

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

3-4-1999

Faculty Senate Chronicle March 4, 1999

Heather M. Loughney
hl@uakron.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>
Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Recommended Citation

Loughney, Heather M.. "Faculty Senate Chronicle March 4, 1999." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 4 Mar 1999. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/436>

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



Corrected

1998-99, No. 7

March 4, 1999

18 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of March 4, 1999	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of March 4, 1999	12
A. List of UA student concerns	12
B. Report of <i>Academic Policies and Calendar Committee</i>	13
C. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	14
D. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	15
E. Report of <i>Student Affairs Committee</i>	16
F. Senate Bylaw change	18

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

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OF MARCH 4, 1999**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Barbara Heinzerling at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, March 4, 1999, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-nine of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Baldwin, Baranowski, Clark, Deckler, Filer-Tubaugh, Ritchey, and Smolen were absent with notice. Senators Bird, J.Buchanan, Lynn, Ofobike, Ozanich, Reed, and Wright were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **APPROVED A RECOMMENDATION FROM CFPC**
- * **APPROVED A FACULTY SENATE BYLAW CHANGE TO ALLOW NON-SENATORS TO CHAIR SENATE COMMITTEES**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chair asked that there be an amendment to re-order the agenda. She wished "announcements" placed as the second item in order to allow Dr. Devinder Malhotra and Dr. Jean Blosser to make an audiovisual presentation of about 15 minutes on the Carnegie Teaching Academy. This was moved by Senator Judy Fitzgerald and seconded by Senator Chand Midha. The body then voted its approval. The Chair also asked that the minutes of February 4 be added under "consideration of the minutes of December 3." This was moved by Senator Peggy Richards and seconded by Senator Mary Konkel. The Senate then approved this motion and the amended agenda.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chair announced that the University had recently lost two senior former faculty. The first was Miss Dorothy Hamlen, former Director of the University Libraries, who had passed away on January 15 at the age of 91. The Chair then read the following paragraph about Miss Hamlen who had given 35 years of service to this University: "She was a graduate of The University of Akron class of 1928, and she started to work in the Library in 1937 in what was called at that time the general college reading room. After working in both reference and circulation, she became the head of the Library in 1946, the post she held until her full retirement in 1972. Miss Hamlen was the president of the library section of the Ohio College Association and was also the president of the Summit County Library Association. She had quite an impact on the organization and service program of the University Library and was the first librarian to achieve the rank of full professor. She started university archives as well as "Friends of the Library," and represented this library at meetings in the 1950's in a library cooperation that would one day lead to the founding of the on-line computer library center, which today supplies the world with international bibliographic data base of over 40 million records. Miss Hamlen was also the person responsible for bringing the valuable Henry Seymour Collection of First Editions in Literature to the University Library."

C. Morris

The Chair stated that the second deceased faculty member was Professor Sam Spinak in the Music Department, who had retired in the 1970's after a long period of service. She asked the body to rise for a moment of recognition for these colleagues, which the Senate did.

The Chair then recognized Associate Provost Jean Blosser to make a presentation about the Carnegie Teaching Academy project.

Dr. Blosser reminded the body that the University had decided to pursue Carnegie Research II status as well as recognition as a Carnegie Teaching Academy. She and Dr. Malhotra were here today to tell the Senate what this initiative was all about. They had already been doing information sessions about it on campus for the past two weeks, and they wanted to talk about the goals of the initiative, how the steering committee had planned to pursue the initiative, and how faculty could be involved and gain benefit for themselves as well as the University.

The Master Teaching Academy initiative had begun with a few of the deans who had received some promotional materials discussing the program and who thought that this would be something good to consider. The initiative was being supported wholeheartedly by the Provost and the President. The underlying goals of this Carnegie Foundation project was to improve the quality of student learning and to elevate the status of teaching. They wanted to initiate campus conversations in order to underline the character of teaching as scholarly work, a concept not well understood not only by faculty but also by our students and constituents. It was scholarly work that was worthy of the time and attention of the faculty. All of this was being co-sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation, the American Association of Higher Education, and the Pew Scholars. The goal of the American Association of Higher Education was to have faculty and universities working together to develop tools and processes that could prompt greater attention to student learning and teaching, to promote the view of teaching as scholarly work, and to establish networks of faculty and universities on campuses across the country.

The University of Akron had declared its interest in being a part of this, and a steering committee had been formed which contained a representative core group of faculty members from each college. Most colleges had at least one representative, and some had 2 or 3, depending on the size of the college. This committee began to meet last December to talk about how to proceed. It had a retreat and set a goal of 150 faculty members at minimum to participate, which had already been reached. A new goal had been set for over 200 to declare their interests and to participate as ambassadors. Many of those faculty who had signed up wanted to know exactly what they were being asked to do. The initiative could take many different shapes or forms, but no matter what else, we needed to define the scholarship of teaching for our campus and our faculty. We also had to take stock of the campus conditions that either supported or subverted good teaching, and we needed to identify topics of importance for the campus and then pursue those as strategic initiatives in the future. This would work well with the strategic plan for the campus already being developed. Next year, the American Association of Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation would link campuses together that had similar projects, or they might link us with a campus that had already achieved what we wished to achieve, so that they could act in a mentoring role.

