

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

2-5-1998

Faculty Senate Chronicle February 5, 1998

Heather M. Loughney

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

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

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 5, 1998	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 5, 1998	16
A. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	16

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 FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 5, 1998

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, February 5, 1998, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Batur, Frederick, Jalbert, Kimmell, McGucken, Patankar, and Smith were absent with notice. Senators Borowiec, Braun, C.Buchanan, Pelz, Redle, and Stinner were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **PASSED THREE RESOLUTIONS FROM THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE AND REFERRED A FOURTH TO APCC**
- * **PASSED A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE REFERENCE COMMITTEE REGARDING THE FACULTY MANUAL**
- * **REFERRED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THE ISSUE OF GEAC BEING TRANSFERRED TO SENATE OVERSIGHT**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chairman asked whether there were any additions, subtractions, etc., to the agenda. Since there were none, the Senate approved the agenda.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 1997 - Secretary Gary H. Oller stated that he had no corrections. Since there were no corrections from the body, the minutes were approved.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - The Chairman announced that Mary Mostenic, a colleague who had taught part-time in the English Department for 47 consecutive years, had died recently. She had made immense contributions to the English Department, and he requested that the Senate rise for a moment of silence in her memory, which it did.

The Chairman noted that during the past two weeks he had observed many things happening, and it was likely to be a busy semester for the body. With budget formulations and new initiatives soon to come forth, it was possible that down the road some special sessions of the Senate might need to be scheduled, for which sufficient advance notice would be given. He also wanted the Senate to know that its offices had now been moved from Schrank to Carroll Hall 326. Senators should feel free to stop by and visit. The office had new carpets and overlooked a vast vista of green over Jackson Field. There were very few perks here, and this was one of them. Also, any of the Senate committees which wanted to use the meeting room should feel free to call Mrs. Quillin to schedule the

date. It was a small room but could hold 12-15. He also said that it should be made known to the faculty at large that if any faculty groups of that number (12-15) needed to get together and discuss issues or to have a brainstorming session, they too should call Mrs. Quillin to use the room. The Executive Committee wanted to designate that room as a faculty resource room where faculty could get together in an informal fashion and discuss whatever was on their minds. There would be an attempt to keep material there which was relevant to the faculty.

Finally, he asked members who were unable to attend Senate meetings to call or email Mrs. Quillin as soon as possible. He also made a personal request to committee chairs. If the committee had met during the month, it was a good idea to make a report to the Senate even if the committee had not arrived at a final resolution of whatever it had been discussing. An interim report would be very welcome, so please let Mrs. Quillin know if you had had a meeting of the committee and you might have something about which you wanted to inform the Senate.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chairman introduced Mrs. Desnay Lohrum from the Benefits Office, who wanted to make some announcements pertaining to the health care initiative.

At the request of Provost Leathers, Mrs. Lohrum informed the Senate that the Human Resources Department would be revisiting the issue of the medical health insurance plan. She was present before the Faculty Senate to clarify the procedures and wanted the Senate members to be informed and to be prepared to answer questions from their colleagues about the different approach that would be taken. Basically, over the next week or so letters from Provost Leathers would be going out to various faculty members, contract professionals, and staff employees asking them to participate in employee focus group meetings on the issue of the medical piece of our group health care plan. Mrs. Lohrum introduced Mr. Steve Likovich, the senior manager from the consulting firm of KPMG Peat Marwick, who had been working with the University's plan for three or four years now. Mr. Likovich would review the steps involved in the program.

Mr. Likovich expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to appear before the Senate. He would present a brief overview of the process that would take place over the next couple of months (February and March) concerning the focus group meetings with group health initiative. Rather than review the entire program conducted at each of these meetings, Mr. Likovich would highlight what would be involved. Mrs. Lohrum would hand out a sample of a survey tool used as part of that meeting process so Senators would have a sense of that as well. A total of 10 meetings would occur over the course of approximately the next month. Mr. Likovich stated that each meeting would have 20 or 25 people participating in them, assuming people would accept the invitation to participate.

