Tech - Small Business Mangnt Option |
| CT-99-38 | Program Change | Delete Business Mangnt Tech - Data Administration Option |
| CT-99-39 | Program Change | Change minor in Business Management Technology |
| CT-99-05 | New Program | Certificate Program in Surveying Technology |
| CT-99-15 | Program Change | Replace technical elective |
| Engineering | | |
| EN-99-17 | New Program | Obtain both degrees with a minimum of duplication |
| EN-99-18 | Program Change | Addition of two design electives |
| EN-99-19 | Program Change | Addition of new course, to replace old requirement |
| EN-99-20 | Program Change | Addition of new course, to replace old requirement |
| EN-99-21 | Program Change | Changes made in under-graduate and graduate level courses |
| EN-99-24 | Program Change | |
| Fine and Applied Arts | | |
| FAA-99-015a | Program Change | Addition of a course (3credits) |
| FAA-99-015b | Program Change | Addition of a course (3credits)B.S(Theatre Arts-Musical Theatre) |
| FAA-99-01f | Program Change | Change number of credit hours 8 credits to 10 credits |
| FAA-99-02 | Program Change | Deleting program - pre-kindergarten certificate |
| FAA-99-10 | Program Change | Change in requirements for Photography emphasis of B.F.A |
| FAA-99-11 | New Program | One unified Painting/Drawing course from 2 seperate ones |
| FAA-99-16 | Program Change | Adding Musical Theatre Production, 3 credits- B.F.A. in Dance. |
| FAA-99-23 | New Program | Several changes in undergraduate Commn. -Mass Media Major |
| FAA-99-23A | New Program | This is a continuation of FAA-99-23 |
| FAA-99-23B | Program Change | This is a continuation of FAA-99-23 |
| FAA-99-23C | Program Change | This is a continuation of FAA-99-23 |
| Nursing | | |
| NU-99-05 | New Program | establishment of a Post-MSN certificate program |
| Wayne College | | |
| WC-99-02 | Program Change | Course change previously approved by BOT |
| WC-99-03 | Program Change | Course change previously approved by BOT |
| WC-99-04 | Program Change | Course change previously approved by BOT |
| WC-99-05 | Program Change | Course change previously approved by BOT |
| WC-99-06 | Program Change | |
| Provost | | |
| PR-98-02 | New Program | Health (MPH) Program |

Proposals (Course change) that are approved by Provost**Arts & Science**

| | | |
|----------|----------|----------|
| AS-99-07 | AS-99-47 | AS-99-78 |
| AS-99-39 | AS-99-54 | |
| AS-99-40 | AS-99-58 | |
| AS-99-41 | AS-99-62 | |
| AS-99-42 | AS-99-63 | |

Business

| | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| BA-99-16 | BA-99-23 | BA-99-29 | BA-99-37 |
| BA-99-17 | BA-99-24 | BA-99-30 | BA-99-38 |
| BA-99-18 | BA-99-25 | BA-99-31 | BA-99-39 |
| BA-99-19 | BA-99-26 | BA-99-32 | BA-99-40 |
| BA-99-20 | BA-99-27 | BA-99-34 | BA-99-41 |
| BA-99-22 | BA-99-28 | BA-99-36 | BA-99-42 |

Community & Technical College

| | |
|----------|----------|
| CT-99-07 | CT-99-17 |
| CT-99-08 | CT-99-22 |
| CT-99-09 | CT-99-25 |
| CT-99-11 | CT-99-34 |
| CT-99-16 | |

Engineering

EN-99-08
EN-99-23
EN-99-25

Fine & Applied Arts

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| FAA-99-000a | FAA-99-03 | FAA-99-09 | FAA-99-18 |
| FAA-99-000dTh | FAA-99-05 | FAA-99-12 | FAA-99-20 |
| FAA-99-000h | FAA-99-06 | FAA-99-13 | |
| FAA-99-000m | FAA-99-07 | FAA-99-15 | |
| FAA-99-000sw | FAA-99-08 | FAA-99-17 | |

Graduate School

GS-99-01
GS-99-02

Nursing

NU-99-02
NU-99-03

Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

PS-99-01

Wayne College

WC-99-01
WC-99-07

APPENDIX C**REPORT OF CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY
SENATE, FEBRUARY 4TH, 1999**

CFPC has met twice since the last Senate Meeting: on December 14th and January 28th. On December 14th they met with Sasaki and Associates to review the Draft version of the Campus Development Guide Plan. The members of the Committee were impressed with the overall concept of the plan and were excited by the long-term improvement in the campus which it represented.

