

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

3-26-1998

Faculty Senate Chronicle March 26, 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.



1997-98, No. 7

March 26 & April 2, 1998

36 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of March 26, 1998	1
Appendices to Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of March 26, 1998	
A. The Carnegie Foundation - Definitions	5
B. Planning and Budgeting Committee Report	8
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of April 2, 1998	11
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of April 2, 1998	
A. Report of <i>University Well Being Committee</i>	30
B. Report of <i>Academic Policies and Calendar Committee</i>	31
C. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	33
D. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	34
E. Report of <i>Research Faculty Projects Committee</i>	35

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Acting Secretary, Mrs. Peggy Richards (+1906).
FacultySenate@UAkron.Edu

Senator Lindgren Chyi stated that this year the Lord dispensed "El Nino dividends" to the mid-westerners. Did we have an idea how much savings this University acquired because of this warming trend and lack of snow and so on? He knew his family had saved a couple hundred dollars.

In response to the question, Provost Leathers said about \$600,000 had been set aside to pay utility bills. The normal bill should have been down 15-20%. Quite frankly, we would be stealing money from every account we have to achieve our goals.

Provost Leathers replied that the request of the colleges, academic units, and the technology group would exceed \$10 million; the 5% increase would mean another \$5 million; a million and a half into research would put us way up in the stratosphere someplace. We hoped we would pick up \$475,000 from the state; and, the tuition increase would be another 3 and a half. So there would be \$4 million new money and about \$15 million worth of requests. We had established our two priorities - one would be that we go with 5% on merit, and secondly that we would really go after the Research 2 target. It would be a monumental change in the focus of the University, but we could do it. We had gone through most of the budget very carefully. There would be a lot of things that could be handled with one-time money, and there would be some other things we could do to help meet the expenses. We could not do everything that everybody would want, but we could achieve our goals.

One Senator asked if there was a place where we could look at the criteria for Research 2 that we're shooting for? Was there anything outlined?

Provost Leathers responded that he would get the information directly from the Carnegie Foundation and make that available. (Appendix A)

III. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - Before moving on to the next item of business, Chairman Malhotra announced that Prof. Azmi Kaya, Professor Emeritus in the Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, had passed away a couple of months ago. The body stood for a moment of silence in his memory.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE REPORT - Senator Chand Midha then moved and the motion was seconded that the Senate go into Committee of the Whole as we had done in the past for the purposes of discussion.

Chairman Malhotra as a point of information informed the Senate that in the absence of Senator Heinzerling who was our Vice Chair, the Committee of the Whole would be chaired by Senator Richards, who was the Acting Secretary of the Senate in the absence of Gary Oller, who was in England.

There was no discussion on the motion, and the body unanimously voted its approval.

Senator Richards took the chair as the Senate resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the planning assumptions as presented by the Planning and Budgeting Committee. (See Appendix B.)

During Committee of the Whole Senator Jesse Marquette as Vice-Chair of the PBC, elaborated on the planning process that led to the final proposal and took questions and comments from the body.

March 26, 1998

Page 4

Although minutes are kept, they are not reported.

When the body came out of the Committee of the Whole, the Chairman returned to the chair, and reported that while in Committee of the Whole the body had made and passed a motion to accept the report of PBC. The Chairman then called for a vote on the recommendation.

There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously. (Appendix B)

V. ADJOURNMENT - The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. This was moved and seconded. The meeting ended at 4:05 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quinn

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

The 1994 Carnegie Classification includes all colleges and universities in the United States that are degree-granting and accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education.

Research Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees¹ each year. In addition, they receive annually \$40 million or more in federal support.²

Research Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees¹ each year. In addition, they receive annually between \$15.5 million and \$40 million in federal support.²

Doctoral Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at least 40 doctoral degrees¹ annually in five or more disciplines.³

Doctoral Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award annually at least ten doctoral degrees—in three or more disciplines—or 20 or more doctoral degrees in one or more disciplines.³

Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines.³

Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 20 or more master's degrees annually in one or more disciplines.³

Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award 40 percent or more of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields⁴ and are restrictive in admissions.

Baccalaureate Colleges II: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award less than 40 percent of their baccalaureate

degrees in liberal arts fields⁴ or are less restrictive in admissions.

Associate of Arts Colleges: These institutions offer associate of arts certificate or degree programs and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.⁵

Specialized Institutions: These institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate. At least 50 percent of the degrees awarded by these institutions are in a single discipline. Specialized institutions include:

Theological seminaries, Bible colleges and other institutions offering degrees in religion: This category includes institutions at which the primary purpose is to offer religious instruction or train members of the clergy.

Medical schools and medical centers: These institutions award most of their professional degrees in medicine. In some instances, their programs include other health professional schools, such as dentistry, pharmacy, or nursing.

Other separate health profession schools: Institutions in this category award most of their degrees in such fields as chiropractic, nursing, pharmacy, or podiatry.

Schools of engineering and technology: The institutions in this category award at least a bachelor's degree in programs limited almost exclusively to technical fields of study.

Schools of business and management: The schools in this category award most of their bachelor's or graduate degrees in business or business-related programs.

Schools of art, music, and design: Institutions in this category award most of their bachelor's or graduate degrees in art, music, design, architecture, or some combination of such fields.

Schools of law: The schools included in this category award most of their degrees in law. The list includes only institutions that are listed as separate campuses in the 1994 Higher Education Directory.

Teachers colleges: Institutions in this category award most of their bachelor's or graduate degrees in education or education-related fields.

Other specialized institutions: Institutions in this category include graduate centers, maritime academies, military institutes, and institutions that do not fit any other classification category.

Tribal colleges and universities: These colleges are, with few exceptions, tribally controlled and located on reservations. They are all members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

Notes on Definitions

1. Doctoral degrees include Doctor of Education, Doctor of Juridical Science, Doctor of Public Health, and the Ph.D. in any field.
2. Total federal obligation figures are available from the National Science Foundation's annual report called Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Nonprofit Institutions. The years used in averaging total federal obligations are 1989, 1990, and 1991.
3. Distinct disciplines are determined by the U.S. Department of Education's Classification of Instructional Programs 4-digit series.
4. The liberal arts disciplines include English language and literature, foreign languages, letters, liberal and general studies, life sciences, mathematics, philosophy and religion, physical sciences, psychology, social sciences, the visual and performing arts, area and ethnic studies, and multi- and interdisciplinary studies. The occupational and technical disciplines include agriculture, allied health, architecture, business and management, communications, conservation and natural resources, education, engineering, health sciences, home economics, law and legal studies, library and archival sciences, marketing and distribution, military sciences, protective services, public administration and services, and theology.
5. This group includes community, junior, and technical colleges.

 [Home](#)  [Publications](#)  [Book Index](#)

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
Planning and Budgeting Committee

Long-Term Planning Strategies

Over-Arching Goal:

- ♦ The University of Akron should pursue a plan to reach Research II classification by 2006 while continuing to improve undergraduate education.

Necessary Steps to Achieve This Goal:

- ♦ Provide support funding for research initiatives.
- ♦ Establish an enrollment target of 23,575 students by 2006.
- ♦ Increase faculty salaries to above the median of Ohio Category 1 institutions by 2006
- ♦ Create a Physical Plant that supports the academic mission by 2006.
- ♦ Restore operating budgets of academic departments.
- ♦ Continue to support the development of technology on campus.
- ♦ Improve faculty and staff morale by:
 - a. Professional Development
 - b. Salaries
 - c. Benefits
 - d. Environment

Revenue Assumptions

1. State of Ohio institutional subsidies will increase 1% from previous year.
2. Tuition increase of 6% for undergraduate, graduate, and law students.
3. Student enrollment will not decline more than 1% from 1997-98 actual numbers (514,000 SCH projected).
4. Establish a matriculation fee based on student status.