To prepare the sample, 260 names had been randomly selected from the total list of all employees at the University to get 10-12% of the total population of members of the University involved. Within the sample, the demographics in terms of faculty, staff, and contract professionals was close to the University's composition overall. If 90% of those people who received the letters from Provost Leathers would participate, attendance at those meetings would be a little more than 10% of the full-time member population.

People who received letters would call Mrs. Lohrum's office to schedule a convenient time for one of the 10 planned meetings. However, times could be restrictive when it comes to scheduling

convenience. Therefore, to make sure that a similar good representation of the different mixes of employed demographics and characteristics would take part in each meeting, people should not give their letters to someone else if they cannot attend. If someone would attend who was not in the same percentage category, that would distort the sample. People should instead notify Mrs. Lohrum that they would not be able to participate. A replacement from the list of others who had the same characteristics would be selected to keep the sample the way it should be.

People not invited to participate in one of these meetings but who had opinions about the group health initiative should send written comments, e-mail or hard copies to Mrs. Lohrum. These findings would be incorporated into the final results. So there would be an opportunity for everybody to participate in some sense, but the element of control in the focus group process would make certain to maintain the mix and the meeting process.

Individual meetings, structured in three main phases, should run about an hour and a half. The first part would spend no more than 5 minutes on some overview issues regarding the medical benefit plan in terms of historical cost patterns over the last 3 years or so. This would include costs, distributions between the different plan options offered, who is enrolled in what, how many people have employee-only coverage vs. dependent, and how the plans are structured in terms of deductibles based on wages and earnings. This would give everyone a sense of how things operated today.

Review would also include the traditional indemnity plan and how that plan worked in terms of the providers, the number of providers, the distribution of providers, the fact that some providers were more favored than others, and the sense of how the plan was essentially operating in the marketplace.

Following the introductory process, participants would take about 15 to 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire that Mrs. Lohrum had already distributed to the members of the Senate. People would then comment on the questionnaires, basically to find out not only what people thought but why, giving just a little bit more than what a survey would do.

The survey questionnaire would contain four specific sections. The first section had asked for general information and participant demographics, finding out how long someone had been involved with the University, how many dependent children they had, what their current coverage ranges were, etc. Responses not discussed in the focus meeting would contain essentially private information not relevant to the process for purposes of discussion, but relevant in the context of final analysis in terms of correlations or patterns with regard to how people think.

The second section of the survey questionnaire would provide feedback or perceptions of current benefit plan arrangements that were in place today; the way the plan worked today; how people felt about it; how good it was, basically looking at a snapshot of the way things operated today. This section would not be part of the discussion process.

Discussion would focus on the third section, choosing between "A" and "B" options if two options were presented and what people preferred. Mr. Likovich would not assume that people would find an option better than what already exists or even one clearly better than the other. The choices would be difficult for many people who would probably look at them and say, "You're

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met yesterday to discuss a few matters and had heard a report from him regarding a meeting which he, Chairman Malhotra and Vice Chair Heinzerling had had with the Provost and Presidential Assistant Gigliotti on January 30. At that meeting a variety of subjects had been discussed relating to the planning and budgeting process, both short and long term. Some of these the Provost had already begun to initiate in the PBC and others he would be presenting shortly.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Graham Kelly reported that earlier in the week he had sent a letter listing those curriculum proposals that had matured without objection and had been approved by the Provost. He was supplementing that list with another today which contained additional proposals that had since matured and been approved (see **Appendix A** for both). Following the normal procedure, if there were no objections to these in the Senate today, they would be assumed to have been approved. There were a few on the list with editorial changes still on the Web, but he had not wanted to hold them up just for those editorial changes.

Since there were no questions, the Chairman thanked Associate Provost Kelly for informing the body.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - Senator Tim Norfolk, the Chair, reported that he had a set of four resolutions from the Committee to present to the body, and these were contained in a handout. These had been passed last Monday after much discussion over the last semester or so. He suggested that they be taken up one at a time, and the body agreed.