Dr. Blosser went on to say that this was all unfolding as a work in progress. There had already been some effort to define teaching as scholarly work, which was a good conversation starter. We wanted to see teaching as more than just a method or technique. It was selecting, organizing, and

transforming one's field of study in order to be engaged and understood by others. Like research, it was intellectual invention, and like research, it did contribute to the scholarly community. Often, there was a distinction made between research and teaching, and Lee S. Shulman, currently the President of the Carnegie Foundation, had done some writing on that subject to stimulate thinking. He indicated that research had some characteristics which included being very public, susceptible to critical review, and accessible for exchange and use by the scholarly community. Teaching, by contrast, was very private (limited to the teacher and the students in the room), rarely evaluated by professional peers in the same way research was, and was not used as a means of homage to build one's worth. These were issues that the teaching ambassadors could focus on. (How can we make it a little more public, how can we subject it to critical evaluation, and how can we make it usable to others?) Therefore, depending on the makeup and interest of the groups, the conversations could go in these directions and help us define those topics that we needed to pursue on this campus.

Time was a key factor here. She was glad to see that 150 people had signed up not knowing what they were getting into or how much the time commitment would be. The individual groups could decide that themselves, and there would be different forums for people to participate. Since there were already groups on campus dealing with these questions, the Carnegie teaching initiative could form an umbrella over some of these existing efforts. For example, the General Education Advisory Council might sponsor a meeting to talk about issues of teaching related to the General Education courses. The same could be done for Diversity and the Student Assessment Task Force. There could be guest speakers. She had been reading progress reports related to the teaching excellence grants that were funded in the past few years, and there were really exciting, dynamic things going on on campus. These could be showcased and presented at a day conference where we could all take a look at what these grants were supporting. She hoped that there would be department level conversations, and that the Faculty Senate would get involved.

Michael Johanyak in C&T had developed a web site for the project. She recommended visiting it. It had chat room capabilities. There were advantages to participating in this project. You would be helping to set the direction for the future of the University rather than having it set for you. You could expand your repertoire of teaching methods and techniques and exchange ideas with colleagues. She thought that one of the best things about this project had been meeting people from different colleges and hearing about how they went about teaching their discipline. There were forms which she would hand out to the Senators who were interested, and you could also register by email. From all of this, the University could let the community and the students know that we were focused on teaching.

There were 140 other universities already registered in this project. Some of these universities already had Research I and II status. One of the questions that she had often heard was why we were trying to pursue two goals. Why didn't we stick with just one, Research II? Yet there were universities that already had the research status and were pursuing this one as well. This was what was happening in higher education. It was not just one or the other, but it was a combined effort at the University. As President Proenza had said at various college meetings, service should be put in here too, as these were all things that we did. She concluded by asking for questions for either herself or Dr. Malhotra.

Professor George Prough asked what measures would determine whether or not we achieved the goals.

Associate Provost Blosser answered that that was a good question, but the Carnegie Foundation and the AAHE had not set measures. They wanted this to evolve in terms of specific measures. They were trying to avoid the process that they used for developing research measures, x number of dollars or whatever. In the spring, there would be an open meeting where many universities would be represented and talk about what they had been doing. She thought that Dean Frank Kelley had had the best idea by suggesting that we set the benchmark ourselves. Let's lead the pack and tell them what the criteria ought to be. She thought they would be looking for cultural change or the setting of major initiatives and their accomplishments. It might be different for different campuses. Some were looking at RTP procedures; some were looking at establishing support mechanisms for teaching. She did not think that Carnegie wanted to say that you must do this. They want to measure you against your own goals and how you accomplished them. Did they result in better student learning and elevating the status of teaching on your campus? This was why it was a faculty-driven effort.

Senator Konkol did not have a question, but she wanted to note that you did not have to be in the classroom full-time to be involved. Anyone could join; she had, and she was a librarian. Her primary job was not teaching in the classroom, but her work certainly supported the mission and she had been welcome to join the conversation. Even if you only taught one class, that should not stop you from participating.

III. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3 AND FEBRUARY 4 - Secretary Gary Oller said that he had no corrections to the minutes of December 3. The Chair asked for a motion to approve the minutes, and Senator Richards so moved and Senator Konkol seconded. The body then voted its approval.