Expenditure Assumptions

1. Establishment of Research Development Fund of \$1.5 million.
2. Establish a merit-based salary pool of 5% overall for continuing faculty, part-time faculty, contract professionals, and all staff. Consider "set-aside" of some funds for implementation of completion of new Salary/Compensation Study in January, 1999.
3. Increase institution scholarship budget to reflect tuition increases.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
Planning and Budgeting Committee

FY 98-99 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

Planning Guidelines

1. There will be no new net positions. The ratio of faculty positions to non-faculty positions will not decline.
2. There will be a reallocation of one-time monies to:
 - a) reduce carryover funds throughout the entire campus; and
 - b) utilize these funds to make one-time purchases.
3. There will be a 10% shift in graduate student support funds to reflect enrollment patterns and programmatic quality and to expand particular doctoral programs.
4. Procedural rule changes will be made to improve processing of graduate student financial aid programs.
5. Review of all degree programs to ascertain:
 - a) numbers of degrees awarded per year;
 - b) enrollment patterns and performance for each course and section from 1994 through 1997-98;
 - c) faculty load assignments;
 - d) utilization of part-time faculty; and
 - e) assignments of graduate assistants.
6. Maintain present health benefits programs for 1998-99.

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OF APRIL 2, 1998**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:06 p.m. on Thursday, April 2, 1998, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-four of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Batur, Drummond, Dubick, Gibson, McGucken, Oller, Ozanich, Rasor-Greenhalgh, Rich, Turek, and Woodley were absent with notice. Senators J.Buchanan, DePaul, Johnston, Lynn, Redle, and Ross-Alaolmolki were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **APPROVED THE SEPARATION OF STATISTICS DIVISION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES**
- * **APPROVED THE NAME CHANGE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCES**
- * **APPROVED A CHANGE IN THE WORDING OF THE *GENERAL BULLETIN* TO REQUIRE STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ASSESSMENT TESTING**
- * **APPROVED THE REPORT OF THE FACULTY RESEARCH PROJECTS COMMITTEE WITH ONE AMENDMENT**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chairman asked for a motion to approve the agenda, which was made by Senator Chand Midha and seconded by Senator Timothy Norfolk. There were no additions or deletions. The body approved the agenda.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 5, 1998 - There were no corrections to the minutes, and they were approved by the Senate.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN - The Chairman noted that the budgetary guidelines that had been passed by the Senate at the Special Meeting of the Senate on March 26, had been transmitted to the President, and the President had referred them to the Board of Trustees. The Chairman had been an observer at the Board meeting and was happy to report that the Board had approved those budgetary guidelines. When Provost Leathers had shepherded the discussion in the open session, he had one point to mention, that that particular document had not only the approval of the Senate but also the Council of Deans, and he had cited it as an example of shared governance. Provost Leathers had been surprised that the Board had gone into a spontaneous ovation. The Chairman had also been very pleased at this response. One Board member had gone on record to say that he had attended the PBC meetings and had

also attended meetings of some other committees where he had seen faculty interact with each other and with the administration and he thought that all parties concerned had conducted themselves in a manner that was very deliberate, and the discussions had a very serious and substantial level and he had been very pleased by it. So in some sense the positive perception of the Board had been very encouraging.

But at the same time the Chairman hoped that the Board's positive perception would now move a step further and go into the area of the presidential search, and would seriously consider opening up the process where faculty would actively be involved in the search. The Board had also approved the hiring of a new firm for the presidential search.

The Planning and Budgeting Committee had its work cut out for itself; it had its planning assumptions now and would be meeting four times in the next 2 weeks to complete the budget. In order for us to consider the budget there would be a special meeting of the Senate on April 23; Senators should mark their calendars. A notice would be sent out, and at that point the only item on the agenda would be consideration of the budget. Hopefully, we would be able to send Senators the recommendations of PBC at least 4 to 5 days prior to the meeting.

Finally, the list of Spring 98 commencement candidates would be available in the Senate office for Senators' viewing.

IV. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - President Ruebel made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, will keep my remarks brief because it's warm in here. Whoever's in charge of the heat is doing a good job. Today I want to speak briefly about two items of action from Monday's Board meeting. First, as the Chairman indicated, Provost Leathers presented the progress report on the planning and budgeting process to the Trustees. Specifically, he gave an overview of the assumptions and guidelines being used by the Planning & Budgeting Committee to prepare for the 1998-99 budget. At the Provost's request the Board endorsed the use of these assumptions and guidelines. The proposed 98-99 budget should be presented to the Board of Trustees for their consideration and approval at their next meeting which is currently scheduled for May 6.

The employee classification system - the Board also approved the hiring of William M. Mercer, Inc. to assist the University in developing a new employee classification system. This system will affect contract professionals, unclassified exempt, non-exempt, and classified personnel. According to the contract, the firm must complete a job and salary classification study within the next 12 months. The goal of the study is to develop and update the salary grades and the job descriptions in an audit system. Very important to this is an audit system that will keep this updated. The study will include a review of salary equity for similarly situated males and females and whites and people of color. This study is important and probably long overdue, because most of you remember the Hayes Hill classification that we simply did not keep up to date as the institution should have, so we're going to go through this process.

I'm sure everyone knows that a review of all degree programs is now affirmed. This review was mandated by North Central in its recent reaccreditation of the University. We're taking a very deliberate and thorough look at the degree programs. This is not an exercise, but rather a serious examination of

how we sensibly can save and perhaps reassign some resources in the institution. The examination will include many quantitative as well as qualitative factors. The point I want to stress is that there will be no rash decisions made on simplistic criteria. In other words, we're going to look at this thing over a period of time and see where the important areas lie. Before any actions are taken, Provost Leathers and his staff will engage in discussions with deans and chairs of any programs that are affected. We must do this; it is long overdue, and our goal is to reinvigorate the University and this is the only way I think we can do this.

Finally, I'm glad to report that our architects are in the process of redesigning or designing the new academic building of Olin 2. They recently made a presentation to the vice presidents, and their concept is very exciting. The Facilities Committee of the Senate will be involved in this process. They're talking about the concept right now regarding what the building should be and what the total area should look like when it's completed. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report."

Senator Hebert stated he had been troubled by a couple of things that had happened on the campus lately, and one of them involved the fact that in our new budget planning we aspired to be Carnegie 2 Research; we would try to reach that designation. He believed that Dean Irving Miller of Engineering had been the champion of that cause on this campus. He did not see the connection with Carnegie 2 becoming a cornerstone of our planning and yet Dean Miller had been asked to resign or had resigned lately. He had asked his faculty advisor, a person on the Faculty Advisory Committee, to ask the President and it had not been done. He also knew that this would be a difficult thing to comment on, but asked whether the President would comment on that for us.

President Ruebel replied, "No, this would not be the proper forum." He would speak to the designation of Research 2 classification, but he would not speak to a personnel issue. Senator Hebert could speak with the President privately if he would like.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Acting Secretary Richards stated that the Executive Committee had met on March 11 to set the agenda for the April 2 meeting, and again on April 1 with President Ruebel and Presidential Asst. Dick Gigliotti to discuss matters of mutual concern. The Executive Committee had concluded that they did not fully understand the disparities of how the Workload Policy was implemented, but they did know that the policy appeared in the April 28, 1994, *Chronicle*.