On January 28th, the Committee had its initial meeting of this semester. Mr. Curtis, the University Architect, reported further on the Campus Development Plan and the interaction with the Board. Among the issues he noted was the concept of marking the edges of campus development with trees and shrubs – "building to lines". The Board had agreed to a slight change of site for the new A&S Building so it would fit this concept. Some placement issues for projected buildings still remained.

The CFPC observer to the Board Facilities Planning & Oversight Committee, Dr. Sterns, also reported to the meeting.

The Committee is considering the issues it plans to investigate this semester. The next meeting is on Thursday, February 18th at 3:15 p.m. in ASC105. Anyone is welcome to attend.

We also wish to present a report by Dr. Chyi, the representative of CFPC on the Academic Renovation Project Review Committee set up by Dr. Gigliotti. As we reported at the last meeting the Committee has just completed its first set of evaluations. (Dr. Chyi's report is attached).

Respectfully submitted,



Elizabeth Erickson

Chair, Campus Facilities Planning Committee

Report of Academic Renovation Project Committee

1998 Academic Renovation Projects

In October of 1998 a pool of money was released by Provost Leathers to be used for renovation projects in academic areas. The dollars for these projects were budgeted by PBC and supplemented by carryover funds. Eligible projects were those falling outside of the normal maintenance and painting funds. Typically, eligible projects were those which, while necessary, could not be funded by a department or the physical plant.

Proposals were requested from all academic or academic-service departments. The review committee was composed of:

Dr. Lynn Chyi, Faculty Senate, CFPC, Geology Department
Dr. Richard Gigliotti, Administrative Services, Sociology Department
Mrs. Laurie Madden, Director of Physical Facilities
Mr. Phil Bartlett, Director of Space Utilization

As recommended by Provost Leathers, the projects were evaluated following similar procedures used with faculty research projects. Evaluation criteria included such factors as the extent to which the project supported UA's Goals and Strategies as listed in the Master Academic Plan, the condition of the project, the visibility of the project, and so on.

Eighty (80) Proposals were received and 21 were given a priority score high enough to result in an award. In November departments were notified of their score on each project request, and cost estimating was begun by PFOC for selected projects. The estimating is almost done and the work will soon begin on funded projects. If any dollars remain after estimating is done, those dollars will be awarded to the next highest scores on the priority list.

The Committee was quite pleased with the process, as were all participants, including those who did not get an award. Unfunded projects with a high score can apply for the next round of funding, providing that this program is allocated dollars for the next fiscal year.

List of projects receiving an award:

1. New drapes will be put into classrooms where absent or needed.
2. New or refurbished seating will be put in all classroom buildings
3. All exterior windows on academic buildings will be washed this Spring.
4. Two large classrooms (SHN 351 & 354) will be converted into three more usable rooms.
5. Computer center labs (CC139, 141, 142, 146) and testing lab (CH 325) will receive carpeting and drapes.

6. The ventilation system in OLRC will be modified to accommodate 4 hoods.
7. SHS 131 will have a suspended drop ceiling installed.
8. OLRC 113 will have a lab renovation for new faculty member.
9. AH 105, 111 (Physics) will be renovated for safe human occupancy and computer use.
10. Former WZIP studios will be remodeled for "Ohio's Pride", the University of Akron band.
11. SHN 56/57 will be subdivided into three separate lab areas for the instruction of GPS.
12. GH 386 will be renovated to accommodate a electronic music lab with modern space which will meet electrical and acoustic requirements.
13. Electric power will be increased in OLRC 15 for the installation of new extrusion equipment.
14. The Law Library will receive new carpeting (partially funded).
15. New drapes will be installed in the food science labs (SHS 209, 216).
16. Three tables in SHS 219 will be modified to accommodate current sewing machine models (SHS 219).
17. The rappelling wall in SHS parking deck will be renovated.
18. Tables and chairs will be installed in CH 207.
19. Miniblinds will be installed in CH 206, 208a, and 212.
20. The undergraduate study lounge and graduate computer lab in WH 71, 118 will be renovated, and furniture and student lockers will be purchased.
21. In Folk 103, the carpet in the auditorium and administrative area will be replaced.
22. In Folk, the lighting in Davis Gallery, the main lobby exhibition and atrium areas will be replaced and updated.
23. The worn carpet in CBA Academic Advising and classrooms will be replaced with vinyl tile.



4 3 1 2 3 4