The first resolution read as follows: **"The athletics budget should be allowed to continue its slow growth provided that any additional funds to ensure that gender access/equity issues are addressed"**.

Senator Norfolk realized that this resolution might come as quite a surprise to those who knew of his opinions on athletics. The slow growth mentioned here referred to a 4-year plan that had been described by Athletic Director Bobinski. Last year he had asked for an additional \$750,000, which he had received. This year the request was to be for \$124,000, and next year it would be less again. This was a 4-year plan to build up the gender access issues. The Committee was recommending this resolution because the University was in the position of being stuck with the decisions that had been made some time ago. The move to Division 1A was essentially financially irrevocable. We either stopped competitive athletics at the University entirely which simply would not fly, or we stayed with what we had started. If we dropped down a division, we would lose money consistently. The MAC was good for our travel budget. If we were out of the MAC, we would have to be in some other independent conference. There was a lot more at stake than just travel money. We would also lose the opportunity to make the approximately \$800,000+ that were made in conference games this year for a savings of about five football scholarships and one football coach. We were also at an absolute minimum in the number of sports that we supported for Division 1A, so there was nothing to be done there. In fact, we were closing down the men's tennis team this year. We had to keep women's tennis for exactly the problems that we had had before. In conclusion, we were suffering the sins of what happened ten years ago. There was no way of backing out of it. He offered to answer any questions.

Since there was no discussion, the Senate voted its approval of the first resolution.

The second resolution read as follows: **"The faculty athletics representative should be placed on the Faculty Senate agenda at least once a year to make a report."**

In answer to a question from the Chairman, Senator Norfolk stated that this referred not to the Senate's Athletic Committee Chair but to the University's liaison to the NCAA, Mr. David Jamison. This was his official title. The Committee was suggesting this so that there would be improved communications between that end of the athletics program and this body. Some of the comments that he had heard from his colleagues about athletics had come about because of ignorance. From that perspective, it would be a good thing to ask the faculty athletics representative to make a short report to the Senate as to what the Athletics Department had done during the year.

After a brief discussion of the exact title of this position and a few friendly amendments by Senators Erickson and Rich, the final version of the resolution read, **"The report of the faculty representative to the NCAA should be placed on the Faculty Senate agenda at least once a year."** Since there was no further discussion, the body gave its approval.

The third resolution read as follows: **"The Faculty Senate should establish a subcommittee, formed in June 1998 and reporting to the Senate by May 1999, of representatives from Athletics, Admissions/Advising, Financial Aid, Office of Minority Affairs, and Developmental Programs to recommend a policy and plan of action, possibly modeled after the athletics support programs, to address the specific problems of all students who are at academic risk."**

Senator Norfolk explained that the rationale for this resolution was the fact that in the last five years the football coach and Mr. Bobinski with their recruiting tactics had done a very good job in helping student-athletes increase GPA's and increase graduation rates. If we could do it for the athletes, we could do it for the other 6,000-8,000 students on campus who had problems academically. Therefore, we had to look into this issue.

Senator Oller asked of what Faculty Senate committee this subcommittee would be a part.

Senator Norfolk replied that this was a good question and suggested that the Academic Policy and Calendar Committee would seem to be the best committee for it. However, perhaps the Senate would prefer that it report directly to the body. It was up to the Senate to decide.

President Ruebel wanted to congratulate the Athletics Committee and Senator Norfolk as its Chair on this resolution. However, he wondered what this subcommittee would do. He assumed that what the Athletics Department was doing was taking a very integral, individualized interest in these particular student-athletes to see that they were successful. By definition, this would be a part of the responsibility of a faculty member, and he did not know what a committee could do to see that this was done. We could do an awful lot as individual faculty members and advisers of students to see that this was done, but he would be very curious to see what you were going to do as a committee. He would hate to see the Senate establish another committee to report on something that was not being done.