THE UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Butler, in the absence of Senator Drummond, presented the report. The Committee had met on April 1 to discuss committee business. They had taken four actions which Senator Butler wished to present out of order for the purposes of discussion. (Appendix A)

No. 4 first - Dr. Suzanne MacDonald would serve as a liaison to the ad hoc committee of the Campus Facilities Planning Committee that would be looking into the issue of child care on campus. As reported earlier, the committee would be chaired by Senator Connie Murray.

There was no discussion on this item.

No. 3 - There had been a brief discussion of the concern of some people in the Computer Center over the location of a hazardous waste storage facility. University Well-Being had not been

involved in this decision. This had not been the first choice, to Senator Butler's understanding, for this location. The concerns had not been addressed adequately by University safety officers in some folks' opinions, and this issue would be looked into jointly by University Well-Being and Campus Facilities Planning Committees.

There was no discussion on this matter.

No. 1 - The charge to the committee related to the issue of smoking in Gardner Student Center. The committee received correspondence from a faculty member who was concerned about the effects of secondhand smoke and thought it was time that the committee address the issue again. The policy appeared in the *Faculty Manual*, but there had been changes in laws recently and before the committee could move forward, they would refer the issue to General Counsel for advice.

The Chairman then commented that the committee would seek more information and would report to us at a later date.

Senator Butler presented the last issue:

No. 2 - The health care issue was discussed at length, and generally the consensus was that University Well-Being has not been adequately involved in the planning or implementation of the focus groups. There has been insufficient feedback from Human Resources to the committee, and the committee has great concern that we're rapidly approaching the summer break and that decisions on health care will have to be delivered to campus early in October.

The Chairman asked whether this was also informational in nature.

Senator Butler stated there was a resolution.

The Chairman asked whether Senator Butler would state the motion of the committee, but it would not need a second because it comes from a committee. However, we would then have a discussion.

Senator Butler did not believe that there was a current resolution. The committee had referred to the resolution that had been passed at the September 18, 1997, meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The Chairman noted that as the resolution had been previously passed, it would not need further action.

Senator Butler said he agreed. The committee just wanted to inform the Senate that it was the wish of the Senate that University Well Being be involved in the process, and it was their opinion that it had not been involved.

Chairman Malhotra read the resolution from the report: **"We (the University Well Being Committee) also move that in the future, budgetary considerations involved in health care issues be taken up by the Planning and Budgeting Committee prior to submission to University Well Being Committee."**

The Chairman commented that the health care discussion has not yet reached the budgetary stage, so at this stage it would be the University Well Being Committee which would be consulted.

Senator Erickson asked for a matter of clarification. She knew the Senate had passed a resolution saying it should go through Budgeting & Planning, but did the committee want it to go to Well Being afterwards rather than before? She believed from what Senator Butler had said that the committee was interested in being involved in the whole process at the moment. Was that not so?

Senator Butler responded that the issue really was two-fold. As the committee reviewed the process the last time, it seemed as though the issue of changing the health care system at the University was brought to University Well Being with a dictate that x number of dollars had to be removed from the budget. The decision was made up front that the total dollars invested in health care would be reduced and the committee would basically have to implement that decision. It was the desire of the committee that that would be taken to the Planning & Budgeting Committee so that PBC could make the decision as to whether or not these dollars actually had to be cut from the budget.

The Chairman said he could shed some light on this controversy. The issue had come up here and had been discussed in the Executive Committee meeting with the President. The President had assured the Executive Committee that Human Resources had been directed that the University Well Being Committee should be informed at all stages. The Chairman suggested that it was time now, because of the fact that summer was fast approaching, to schedule a few meetings, get into the loop and get the discussions started. Had the committee Chair informed the committee that there would be such discussions?

Senator Butler noted the general concern was that the document had gone out for the focus groups. University Well Being had not seen nor approved that document before distribution. The committee was to be given feedback on how the focus groups had been going. The committee Chair had been contacted twice by Human Resources and had not received any contact after those two initial phone calls. That was not the level of involvement that the committee was seeking.

Chairman Malhotra stated that since this was informational it did not require a vote at this time, and hopefully, the committee Chair and Human Resources would work together and by the next meeting of the Senate some of these concerns would be allayed.

ACADEMIC POLICIES & CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Kimmell stated that there was a handout from the committee. The Academic Policies & Calendar Committee had three motions that it would advance to the floor. The first motion was that the Department of Mathematical Sciences be divided into two separate departments - that a Department of Statistics be created. There were 3 or 4 paragraphs that explained the rationale for this. These words came from the college in strong support of the recommendation. (Appendix B)

The motion is that there be a separation of the Statistics Division from the Department of Mathematical Sciences to form a new Department of Statistics.

The Chairman noted this was a motion from the committee. It would not need a second so it was open for discussion.

President Ruebel asked whether the department had looked at what this would do to the total number of graduates within the department.

The Chairman stated that Assoc. Dean David Buchthal would like to address the body. There were no objections to the request.

Assoc. Dean Buchthal responded that the Department of Math Sciences was made up of 4 divisions - math, applied math, computer sciences, and statistics. Their graduates were reported singly, not totally, in Dr. Marquette's analysis. The effect on the number of graduates in statistics would make no difference whether they would be in math sciences or out standing by themselves.

President Ruebel asked for further clarification.

Assoc. Dean Buchthal replied that it was akin to saying whether it would make a difference to the number of graduates in the College of Education if secondary and elementary would be separate or combined, and the total number of graduates from the College of Education would stay the same no matter where they came from. In terms of math sciences graduates, the total number of math science graduates would decline but they would not, because they would be listed as stat graduates rather than math science graduates. Did that help?

The Chairman then stated that Dean Roger Creel would also like to address the body. There were no objections.

Dean Creel commented that within the mathematical sciences department there was a division of math, applied math, computer sciences, and statistics, and in a sense it operated like a small college. There were division coordinators who had jobs that were somewhat parallel to department chairs. Splitting statistics out would have absolutely no effect on the number of degrees in math or in computer science. It probably would have the effect of increasing the number of degrees in statistics.

Senator Marquette called the question. There were no objections.

The motion carried unanimously.

Senator Kimmell directed the body's attention to the second motion.

We move to rename the Department of Mathematical Sciences to the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.

There was no discussion, and the motion carried unanimously.

The third motion read as follows:

We move that the statement on page 41 of the *General Bulletin* be revised, and the new statement should read as follows: The purpose of The University of Akron's student assessment program is to improve student growth in academic and social skills, students' services, and the quality of campus life. Most students will be involved in both voluntary and required assessment

activities. Participation in these activities will be monitored. Failure to comply with required activities will delay processing of the Degree Clearance Form.

Senator Kimmell reported that the committee vote had been 8 in favor and 1 opposed. There were 2 people on the committee that were not tickled about the idea of assessment, and the sanction of delaying degree clearance had a couple of folks on the committee not in favor of it. But the majority had been supportive, and as a result we brought the motion to the floor to help implement the process of assessment. The General Education Advisory Committee approved the following for inclusion on the Intercollegiate Transfer Form, and that addition would read:

Whether or not the students have completed the general education assessment required of them, whether it's required and completed or whether they're exempt.

Senator Gunn asked for clarification.