Secretary Oller then said that he had no corrections to the minutes of Feb. 4. President Luis Proenza noted that on page 5, "Paul Kinkelman" should read "Paul Finkelman." Since there were no further corrections, the Chair asked for a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Senator Dollie Markovich so moved and Senator Stephen Aby seconded. The body then approved the amended minutes.

IV. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY - The Chair recognized President Proenza, who made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Madame Chair, ladies and gentlemen. It's good to be in your good company again. Since our last meeting I've had occasion to visit all of our academic colleges, but not all the departments, however, in particular the College of Arts & Sciences. In this regard, I'm going to ask Roger Creel to give me more time since I only had a chance to see three of the departments. But I am very pleased to have had a chance to get around to all of the colleges and begin to get a sense of the University as a whole.

I've also had a chance to begin to get to know our non-academic units and hope to have completed that cycle by the end of this month. To date, I've visited Athletics, Physical Facilities, and

Human Resources, and in each place I visit I continue to find great strength and a very committed faculty and staff, and for that I'm most grateful. There are indeed many hidden treasures throughout the University that we need to find a way to better celebrate and know about, so we will endeavor to better communicate that.

Let me just tell you a few things that have happened, many of which you're probably already aware of, but let me share some of them nonetheless. We have made some progress in beginning an overall campus planning effort. As I indicated at our last meeting, I'd begun by giving our deans and vice presidents and selected staff some homework. This has been now accompanied by two brief, one-hr. seminars conducted by George Prough, who I see is joining us here today. Assisting George have been Laurie Madden and Ramesh Vakamudi. We will be endeavoring to continue to get some of our senior staff on an equal footing and then gradually begin to expand this process so that it can be inclusive of our campus as a whole. In the meantime, our deans and department chairs have completed a draft of our master academic plan and Provost Leathers has circulated that to the campus community.

A facilities plan is now emerging that should then dovetail with the master physical facilities plan of Sasaki & Assoc. that should be available within the next month or so. Likewise, in order to appropriately enable us to see how we can develop the facilities that are being called for, Brian Davis and Hank Nettling have completed the first draft of a financing plan to enable us to see how we would meet our financial obligations over the next 3 to 5 years. That plan has been circulated briefly, and as it gains some more detail and background, we'll plan to share it with you as well.

We've made some significant advances in some simple administrative procedures, and I'm pleased to note that the Board of Trustees has asked that the appropriate staff be thanked. They have noticed the progress that has been made and it has certainly made my life a lot easier, and I trust that some of you will find your lives also being made easier.

We've also begun laying the groundwork for a program of federal and state governmental relations. With regard to our goal of Carnegie II, I've mentioned to many of you as we visited that this would be something we needed to do in order to have the appropriate information and to interface our faculty and staff appropriately with the federal programs and the staff that run those programs. I'm happy to tell you that in that process the University has been asked to join the Council on Competitiveness in Washington. This is currently presided over by John Yochelson and is chaired by Bill Hambrecht of W.R. Hambrecht & Co., and their next meeting is the end of next week, which I will be attending.

I have no doubt continued to be interested in the intellectual property, conflict of interest policy, and on the 15th of March the colleague I indicated that I've asked to join with our staff and the Executive Committee of the Senate will be in town; and, hopefully, we'll make some good progress and understanding in both what we have to do and the range of options that are available to us in doing that well within the requirements of the law.

In addition, in terms of our availing ourselves of better information systems such as those that are being provided by our implementing the Peoplesoft modules, we have asked a very fine colleague in this area, Tom Gaylord, to visit our campus, and I understand from Provost Leathers that he arrived last night. Visits are going very well, and perhaps some of you have already met him. He's with us

through tomorrow afternoon I believe, and he'll be looking at our information systems and institutional research capability with an eye on informing us on how we can better do that.

I mentioned to you at our last meeting that the Board of Regents was conducting a survey of international students. That survey is continuing. We had a meeting of the Interuniversity Council with Board of Regents staff and found much to our concern that Regents staff needed considerable help in understanding how international students and international graduate students in particular figure within the institutions of Ohio's university system. That elaboration of the data is continuing. Suffice it to say that I was delighted to have my colleague from Ohio State present at that meeting. She happened to have all of the data for their campus, and between that and what little I knew about our data we communicated in very stern terms to the staff that their data was not an accurate reflection of what we had provided them and needed to be appropriately corrected. They have proved to be very receptive to our Council and so I'm pleased at least to know that they are not trying to pursue an agenda independent of our University's.

I'm sure you have seen that we are moving to significantly enhance our commencement ceremonies. If you did not hear it, then let me just advise you that upon review with the staff and recognizing the need to make this a very significant experience for our campus and our students in particular, we have determined to move commencement to EJ Thomas. This will require some sacrifices on our part because three ceremonies will be required in order to accommodate all of our students into that space. Now that doesn't mean that you have to attend three ceremonies, but it does mean that I and Provost Leathers will be doing yeoman duty. One of my colleagues asked if I didn't think this was perhaps too much of a burden, and while I do recognize that it is, I had to confess and report that at my last institution I did 15 in one week, and that is not what we need to do, thank goodness. But I think EJ Thomas will provide an exceptionally fine environment for a quality ceremony with considerable dignity and indeed, class, if you will. I trust you will find that to be a very good change for the campus and invite your participation in the appropriate ceremony where your college is being featured.