Senator Norfolk responded that this had been exactly one of the issues discussed in the Committee. The problem was that in the Athletics Department they could make their students do things. The Committee was suggesting that we look at their model to make students who were in trouble and needed help get that help. This was why it had been proposed that the Office of Financial Aid be involved. If you could at least hold people's scholarships or loans over their heads in some way to make them go to class or to a math workshop, etc., then they had an increased chance at success. If we could do it for 500 student-athletes, we should be able to do it for a few thousand students.

The President said that he did not want this to become a discussion between just himself and Senator Norfolk, but as he reflected back on his days as a student, individuals who had helped him the most by guiding in the right direction had been individual faculty members, not a committee of faculty.

Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh thought that this was why the resolution asked the subcommittee to recommend a policy and a plan of action. The subcommittee would be coming up with suggestions on how we could go to faculty members to help these students succeed like the Athletics Department was helping the student-athletes.

Senator John Hebert said that there was a vast difference between the way things were looked at. He had had the privilege of being a visiting professor to the United States Naval Academy. His job there had been to make sure that each and every student in his class knew enough to pass that class. So it had been his job to identify and help those students who were at risk. He did not feel that pressure here at all. The Committee had been impressed by what athletics had done in terms of the way it had recruited, the way it had identified students at risk and what they were doing for them. They had made a vast improvement in the last few years, and this would be a good thing to bring to the whole University.

Senator Lindgren Chyi had two questions for Senator Norfolk. Why in the proposed membership list of involved offices or units for the subcommittee had academic faculty not been mentioned and how did one define academic risk?

Senator Norfolk replied that in regard to membership it had not been the Committee's intention to exclude anyone. Any faculty member who wished to serve on such a committee could contact the Senate office, and the Executive Committee would probably be more than happy to add the individual. As to the definition of academic risk, certainly students on probation would be one example. Also, students who came in with insufficient math scores, students who had not tested well on incoming placement tests, conditional admits - these were all examples of at-risk students. We could identify those people, but we also tested people quite extensively when they first came here, and once they had been here a couple of semesters we had a better idea as to whether they were likely to succeed or not. He had had a student who had been full-time since 1986 who might or might not have graduated in the last few years. We had some outstanding achievers of that nature, but by and large students came here and left after the first year. We needed to identify those and the ones that we could help the most.

Senator Oller wanted to know whether the Committee had actually talked to any of the groups listed in the proposal to find out whether they were already involved in efforts to do exactly what was

covered had been very au courant for people at The University of Akron. One issue had dealt with the touchy business of choosing university presidents and the dangers of trustees taking things entirely into their hands. The most recent issue of the journal was also alarming to the retired. It told about the alarming erosion of our tenure system, the dangers and challenges of using too many part-time faculty, and too many term appointments. This issue related to the entire configuration of the academic world that members of the body still lived in and from which he had escaped. Of course, the basic issue came down to money. Will we have enough to hire more full-time faculty and so on? There was a full run of AAUP journals in the Faculty Senate office because he had contributed them when he had retired. If one joined the association, one would find all kinds of interesting information. In the issue which he was holding, there was a statement made on the use of part-time faculty which had been worked out at a conference attending by representatives from the American Historical Association, The Organization of American Historians, the American Mathematical Society, the American Philosophical Association, the American Science Association, the National Council of Teachers in English and the Community College Humanities Association, quite a wide-spread group. Even as a retiree, he found the issues raised very interesting but also alarming. He concluded by telling his colleagues that they were all in danger, and if they needed to find out how to subscribe to *Academe*, they could go to the Faculty Senate office and get that information.

Senator Virginia Gunn said she knew that the President did not want to speak on the topic of the presidential search, but she was one of the faculty representatives to the Advisory Committee for the Presidential Search, and they had not heard anything more than the rest of the campus had. They too had received the letter which stated that the team with which they had met before Christmas was no longer in place. It seemed to her that something should be happening that we should probably be aware of. Plus, we had been written up in the *Northern Ohio Live* magazine.