Senator Midha replied that for the last 8-10 years the North Central Assoc. had required institutions to give evidence that they had been assessing the student outcome, learning, whether they had or had not learned what they were supposed to have been taught. In that process, at orientation time a pre-test had been given to students just to find out their proficiency level in writing, reading, and math skills. We had been doing that for the last 3 years. Two years ago the General Education Advisory Committee had recommended giving the post-test after students had completed roughly 80% of the general education courses to see whether there was any value in it in the proficiency level. We had tried that approach for 2 years; we had requested that President Ruebel write a personal letter for the students, to give them \$15 gift certificates, and out of 671 students 27 students had appeared for the test. That was less than 5% participation.

The second time we had requested that Provost Leathers write a letter, and let me add that the first standard letter had been sent to the students' home addresses by President Ruebel. The second time we had tried to go the classroom approach, so Dr. Leathers had written a letter to the deans and the deans in turn had written a letter to the chairs, and the chairs in turn had forwarded that letter to the students in the classrooms. We had emphasized the importance of the test and had asked them to take the test again with the same incentive, and this time out of the 647 students 23 students had appeared for the test.

When the NCA team was here, we had told them how our assessment process was in place; that we had been trying to implement it, and that we would try to get some statement in the *Bulletin* so that students would be aware of it. It would not affect their grades; it would be for the improvement of all general education programs on this campus. So, we had to bring this procedure to the Senate for approval to require that the students take this test. Other institutions had done that; in fact, at a recent NCA meeting in Chicago, one of the schools, Western New Mexico University, had said failure to participate in these assessment activities could result in various consequences for the student until the requirement had been met. The consequences could include but would not be limited to restricting the students' enrollment in certain courses. The students enrolled in all courses for that semester would have a reduction in the course grade if they did not participate in required activities. One semester they had disenrolled 170 students who had refused to participate. They had re-sent the message, and the second time they had to disenroll only 3 students. Everyone had taken the test by the second semester.

We would not be going to that extreme. We would request that at the present time our *Bulletin* would include a statement that students would be expected to participate in these activities. We had spent money for tests and we had provided benefits, and it had not worked. We have worked with Academic Policies & Curriculum Committee through all the concerns that have been raised there, and we have worked with the General Education Advisory Committee. Dr. Tom Vukovich from the Students Affairs office was here today and we have worked with him and have tried to determine how we would educate our students through orientation. We would tell them that 2 or 3 years from now they would have to take this course test and why it would be important. We would also send enough notices in between to inform them that they would have to participate in this activity.

Senator Hebert asked if any research had been done on whether the fact that people forced to actually do things would have any adverse effects on the results and reliability on the test at all.

Senator Midha replied that there was always concern for that, and perhaps 10-20% of students would go and would write their names but would leave everything else blank; that would happen. Some things would, perhaps, need to be deleted. It would take some time to build a culture here; but this would be a start.

Senator Braun asked why the student assessment committee just did not mandate the testing.

Senator Midha responded that we were heading in that direction - requiring would be the same as mandating.

The Chairman asked whether it was fair to say that in requiring or mandating, it would be a matter of determining what length of the stick would be used.

Senator Heinzerling thought perhaps she was confused. If it was an assessment program, was it designed to assess or to improve, and if it was designed to assess, what kinds of social skills would be assessed? Or would we be trying to improve social skills?

The Chairman asked whether there was any objection for Dr. Vukovich to address the body, and there were no objections.

Dr. Vukovich said the intent was to make the statement broad enough so that we would not be talking about just the assessment program we had in place today. There could be many assessment instruments and things we would want to assess throughout the life of this program that would be important for improvement of these various areas. So we would assess perhaps social skills and students services. He did not exactly understand the question, but the intent would be to be able to have broad enough statements that assessment could take place all the way through this.

Senator Heinzerling asked whether Dr. Vukovich meant that he really wanted to assess, but not to improve? The result may be that you improve student services or something else, but the assessment itself....

Dr. Vukovich replied that the result could be both of those. It could be assessment of the service or results that could be used to improve those services and social skills.

Senator Midha added that the pre-test and the post-test had concerned academic achievement here. From time to time there had been surveys about student satisfaction: had students been satisfied with the shuttle service on the campus; had they been happy with Gardner Student Center, and how had they interacted; whether one group had met with another group only all the time or had they mingled with each other. If there was some correction that had to be made, we would try our best to do that. That was what his interpretation was, to see if we could improve anything in the social skills. Of course, Student Affairs knew more about this issue.

Senator Aby stated that that was just his point - there would actually be a number of components to the assessment, and Senator Midha just spoke to that.

Since there was no further discussion, the body voted. The motion carried with 3 abstentions.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Assoc. Provost Kelly had one proposal:

The following proposals have matured without objection and have been approved by the Provost. Unless Faculty Senate acts otherwise at its meeting of April 2, 1998, these proposals will be approved (CT-98-02 and CT-98-03). (Appendix C)

Senator Griffin asked whether the two proposals could be listed again.

Assoc. Provost Kelly replied that they were: CT-98-02 and CT-98-03 from the Community & Technical College, and the memo would be available for those who were interested afterwards.

Since there were no comments, the proposals were automatically passed.

Assoc. Provost Kelly did add a point of information. A look at the curriculum review proposal system would show proposal PR-98-01, which would be open for University-wide review. The proposal for Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies had come from three colleges, Fine & Applied Arts, College of Arts & Sciences, and the Community & Technical College. It had been posted on the Web and made available for University-wide review. The date on the Web for objections, April 8, should be April 15 because we had spring break in the middle. A meeting for the Curriculum Review Committee had been scheduled for April 21 specifically to discuss this proposal.

Assoc. Provost Kelly encouraged the body to look at the proposal on the Web. A few years ago there was a proposal for a similar type of degree before this body. It was not approved by the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee at that time or Faculty Senate. Some of the concerns expressed at the time had been addressed in the new proposal. He suggested again that Senators take the time to look at the proposal. A hard copy of the proposal could be requested from the Provost's office. Any comments or questions should be sent to him whether favorable or unfavorable. Those who did send comments would then be invited to speak before the Curriculum Review Committee on April 21.

The Chairman wanted to underscore one thing which Assoc. Provost Kelly had mentioned, and that was, if Senators needed a hard copy of any proposal which was under consideration, Senators could call Dr. Kelly's office and a hard copy would be sent to them.

Senator Kimmell requested the thread of the URL for location of the proposal.

Dr. Kelly responded that the proposal could be accessed in the following way: Click on Administration from the main Home page; click on Curricular Instructional Studies which would actually bring up Dr. Kelly's page; and, click on curriculum review data base from there.

The URL for this proposal is:

<http://www.uakron.edu/provost/proposal97/proposal-show.phtml?pnum=PR-98-01>

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Assoc. Provost Kelly also reported for Senator Drummond that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee had met on April 1, chaired by Dr. Drummond, and at the beginning of the meeting the committee had a discussion with Dr. Ed Wilson concerning campus planning. During that meeting Dr. Wilson had informed the committee that the city of Akron had expressed a willingness to permit the closing of Carroll and Union Streets through the campus and to restructure some other roads around the University. Such a development must now go through the City Planning Commission with appropriate hearings, but the concept of potential closing of the streets would make it possible for the future planning of the campus to go forward. CFPC had unanimously supported this concept. That was for information. The committee had also been given updates on several projects approved in the last capital budget and had been assured that several rumors, including those concerning the disposition of the Polsky Building had been just that, and that no decisions were ready to be made.

Senator Norfolk asked which bit of Carroll would be shut off - the whole thing?

Dr. Kelly replied, "basically the whole thing."

Senator Norfolk said the access to the parking decks would have to be rerouted as well and he was just trying to envision how we would get into a parking deck without a road.