Just so that the record will show it, there will be two ceremonies on Sat., May 15. The first one will include Fine & Applied Arts, Business Administration, and Polymer Science/Polymer Engineering beginning at 10:00 a.m. and will last approximately an hour and a half. So one of the things that happens is the ceremony is shortened. The second ceremony will commence at 2:30 p.m. and will include the College of Arts & Sciences, Wayne College, and the College of Nursing. The third ceremony will take place on Sun., May 16, at 2:00 p.m. and include the C&T College, Education, and Engineering. Again, I encourage all of you to participate in all of the individual ceremonies respective to your college.

Just a couple of last points - we are beginning to come to closure on a time schedule for the searches that will be required to replace those individuals that are either retiring in the ERIP process or who are in interim positions. Joe Walton will be assisting me, together with Kathy Watson and Jean Blosser in a preliminary process, and of course we'll be forming the appropriate search committees. I've asked the Trustees to approve in selected cases our engagement of an executive search firm, and I'll appraise you of how that proceeds as we move forward in that planning.

I'm pleased to report the continuing appointments of Deans Steve Hallam and Dick Aynes to, respectively, the College of Business Administration, and Law.

Next to the last, you are aware that we are coming to closure on the Mercer study for classification of our various personnel ranges and positions and so forth. We had a briefing this past Monday, and at the moment we've asked senior staff to do a reality check against the adjustments in titling and various kinds of elements that the Mercer Co. has done. Following that, we should be in a position to distribute this and discuss it and begin to implement some of the recommendations that will ensue from that.

Earlier this week I received the leadership committee from the Status of Women Committee. They have completed the report and have shared it with some. We will distribute this to the campus community later in the month or very early in April. I think we're trying to hit March 30 or 31, if possible. That committee makes some very important recommendations which we intend to take very, very seriously. It coincides very nicely with the completion of the Mercer study, and it coincides very nicely with the request that you've made to have an equity study, so that will come together as we move forward.

We met with the Executive Committee of the Senate yesterday, and we've asked that the Executive Committee work with selected staff to develop an appropriate committee with the requisite expertise to do what we need to do. I think as we move forward you'll not only understand the dimensions that we need to look at, but the fact that at the present time our data is very fragmentary, one of the very first things we need to do is get in process an approach to getting the data that we need so we can go forward from an informed position.

Lastly, Brian Mormino and his colleagues in the Student Government have been asking me to meet with several groups, and I've been pleased to do so. I met with the house of the Student Government Assoc. and heard from them a number of concerns that have tended to figure prominently among students. I'd like to read a couple and the rest can be entered into the record so that it can be shared more broadly. (See **Appendix A.**) Some of these elements should be no surprise. The students very much want the physical facilities to be improved on our campus; in particular, the Recreation Center that has been discussed for some time, and the Student Center. Students have concerns with parking, with food services, with academic advising, with orientation classes, with access to computer labs, with unpaid parking lots. Parking figures about 5 times here, but they're very seriously concerned also about tutoring, about diversity, and about something our society as a whole is concerned with; namely, the apathy of students and participation in student-run organizations and functions. With that, I'd be happy to entertain any questions, and thank you for your attention."

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Provost Noel Leathers said that he had no remarks.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met once last month to deal with a variety of items, including setting today's agenda. It also had met yesterday with President Proenza and Executive Assistant Walton to discuss matters of mutual interest.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Sheryl Stevenson, the Chair, stated that a report had been distributed to the body (**Appendix B**). Since the Committee would be bringing business to the body next month, she would make it short today and just suggest that members read the report - particularly the boldface side which was an item of information. It was not controversial and was something to take back to the departments and colleges.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Blosser, the Chair, said that she had submitted a report on the remainder of the curriculum proposals that the Committee had reviewed in February (**Appendix C**). She thought that there were still a few remaining to be reviewed in March, but this handled most of the proposals that had been submitted with the intention of implementing them in 1999. The Committee had done a very good job.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - Senator Tim Norfolk, the Chair, reported that the Committee had been meeting every month with the coaches and the academic support staff to determine what it could do to help them. It had discussed long-term plans including the long-term improvement plans for the physical facilities, which was part of the Sasaki plan, and thanks to being collared in the hallway several times, the Committee had been discussing the situation of the half-price tickets for those who were interested.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair, said that there was a written report (**Appendix D**), but there were a couple of important items. The Committee had met twice in the last month, reviewing the situation with respect to physical facilities, especially the energy conservation project which was involving the renovation of air handling facilities on campus. This was going to involve most buildings. Those involved in those buildings probably knew that the problems were greatest for Olin and Guzzetta. Since this report had been written, there had been some modifications of timing to try to take into account some of the problems which would exist if you had to shut down the whole building's air conditioning in the summer.