The Chairman responded that the only thing he knew in addition to what Senator Gunn had been saying was that in the minutes of the Board Meeting of December 12 he had noticed that the Board had passed a resolution which had asked the Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Counsel Mallo, and the Purchasing Department to look at other firms and send out requests for proposals. He had been told that requests for proposals were out, but what had happened beyond that he did not know.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. This was moved and seconded. The Senate gave its approval, and the meeting ended at 4:17 p.m.

APPENDIX A**Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost**

Akron, OH 44325-4703

(330) 972-7593 Office

(330) 972-8699 Fax

Date: February 2, 1998

To: Faculty Senate

From: Dr. S. Graham Kelly, Associate Provost

Subject: Curriculum Proposals

The following proposals have matured without objection and have been approved by the provost. Unless Faculty Senate acts otherwise at its meeting of February 5, 1998 these proposals will be approved.

AS-98-10A	BA-98-10	ED-98-05	FAA-98-14
AS-98-14	BA-98-11	ED-98-15	FAA-98-15
AS-98-18	BA-98-12	ED-98-17	FAA-98-16
AS-98-19	BA-98-13	ED-98-33	FAA-98-17
AS-98-23	BA-98-14	ED-98-34	FAA-98-18
AS-98-25	BA-98-15	ED-98-35	FAA-98-19
AS-98-27	BA-98-16	ED-98-36	FAA-98-20
AS-98-30	BA-98-17	ED-98-38	FAA-98-21
AS-98-31	BA-98-18		FAA-98-22
AS-98-38	BA-98-19	EN-98-02	FAA-98-24
AS-98-39	BA-98-21	EN-98-03	FAA-98-25
AS-98-41	BA-98-24		FAA-98-26
AS-98-42	BA-98-25	FAA-98-01	FAA-98-27
AS-98-43		FAA-98-02	FAA-98-28
AS-98-44	CT-98-04	FAA-98-04	FAA-98-29
AS-98-45	CT-98-06	FAA-98-05	FAA-98-30
AS-98-46	CT-98-06B	FAA-98-06	FAA-98-31
AS-98-48	CT-98-07	FAA-98-07	FAA-98-32
AS-98-49	CT-98-08	FAA-98-08	FAA-98-33
AS-98-50	CT-98-09	FAA-98-09	
AS-98-58	CT-98-11	FAA-98-10	WC-98-01
	CT-98-12	FAA-98-13	WC-98-02
	CT-98-16		



Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

Akron, OH 44325-4703

(330) 972-7593 Office

(330) 972-8699 Fax

February 5, 1998

To: Faculty Senate

From: S. Graham Kelly, Associate Provost

Subject: Additions to List of Curriculum Proposals to be Approved

The following curriculum proposals have matured without objection and have been approved by the Provost. Unless Faculty Senate acts otherwise this afternoon these proposals will be approved.

AS-98-24	ED-98-18	EN-97-15
AS-98-66A	ED-98-19	EN-98-22
AS-98-66B	ED-98-20	FAA-98-11
BA-98-20	ED-98-21	FAA-98-12
BA-98-22	ED-98-23	WC-98-03
BA-98-23	ED-98-24	
BA-98-26	ED-98-31	
BA-98-27	ED-98-32	
CT-98-1B	ED-98-37	
CT-98-1C	ED-98-44	
CT-98-1D	ED-98-45	
CT-98-1E	ED-98-51	
CT-98-1F	ED-98-56	
CT-98-1G	ED-98-57	
CT-98-1H	ED-97-58	
-CT-98-05	ED-97-59	
Ct-98-15	ED-97-60A	
ED-98-02	ED 98-61	
ED-98-03	ED-98-63	
ED-98-06	ED-98-64	
ED-98-08	ED-98-65	
ED-98-09	ED-98-66	
ED-98-10	ED-98-67	
ED-98-11	ED-98-68	
ED-98-12	EN-98-01	
ED-98-13	EN-98-04	
ED-98-14	EN-98-05	
ED-98-16	EN-98-06	