Dr. Kelly responded that the plans from the planning office showed that there would be some turnarounds available to get into parking decks and other areas which would need access.

Senator Norfolk presumed there might be some improved access for the trucks trying to park at the Student Center as well.

Dr. Kelly said, "Yes, that had been discussed too - improved access to the loading dock at the Student Center." This portion of the report had been for informational purposes only. However, some items needed to be brought forth, and the three items were tied together so he would present them together. (Appendix D)

First of all, the assignment of Leigh Hall 102 which is currently a classroom, will be reallocated to the Department of Statistics for the purpose of relocating one of the two labs now located in Schrank Hall North. We had just heard the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee bring forth the motion to create the new Department of Statistics. Basically, the Department of Statistics would be housed in Leigh Hall, and what they would be doing here is bringing the two labs from Schrank Hall over to Leigh Hall. One of the labs would be housed in the basement of Leigh Hall, and they had some

problems with access, restructuring and so on, so it had been suggested that the second lab go in Leigh Hall 102. The reason for the additional request is the need for computer space and ADA accessibility.

Secondly, the assignment of Leigh Hall 103 to the English Language Institute to replace the lab that is now in Olin 372. The ELI lab was initially to be part of the move of that group to Carroll Hall, a move held up since the present occupant has been unable to move. The reallocation will provide sufficient space for the ELI labs and keep them close to the ELI offices being moved to Leigh Hall. Basically, ELI had already moved to Leigh Hall. This request would move their computer lab to Leigh Hall Room 103.

Third, the temporary assignment of Olin 372 to the Department of Economics for use as a computer lab. That room had been vacated in Olin by ELI. The lab will eventually be located next to department space when the History Department moves to the New Arts & Sciences building. The CFPC unanimously approved those three items with the following contingencies:

- 1) That the vacated rooms in SHN be used as general-purpose classrooms for Fall, 1998. We had heard from Registrar Gerri Hill that she would be able to relocate all classes displaced from Leigh Hall into these rooms in Schrank Hall for Fall, 1998.
- 2) The space that was previously approved for use by ELI in Carroll Hall be renovated into general-purpose classroom space during the Fall of 1998. Earlier this year, the Fall semester, CFPC had presented a proposal to Faculty Senate that was approved in which ELI was to move into the basement of Carroll Hall. The problem had been that the current occupant, Electronic Services, was still in the basement of Carroll Hall when it was necessary for ELI to move out of Olin Hall in advance of that space being ready, so it had since been approved that ELI move into Leigh Hall. Therefore, the basement of Carroll Hall had been unallocated, so the idea was then that the space in Carroll Hall that was currently unallocated would be converted into two general-purpose classrooms.
- 3) Third, that any temporary need for the rooms in SHN, presumably needed if Whitby Hall is renovated, be delayed until the Spring of 1999.

The Chairman remarked that this was a resolution as simple as the Camp David accord, but since it was a motion from the committee and did not need a second, it was open for discussion.

Senator Cheung said vis-a-vis the last contingency, while he did not know anything about renovating Whitby Hall he had resigned himself to the likelihood that he would retire from this University before Whitby was renovated in the true sense of the word. He had understood, unless he had been misinformed which was entirely possible, that some significant work would be done on Whitby Hall perhaps as soon as this summer, such as asbestos removal and doing away with the lovely internal waterfalls.

Dr. Kelly replied that Senator Cheung was correct.

Senator Cheung replied that if in fact that would take place this summer, might not that space be necessary to house Engineering while they would be tearing up the floor tile and doing the other things

he understands were part of the asbestos removal?

Dr. Kelly said it was his understanding that relocation would not be necessary during that time. Space would be available in Schrank Hall in the summer if it was necessary.

Senator Cheung inquired whether this would in any way delay not renovation, but the patchwork that was planned.

Dr. Kelly said this renovation he was talking about was in addition to that.

Senator Cheung remarked that there were some things rather urgently needed in Whitby Hall that maybe would not be called renovation but would need to be done this summer.

Dr. Kelly said those matters would be taken care of this summer.

There was no further discussion. The motion was carried unanimously.

PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Marquette said that the President and the Chair had stolen his thunder - the Board had approved what we had recommended last week, and PBC would be meeting four times in the next two weeks to put the budget together.

The Chair added that the Board of Trustees had made two modifications to the report we had approved. The first was to change the wording in the "Over-Arching Goal" from **The University should pursue a plan to reach Research II classification by 2006 while continuing to improve undergraduate education, to: The University should pursue a plan to reach Research II classification by 2006 AND CONTINUE TO IMPROVE undergraduate education.**

Senator Marquette explained that the second change was under "Expenditure Assumptions." The proviso was that it be put in **up to 5%**. So, the new wording would be: **Establish a merit-based salary pool of UP TO 5% overall for continuing faculty, part-time faculty, contract professionals, and all staff.** The understanding was that it would be 5%. The Board just wanted to be sure that the wording was clear, that there would have to be a contingency if the state of Ohio decides not to fund higher education this year.

Senator Norfolk asked when the decision by the state would be due on what would happen.

Senator Marquette said the decision by the state would probably be like waiting for the results of the May 5th vote which would determine whether or not the sales tax would go through. If it would pass, then we could expect at least relative flat funding for a couple of years.

Senator Norfolk asked whether we would be looking at the old standby of the same amount on the contract as last year.

Senator Marquette replied that hopefully that would not happen, because the vote of the Board of Trustees had been scheduled for May 6.

Senator Griffin wanted to know the amount of the other half of that if it did not go through.

Senator Marquette responded that he had had a brief conversation with one of the people from the Ohio Budget and Management Division at the subsidy consultation meeting during the past week. There was one horrifying graph that looked like Niagara Falls where they had shown a 15% cut. That would be if the sales tax failed and there was even a mild recession: we would be looking at a 15% real cut, not just a cut to our future increase, but a 15% decrease. That was sort of the "Frankenstein scenario" which he thought was being motivated to terrify everybody into voting for the tax, at least it would be to get us out to work for the tax vote. If the sales tax did not pass and there was no recession, then the scenario would basically be in the next couple of biennia we would be looking at flat support. If the sales tax was not passed and there was no recession, then obviously there would be some increases, but the state would not have any sense yet. There was one possibility - the State Treasurer said they expected to have an \$800 million surplus this year so if we could convince them to eat part of it to fund it, then it would also depend on whether or not the Supreme Court would choose to provoke a constitutional crisis if the legislature would fail to act. What would happen then? At this point we did not know what would be going on.

FACULTY RESEARCH PROJECTS COMMITTEE - Senator Tausig said he had three things to say prior to discussion on this motion. One was that the University Research Council was looking into more issues than just questions about moving the University to Research 2 status. So a number of recommendations would have to deal with intellectual property, and in an attempt to address some of the difficulties that, among others, faculty in the College of Engineering had been having in getting contracts signed. Secondly, this was not intended to be a comprehensive list of actions that the University should take in order to realize Carnegie level 2 research. For the most part, the Council had met without knowing that the University was going to endorse it and the Planning & Budgeting Committee was going to recommend that the University move to Research level 2; it was one of our recommendations. The third thing was that whatever was in this report was in fact only advisory to the Provost's office, and was certainly subject to modification and further discussion. (Appendix E)

Senator Norfolk had a question about the second bullet in Mark Auburn's report - the University Research Officer having authority over graduate studies. If we would endorse that, then would we have done something to the Dean of the Graduate School? He was not sure what it was, because right now the Dean of the Graduate School was on the Council of Deans reporting to the Provost and now we would be putting him to the side somehow.