The Committee had also met with Mrs. Calderone on the hazardous materials facilities which this body had voted on last semester to review where they were on this. They were still trying to get that research support building. Hopefully, the city would accept their plans. On the other hand, changes for the ventilation at Knight Chemical were in process, and one thing which they asked the Committee to make Senators and faculty aware of was the issue of equipment, especially respirators. This was not a problem for the physical facilities staff who did meet the requirements, but it was a problem for the faculty that did not necessarily make sure that employers and employees were using the appropriate equipment. The Committee agreed that this was something it should be doing.

There was a small report from the subcommittee on Childcare facilities that were being developed by the Institute of Policy Studies. This needed to be extended to determine the needs for child care, and the Committee was looking at some of the alternatives with respect to Polsky's.

On February 26 the Committee met with the architectural team who were looking at the plans for the proposed Recreation Center, and not going with one model, but alternative models for a building on the site of Spicer. The Committee made sure it was not to be done on the basis of the Brailsford study, which the Senate had voted on record as not using an acceptable method to reach its conclusions. Most of the Committee members had been pleased to see that they were starting with a set of basic features rather than an all-inclusive Recreation Center. This was the first step, and the Committee thought that we should be differentiating our facility from that of KSU. They mentioned there was a possibility being explored on the concept of the Wellness Center and sports medicine component. All of these were explorations and first efforts.

The Committee had one action item which fit very much with what the President had just spoken about. The Committee had evaluated last semester priorities for proposed buildings, and its

report had been submitted to the Senate at the December meeting and to Sasaki, the Provost, and the President. Possible alternatives for funding included long-term borrowing, and given the role of PBC to examine a recommendation on budget issues including long-term capital budget, the Committee recommends the following: **That the Senate request the Planning and Budgeting Committee to consider the long-term capital funding plans for the proposed capital projects reported to the Senate by CFPC in December.**

Since this was a motion from the Committee, it did not require a second. There was no discussion, and the Senate voted its approval.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Rebecca Gibson, the Chair, stated that thanks to Dr. Proenza's explanation of graduation, her report would be short. (See Appendix E for full report.) She wanted to put out an appeal for individuals to serve as additional marshals for the three ceremonies. It was actually a pretty nice way to go to graduation. You did not have to sit, but you got to stand, which was actually more relaxing. There was also a need for people to announce graduates' names, so if you had a nice voice and were very good at pronouncing many various different types of names, she would like you to volunteer. If interested, please let her or Dr. Vukovich's office know.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Jesse Marquette reported that the Committee was working on the budget and had been meeting weekly. It had also dealt with two significant planning issues. One was to change the way in which we had been funding summer session schedules so that we did not have the situation recurring where classes were not offered that would fill because there was no budget. The Committee had reexamined that, and the proposal had been examined by the Council of Deans and just this morning by the Council of Associate and Assistant Deans. Therefore, the Committee should finalize that proposal next Monday.

For the C&T College right now, the Committee had been examining issues relating to an understanding that we did not have to charge the same tuition to every student that came to The University of Akron. This gave opportunities for the C&T College both to deal with its own problems internally and also to become more competitive with a number of schools in the area. With that in mind, the Committee had been examining the possibility of both altering the way in which the C&T tuition occurred and taking advantage of the Board of Regents initiative in the access challenge funding. There were now access challenge monies that were provided by the Board of Regents to those types of 2-year schools that did succeed in holding tuition down. So the Committee had an extensive discussion of this issue with Dean Sam, and it would be proceeding with a series of recommendations from that discussion which would also be followed.

It was the Committee's intention to try and get a budget recommendation available in time for the April Board meeting and to again do contracts, as traditionally done. Given the wide variety of initiatives that were in place, Provost Leathers had instructed him to inform the body not to hold its breath. The Committee was going to do the very best it could, but it could not guarantee anything.

President Proenza wanted to add a point of information in regard to Senator Marquette's comments about the differential tuition possibilities. At the present time, our C&T College was apparently in a disadvantageous position in that University tuition was higher than that of other community colleges. There were several additional options available to us that he had asked Dean

Sam to explore, and he would certainly ask Senator Marquette and the PBC to do this as well. If we offered a particular set of quality programs, ignoring the price was not always the road to success. Secondly, he had informed them that there were at least three and probably several more universities that had that kind of programming go beyond the associate's degree and include 4-yr. and in some cases master's programs. In those places that had done so, they indeed had a premium paid and had students that were benefitting by frequently having 10, 20, or 30 job offers upon completion of their degrees. We would be looking at those options as well.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chair reminded the body that there was a motion on the table from last month which was a Senate Bylaw change. The appropriate 30 day waiting period had passed so that it was now time to take it up for discussion and/or approval. It was a change to Bylaw IIID regarding committee chairs (see **Appendix F**).