Senator Tausig said he was not sure the intent of the Council was to spell out exactly what the fate of the Graduate Dean would be in this. What the Council was concerned with was that decisions about research have a very central, structural position within the University so that the interests of researchers had been considered by members.

Senator Norfolk would just like the point noted, that was all, so that we did not endorse something we did not believe in.

Senator Gunn was concerned about how the passage read - authority over graduate studies. While she thought research was extremely important, she did not think it was everything that should charge graduate students or studies. She thought the thing should be much more comprehensive than that, and she did not want the tail wagging the entire dog. It concerned her.

Senator Tausig reaffirmed that he had not thought the intent was to make the Graduate Dean an appendage of the University research effort. He believed the idea was that, in part, this would reproduce some of the authority structure that existed now, and he also thought there was a Provost's responsibility to provide this supervisory responsibility for the Graduate Dean. I think this was just an idea about merging on this.

Senator Erickson said hopefully this was the answer, that it was not arguably with authority over graduate students. That was even vaguer.

Senator Tausig said that it was certainly within our power to change that recommendation or to at least indicate to the Provost our concern about the implications of that recommendation.

Senator Midha added that if he was not wrong, about 4 or 5 years ago our late Dean Griffin was promoted to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and at that time we also had the Dean of the Graduate School. He thought we had had that setup before and they would probably be going in the same direction.

Senator Chyi had a comment on bullet 10 on the second page - the current formula for faculty summer compensation was $4.3M + 1.1H$ is less than or equal to 13. If we did not encourage research, then we should show some incentive right here; incentive works. If we could lower that 4.3 to 4.0, that would be a little better - was that part of the consideration or had that been debated?

Senator Tausig replied that the intent there was in fact to offer some additional incentive to researchers who would bring in employee grants with full indirect cost recovery, because what the first part of this would do in effect was allow us to fit two more weeks of pay into the entire calendar year to the benefit of researchers.

Senator Cheung said the only way for him to interpret that and come to a conclusion that there was an incentive here was if you had said that those two weeks would not be considered part of the summer compensation. But otherwise, if it would add up to 13, we would get the change in there, unless he was really mathematically deficient this afternoon.

The Chair replied that we use the word "challenged."

Senator Tausig asked whether the body would indulge Dean Creel, who had worked on the subcommittee that had drafted this recommendation for the University Research Council, as he would probably be much more aware of the technical aspects of how to get to 13.

There were no objections from the body.

Dean Creel explained that the idea was to try to produce some kind of adjustment to the calendar in order to allow people who would be capable of bringing in grant hours that would pay summer salaries to be able to get paid more. It was not a very simple issue, because if you used the formula $4.3M + 1.1H$ is less than or equal to 13, those who would be capable of bringing in grants could figure out how to maximize that formula. In doing so it would lead to 3.25 months pay; in fact, that pay would occur during the period from the end of commencement until May 31, the end of the 9-month contract. The original recommendation or proposal that had come out of engineering was to effect change to the

calendar to an 8-1/2 month contract. There was some concern that if it had gone to the Board of Trustees for a recommendation to change the 9-month contract to an 8-1/2 month contract they would say, "Fine, we'll reduce the salary accordingly." So it was thought that that was not a good thing to do. Instead, a recommendation had been made to say that researchers who could bring in money on grants could be paid from Monday after commencement until Fri. before the beginning of the Fall term, and then not change the formula as it applied to faculty who got paid by some combination of grants and teaching.

Senator Braun questioned what exactly was meant by full, indirect cost recovery.

Senator Tausig said he believed that would refer to grants that were based on federal dollars that would have the 47% indirect cost figure added to them.

Dean Creel believed that it could be interpreted as whatever the granting agency would normally pay in overhead.

Senator Braun wanted to confirm that the period of time was not of significance here, whether there was a quarter time recovery during the year, just whatever money was coming had to be 47% recovery.

Senator Chyi had a question about this guideline or whatever it was called - it was about interdisciplinary research projects. We had been more into interdisciplinary research projects or proposals, that would eventually result in some kind of joint occupations. The emphasis of research would vary quite a bit between individual departments, and the problem we could have would be a situation where we co-authored or shared a joint paper with engineers for instance, and his department's share might be \$50 where engineers might be \$500. Would we have anything to deal with that kind of situation?

Senator Tausig said we did not in this document. As he indicated, this was a set of recommendations that had been developed in fact without realizing that the University was going to move as quickly as it had to the Research 2 goal, and it in no way represented the complete blueprint for how we would get there, so those kinds of things would certainly need to be worked out in the future.

Senator Markovich said that as a staff person who had worked under the model that had been described with Clay Griffin and John Wodarski before that, when the Graduate Dean had reported to them as an entrance stop before the Provost, she believed that it appeared to not have been as effective as the current model that we had been using. It tended to diminish the position of the Graduate Dean within the University structure and also on the outside when they would go to other meetings in the state of Ohio. So, she would like to see that language taken out of the second bullet.

The Chair asked whether Senator Markovich had a friendly amendment.

Senator Markovich did offer a friendly amendment to strike the words "and arguably" and the words "graduate studies as well as" from the second bullet. The sentence would read: "Appoint a permanent University Research Officer, preferably at the level of Vice President with authority over research and technology transfer."

Senator Tausig agreed to accept the changes as a friendly amendment.

The Chair asked for any further comments or questions on the report as amended and presented to the body by Senator Tausig, Chair of the Faculty Research Projects Committee. The body was ready to vote on the endorsement of the report.

The report as amended was endorsed by the Senate.

V. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Midha said that he had been approached by several of the department chairs regarding the Senate-approved resolution that had passed in the last year or two that restricted department chairs from attending RTP meetings unless they had been invited. There had been comments that this resolution has caused some problem in some departments, and he would like to propose that perhaps rather than being invited, chairs could attend the meetings as observers. As an example he noted that we had some deans and vice presidents at today's Senate meeting, and when the necessity had arisen, they had been asked to speak up or comment with the permission of the body. Senator Midha then moved that chairs be allowed to attend RTP meetings as observers. Seconded by Senator Norfolk.

Senator Markovich asked whether she could make a friendly amendment that it would be chairs and school directors.

Senator Midha accepted.

The Chair stated the motion now was: **That chairs and school directors be allowed to attend RTP meetings as observers.**

Senator Cheung remarked that one disadvantage of the wording that had been selected was it would be entirely then at the option of the chair or director. Was that the intention?

Senator Midha replied that this was correct.

Senator Aby asked for clarification on the necessity of the motion. He wanted to know what problems had been created.

Senator Midha said although he had not experienced it in his own department, what had been conveyed was that the chair was just given a recommendation from the committee without knowing what had taken place in those meetings. He thought it had become difficult at times for chairs to be aware of all the discussion that had taken place at the RTP meetings.

Senator Aby asked if that had been the case, was it not possible then that the department chair and the committee could meet to further clarify what the committee had been thinking when they had made their decision? In other words, he wondered whether there was anything to preclude this kind of full discussion when it would be needed.

Senator Midha said he was conveying what had been told to him, and suggested that perhaps some of the chairs could clarify it.

Senator Gill spoke against the motion. When RTP committees met, faculty needed to feel free to do their job, which was to make an evaluation of their peer, if she had understood the motion

correctly; whereas, the department chair or director had another job which was also to evaluate that person. Those really should be two separate things, and if they ended up being in the same space at the same time, then it sometimes would end up being one thing.

Senator Marquette asked when the Senate had voted that chairs could not attend.

Senator Midha replied that it had been two years ago.

Senator Norfolk asked for a point of order before the vote had been taken. He asked if he was correct in thinking that if we did endorse this, then it would have to go to Reference. He wondered whether we would have to change something somewhere in the *Faculty Manual* in the course of this.

The Chair consulted with the Parliamentarian and informed the body that it could choose to report to the Reference Committee or transmit it straight on to the President as a proposed change to the *Faculty Manual*.

Senator Cheung moved that we refer the motion to the Reference Committee so that we may see the resulting changes in the *Faculty Manual*.

The Chair asked whether this was a motion now to substitute the original motion.

Senator Cheung replied that it was, and the motion was seconded by Senator Norfolk.

Senator Cheung believed that it would facilitate our discussion if we could see the actual effect on the *Faculty Manual* and what language was there now. There seemed to be some question.

Senator Griffin opposed the motion because he was very much in favor of the department heads being able to attend RTP meetings. He thought they needed the information. He also thought we could make the decision to recommend this change and put that into the *Faculty Manual* after it had been approved by the President or the Board or whatever. Then the Reference Committee could work out the details later.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted in favor of the motion to refer.

VI. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Gunn wanted to go on record that she had second thoughts about how fast we had published our budget assumptions last week. We would be moving onto a major task to a Research level 2 University. We needed to think carefully so that if we did this, everyone should be behind it, and we should not end up with a Division 1A football scenario. Those of us who are not in the hard sciences, people she had talked to in the College of Fine & Applied Arts, felt threatened, especially when you realized no net increase in faculty. No one could carry out that much research without more faculty doing research, and people felt in a threatened position. If they just happened to have someone retiring from a department with many majors, early retirement, they would not get the position back because they would not be in the hard sciences.

She thought that when moving to a great goal, it would be better to look at where everyone was coming from. She did not mean "look at" just in the sense of holding onto things that should be let go, but also to not let Russian roulette determine what position would go to research and what position would not.

The whole University should deliberate and should think calmly so that when we did want to go for a goal that would challenge us all, that we would all be in favor of it and we would not be sitting around picking on each other and having people feel very threatened and uneasy as we moved to the future.

She stated that this was an opinion that she felt among full-time faculty here, and that we did vote the last time on an issue that we were given as we walked in the room. She was one of those kind of intellectuals that liked to think about something overnight, and she had not had that piece of paper to think about. She did not know whether she would have voted the same way; she admitted she had voted that way but was not in favor of hurrying when a body should be deliberate.

The Chair stated that that information had been provided to Senate members, maybe not sufficiently in advance, but that information had been sent out 3 or 4 days before the meeting.

Senator Gunn replied that she had not received a copy, and the Chair remarked that that was possible.

Senator Marquette said he thought that everyone had the same concerns that Senator Gunn had. It was the expectation of the committee that over a reasonable period of time and it was going to be 3 or 4 years, that a rising tide would lift all boats. This was the one place where we could expect to find additional funding for the University as a whole. You would have to remember that the indirect cost recovery from research comes into the general fund, at least half of it, and the intention of the committee and the planning committees in the future would have to be to make reasoned decisions about what was happening here. It was not an intention to threaten anyone, any more than as the President had spoken at the beginning of the meeting about the degree review; the intention was not to threaten. But we have had to look carefully at the fact that we have limited resources and limited opportunities. We have had to make the best we could of them, and I think your representatives on the PBC have had to wrestle with these questions and would have to continue to wrestle with them, and nobody was looking to hammer anyone.

He did not think any recommendation that would come out of PBC for reallocation of positions was going to be done simply because there was an ERIP. The intention was to try to further the long-term goals of all the programs to improve quality. And you would have to remember that a big part of the discussion, and it was pressed by Dean Moore, was that not only would we go to Research 2, but we would continue to improve the quality of undergraduate education.

Those goals would not be incompatible, but they would be difficult. Neither the representation that had been made to the Senate, nor what we expected to do in the future had been done without due deliberation, and anything we would recommend to the Senate in the future we would expect to have that same kind of concern.

Senator Marquette had understood and shared Senator Gunn's concerns to a great extent that we would have to be careful about how we would do this, but it had not been a flip idea.

Senator Gunn replied she had not said it was, but when you were not in the very hard sciences and they talked about reallocation, she thought she had been very realistic about the amount of work it would take to do research and she was not opposed to it. But if there would be no new resources, it would have to come from somewhere and decisions would be made. And she thought that coming out of a traditionally feminine field knowing the history of the field which was her specialty, there was a realization that sometimes people had been targeted just because of that. That was just the way it was; that was "the facts of life."

Senator Heinzerling wanted to add two things to what Dr. Gunn had said - one with respect to the research thing; and, two with all of the discussion on merit. It had been her experience that very seldom did people look at input at this University. Frequently we had looked at output and only output, and tied in with that there had been rather significant unequal distribution of resources historically across the colleges. So one of the concerns she had was when they talked about research, to try to get all deans to look internally and try to do better resource allocation. That was assuming that everybody was starting at the same starting point and that was not true, and somewhere we needed to cast into these processes that we had to examine where people had started. We had not started from the same starting point. This was just a general point.

VII. ADJOURNMENT - The Chair called for a motion to adjourn, which was made by Senator Midha and seconded by Senator Norfolk. The meeting ended at 4:24 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin

APPENDIX A

**UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE - APRIL 2, 1998**

The UWBC met on April 1, 1998, to discuss committee business. The following actions were taken:

1. The charge to the committee related to the issue of smoking in Gardner Student Center was discussed. It was unanimously approved that we request the Office of General Counsel to determine if it is legal to permit smoking in Gardner Student Center and other campus buildings, and, if that permission is legal, does the University have any constraints that would limit authority of the University in banning smoking in any of those buildings.
2. The health-care issue was discussed at length with the comments essentially limited to the role that should be played by the UWBC in the process of reviewing potential plans. At the September 18, 1997 meeting of the Faculty Senate, the following resolution was passed:

"We (the University Well-Being Committee) also move that in the future, budgetary considerations involved in health-care issues be taken up by the Planning and Budgeting Committee prior to submission to University Well-Being Committee.

As a committee, we are not sure if the PBC has completed any consideration of budget implications surrounding the latest investigation of health insurance choices. We do know that the committee was not involved with or informed of the organization of the present study, we have not been consistently updated as to the progress of the study, and we do not know any details as to the extent or nature of our involvement after the data from the focus-group meetings has been compiled. The committee unanimously voted to inform the Senate of our present role, or non-role, in the process.

3. There was a brief discussion of the concern of some people in the Computer Center over the health hazard presented by the new hazardous waste building that is now being completed. The issue is being investigated.
4. Dr. Suzanne McDonald will serve as a liaison to the ad hoc committee of the CFPC that is looking into the issue of child care on campus.

APPENDIX B

The Academic Policies and Calendar Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the following motions:

- 1. Separate the Statistics Division from the Department of Mathematical Sciences to form a new Department of Statistics.**

This recommendation has the unanimous support of the faculty of the Division of Statistics which presently is one of four divisions in the Department of Mathematical Sciences (Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, Computer Science, Statistics).

The faculty of the Department of Mathematical Sciences voted very positively (22-4-1) for the recommendation, and it has very favorable support from Phillip Schmidt, Chair of the Department of Mathematical Sciences.