Senator Erickson asked to speak for the change. As Secretary Oller had indicated in his Executive Committee report last month, she had asked the Committee to consider bringing this to the Senate. For effective shared governance, we needed chairs prepared to be knowledgeable and proactive. The person on the committee with these characteristics might not be a Senator. Too often it seemed that a specific Senator was chosen as chair because no one else would serve when there was a non-Senator who had background and expertise. This point of view had come to her from experience over some years on a number of committees, especially the Libraries Committee and the CFPC. For example, on CFPC there were several dedicated members who were not Senators who were the most knowledgeable people about the campus that you could find. Yet none of them could be the chair of this committee. They were the ones who could ask the right questions; they were the ones who could be proactive, and she felt very strongly that it had not been effective for the committee that its chair had to be a Senator.

She certainly understood that we needed to have people who had the democratic process saying that you were elected and if you did not do a good job you could lose an election. Senators represented their college members, and, as committee chairs, they were doing the same. But, first of all, committee chairs were elected annually. Secondly, a majority of every committee had to be Senators. That was one of the requirements of the Bylaws, and she certainly did not think that should be changed. This meant that the Senators had the largest input into whether they thought the chair was being effective. Each year they could vote a person out if they did not think they were doing an appropriate job.

The other problem that came up in regard to this was that if this were changed, you would be having people coming to Senate who were not voting members of the body. This was the way it had been back in University Council days, when chairs of committees did not have to be elected members of the body. She herself had served as a committee chair in that status, and she had not minded coming to the University Council meeting in order to present her reports. It would be up to the elected members to take what she said seriously or not. She did not think making it an ex officio and non-voting member was going to be a problem.

Since there was no further discussion, the Chair reminded the body that passage of the amendment required 60% of all Senators voting. A show of hands was taken and there were no negative votes. The amendment carried.

March 4, 1999

Page 11

VI. NEW BUSINESS - There was none.

VII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - There was no discussion.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT - The Chair called for a motion to adjourn which was given and seconded. The body voted its approval and the meeting ended at 4:05 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quilla

March 4, 1999

Page 12



APPENDIX A

Associated Student Government

Gardner Student Center, 127
Akron, OH 44325-4606

(330) 972-7002 Office
(330) 972-6990 Fax

February 19, 1999

Dr. Luis M. Proenza
Office of the President
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325-4701

Dr. Proenza,

Per your request for student questions/issues/concerns, I have re-
find reoccurring themes. These themes are as follows:

1. Improving physical facilities-Simmons Hall, New Recrea
Student Center
2. Parking
3. Improve University food services
4. Academic advising
5. Quality of University orientation classes
6. Evaluations of professors uniformly and student access to the information
7. Course fee and course packet cost increases
8. Cost of using on-campus MAC machines
9. Increase use of ZIP ID cards (i.e. food service, laundry, etc.)
10. Twenty-four hour computer lab access
11. Increase computer lab facilities; either amount or effectiveness
12. Meeting the needs of commuter students
13. Unpaved parking lots
14. Parking costs for athletics and EJ Thomas Hall
15. Improve access to tutoring
16. Diversity
17. Student apathy

Thank you for your continued time and devotion to students. We appreciate your
concern and look forward to our meeting on February 22, 1999 for the House of
Representatives.

Sincerely,

Brian C. Mormino
ASG President

APPENDIX B**Report of the Academic Policy and Calendar Committee****4 March 1999**

APCC met on 24 February to discuss and revise a previously circulated draft of revisions to the "Curricular Changes" section of the Faculty Manual (3359-20-052). We will submit this document as a recommendation to the Senate for consideration at its April meeting. The document represents an attempt to update the Faculty Manual, so that the curriculum review procedures described there will reflect the Web-based review process that has been in place for some time and that was approved by Faculty Senate.

At the same meeting on February 24, APCC discussed and distributed work on a number of items that have been referred to us for consideration. These included (1) a proposal that the University should initiate efforts with other Ohio colleges and universities to move toward adopting a common calendar; (2) a proposal that the General Studies Advisory Council should be changed from its current status as a Provost's committee to being under the responsibility of Faculty Senate; and other items we plan to bring to the Senate's attention during its next two meetings.

Following a request from Professor Lynn Chyi, a member of APCC met with him to discuss a problem facing some departments with regard to university guidelines on promotion committees. The outcome of this meeting and subsequent discussions is the following statement from APCC:

It has been brought to the attention of APCC that, with the repeated implementation of ERIP, departments will be facing difficulties in obtaining the required three-member promotion committees, a situation that will surely become apparent with the RTP process beginning Fall 1999.