The additional visibility of a new department will enhance recruitment of outstanding faculty, especially in the critical fields of biostatistics and actuarial science. Establishment of a separate department, which will be the only department of its kind in northeast Ohio, should also promote cooperation with nearby universities and should enhance its role in the new Master of Public Health Program at NEOUCOM.

The only costs of establishing a separate department are a secretary, a stipend for a department chair, and the one-time costs of moving the department out of Ayer Hall and its Basic Statistics Labs out of Shrank Hall North. Adequate and good space for the department and its laboratories has been identified for the new department in Leigh Hall (this would also alleviate space problems in Ayer Hall). (Dr. Schmidt has agreed to reassign two offices to the Physics Department which would solve their immediate problem in its office complex.)

- 2. Rename the Department of Mathematical Sciences to the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.**

If the proposal for the Department of Statistics is approved, the Department of Mathematical Sciences recommends that a new name be established for the remaining members of the current department. By vote of 18-4 the Department recommends that the new name be the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.

The proposed new name is more accurate and descriptive and provides enhanced visibility for Computer Science.

3. **The statement given on Page 41 of the General Bulletin be revised, and the new statement should read as follows:**

The purpose of The University of Akron's student assessment program is to improve student growth in academic and social skills, students services, and the quality of campus life. Most students will be involved in both voluntary and required assessment activities. Participation in these activities will be monitored. Failure to comply with required activities will delay processing of the Degree Clearance Form.

To help implement the process, the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) has approved the following:

In the interest of assessing General Education, a line will be added to the Inter-Collegiate Transfer Form (ICT) which will read:

General Education Assessment:

☐ - Exempt ☐ - Required ☐ - Completed

April 2, 1998

Page 33

APPENDIX C



Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

Akron, OH 44325-4703

(330) 972-7593 Office

(330) 972-8699 Fax

Date: April 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 April 2, 1998 these proposals will be approved.

CT-98-02

CT-98-03

ald\curr98\fs842

APPENDIX D**CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE - APRIL 2, 1998**

The CFPC met on April 1, 1998, to discuss committee business.

A lengthy and productive discussion with Dr. Ed Wilson on campus planning comprised most of the meeting. One of the major items that has just come to light is the apparent willingness of the City of Akron to permit the closing of Carroll and Union Streets through the campus and the restructuring of some other roads around the University. Such a development must now go through the City Planning Commission with the attendant hearings, but the concept of the potential closing of these streets will make it possible for future planning of the campus to go forward. The CFPC unanimously supported this concept.

The committee was given updates on several projects approved in the last capital budget and we were assured that several rumors, including those concerning the disposition of the Polsky Building, were just that, and that no decisions were ready to be made.

Dr. Wilson will convey to the new Board of Trustees Committee on facilities planning the willingness of the CFPC to be involved in the planning process.

Three decisions on space allocation were approved and are forwarded to the senate for approval:

1. The assignment of Leigh Hall 102, currently a classroom, to the Department of Statistics for the purpose of relocating one of the two labs now located in Schrank Hall North. This is in addition to another lab being relocated to the basement of Leigh Hall that was noted in the CFPC report at the last Senate meeting. The reason for the additional request is the need for computer space and ADA accessibility.
2. The assignment of Leigh Hall 103 to the English Language Institute to replace the lab now in Olin 372. The ELI lab was initially to be part of the move of that group to Carroll Hall, a move held up since the present occupant has been unable to move. The reallocation will provide sufficient space for the ELI labs and keep them close to the ELI offices being moved to Leigh Hall.
3. The temporary assignment of Olin 372 to the Department of Economics for use as a computer lab. House Bill money has been allocated for the lab, but no space has been provided. The lab will eventually be located next to department space when the History Department moves to the new A&S building.

The CFPC unanimously approved the three items with the following contingencies:

1. That the vacated rooms in SHN be used as general-purpose classrooms for Fall, 1998.
2. That the space previously approved for use by ELI in Carroll Hall be renovated into general-purpose classroom space during the Fall of 1998.
3. That any temporary need for the rooms in SHN, presumably needed if Whiby Hall is renovated, be delayed to the Spring of 1999.

APPENDIX E

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

Akron, OH 44325-4703

(330) 977-7593 Office

(330) 972-8699 Fax

February 18, 1998

RE: *Summary Report of the University Research Council Task Force*
 FROM: Mark S. Auburn, Chair *MSA*
 Interim University Research Officer
 TO: Noel L. Leathers
 Interim Senior Vice President and Provost

The University Research Council Task Force urges you to adopt the following recommendations. The current ERIP program affords a profound opportunity to refine the culture of this institution. If the new faculty already here, and the new faculty yet to come, are acculturated to an institution whose aim is to become a Research II university, they will make it so. Accordingly, we urge you to announce frequently that The University of Akron will

- **Aspire to become a Carnegie Classification Research II university by 2006.**

Attaining this aspiration will require many associated efforts aimed at shifting the culture of the University and reallocating monies for that purpose. An early goal should be to

- **Appoint a permanent University Research Officer, preferably at the level of vice president and arguably with authority over graduate studies as well as research and technology transfer.**

One way to assure swifter negotiation with industrial sponsors of research is to

- **Vest authority in the President to negotiate intellectual property rights.**

The President may choose to delegate this authority to the Senior Vice President and Provost or to a vice-presidential level University Research Officer, recognizing that final authority always rests with the Board of Trustees to disapprove the President's recommendations.

Because University-wide support to aspire to Research II status requires economic initiatives both to support deans and to encourage the development of faculty to be active in research, we propose that the University

- **Establish a central University budget for equipment matching, travel, and other extraordinary research-development purposes in the amount of at least \$300,000 (\$100,000 new continuing money and present IDC monies);**
- **Fund permanently two ORSSP positions now on soft money, and add two new positions (and correct inequities) (\$190,000 in new money, with \$100,000 in current IDC available to be reallocated to the purposes immediately above or below);**

Summary URC Report

February 18, 1998

Page 2

- **Fund the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee at \$250,000 continuing;**
- **Create a summer salary program for research proposal development by new faculty (\$400,000 annually);**
- **Signal that colleges should reallocate funds to support college-based research-grant professionals, and provide financial incentives to them; and**
- **Signal that the preparation of a research grant proposal represents an intellectual activity which should be judged and counted in the retention, tenure, and promotion process.**

We have noted the opportunity presented by the retirement of many faculty and recruitment of many new faculty to reshape the culture of this institution. During our work we encountered a number of situations whose correction or implementation (explained at greater length in the full Interim Report) could aid us in aspiring to Research II status. We repeat them here as recommendations. We urge you to

- **Allow researchers on full-indirect-cost-bearing contracts to be paid from just after Commencement to the start of Fall Semester classes, but otherwise maintain the current formula for faculty summer compensation ($4.3M + 1.1H \leq 13$);**
- **Examine the use of thesis and/or independent study hours in graduate curricula and in summer compensation schemes;**
- **Cause to be reviewed the current standard research agreements; and**
- **Cause to be prepared a brochure explaining UA's positions on contractual research agreements.**

We emphasize that our recommendations require substantive if not complete adoption. If the first aspiration becomes our goal, then we must adopt the others. If we do not choose to aspire to Research II status, then the appointment of a permanent University Research Officer and the achievement of a mechanism to negotiate intellectual property will help the current enterprise; the addition of some of the monies proposed will always help; and the last five recommendations (which involve little or no new money) will help the present research atmosphere if not create a new culture.

Attached is the full text of our Interim Report.

Cc. Members, Enhanced University Research Council Task Force