The Faculty Manual (3359-20-037-3-d) states: "If there are fewer than three appropriate faculty members in the department to form the appropriate committee, then rules to add committee members from outside the department will be formulated by the college faculty and included in the procedures of the college or school."

APCC brings this to the attention of all Senators and strongly urges that each department and/or college review its guidelines to be sure that this contingency is addressed.

APPENDIX C



Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

Akron, OH 44325-4703

(330) 972-7593 Office

(330) 972-8699 Fax

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

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

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

Proposals (New Program and Program Changes) approved by Provost

Proposal NO:	Proposal Type	Proposal Title			
Arts & Science					
AS-99-08	Program change	Joint Ph.D. program with Cleveland State University	Dept: PAUS		
AS-99-10	Program change	Additional reqmt for admission into the MA (psychology) program			
AS-99-16	Program change	Change in Pre-requisites in two courses (Psychology)			
AS-99-37	Program change	Addition of courses as Concentration Elective (Anthropology)			
AS-99-38	Program change	Change in admission requirements for the MPA			
Fine & Applied Arts					
FAA-99-23	New Program	Changes in the undergraduate Communication - Mass media major			
Nursing					
NU-99-04	Program change	Changes in requirements to meet the national standards			

Proposals (Course changes) approved by Provost

Arts & Science						
AS-99-05		AS-99-20		AS-99-30		AS-99-77
AS-99-06		AS-99-21		AS-99-31		AS-99-81
AS-99-09		AS-99-22		AS-99-44		AS-99-83
AS-99-12		AS-99-23		AS-99-45		AS-99-85
AS-99-13		AS-99-24		AS-99-52		AS-99-86
AS-99-14		AS-99-25		AS-99-59		AS-99-87
AS-99-15		AS-99-26		AS-99-61		AS-99-88
AS-99-17		AS-99-27		AS-99-67		AS-99-89
AS-99-18		AS-99-28		AS-99-71		AS-99-90
AS-99-19		AS-99-29		AS-99-76		AS-99-91
Engineering						
EN-99-06		EN-99-07		EN-99-12		EN-99-13
						EN-99-14

APPENDIX D**REPORT OF CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY SENATE
Thursday, March 4th, 1999**

CFPC has met twice since the last Senate meeting, on February 18th and February 26th, 1999.

At the February 18th meeting the Committee heard reports from the Assistant Vice President for Physical Facilities, Laurie Madden and from the Manager of Environmental Health and Safety, Coralyce Calderone.

The major issue concerning Physical Facilities is the Energy Conservation project, which involves necessary renovation of the air handling facilities in most buildings on campus. Much of the equipment is 25 years old or more. This renovation will for the most part take place this summer and Fall because it cannot be done when heating is required. Laurie Madden warned that some inconvenience would be caused, because air conditioning would need to be shut off during the work. In most buildings this would not be a major problem, because they had more than one air handler and could be worked on piece by piece. The problems would be greatest for Olin and Guzzetta Halls where there was only one handler in the building. Physical Facilities had met with the Deans and would meet with other academic officers to reduce the effects on services, especially teaching.

Mrs. Calderone reported on the situation relating to the Hazardous Materials facilities. The new Interim Research Support building had been reviewed twice by the city and approval was anticipated. The changes to Knight Chemistry were in process and should come in under budget. Mrs. Calderone also noted that a new computerized system would now allow for more effective tracking and inventory of materials. An important safety problem requiring faculty attention is the new standard for respiratory protection. Faculty need to understand that they are both employers and employees and must meet OSHA requirements for the use of respirators.

The Sub-Committee on Childcare presented a report of their on-going study of childcare facility needs. The Institute for Policy Studies had provided the results of the survey of faculty staff and students. Unfortunately the student sample used was a problem and further work was needed to identify the extent of needs. Exploration is continuing on the possibilities for an additional facility in Polsky's.

At the February 26th meeting, the Committee met with the architectural team who is working on plans for the proposed Recreation Center. They are developing alternative models in scale, scope and cost for a building on the site of Spicer. The Committee determined that the team was not basing their analysis on the Brailsford study, which the Senate had found not acceptable, but was working with the data from the Student Facilities Survey carried out by the Institute of Policy Studies. The team stated that they were starting from a basic set of features (gym, weights, aerobics, Wellness and student health, jogging track, and supplemental classrooms) rather than planning an all-encompassing recreation facility. Discussion took place on the need to plan for effective integration with the present facilities in JAR and the proposed Field House to avoid unnecessary duplication. We also suggested the need to differentiate the UA facility from that at KSU: a possibility being explored with Akron General and Summa is the concept of a Wellness center and sports medicine component.

ACTION ITEM

Last semester the Committee evaluated priorities for proposed buildings- those in the Campus Financing Plan and our additions. Our report was submitted to the Senate at the December meeting and to Sasaki, the Provost and the President. The full list of buildings is estimated to cost over \$150 million. Possible alternatives for funding some part of the list include long-term borrowing. Given that the role of PBC is to examine and recommend on budget issues, including long-term capital budgets, the Committee recommends the following: -

That the Senate request the Planning and Budget Committee to consider the long-term capital funding plans for the proposed capital projects reported to the Senate by CFPC in December.

Respectfully submitted


Elizabeth Erickson, CFPC Chair

APPENDIX E

REPORT OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
 Sub-Committee of Faculty Senate
 Meeting of February 19, 1999

PRESENT: T. Connell, R. Gibson, M. Konkol, D. Laconi, P. Linberger, D. McNutt,
 G. Stewart, T. Vukovich

ABSENT: T. Alexander, J. Buchanan, T. Jolly, B. Mormino

The meeting was convened at 11:00 AM in Polsky 192, Advising Conference Room, on February 19, 1999.

Approval of the agenda was moved by M. Konkol and seconded by T. Connell. The body then voted its approval.

Dr. Tom Vukovich, Associate Provost of Student Affairs presented his report. Topics included:

- **Spring, 1999 Commencement.**
 There will be three commencement ceremonies held the weekend of May 15-16, 1999 in E.J. Thomas Hall as follows:
 - May 15 AM The College of Fine & Applied Arts
 College of Business Administration
 College of Polymer Science & Polymer Engineering
 - May 15 PM Buchtel College of Arts & Science
 College of Nursing
 Wayne College
 - May 16 PM Community & Technical College
 College of Education
 College of Engineering
- **Undergraduate Admissions Policy.**
 The "proposed" changes in Undergraduate Admission applications deadlines ("A Pathway To Quality Service") were distributed to the committee. Early orientation, advising, and scheduling will produce more accurate and reliable enrollment data allowing academic departments to enhance management of course offerings. The proposal will be sent to the Vice President's.
- **New Student Organizations.**
 New student organizations recognized by ASG and the University include:
 - Akron Law Federalist Society (School of Law)
 - Alpha Phi Omega (Co-ed National Service Fraternity)
 - Society of Signers (Public Service, C & T College)
- **Associated Student Government.**
 A "draft" copy of the ASG Constitution was given to the committee for evaluation. The ASG will vote on the new constitution at their March meeting. The ASG compensation policy is being re-evaluated. Further information will be discussed at a later date.

Doug McNutt, Financial Aid director presented his report. Topics included:

- **Scholarships for Excellence.**
 A 63% increase in applications for the "Scholarships for Excellence" has been realized this year. The total list of candidates, totaling 443 applicants, demonstrates a quality student population. Advertising improvements are felt to be responsible for this growth. Fifty students will receive awards.

Doug McNutt, Financial Aid director presented his report. Topics included (cont):

- **PeopleSoft Software.**
Various departments will begin using the new People Soft software March 1, 1999.
- **Federal Freshman Awards.**
Those persons receiving federal freshman financial awards will be announced on April 15, 1999.
- **Student Employment.**
There are various types of student employment opportunities on our campus, however, many times students, faculty, and staff are unaware of the offerings and/or guidelines for proper utilization. The financial aid department will be offering "Supervisor Workshops" for faculty and staff that will introduce proper forms to be completed before hiring, procedures for attaining student employees, and supervision of student employees. Definitions of the various types of employment offerings (i.e., work study, graduate assistants) will be discussed. Faculty/staff should be reminded:
"Students need forms for jobs; not just word of mouth."
The financial aid department needs written job descriptions and written requests for positions. Faculty/staff should not just send students to financial aid with verbal requests.
- **Higher Education Act.**
The Higher Education act was recently approved with only a few changes. These changes will affect The University of Akron, however, because of the way the formula for campus-based aid is calculated which has been to our advantage in the past. Students should apply early, by March 1, 1999, in order to receive maximum financial assistance via the Work Study Program, Perkins Act, and Supplemental Grants.

GOOD OF THE ORDER

Volunteers are needed to serve as marshals and readers for commencement. All faculty and staff are encouraged to participate by calling Dr. Vukovich.

No additional concerns were addressed and the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 Noon.

Respectfully submitted by Senator Rebecca Gibson
Chair, Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee

APPENDIX F

Original Rule IIID of Faculty Senate Bylaws reads:

"In all cases the chairperson of the Senate subcommittees will be a member of the Senate unless otherwise noted."

The new Rule IIID would read:

"THE SENATE COMMITTEES SHALL YEARLY ELECT THEIR OWN CHAIRS, WHO, IF NOT ALREADY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE, SHALL BECOME EX OFFICIO, NON-VOTING MEMBERS."



1
1



1
1

